



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, 24 October 2023

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	3081
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 October 2023, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 October 2023	3081
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3081
Absence of Member	3081
PRIVILEGE	3081
Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	3081
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	3082
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Annual General Meeting	3082
School Group Tours	3082
PETITIONS	3082
TABLED PAPERS	3082
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3085
Bushfires	3085
Renewable Energy	3085
Satellite Hospitals	3086
Hayden, Hon. WG, AC	3086
Bushfires; Renewable Energy	3086
Brisbane City Council, Budget	3087
Renewable Energy	3088
Bushfires; Queensland Fire and Emergency Services	3089
Kindergarten	3089
Satellite Hospitals	3090
Renewable Energy, Training	3090
Manufacturing	3091
Renewable Energy, Transport	3092
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3093
Youth Crime	3093

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 24 October 2023

Youth Crime	3093
Energy and Jobs Plan	3094
Youth Crime	3095
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Priorities	3095
Youth Crime	3096
Housing.....	3096
Youth Crime	3097
Economy.....	3098
Youth Justice, Reforms.....	3098
Free Kindy.....	3099
Youth Crime	3100
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	3100
Energy and Jobs Plan	3100
Great Barrier Reef.....	3101
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Stronger laws for community safety'	3101
Health Infrastructure	3102
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Department of Health Strategic Plan 2021-2025: November 2022 Update'	3102
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Statement of the Queensland Government's objectives for the community'	3102
Corrective Services.....	3103
Housing.....	3103
Youth Crime	3104
Emergency Services, Personnel	3104
MOTION	3105
Business Program.....	3105
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	3106
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3106
ENERGY (RENEWABLE TRANSFORMATION AND JOBS) BILL	3107
Message from Governor	3107
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 24 October 2023, from Her Excellency the Governor, recommending the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023	3107
Introduction	3107
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023	3107
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023, explanatory notes.....	3107
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023, statement of compatibility with human rights	3107
First Reading	3115
Referral to Transport and Resources Committee.....	3116
PROPERTY LAW BILL	3116
Second Reading	3116
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Legal Affairs and Safety Committee: Report No. 45, 57th Parliament—Property Law Bill 2023, government response	3116
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated 2 September 2023, titled 'Housing affordability in Qld now worse than GFC, mining boom'	3120
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3123
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	3123
Liberal National Party, Performance	3125
Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games; Redlands Electorate, LNP Candidate	3126
Liberal National Party, Performance	3127
Home Ownership.....	3128
Freight Retail Discount Scheme.....	3129
Mental Health Services.....	3130
Central Queensland, Health Services	3131
Home Ownership.....	3132
Redland City Council	3133
PROPERTY LAW BILL	3134
Second Reading	3134
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the REIQ, dated 24 February 2023, titled 'Queensland real estate transaction reform bill comes under fire'	3146
ADJOURNMENT	3174
Scenic Rim Electorate, Bushfires.....	3174
Moreton Bay Says No to Violence March.....	3175
'The Right Priorities for Queensland's Future'	3175
Ipswich, Odour Issues	3176
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of electoral disclosure statements relating to donations made to the Liberal National Party by Cleanaway Pty Ltd, Nugrow Pty Ltd and BMI Group	3176
Dig Deep Competitive Boxing.....	3176
Nicklin Electorate, Events.....	3177
Youth Crime	3178
Ipswich Business Excellence Awards.....	3178
Biloela, Health Services	3179
Caloundra State High School, Performing Arts.....	3179
ATTENDANCE	3180

TUESDAY, 24 OCTOBER 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 BILLS



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

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

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

Date of Assent: 19 October 2023

A Bill for an Act to amend the Gas Supply Act 2003 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 for particular purposes

A Bill for an Act to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991, the Criminal Code, the Ombudsman Act 2001, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Summary Offences Act 2005 for particular purposes

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

Yours sincerely

Governor

19 October 2023

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 October 2023, from Her Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 October 2023 [[1726](#)].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Absence of Member



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have received advice from the member for Clayfield, Tim Nicholls MP, that he will be absent from this week's sitting of the House. The member's notification complies with standing order 263A.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House




Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 23 October 2023 I tabled a ruling regarding a matter of privilege relating to a complaint by the Manager of Opposition Business and member for Glass House alleging that the Assistant Minister for Energy and member for Bundamba deliberately misled the House on 24 August 2023 in statements made during a debate on a committee report. Also yesterday I tabled a ruling regarding a matter of privilege relating to a complaint by the member for Burnett alleging that the member for Bundaberg and the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Emergency Services, the member for Morayfield, deliberately misled the House on 19 and 20 April 2023 respectively.

I ruled that these 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 these matters under the standing orders they should do so immediately.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS


Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, Annual General Meeting

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I know that you look forward to this every year. Today is the annual general meeting of the Queensland branch of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your enthusiasm. I appreciate it. The meeting will commence in the Legislative Assembly chamber at approximately 1.05 pm.

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 Mackay North State School in the electorate of Mackay, Monto State School in the electorate of Callide, Strathpine State School in the electorate of Pine Rivers, Mountain Creek State High School in the electorate of Buderim and Cannon Hill Anglican College in the electorate of Bulimba.

PETITIONS

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

Biloela Hospital, Birthing Services

Mr Head, from 3,936 petitioners, requesting the House to return full birthing services to Biloela Hospital [\[1719\]](#) [\[1720\]](#).

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

Brookside Circuit Residential Area, Noise Barriers

Mr Crandon, from 332 petitioners, requesting the House to install noise amelioration barriers adjacent to the Brookside Circuit residential area, Exit 41 of the M1 [\[1721\]](#).

Coomera Springs Residential Area, Noise Barriers

Mr Crandon, from 686 petitioners, requesting the House to install noise amelioration barriers adjacent to the Coomera Springs residential area on the M1 [\[1722\]](#).

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

Victims of Crime, Compensation

2,223 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake a range of measures to ensure victims of crime are compensated for stolen or damaged vehicles [\[1723\]](#).

Redlands, 2032 Olympic Whitewater Stadium

2,574 petitioners, requesting the House to prevent the proposed land at Birkdale in Redland City be developed for the Brisbane 2032 Olympic Whitewater Stadium and designate the existing Penrith Whitewater Stadium as the 2032 Olympic Canoe Slalom venue [\[1724\]](#).

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—

13 October 2023—

[1666](#) Response from the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympic and Paralympic Games Infrastructure (Hon. Dr Miles), to a paper petition (3954-23) presented by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(3), and an ePetition (3910-23) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 307 and 1,516 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to refuse the Brisbane City Council's application to fast-track developments in the Kurilpa precinct

- [1667](#) Response from the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympic and Paralympic Games Infrastructure (Hon. Dr Miles), to an ePetition (3905-23) sponsored by the member for Surfers Paradise, Mr Langbroek, from 4,056 petitioners, requesting the House to support the Gold Coast's Marine Tourism industry on the Spit
- [1668](#) Response from the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement (Hon. de Brenni), to an ePetition (3925-23) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 1,384 petitioners, requesting the House to fix a set price for electricity and to ban or control day rates
- [1669](#) Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 35, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2022-23
- [1670](#) Community Support and Services Committee: Report No. 36, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 19 April and 22 August 2023
- [1671](#) Legal Affairs and Safety Committee: Report No. 45, 57th Parliament—Property Law Bill 2023, government response
- 16 October 2023—
- [1672](#) Response from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Communities (Hon. Furner), to an ePetition (3946-23) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4), from 724 petitioners, requesting the House to end the logging of Deongwar State Forest
- 17 October 2023—
- [1673](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 40, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 July 2023 and 22 August 2023
- [1674](#) Education and Care Services National Further Amendment Regulations 2023 made by the Education Ministers under sections 301 and 324 of the Education and Care Services National Law as applied by the law of the States and Territories
- [1675](#) Education and Care Services National Further Amendment Regulations 2023 made by the Education Ministers under sections 301 and 324 of the Education and Care Services National Law as applied by the law of the States and Territories, human rights certificate
- [1676](#) Education and Care Services National Amendment (Bassinets) Regulations 2023 made by the Education Ministers under sections 301 and 324 of the Education and Care Services National Law as applied by the law of the States and Territories
- [1677](#) Education and Care Services National Amendment (Bassinets) Regulations 2023 made by the Education Ministers under sections 301 and 324 of the Education and Care Services National Law as applied by the law of the States and Territories, human rights certificate
- [1678](#) Legal Affairs and Safety Committee: Report No. 57, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 14 June and 22 August 2023
- 19 October 2023—
- [1679](#) State Development and Regional Industries Committee: Report No. 46, 57th Parliament—Planning (Inclusionary Zoning Strategy) Amendment Bill 2023
- [1680](#) State Development and Regional Industries Committee: Report No. 47, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 14 June and 22 August 2023
- [1681](#) Education, Employment and Training Committee: Report No. 38, 57th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 9 June and 22 August 2023
- [1682](#) Education, Employment and Training Committee: Report No. 39, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2022-23
- 20 October 2023—
- [1683](#) Transport and Resources Committee: Report No. 41, 57th Parliament—Annual Report 2022-23
- [1684](#) National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2022-23
- 23 October 2023—
- [1685](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on trade and investment mission to Japan and Europe by the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment, Hon. Cameron Dick, 14-23 September 2023
- [1686](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Minister for Digital Services (Hon. Bailey) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the exemption from expiry of the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Standard 2010
- [1687](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Minister for Digital Services (Hon. Bailey) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the exemption from expiry of the Tow Truck Regulation 2009
- [1688](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works (Hon. de Brenni) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Electricity Regulation 2006 and the Gas Supply Regulation 2007
- [1689](#) National Electricity (South Australia) (Civil Penalties) Amendment Regulations 2023 (SA) which received Royal Assent on 6 July 2023
- [1690](#) National Energy Retail (Civil Penalties) Amendment Regulations 2023 (SA) which received Royal Assent on 6 July 2023
- [1691](#) National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014: National Energy Retail Amendment (Electricity Consumption Benchmarks) Rule 2023, No. 1
- [1692](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Housing (Hon. Scanlon) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Regulation 2009

- [1693](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games (Hon. Palaszczuk) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Integrity Regulation 2011
- [1694](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence (Hon. D'Ath) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities (Justice, Land and Other Matters) Regulation 2008, the Appeal Costs Fund Regulation 2010, the Associations Incorporations Regulation 1999, the Body Corporate and Community Management Regulation 2008, the Body Corporate and Community Management (Specified Two-lot Schemes Module) Regulation 2011, the Building Units and Group Titles Regulation 2008, the Casino Control Regulation 1999, the Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Regulation 1999, the Collections Regulation 2008, the Court Funds Regulation 2009, the Fair Trading (Code of Practice-Fitness Industry) Regulation 2003, the Fair Trading (Safety Standards) Regulation 2011, the Funeral Benefit Business Regulation 2010, the Gaming Machine Regulation 2002, the Information Privacy Regulation 2009, the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Regulation 1998, the Keno Regulation 2007, the Liquor (Approval of Adult Entertainment Code) Regulation 2002, the Liquor Regulation 2002, the Lotteries Regulation 2007, the Property Law Regulation 2013, the Right to Information Regulation 2009, the Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Regulation 2004, the Security Providers (Crowd Controller Code of Practice) Regulation 2008, the Security Providers Regulation 2008, the Security Providers (Security Firm Code of Practice) Regulation 2008, the Security Providers (Security Officer-Licensed Premises-Code of Practice) Regulation 2008, the Tourism Services (Code of Conduct for Inbound Tour Operators) Regulation 2003, the Tourism Services Regulation 2003, the Trust Accounts Regulation 1999, the Wagering Regulation 1999 and the Wine Industry Regulation 2009
- [1695](#) Office of the Work Health and Safety Prosecutor—Annual Report 2022-2023
- [1696](#) Ruling by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Hon. Curtis Pitt—Alleged contempt of Parliament by the Assistant Minister for Energy and Member for Bundamba
- [1697](#) Ruling by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, Hon. Curtis Pitt—Alleged contempt of Parliament by the Member for Bundaberg and the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Fire and Emergency Services and Member for Morayfield

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2022:

- [1698](#) Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 143
- [1699](#) Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 143, explanatory notes
- [1700](#) Industrial Relations and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 143, human rights certificate

Casino Control and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2022:

- [1701](#) Casino Control and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 144
- [1702](#) Casino Control and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 144, explanatory notes
- [1703](#) Casino Control and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 144, human rights certificate

Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2022:

- [1704](#) Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 145
- [1705](#) Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 145, explanatory notes
- [1706](#) Health Practitioner Regulation National Law and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2023, No. 145, human rights certificate

Health Ombudsman Act 2013, Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, Mental Health Act 2016, Public Health Act 2005, Radiation Safety Act 1999:

- [1707](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2023, No. 146
- [1708](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2023, No. 146, explanatory notes
- [1709](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2023, No. 146, human rights certificate

Environmental Protection Act 1994, Nature Conservation Act 1992:

- [1710](#) Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (K'gari) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 147
- [1711](#) Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (K'gari) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 147, explanatory notes
- [1712](#) Nature Conservation and Other Legislation (K'gari) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 147, human rights certificate

Nature Conservation Act 1992:

- [1713](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) (Apiary Areas) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 148

[1714](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) (Apiary Areas) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 148, explanatory notes

[1715](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) (Apiary Areas) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 148, human rights certificate

Petroleum Act 1923, Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004:

[1716](#) Petroleum and Gas (Safety) (Fee Unit Conversion) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 149

[1717](#) Petroleum and Gas (Safety) (Fee Unit Conversion) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 149, explanatory notes

[1718](#) Petroleum and Gas (Safety) (Fee Unit Conversion) Amendment Regulation 2023, No. 149, human rights certificate

MINISTERIAL PAPER


The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Resources (Hon. Stewart)—

[1725](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Resources (Hon. Stewart) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Aboriginal Land Regulation 2011, the Torres Strait Islander Land Regulation 2011, the Mineral Resources Regulation 2013 and the Vegetation Management Regulation 2012

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Bushfires


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.34 am): Once again Queenslanders are faced with the devastating impacts of bushfires. I am advised that a blaze in Tara escalated overnight, with further structures lost. Property damage assessments will occur when it is safe. A total of 49 people are in evacuation centres, with five taken to other accommodation.

I am informed that fire danger ratings are expected to ease today but they will likely increase over the next few days. We only have to look around us to see how dry conditions are. Fire weather warnings will likely be issued for parts of Western Queensland and interior parts of Queensland. In addition, severe thunderstorms with locally damaging winds and large hail could be possible around South-East Queensland during Thursday afternoon and evening.

We have more than a dozen contracted aircraft services operating this fire season. They have already accumulated thousands of hours of air time and conducted in excess of 6,000 water and fire retardant drops. Recognising that we face a protracted fire season, we have extended the existing contracted aerial firefighting capabilities beyond the usual late November finish.

I urge everyone not to take risks and to listen to the advice coming from our Fire and Emergency Services. Once again, I want to thank all of our fireies out there in our Rural Fire Service—everybody. They are doing an extraordinary job in very tough conditions. I think all members of this House would want to thank them for the great service they provide to try to keep people safe.

Renewable Energy

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.36 am): When I announced the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan I said that we needed to act and act in a world-leading way to revolutionise Queensland's energy grid, to secure jobs for the future and to address climate change and its effects. Today we forge ahead on that journey by introducing the laws that will guide our transition from coal-fired power to renewable energy in our state. We want to set in place our renewable energy targets of 50 per cent by 2030, 70 per cent by 2032 and 80 per cent by 2035 and secure 54 per cent majority public ownership for our generation assets and 100 per cent ownership of transmission assets and our world-leading Borumba and Pioneer-Burdekin pumped hydro projects. All of this is at risk under the LNP, who will still want to sell off our power assets and have only committed to maintenance. The bill will also legislate our job security guarantee. Our Energy Workers Charter is world leading and an Australian first, backed by \$150 million in funding. This is about setting up Queensland for the future.


Just last week I was with the Minister for Energy in Dulacca, near Miles on the Darling Downs, to open a new wind farm supported by CleanCo. Its 43 turbines will help power over 120,000 Queensland homes and it is connected now. Earlier this month I announced another new project: the 228-megawatt Boulder Creek Wind Farm, which will be 50 per cent owned by CS Energy. Today another project can be announced. CleanCo have started work on the first project out of a portfolio of 2.3 gigawatts of

renewable energy under development in partnership with Central Queensland Power. The proposed Moah Creek Wind Farm could potentially support 400 jobs during construction and power nearly 200,000 homes. The project will transition to public ownership on completion—built by Queenslanders and owned by Queenslanders.

We are delivering more renewable wind and solar farms because they place downward pressure on power prices. Just yesterday the Australian Energy Market Operator published a report showing Queensland had a 71 per cent drop in wholesale power prices, driven by a nation-leading increase in wind and solar energy. That included a 42 per cent increase in grid scale solar, up by 183 megawatts, and wind power output increasing 56 per cent, up by 128 megawatts.


Our Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan is delivering. Our government will not take our foot off the accelerator because renewable energy not only delivers cheaper energy but also, combining it with the world's largest pumped hydro storage, sets up our regions for the next century by delivering reliable, affordable and renewable power for manufacturing jobs supporting our regions. We can do this because we own our assets. This bill is all about continuing that into the future.

Satellite Hospitals

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.39 am): Our government said we would provide better health care closer to home, and that is exactly what we are doing. We are spending nearly \$10 billion on our health and hospital Big Build to do so: building three new hospitals; delivering 11 major hospital expansions, in places like Cairns, Townsville, Ipswich and Mackay; undertaking major redevelopments at Caboolture and Logan; and delivering extra beds at some of the busiest hospitals, like Gold Coast University Hospital and Princess Alexandra. Importantly, we are delivering an Australian-first satellite hospital program.

Three of our seven satellite hospitals are open and have already treated nearly 9,000 Queenslanders through the minor injury and illness clinics: 3,600 at Caboolture, 2,600 at Ripley and almost 2,000 at Redlands. The numbers are growing each week. Queenslanders are receiving free and quality care in their communities, without having to go to emergency departments. Since the Ripley and Redlands satellite hospitals came online there has been a significant drop in patients going to the Ipswich and Redland EDs. This is exactly why we built them. People can have the care that they need and the treatments they need closer to where they live.


Hayden, Hon. WG, AC

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games) (9.40 am): Australia lost a titan and the nation is the poorer with the passing on the weekend of our friend and giant of Australian politics Bill Hayden. For 27 years as the member for Oxley, as a minister in the Whitlam and Hawke cabinets, as opposition leader and, later, as governor-general, Bill was a champion of Queenslanders and all Australians. As many have said, Bill Hayden was probably the best prime minister Australia never had. As Prime Minister Anthony Albanese observed, Bill was noted for his humility, but there was nothing humble about his ambitions for the Labor Party and for Australia.

He was a man of true Labor values, who fought for equality and a fair go and oversaw some of the biggest social justice reforms the nation has seen. He was revered for introducing the single mother's pension and Australia's first universal health insurance scheme, Medibank—bold reforms that changed Australia and Australian lives forever. Bill Hayden sought and brought change because he cared. He cared for his community and he cared for his country. As a man of principle and integrity, he wanted no-one left behind and believed everyone should be treated equally and with respect.

The nation is richer for having had Bill Hayden and, as I said, is poorer for his passing. We will be forever grateful for his service. I am sure the House joins me in extending sympathies and support to his wife, Dallas, and the entire Hayden family.

Bushfires; Renewable Energy

 **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) (9.42 am): As the most disaster impacted state, Queensland is quick to act to support those impacted by disasters. I can advise the House that Queenslanders whose homes have been impacted by the Baffle Creek and Deepwater bushfires south of Gladstone can now apply for financial assistance to support them during this challenging period. Over the weekend, the Australian

and Queensland governments activated disaster recovery funding arrangements to provide practical assistance to those impacted. Our emergency services and officers from the Queensland Reconstruction Authority are on the ground and will continue to work with local government to provide further assistance to those in need.


The Palaszczuk government is committed to investing in new and emerging industries to secure our energy future. Our Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan is our government's blueprint for achieving decarbonisation and putting Queensland on the map as a global leader in renewable energy. Without a doubt, it is the most detailed energy plan of any government in Australia. It delivers the economic infrastructure that will set up our regions for future generations through supplying reliable, affordable and renewable energy. This plan is our path to more renewable energy in Queensland and the creation of more good, secure, local jobs. Regional Queensland is at the heart of that plan.

While in Gladstone last week I joined Minister Butcher to launch works for a new project that will be the first of its kind in Australia. Construction has started on the Australian Gas Infrastructure Group's Hydrogen Park Gladstone, known as HyP Gladstone. Throughout the region there is certainly a lot of hype about this project. It will be Australia's first city-wide supplier of a hydrogen blend into an existing gas network. It will deliver this renewable hydrogen into the city's gas network, servicing about 770 properties. The Hydrogen Park Gladstone project is expected to create new training, research and job opportunities for the whole region. Through our Hydrogen Industry Development Fund we are investing \$2.72 million into this groundbreaking project.

Queensland is the ideal location for a strong, green hydrogen industry because we have the manufacturing and skilled workforce and the resources the industry can grow from. That is why our government has committed more than \$165 million to support exciting renewable energy and hydrogen projects like Hydrogen Park Gladstone. Together with industry, we are building a stronger energy future for regional Queensland. This project is just another great example of how we are powering towards a cleaner, greener future and placing Queensland at the forefront of hydrogen production.

Today we will introduce legislation to take us further in our renewable energy transition and, importantly, safeguard our electricity assets. We will legislate our renewable energy target of 70 per cent by 2032 and 80 per cent by 2035, and we will ensure the majority of Queensland's power generation and 100 per cent of our poles, wires and transmission lines are publicly owned, because on this side of the House we think our energy assets should be owned by Queenslanders and deliver for Queenslanders. We will keep investing in projects to ensure Queensland is in the best possible position to capitalise on new industries and the renewable energy revolution.

Brisbane City Council, Budget

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.46 am): Last week Lord Mayor Adrian Schrinner announced his decision to impose \$400 million in savage budget cuts on the people of Brisbane. This decision is a hammer blow to confidence in our capital—the biggest economy in our state. These cuts are all the more damaging when we consider that the Lord Mayor brought down the Brisbane City Council budget less than five months ago. The Lord Mayor is already backsliding and breaking promises when his budget ink is yet to dry.

While our government is working hard to attract new investment, including in housing, all of our hard work is being undermined by a Brisbane City Council culture that see cuts as the only answer to every challenge. Our government has heard reports that casual employees are being sacked by the council. We see the bizarre situation where in August the Lord Mayor was bragging about cutting fees for property developers, winning plaudits from the development lobby, then less than two months later we see vulnerable council workers being shown the door due to a lack of funding.

That is what happens when you cut revenue to cater for your friends in big business: ordinary workers suffer the job cuts that inevitably result. Through these cuts Lord Mayor Schrinner is demonstrating that we cannot trust any commitment he makes, nor can we trust anyone who shares his values and his approach to budgeting. Lord Mayor Schrinner would have the people of our capital believe that his challenges are unique and that there is no alternative to his budget cuts, yet the truth is that governments all around the world are faced with rapidly increasing costs, including our government.

Let me be clear: unlike Lord Mayor Schrinner, our government will not inflict pain on Queenslanders through broken promises and cuts. We make no apology for doubling down on our commitments, delivering our \$89 billion infrastructure program even as costs increase due to global inflation and supply chain constraints. It is worth reflecting on what would happen if the Lord Mayor's approach to budgeting was applied to the state government.

Mr Lister interjected.

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

Mr DICK: How would Queensland suffer if someone like the Lord Mayor, someone who shared the same values and culture as the Lord Mayor, were to become premier? Let's do the maths. The Lord Mayor's cuts program represents 10 per cent—let me say that again, 10 per cent—of his budget. Applying that to the state budget, that would equate to a \$7 billion budget cut. Where have I heard that number before? \$7 billion is exactly the amount of revenue attributable to progressive coal royalties.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr DICK: A \$7 billion budget cut would be a catastrophe for Queenslanders, and I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth. He talks about budget blowouts. We know what he wants to do—cut and cut infrastructure. That \$7 billion budget cut would be a catastrophe for Queenslanders and would mean that hospitals, schools, nurses, teachers, police and our building program are all under threat. The Energy and Jobs Plan, the subject of landmark legislation to be introduced this week, would be dead in the water. There would be no public ownership of energy assets in this state anymore. All of it would be on the chopping block if someone like the Lord Mayor or someone who shared the Lord Mayor's approach was to become premier of this state.

When those in public office in this state use the language that the Lord Mayor uses, Queenslanders need to be on high alert—high alert for phrases like 'responsible financial management', when they hear complaints about the 'tax burden', when they hear complaints about the 'debt burden' and when they hear talk about 'intergenerational equity'. Coming from someone like the Lord Mayor, those words mean one thing: cuts. Queenslanders understand that only the Palaszczuk Labor government will keep progressive coal royalties. Queenslanders understand that only the Palaszczuk Labor government will keep \$7 billion in expenditure that those royalties fund. Only the Palaszczuk Labor government will defend Queensland from savage budget cuts.

Renewable Energy



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement) (9.51 am): This Labor government is building a world-leading renewable energy system, and we are doing it right now—one that will deliver cleaner, cheaper and more secure power to all Queenslanders. Today we have announced our newest renewable project, the Moah Creek Wind Farm near Rockhampton—enough clean power for every home in Townsville, Cairns and Rockhampton combined. It will boost the Queensland economy by an anticipated \$600 million.

Our plan is delivering for Queensland. Today the Premier reported on a 71 per cent reduction in wholesale electricity prices in Queensland driven by more renewable energy and storage delivered by this government, and we are not finished. There are 80 gigawatts of renewable energy projects in Queensland's pipeline. In fact, I am advised that Queensland is the only jurisdiction in the nation with enough projects in its pipeline to meet its renewable energy targets, and our plan means energy assets remain publicly owned by the people of Queensland. We have funded this plan with \$19 billion in this year's budget.

As the Premier has announced today, the Palaszczuk Labor government will introduce a bill to achieve Queensland's renewable energy targets and enshrine that plan in law. We are taking real action to tackle climate change. The bill we will introduce will enshrine public ownership of Queensland's energy system—something that only Labor supports and something that only Labor would bring into this House. The laws that we will introduce into this House today will make it clear that Queensland's energy system is not for sale. We will legislate the required frameworks to build the Queensland SuperGrid, to build renewable energy zones and to harness our incredible natural resources.

Importantly, the bill will establish the frameworks to work with regional communities. We will align with the Local Energy Partnerships initiative released by the Premier and Deputy Premier just last week. We will unlock massive opportunity for new industry in this state in critical minerals, in green hydrogen, in manufacturing and in batteries, and we will do it through visionary projects including CopperString 2032, which we know is only supported by this side of the House. Our approach will be underpinned by a strong system of accountability. We will ensure our commitments to job security and regional partnerships are delivered. Importantly, we will formalise the historic Energy Workers' Charter. We will deliver for every worker in our government owned power stations. We will do all of this while ensuring cleaner, more affordable power for generations.

Bushfires; Queensland Fire and Emergency Services



Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (9.54 am): I start by acknowledging the Queensland Police Service ministerial liaison officer in my office, Inspector Don Baillie, who is celebrating his birthday today. He is a hard worker and I know that he is well known to many members of this House.

Notwithstanding the outstanding work of the Rural Fire Service and partner agencies, difficult weather conditions are fuelling and fanning bushfires in a number of locations across the state, creating challenging circumstances for many Queenslanders. Our thoughts are with all of those people who have been impacted by these ongoing events. I also want to sincerely thank all of our firefighters, disaster management and Fire and Emergency Services personnel and other partners who are working around the clock to protect their fellow Queenslanders and their properties.

The government deliberately increased the investment in our aerial firefighting capability in this year's state budget—an extra commitment of over \$17 million over three years to boost the fleet. To support the large air tanker and other aerial assets, that investment this season has already delivered additional aircraft capability, including the Black Hawk helicopter water-bombing aircraft based at Bundaberg. Since September, more than 14 million litres of water and fire retardant have been dropped in operations undertaken to keep Queenslanders safe. This fire season our firefighting aircraft have accumulated in excess of 2,000 hours in the air. As the Premier said, it was only prudent in the face of a protracted fire season that we have now extended this critical aerial firefighting capability. With volatile weather conditions upon us, I urge everyone to stay alert to the dangers ahead, keep up to date with the warnings from authorities and have a plan in place to leave quickly if required.

With the state facing a protracted fire season, strong leadership is critical. I want to thank Commissioner Greg Leach AFSM for his dedicated efforts over the last four years. Commissioner Leach has secured a new role in his home state of Victoria and steps down from his role here in Queensland this Friday, and I know that he is looking forward to being closer to his family. I can announce that current Acting Deputy Commissioner Stephen Smith AFSM will take up the role of acting commissioner until the permanent position can be filled following a full and proper recruitment process. With almost 30 years of service in Fire and Emergency Services, Acting Deputy Commissioner Smith has extensive knowledge, skills and experience in emergency management, both here in Queensland and internationally.

Other leadership changes are being put in place as Queensland Fire and Emergency Services undergoes historic reform. That reform will see the establishment of the Queensland Fire Department and the Rural Fire Service as its own entity within the department. I am advised by Commissioner Leach that current Deputy Commissioner Mike Wassing AFSM will serve as the interim chief officer of the Rural Fire Service. I am advised that the interim deputy commissioner of the Fire and Rescue Service will be current Acting Deputy Commissioner Kev Walsh AFSM and the interim chief operating officer of Corporate Services will be current Acting Deputy Commissioner Adam Stevenson. Further announcements about other leadership roles will be made by the department in due course. Each member of the executive leadership team brings a wealth of experience to these roles and we wish them well as they undertake their important work on behalf of all Queenslanders.

Kindergarten



Hon. G GRACE (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing) (9.58 am): Last week I was delighted to join the Premier at Lady Gowrie Spring Hill for the launch of the most adorable advertisement you will ever see. I am of course talking about our free kindy campaign. The early years are critical to a child's future, so we want every single family in Queensland to know that the countdown is on for free kindy from January 2024, and who better to spread the message than kindy kids themselves? That is why the ad features real Queensland kindy kids as spokeskids telling grown-ups all about the benefits of kindy and reminding them that it is time to enrol. The campaign is translated into eight other languages. It will be broadcast on targeted media channels like Aboriginal Health Television. We are also taking the message to events like the International Street Fiesta in Toowoomba this weekend.


Backed by an additional investment of \$645 million, free kindy is set to save families up to \$4,600 a year. It will provide real cost-of-living relief for Queenslanders, ensure every child gets a great start and deliver significant investment and support for the early childhood workforce. Under our current

Kindy for All program, 14,000 children received free kindy. Our new historic free kindy reform means that more than 50,000 additional children a year will be able to attend for free, including around 8,000 kids a year who could be enrolled in kindy but currently are not.

We want everyone to experience the benefits of a quality kindergarten education in the year before school. Fifteen hours a week for 40 weeks a year makes such a difference, and I know that our teachers and school leaders see the benefits firsthand. One of our experienced principals in the Logan area was telling me recently that previously around 40 per cent of prep kids had been to kindy in that area. With the introduction of Kindy for All making it free for vulnerable and disadvantaged families, that number went up to 100 per cent. Every prep kid had attended kindy, and the difference it made to being school ready was incredible.

The campaign also promotes the new Free Kindy Finder tool, which makes it simple for families to jump online, enter their postcode, find the nearest free kindy and enrol today. That is exactly what I encourage families to do. Do not just take my word for it, take it from the spokeskids: kindy is fun, you make new friends and it helps you learn. The Premier and I had the pleasure of meeting the stars of the ad, and I want to make special mention of Bianca, Endia, Aleka, Giana, Archer and Ashana for being such great kindy advocates and, for a change, a very cute and kind press pack. It is a fantastic campaign, a fantastic initiative and just another way the Palaszczuk government is delivering on the things that matter to Queensland families. We cannot wait for free kindy in 2024.

Satellite Hospitals


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women) (10.02 am): We know that our health system is facing record levels of demand which is putting strain on our hardworking frontline health workers. A decade of underinvestment by the federal LNP government, combined with Queensland's booming population, has meant that our emergency departments are seeing more presentations than ever before, even for things that do not require emergency care. That is why we committed to building seven new satellite hospitals across the south-east: to ease the pressure on our emergency departments and provide more options for Queensland families.

We are absolutely committed to providing free, high-quality health care close to home and, as the Premier has said, we are delivering. Reports today show that over 4,600 patients presented at the Ripley and Redlands satellite hospitals during their very first weeks of operation. That is 4,600 patients receiving the high-quality care they need in a timely manner. Most patients were in the door, cared for and back on their way within 90 minutes. It is 4,600 fewer patients arriving at the Ipswich Hospital or Redland Hospital emergency departments.

The vast majority of patients who presented at our satellite hospitals were less urgent category 4 or 5 patients. Critically, the number of category 4 and category 5 presentations at both major hospitals decreased in the time that our satellite hospitals were open. In fact, there were twice as many category 5 presentations at the Ripley Satellite Hospital compared to the Ipswich Hospital in that same period. In the Redlands, that number was three times higher. This is remarkable and it means one thing: our satellite hospitals are doing exactly what they were designed to do. Patients are getting the care they need and we are reducing the burden faced by our busy hospitals and our hardworking health workers.

I am looking forward to seeing these results continue right across our fastest growing suburbs as more of our satellite hospitals come online. Tugun, Kallangur, Eight Mile Plains and Bribie Island: all of these communities and their local hospitals will benefit from the Palaszczuk government's nation-leading satellite hospital program. It is all part of our government's plan to deliver free, high-quality care closer to home.

Renewable Energy, Training

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business, Minister for Training and Skills Development and Minister for Youth Justice) (10.05 am): Since 2017 the Palaszczuk government has invested close to \$300 million in building new and upgrading existing training facilities across Queensland. There is so much going on through our Big Build investments that I have literally turned a sod or opened a new or upgraded TAFE facility on average almost every month for the last year. Through this program we are building the infrastructure to meet the demand for the jobs of the future and in no space more so than in making sure Queensland workers are skilled to work in the renewable energy future of our state under our Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan.

Last week it was my great pleasure to turn the first sod on the latest of these projects, the new \$40 million Big Build robotics and advanced manufacturing centre at Eagle Farm TAFE. Expected to be completed in September 2024, this new facility will provide specialised training in robotics, advanced manufacturing and process instrumentation and, importantly, renewable energy technologies. The investment in this project is on top of the significant investment we have already made in equipping our workers for the renewable energy future: the \$50 million we had already committed to new facilities, including for our new hydrogen training centre of excellence at Beenleigh and the new Pinkenba renewable energy training facility; \$12.45 million to build a hydrogen and renewable energy training facility at Bohle TAFE; and upgrading facilities at Gladstone State High School. Under our \$15 million VET Emerging Industries initiative, in partnership with industry, we are investing in pilot projects to develop new training initiatives in renewable energy like the skills mapping at the Kogan Creek green hydrogen demonstration plant and training for battery EVs and H2 fuel cell vehicles.

Queensland was the first state to produce a hydrogen industry workforce road map, guiding our investment in skills—many of those still to be defined—in this very important but emerging industry. That includes an investment in our school students. Many of our future hydrogen industry workers are still at school. We know that if a student has direct experience in an industry they are more likely to choose a career path in that industry. That is why this year we added hydrogen to our successful Gateway to Industry Schools program. The hydrogen GISP is being delivered to 32 schools and is projected to help 2,000 students over the next three years and build a pipeline of workers for the hydrogen industry.

Last week we signed the National Skills Agreement with the federal government, providing access to over \$2.5 billion for skills and training in Queensland. This is a major coup for Queensland, recognising the challenges but also the opportunities in delivering training to a vast and decentralised state like Queensland. It includes an allocation of 44,500 Fee-Free TAFE places, on top of the 37,000 Fee-Free TAFE places we funded in partnership with the federal government last year, which we managed to convert to 58,000 free training places with additional allocations. Under this initiative, important renewable energy courses have been offered free, including in sustainable energy, in battery electric vehicle inspection and servicing skill set, and in automotive electric vehicle technology—Queensland's first EV apprenticeship through TAFE Queensland. Clean energy industries are an important future for our workers and we are making sure we have the skills and training to get them there.

Manufacturing



Hon. GJ BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (Minister for Regional Development and Manufacturing and Minister for Water) (10.09 am): Manufacturing contributes about \$20 billion to this state's economy and employs over 180,000 Queenslanders. We want to see this industry continue to grow and grasp those opportunities that we know are coming in this state. It really is quite simple: if we can make it here, we should. There is no bigger supporter of job-generating industries in Queensland than the Palaszczuk Labor government. Everywhere I go, our manufacturers are doing amazing things. They are out there getting the job done in Queensland. As a government our role is quite clear: we need to support them to reach their full potential, and that requires a plan.


Our plan is working. We are investing directly into businesses right now and giving them a pipeline of work into the future. We have invested nearly \$200 million across our Made in Queensland grants program, our Manufacturing Hubs Grant Program, our Manufacturing Energy Efficiency Grant Program and our six manufacturing hubs in regional Queensland. This direct investment is giving manufacturers the tools that they need to grow and harness future opportunities. Together we are creating the manufacturing jobs of the future.

Thanks to our Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, there are opportunities for Queensland manufacturers everywhere you look in this state. From refining critical minerals to producing hydrogen and building energy storage systems, manufacturing is how local communities right across Queensland power not just our nation but also the world economy. Our Energy and Jobs Plan builds on our existing investment in positioning Queensland to have a thriving clean energy economy. We are already at the forefront of becoming a renewables, hydrogen and clean energy manufacturing superpower. We are positioning Queensland as a world-leading hub for manufacturing because we want to see a future that is made in Queensland. Our state's strong manufacturing sector is ready and capable of delivering what those big projects need. We are providing manufacturers with equipment and technology, and that means that they are positioned to capitalise on the pipeline of investment we are creating through our Energy and Jobs Plan.

I have seen firsthand the innovations that are going to drive the renewables revolution from businesses such as EcoJule and Anteo Tech, which are pioneering refinements in battery technology. AGIG is blending green hydrogen with gas for an entire city's supply. Linked Group is working towards a decarbonised future and Alpha HPA is using world-leading technology to refine high-purity alumina. These are manufacturing capabilities that exist right here in Queensland and that are in demand right across the world. From what I have seen, Queensland has the capability and the capacity to be a leader in energy production and in energy storage manufacturing.

Our government's plan for manufacturing is delivering now, creating jobs and economic growth right across Queensland. Thanks to the Energy and Jobs Plan, confidence in the manufacturing sector is high. It is a plan for the future of this state and the future is bright for Queensland manufacturers, Queensland businesses and Queensland workers in this state.

Renewable Energy, Transport

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Minister for Digital Services) (10.12 am): As part of the Palaszczuk government's Energy and Jobs Plan, we know that reducing transport emissions will play a key role in achieving net zero by 2050 and acting on climate change. In Queensland, transport emissions make up 15 per cent of overall emissions and, as of 23 October, there are 30,000 electric vehicles on Queensland roads. That is a 132 per cent increase in the past year, and that number will continue to rise as more Queenslanders make the switch.

Since we were elected in 2015, the Palaszczuk government has been committed to supporting more Queenslanders to take up electric vehicles. We know that it is better for our air quality, noise pollution and reducing emissions to act on climate change. We were the first state in Australia to release an electric vehicle strategy. At the centre of the strategy is the publicly owned Queensland Electric Super Highway. We have already invested over \$8 million in charging stations from Coolangatta to Port Douglas, and Brisbane to Mount Isa. Once finalised, the Electric Super Highway will provide a publicly owned infrastructure network of 55 different locations across the state. It will be the longest electric vehicle superhighway in a single state anywhere in the world. The Palaszczuk government is partnering with Yurika to deliver the latest phase with the use of 75-kilowatt Tritium fast chargers, manufactured here in Queensland. Tritium is an international success story but it started right here as a Brisbane-based company. It is exciting to see our manufacturing capabilities grow as we expand the network.

Earlier this year I announced the successful applicants of our \$10 million co-contribution electric vehicle charging fund. The government will partner with Evie Networks, Engie, NRMA, RACQ and Tesla to roll out more than 46 fast-charging sites across Queensland, resulting in an overall investment of \$24½ million. Motorists who may be thinking about making the switch to an EV need to have confidence that the charging infrastructure for longer journeys will be easily found across Queensland. By doubling the existing network we are doing exactly that. I am happy to report that the first chargers from this fund are now up and running in Miriam Vale, on the Bruce Highway. It features six 250-kilowatt fast-charging units, six charging bays and an additional accessible charging bay. They are nice big units. That is what we like to see.

Today I can announce the full list of locations for each of those chargers. The locations of the new regional Queensland electric vehicle fast-charging stations include: Townsville, Mackay, Bundaberg, Cairns, Maryborough, Toowoomba, Rockhampton, Bowen, Tully, Ingham, Gayndah, Atherton, Nanango, Dalby, Airlie Beach, Maroochydore, Woodford, Pimpama, Ormeau, Hervey Bay, Biloela, Pentland, Alpha, Monto, Goomeri, Yandina, the Sunshine Coast, Coochiemudlo Island, Miriam Vale, Gladstone, Mitchell, Gympie, Moranbah and Agnes Water. I am out of breath, Mr Speaker! There is a huge list, and people can jump onto the Department of Transport and Main Roads website to see the full list. In some of those locations there will be more than one station. Those fast chargers will progressively roll out over the next 12 months. The opposition may well laugh. We will keep building the infrastructure for a clean energy future.

Mr Power interjected.

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

Mr Saunders interjected.

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

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.16 am.

Youth Crime



Mr CRISAFULLI (10.16 am): My question is to the Premier. Today the opposition can reveal RTI documents that show a senior Labor government figure admitting that the youth crime measures announced in December were ‘almost everything in the cupboard’. With crime rates continuing to rise in 2023, does the Premier agree that the Labor government’s cupboard is bare of ideas to fix the youth crime crisis?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As every Queenslander knows, we are absolutely determined to keep communities safe. That is why we have rolled out programs. It is why we are recruiting more police—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are actually seeing some progress, especially around the state where we have youth justice—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, Premier. Pause the clock. Members to my left, the Premier is being responsive to the question as I hear it. I would like to hear the answer.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We have the Stronger Communities program working in Townsville, where there is intensive case support happening with young people and their families. The Minister for Education is working on getting more disengaged young people back into schools. The Minister for Police has an active recruitment campaign and we are seeing record interest from police officers from overseas and around the country who want to move to Queensland. Why would you not want to move to the great state of Queensland?

We have the rollout of our early intervention and prevention programs and youth justice conferencing for the more minor issues, which those opposite abolished. We had to rebuild the Murri Court, the drug diversion court and youth justice conferencing. Those opposite cut those courts. A lot of damage was done in the early years of the LNP government and we have had to rebuild those courts and youth justice conferencing across the state.

We will do everything we possibly can. Recently we announced in the House—and I cannot comment on it at the moment—an increase in victims assistance. We know that people across the state have been saying that they want more government assistance. We are putting victims front and centre. The increased investment in our early intervention and prevention programs—over a billion dollars towards youth justice—is something that we are absolutely committed to. The increased visibility patrols by police are across our suburbs, police beats and shopping centres, ensuring the community feels safe. We will continue to work hard. We will continue to roll out our programs across the state, as we said we would. We have a plan and we will implement that plan.

Youth Crime

Mr CRISAFULLI: My question is to the Premier. Since the announcement in December, there have been over 50 cars stolen and over 130 properties broken into every day in Queensland. That is a rise across both categories. Does this prove that the cupboard is bare and the Labor government has no answers to fix the youth crime crisis?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Those opposite voted on the laws that we introduced into the parliament. There was bipartisan support—unless they want to walk away from those as well.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for McConnel and member for Gladstone!

Ms PALASZCZUK: At least we produce plans. Those opposite produce pamphlets. We saw the little pamphlet over the weekend.

We are backing our commitments with real investment in programs to change young people’s lives. If the Leader of the Opposition is referring to statistics, people can see those statistics because we release them—unlike those opposite, who axed the crime statistics so that Queenslanders could not see them. Those opposite should not talk to me about openness and transparency.

We introduced laws, which those opposite supported. We have invested more than \$446 million into: targeting serious repeat youth offenders, \$37 million; tackling the complex causes of youth crime, \$267.5 million; and investing in community safety, \$132 million. I am advised that in the 12 months ending 31 May 2023, 42 per cent of young people did not return to the youth justice system after their first appearance. That is a statistic that shows that work that is happening is working. Also, there has been a two per cent—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Do you want to listen or not? So rude.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is what you will get: someone who is rude, whingeing—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left!

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I am talking about the increased investment, results have also shown a two per cent decrease in the number of 10- to 17-year-old offenders with a proven offence in Queensland—

Mr Powell interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—in the 12 months ending 30 June 2023 compared to the 12 months ending 30 June 2022. Overall, there has been a 34 per cent reduction in the number of young offenders aged 10 to 16 over the past 10 years. These are the facts.

Mr Mander interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: If I were the member for Everton, I would not be interjecting after his demotion over the weekend.

(Time expired)

Energy and Jobs Plan

Ms BUSH: My question is to the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. Can the Premier update the House on how the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan is a priority for the state, and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Cooper for the question and for coming along to our morning tea on Sunday. There were many young people there. They are concerned about climate change. We on this side of the House have a firm plan for climate change: our Energy and Jobs Plan. Today is a very proud moment for our government. I acknowledge the young people here today observing parliament. Today the minister will introduce legislation that will see our renewable energy targets become law. This is the first time this has happened across the nation.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is about guaranteeing the future of our planet and the future of our young people, who are passionate about the issues that mean so much to each and every one of us. If we think about the transformation in terms of Queensland—reliant on coal-fired power over so many years—transitioning to a clean, green, renewable energy future, this is what being in government is about. It is about making a difference and about transforming our economy in a way that has never happened before. It is not just words; it is action. It is backed by our \$62 billion Energy and Jobs Plan.

Mr Mander interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: \$62 billion—that is a plan. Those opposite are silent when it comes to what they are going to do when it comes to renewable energy. The test is coming. They will have the opportunity to vote on our plan when it is legislated in this Queensland parliament.

We will have 70 per cent renewable energy by 2032—I am quite sure the young people in the gallery are appreciative of the measures we are taking—and 80 per cent by 2035. We are taking real action on climate change: building the largest pumped hydro in the world and seeing wind and solar

investment happening across our state. I am inspired every time I go out and see the investment of companies and the people they are employing locally to work on building the infrastructure that is needed to transform our state. The SuperGrid, the likes of which Queensland has never seen, will carry that optic cable which will make it easier and faster for digital capacity in rural and remote communities across our state. It is a plan. We are introducing it into parliament. It will be legislated—

(Time expired)

Youth Crime

Mr BLEIJIE: My question is to the Premier. Documents from the Premier's department expose senior government figures admitting that the youth justice issues affecting Queenslanders 'ain't great', 'things are hotting up' and, from Steven M, 'That's almost everything in the cupboard' when it comes to youth crime announcements. Can the Premier tell Queenslanders who is 'Steven M' and does the Premier agree—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my right, you know the practice. You will hear the question. You will have an opportunity to answer it.

Mr BLEIJIE: Can the Premier tell Queenslanders who is 'Steven M', and does the Premier agree with Steven M when they said, 'That's almost everything in the cupboard'?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Well, this is as low as we go.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members!

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnell!

Ms PALASZCZUK: They always get the member for Kawana to ask the doozies!

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana!

Ms PALASZCZUK: Oh, my goodness.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I think we have had enough fun with that, members.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This must be as good as it gets from the member for Kawana.

Mr Bleijie: Who said it?

A government member: Where's the laptop?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I will ask you to address the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Searching the cupboard for the laptop. The member for Kawana wants to talk about cupboards. It was completely bare when 14,000 people lost their jobs. There was no food to put in the cupboard when those opposite were in power because of the devastation they caused to Queensland.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you have asked the question. I will wait to hear the response.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am not even going to dignify that absolutely ridiculous question with an answer.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Priorities

Ms McMILLAN: My question is of the Premier and Minister for the Olympics and Paralympic Games. Can the Premier update the House on the Palaszczuk government's priorities for Queensland, and is the Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to thank the member very much for the question. The member, having been a fine principal before coming into this House, knows the importance of education and how much our government is committed to education. I also want to thank the member for Mansfield for coming along to the morning tea on Sunday where we were able to hear from people what their issues are—

whether it is climate change, whether it is about building the hospitals that we need across our state, whether it is the satellite hospitals I mentioned earlier which are showing real, tangible results in lessening the impacts on emergency departments by people presenting locally, or whether it is our free kindy. I commend the Minister for Education for really going out and promoting this, because the No. 1 issue Queenslanders are facing is cost of living. That is why our government is committed to giving the largest cost-of-living relief anywhere in the country. Free kindy will save families \$4,600. We met with Elizabeth up at Lady Gowrie. She said, 'I am now able to go back to work because my child will be accessing free kindy.' This is what being in government is all about. It is about delivering for people, making a difference to their lives and making a difference through those young people getting the free kindy they need before they enter school.

Secondly, we are giving electricity rebates. I will talk about this every single day, because I am passionate that, because we own our energy assets, we are able to give families \$550 in energy cost relief. It is wonderful to see that our pensioners are receiving up to \$1,000, because this is having a big impact when they are finding it hard to make ends meet. I say to the member for Kawana that people are not interested in emails. They are interested in real issues that are impacting on their lives: the cost of living; housing, getting a roof over your head; and hospitals, making sure they get good quality health care closer to home. These are the issues that Queenslanders are interested in, not—

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Kawana will put down the prop.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is no plan. Walk around with it, because it is a pamphlet—

(Time expired)

Youth Crime

Mr LAST: My question is to the Premier. If the Labor government's cupboard is bare on policies to reduce crime and keep Queenslanders safe, will the Premier adopt another LNP policy and remove detention as a last resort?

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think that question included a number of imputations.

Mr SPEAKER: No, it did not. The imputations need to be directed at a member, not a policy.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member may not be aware, but it is part of a UN convention. He might need to go to the United Nations to deal with that issue.

Mr Krause interjected.

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

Housing

Ms RICHARDS: 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. Can the Deputy Premier advise the House how delivering more housing is a priority for Queensland, and is the Deputy Premier aware of any alternative approaches?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Redlands for the question. She certainly represents a beautiful part of the world, and no doubt that is one of the reasons people are flocking there. It is also one of the reasons the Palaszczuk government has had to step in and assist the council to ensure there is sufficient housing and infrastructure to house that growing population while maintaining the fantastic Redlands lifestyle. It is the first time the state has sought to assist a local government to that extent, drafting for them the Redland Housing Strategy which is currently out for public consultation. It is a plan to protect the lifestyle in the Redlands. It is a plan to ensure that young people who have grown up in the Redlands can keep living there. It is a plan to ensure that when older Redlands residents need to downsize they will be able to stay in the community they have lived their lives in and where they have raised their kids. The plan is out for community consultation right now. We encourage the community to provide their feedback.

On this side of the House we are not leaving our policies in the cupboard when it comes to delivering on housing. The Leader of the Opposition's only concrete policy to address housing was to take housing off the shadow housing minister. Out of 44 pages of motherhood statements, platitudes and glamour shots of the Leader of the Opposition, the only concrete policy was to demote the member for Everton. I guess, with his record, that is something we can all agree on. He did say that he left in

the cupboard a plan to assist young people into houses with state government assistance, and that reminded me of something. I was sure I heard an LNP figure talk about policies like that. I thought and I thought, and then I remembered—

Mr Crandon interjected.

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

Dr MILES:—Amanda Stoker, the gift that has only just started giving. Amanda Stoker told Sky News that, after hundreds of years of observing government, the market is much better at assisting people into houses than government can be. Policies from governments to try to assist young people into housing are dangerous and worrisome, according to the Leader of the Opposition's hand-picked candidate for Oodgeroo. We do not even know which of them is losing their job so that Stoker can go straight into the shadow front bench, but she is already calling her boss's policies worrisome and dangerous.

Youth Crime

Mrs GERBER: My question is to the Premier. Documents from the Premier's department show that a priority of the Labor government was organising a government funded crime advertising campaign only three days after Emma Lovell's death. Was the Labor government more interested in fixing its image on crime or fixing the youth crime crisis?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am not aware of the government conducting any advertising campaign in this space. Minister for Police?

Mr Ryan interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No.

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is a difference between what you are saying and what actually happened.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you have had a good run today. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Let me just say that, first of all, we have been working very closely on the legislation that was passed in this House and the rollout of the intervention and prevention programs, as I have said in this House previously. Secondly, the police are recruiting more police, which are absolutely needed, and that is happening. I commend the Police Commissioner and the police minister for—

Mr Ryan: About 600 applications.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Over 600. Some of them are currently going through the police academies. That is what people want. They want their communities to be safe. Let me also say: this House has established a select committee, chaired by the member for Noosa, which has—wait for it—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: And I said that did not happen. My advice, I am informed, is that that did not happen. I will double-check with the director-general, but that is my advice.

We have a bipartisan committee and that committee needs to get to work. It has very comprehensive terms of reference. As we have said, we believe that we work best when we work together, and I look forward to seeing the outcomes of that committee.

As an update for people in this House on how we are tackling those complex causes of crime, let me outline where some of the money is being expended because I think those opposite might like to know. There is \$4.2 million for Townsville Street University; \$56 million for community services that target after-hours support, education, cultural mentoring and intensive case management; \$96 million—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Member for Currumbin, you are so rude.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. You will direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Well, Mr Speaker, I am giving my answer—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you will direct your comments through the chair. I am keeping an eye on members interjecting. I will manage the business of the House.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is \$96 million to extend and expand youth co-responder teams; \$5 million to extend and expand the early action groups operating in Townsville to Cairns and Mount Isa; \$17 million to boost statewide flying squad capabilities and a new Youth Flying Squad called Taskforce Guardian; a very important \$12.7 million for youth drug and alcohol treatment—

(Time expired)

Economy

Mr SULLIVAN: My question is of the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. Will the Treasurer please update the House on how the government is delivering a stronger economy, which is the right priority for Queensland, and is the Treasurer aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Stafford for his question. He knows that one way to protect and grow a strong economy is to avoid massive cuts—to avoid making those damaging cuts that impair your economy, impair jobs and impair economic growth. That is why our government will not take a backward step. Over the forward estimates we will be spending \$89 billion on our big infrastructure build, transforming Queensland along the way. We are doing that. While every year we do a budget, our debt forecasts continue to reduce. We are spending more in Queensland while our debt profile continues to reduce. We can do that because of our strong response to the pandemic and our revenue settings.

I am asked by the member for Stafford about an alternative approach. The Lord Mayor of Brisbane has demonstrated yet again the LNP's approach to budget management, and we saw that last week: you first cut revenue and then you cut services, infrastructure and jobs. It is the LNP playbook. Over the weekend we saw that the Leader of the Opposition will follow suit. It was short on detail but used a lot of slippery words to disguise its purpose. What does that fake plan issued by the Leader of the Opposition say? I quote—

An LNP Government will work to reduce the tax burden facing Queenslanders today and the debt burden future Queenslanders will inherit. This will be achieved through disciplined financial management ...

These were the same words that Campbell Newman used and the same words that Adrian Schrinner uses. Those words mean cuts. First they cut the revenue and then they cut the services, with \$7 billion in cuts by the LNP leader. That is progressive coal royalties handed back to the coal lobby, because the LNP leader has said that he will ditch progressive coal royalties. That \$7 billion is enough to pay every single nurse in every public hospital in this state and then some. Every dollar of it will go under the Leader of the Opposition—cut new hospitals, cut roads, cut CopperString.

What is most interesting about the fake plan is what was left out. The member for Toowoomba South gets a new title but there is no mention of the Commission of Audit 2.0, the intergenerational equity report. That has gone. They must have been told to keep that quiet. What about the debt strategy that they announced one year ago? It has gone into the memory hole. That is not in the fake plan. There is one other thing that is missing from that fake plan. There is not one single, solitary mention of a dollar—not one, nothing in the plan. That is because the Leader of the Opposition does not want to tell Queenslanders how much pain he is going to inflict on them when he cuts—cuts hard and cuts deep—because that is what he and the LNP do.

Youth Justice, Reforms

Mr McDONALD: My question is to the Premier. Documents from the Premier's department show that less than two hours before the 29 December youth justice announcement the Premier had not approved the measures and the Premier's chief of staff stated that they were possibly adding two new detention centres. Is the Labor government's policy cupboard so bare it has to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in two hours just to have something to announce?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think they are referring to messages that were exchanged way before we announced our stronger laws for community safety. They were before we announced the legislation into the parliament and before we announced the bipartisan parliamentary committee. You can go back in the past but we are focused on the future. As I said, I want to see this parliamentary committee get to work.

Whilst I am on my feet, I want to continue to outline the early intervention and prevention programs that our government has committed to rolling out. I finished by saying that there was \$12.7 million for youth drug and alcohol treatment. There is also: \$64 million for policing responses, including high-visibility patrols and specialist youth crime response squads; \$56 million—and this is popular in all electorates that got the extra funding for PCYCs—to target youth offending and recidivism; \$1.5 million for Cairns Safer Streets—and I know that the member for Cairns is very happy about that; \$9.8 million for on-country programs; \$61 million for Transition 2 Success; and \$56.8 million for that intensive case management support that I talked about. It is very important to make sure you get in there when the families may be having trouble making ends meet to make sure younger siblings do not follow the same path. It is important to show that support. I want to thank all those workers who go out there every day and do this work. They said to me that they feel like they are not thanked for the work they are doing, so I publicly thank them. There are hundreds if not thousands of workers out there making a difference to people's lives each and every day.

There is also \$17 million for expert youth justice workers to partner with the QPS in targeting high-risk youth offending. That is what the Police Commissioner said: it is those serious repeat offenders we need to be doing most of the work with, and that is exactly what is working. The Minister for Police recently announced \$11.5 million for Jeff Horn's Bullyproof program, which will be rolled out through schools. We have funding for the JT Academy, which is doing a lot of work where a lot of these young boys do not have any male role models in their family, and I commend Johnathan Thurston. The program started in Cairns and is being rolled out to Mount Isa and Townsville. These are programs that are working and are making a difference to people's lives.

Mr Harper: They will all be cut under the LNP.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. They will be completely cut under the LNP.

Free Kindy

Mrs MULLEN: My question is of the Minister for Education, Minister for Industrial Relations and Minister for Racing. Can the minister update the House on why the \$645 million investment to make kindy free is a priority for Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Jordan for her question. I know that we often talk about this issue. She can see the results in her electorate and many others can see the results in their electorates. Our free kindy is a historic initiative—one that will leave a positive, lasting legacy to our children with an education system in this state that is world class. Not only will it give kids a great start; it also represents cost-of-living relief, with families saving up to \$4,600 a year for kindy. We do not want cost to be a barrier. Nothing warmed my heart more than when a principal in the Logan area recently said that all of the kids enrolled in prep had attended kindy and spoke of what a difference that made to the first day for teachers because the children were school ready from day one and they could get on with the work. That is what this is all about—a policy that is delivering positive outcomes for our children and great education outcomes as well.

As well as that, since being elected we have increased the workforce in kindy by 50 per cent. We had 2,500 kindy teachers; we now have 3,750. Our First Nations people are certainly benefiting from this as well. In fact, every single government approved kindy service in Queensland—all 2,104 of them—have signed up for free kindy.

The industry is behind the Palaszczuk Labor government's initiative. Louise Jackson, the CEO of Lady Gowrie Queensland, said they are well placed to deliver kindergarten in 2024 and welcomed this initiative wholeheartedly. The mayor of Cherbourg, Elvie Sandow, said—

Giving free kindy to every Queensland child is a big step to closing the education gap for First Nations children and laying the foundation for the future. Our First Nations children will learn and thrive in the kindy environment. Now nothing can hold them back.

In terms of alternative policies, I have heard nothing from those opposite. No words ring more true than those of Jann Stuckey, the former member for Currumbin, who said that they are nothing but a whingeing, weary, policy-vacant bunch of ageing, grumpy individuals. I keep saying that time and time again. In the latest pamphlet they put out, they talk about education. I went searching to see if they going to support free kindy and whether they have a policy in relation to it. All I found was a bunch of parenthood statements that meant absolutely nothing. There was nothing but whingeing and whining in the document. Guess what: true to form, there was not one announcement about preschool.

(Time expired)

Youth Crime

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Premier. Jen and her family from Arana Hills had their home invaded and car stolen by an alleged machete-wielding youth and had to track their car via social media. Given that the Labor government has admitted its cupboard is bare of ideas to fix the youth crime crisis, will the Premier apologise for failing to keep Queenslanders like Jen and her family safe?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe that the statements made in that question are inaccurate and are based on the answers provided by the Premier already today. The member should have to verify that in fact those statements have been made. I also question whether this is a matter currently before the courts and sub judice may apply.

Mr SPEAKER: In terms of sub judice, I am going to take some advice on that. Regarding the question, member for Everton, your question does differ from other questions asked this morning in terms of making a specific claim around government policy as opposed to asking the question around government policy. I ask you to rephrase that question, noting that I will be taking advice first regarding the other issue. Member, given that you have asked the question, can you assure the House that there is no matter before the courts?

Mr MANDER: On the research that I have done—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. This is not a time for interjections.

Mr MANDER: On the research I have done, I am satisfied that this is not before the courts.

Mr SPEAKER: Now, member, I ask that you rephrase your question.

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Premier. Jen and her family from Arana Hills had their home invaded and car stolen by an alleged machete-wielding youth and had to track their car via social media. The RTI documents, sourced by the opposition, said the government's cupboard is bare of ideas to fix the youth crime crisis. Will the Premier apologise for failing to keep Queenslanders like Jen and her family safe?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I will rule the question out of order. You are not asking a question; you are stating what you believe to be a statement of fact, and that does require verification because you are making your own opinion and assumption around RTI documents as opposed to explicitly saying what you are saying. That is my interpretation. I rule the question out of order.

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The quote used by the member for Everton is directly taken from the RTI document.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I will ask you to resume your seat. It is not about whether there is a quote. There is a suggestion that this is a point of fact as opposed to asking the question of the government, so the question is ruled out of order.

Energy and Jobs Plan

Ms LAUGA: My question is of the Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement. Can the minister advise the House how the Palaszczuk government's Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan is delivering this government's priorities of reliable and affordable clean energy, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for Keppel for the question. It is a pleasure to rise in this place today to speak about the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. The member for Keppel and all members on this side of the House know that the Energy and Jobs Plan is delivering. The proof is that the Australian Energy Market Operator has confirmed in its 2023 update, published just last month, that Queensland has the most reliable energy system of all mainland states in the national market—the most reliable. The industry regulator just yesterday confirmed that renewables are what is driving lower energy prices here in Queensland. We know that power costs will always be lower under a Palaszczuk Labor government because we are delivering more renewables. That is about lower prices, lower emissions. To the young people in the gallery this morning I say: that is real action on climate change. We are getting on with the job.

Last week it was a pleasure to join the Premier as we opened officially the Dulacca Wind Farm—another 180 megawatts of clean power. Today we have announced the Moah Creek Wind Farm—372 megawatts of clean power for Queensland. It is those clean renewables that are protecting jobs in

regional Queensland. CleanCo, the publicly owned clean energy company, will be delivering clean energy from these projects to Queensland's largest companies and employers—companies like Wesfarmers, Coles supermarkets and Westfield. We have a clear plan, a funded plan, a plan that we will now put into law.

When it comes to the alternative, the LNP have no clarity and no funding. They have no evidence and they have no accountability. In 44 pages of dot points, they forgot to mention their secret energy policy. There is no dot point talking about their moratorium on renewables. There is no dot point on their hugely expensive and slow nuclear industry which will see 25 reactors up and down the coast, from Cairns to Coolangatta. It is all about denial and delay on that side of the House. Their one attempt at energy policy amongst their 44 pages of dot points was to put a slogan on an existing maintenance obligation—one which already exists—literally copying the homework of this parliament. The reality of their policy is that it is CoalKeeper revised. Their priorities are clear. They want to keep coal going. They want to keep fossil fuels burning. Whilst Labor is delivering a plan, funding it to prepare to make it law, all the LNP have is dot points of denial and dot points of delay.

Great Barrier Reef

Mr KATTER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games. On 25 May the federal Minister for the Environment and Water, Tanya Plibersek, wrote to the UNESCO Director-General detailing a suite of new water quality, tree clearing, fisheries and climate measures being pursued in response to UNESCO's Reactive Monitoring Mission to the Great Barrier Reef report. Given these UN demanded policies will rip the heart out of North Queensland's rural and regional communities, will the Premier revoke her support for them and enable her Labor MPs representing these areas to do the same?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to get back to the member with more detail. I think I said in the House last time that there were 242 licence holders affected, and some of them are in the gulf as the impacted species move between the two areas. In relation to the specific question, I will definitely get back to the member.

Whilst I am on my feet, I can also answer a question that was asked by the opposition about the stronger laws for community safety campaign and whether or not it was placed in media outlets. I am advised that the director-general approved a campaign, which was the stronger laws for community safety.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am clarifying the record. As soon as I have the information—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Traeger, please resume your seat. I would like to hear this component and I will deal with your point of order after that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet that it was in newspapers and online to inform the community about the new actions announced in December. I table—

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

Mr SPEAKER: Please resume your seat. I am already going to be dealing with the member for Traeger's point of order. It is disorderly to supersede the point that the member for Traeger will be making in a moment. I do not know where he is going to go. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I table that.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Stronger laws for community safety' [\[1727\]](#).

Mr SPEAKER: I will hear your point of order, member for Traeger.

Mr KATTER: I appreciate that the Premier wants to address things from earlier, but I was seeking an answer to my question as put.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Traeger, my response to you is that the Premier did answer the question and gave a commitment that she would provide further information to you directly.

Health Infrastructure

Ms PEASE: My question is of the Minister for Health, Mental Health and Ambulance Services and Minister for Women. Can the minister please update the House on how the Palaszczuk government's health Big Build is a key priority delivering better health outcomes for Queenslanders, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Lytton for her question. She is a passionate advocate for members of her community being able to access health care closer to home. Day by day we are seeing that our plan to tackle the pressures on our emergency departments is working. As I said this morning, we are seeing amazing results from our satellite hospitals and our health Big Build.

Whilst we have the health Big Build, on Sunday we saw the big reveal, but it was a big disappointment. There were no real policies and no real vision. Once again the Leader of the Opposition has come up short, hell-bent on taking the small-target approach. Let's look at his plan for health. Firstly, there is better resourcing. I am so pleased the LNP support our plan, because we are actually giving our hospitals and health services 90 per cent more funding than when they were in government under Campbell Newman. Their next big policy is for better triaging. Again, I am so pleased he supports our \$764 million Putting Patients First plan, which is all about improving response times in our emergency departments. Then there is something that I am very proud of: our median wait time for emergency departments is currently 17 minutes, and that is one of the best in the country.

As I was working through the dot points and the lack of vision, I noticed a quote from the Leader of the Opposition about what he believes they need to deliver on health care. It says, 'Queenslanders deserve a world-class health system no matter where they live.'

Dr Miles: Where have we heard that before?

Ms FENTIMAN: I was thinking last night that I am sure I have heard that somewhere before. It turns out that the Department of Health *Strategic Plan 2021-2025* says 'ensure all Queenslanders can access world-class health care no matter where they live'.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you will put that down.

Dr Miles interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, you are warned under the standing orders. Minister, I will ask that you table that document or cease using it as a prop. Minister, you have 37 seconds remaining.

Ms FENTIMAN: I table that.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Department of Health Strategic Plan 2021-2025: November 2022 Update' [1728].

I was then looking at the statement of the Queensland government's objectives for the community, which says 'ensure all Queenslanders can access world-class health care'—

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It relates to the use of a prop.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Member, there is a difference between reading concurrently—and I will be instructing the member to table that immediately she has finished reading from the document. I will ask that you not hold it up as a prop whilst doing so, Minister for Health.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. While that point of order was being made the member for Oodgeroo was up the back holding up a document, as he is doing now. It is a complete abuse.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Leader of the House. I appreciate your eyes. Member for Oodgeroo, you are warned under the standing orders. Members, it is a general warning to all in the House that props will not be tolerated. I appreciate the nuance between reading from a document and holding it up. Please hold it towards yourself.

Ms FENTIMAN: As part of the Queensland government's objectives we want to ensure that all Queenslanders can access world-class health care no matter where they live, and I table that statement of objectives for the Leader of the Opposition.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Statement of the Queensland Government's objectives for the community' [1729].

Their plan is not just about doing what we are already doing in health; they are now just copying what we are saying about health care. The Leader of the Opposition has come up short once again.

(Time expired)

Corrective Services

Mr BERKMAN: My question this morning is to the Minister for Corrective Services. Selesa Tafaifa died in a spit hood after asking for her puffer and telling prison officers four times that she could not breathe, yet spit hoods have been used hundreds of times in Queensland prisons since then. Will the government ban spit hoods in Queensland before we see another death like this?

Mr RYAN: Mr Speaker, this is a matter before the coroner. In respect of those judicial processes, I will not comment on the specific matter. Of course, we have some of the region's leading corrective services officers employed by Queensland Corrective Services. In fact, they are amongst the best trained, best resourced and best paid in all of Australasia. We owe them a debt of gratitude for the work they do. It is often unseen work, dangerous work, but work that is done on behalf of the community to keep the community safe, dealing with people who have been found by the courts to have harmed the community in one way or another and have been found by the courts to be required to spend a period in detention because of the actions those particular offenders have taken in the community.

Queensland Corrective Services is obviously investing a lot in custodial operations, not only in expanding capacity, including a new prison at Lockyer Valley—the Lockyer Valley Correctional Centre, which will be a state-of-the-art correctional centre with a therapeutic operating model—but also in investing in existing infrastructure and additional equipment, resources and training for custodial officers. In fact, I was advised by Queensland Corrective Services that the rollout of new specialist training called Maybo training is continuing across the state. This is about empowering custodial officers with additional tools and additional skills around dealing with complex behaviours and complex needs of offenders.

I support the work of custodial officers. They are well trained; they are well resourced. They make decisions about the appropriate use of force in very dynamic, often violent situations. If they do the wrong thing, of course there should be consequences for doing the wrong thing. However, if they do the right thing and they operate within the guidelines using the equipment they are given, we should all support them for the work they do rather than condemn them.

Our custodial officers continue to work closely with offenders across the state. They engage in rehabilitation actions but they also engage in action around keeping prisons safe, people who work in prisons safe and visitors and other offenders safe. We often have to remind ourselves that the people who are in custody are there for a reason. Sometimes they are there because they are violent and dangerous. That requires trained experts; it requires our custodial officers to be well trained, well resourced and well equipped. I 100 per cent support them. We will continue to support them. We have provided record funding for Queensland Corrective Services and we will continue to do so.

Housing

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Minister for Housing. Can the minister update the House on how unlocking more homes for Queenslanders is a priority of this government, and is the minister aware of any alternative approaches?

Ms SCANLON: I know that the member for Capalaba has been a big advocate for his community to deliver a housing plan when LNP members in his council would not. Our Labor government is focused on delivering more social and affordable homes across the state. We are helping renters. We are planning for growth. We are giving young Queenslanders a leg up into home ownership and we are supporting an end to homelessness. We have been open and clear about how we are going to do that. We have also been clear on how we are going to pay for it—making sure all Queenslanders get a fair share of coal profits. We make no apologies for directing that money to where it is needed most.

That is more than we can say about those opposite. We have all read the glossy brochure that they released this weekend. I was reading with interest the section on housing. There are five slogans which are things we are already doing. Then I clicked on the 'more details' section hoping to find a little more information. It was effectively the same five slogans regurgitated—in a different colour, though. There were a couple of additional points, one of those points being that apparently part of their plan for housing is water security.

There is another section that talks about 'strengthening the Public Service's project management capabilities'. That is particularly interesting given it was, of course, the LNP that gutted this very function within Economic Development Queensland. They basically prohibited their ability to deliver social and affordable homes—took it out of the function of that area. It is rank hypocrisy.

Even the vaguest positions that were announced by the leader of the LNP have started to cause division. We have seen the member for Everton sent to the sin-bin. Do not worry: we now have the very cool and relatable member for Toowoomba South to talk to young people in Queensland.

I saw the member for Oodgeroo floating around with the so-called priorities document just before. It appears that the candidate for Oodgeroo has a very different position. She does not seem to be on board with the opposition helping first home buyers with the shared equity scheme. In a Sky News interview she referred to the Help to Buy Scheme, that the federal Labor government has committed to and that we will be working with them on to deliver enabling legislation to help young people get into home ownership, as 'really dangerous'—not one, not twice, but three times. She went on to say that helping first home buyers is 'really quite worrisome'. The candidate for Oodgeroo is not even in here and she is already disagreeing with the Leader of the Opposition. I have good news: we will be working with the federal government on this. Queenslanders know what is really dangerous for housing and that is the LNP.

Youth Crime

Ms SIMPSON: My question is to the Premier. Jen from Arana Hills, who is in the gallery today, had her home invaded and her car stolen by an alleged machete-wielding youth and had to track the car via social media. Will the Premier apologise for failing to keep Queenslanders like Jen safe?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Of course we apologise. One victim of crime is one too many. If Jen would like to meet with the police minister or someone from the Police Service in relation to that matter—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am more than happy to meet with her, too. We give the police the resources they need to do their job. I would say to Jen that we also have support available for victims of crime. We have put that into legislation which we introduced into this House and is currently before a committee. There are massive increases in that legislation, backed by a \$225 million commitment, to make sure that victims are front and centre.

Emergency Services, Personnel

Mr WHITING: My question is of the Minister for Police and Corrective Services and Minister for Fire and Emergency Services. Will the minister update the House on the ways the Palaszczuk government is backing in our police, corrective and fire and emergency services personnel as a priority for the Queensland community, and is he aware of any alternative approaches?

Mr RYAN: The member is a big supporter of police, fire and emergency services in his electorate. In fact, a brand new fire station has been built in the Bancroft electorate because of the member's strong advocacy and this government prioritising community safety. It has always been a priority for this government to invest in community safety through support for police, fire and emergency services, and we have been very clear about that investment. We have been very clear about our plans for prioritising community safety by strengthening laws, by resourcing the police, by supporting them with recruiting more officers and investing in interventions to help turn people's lives around.

Those opposite have not put the same priority on community safety and developing a plan. It was on 8 January 2021 that the member for Burdekin mentioned to the *Townsville Bulletin*—it is not a typo; it was 2021—that the LNP would have a plan around community safety. That was over 1,000 days ago, or 145 weeks ago, or 33 months ago, or almost three years ago. Where is the plan? We hear them talking about cupboards a lot today, but the member for Burdekin cannot even find the cupboard. He has not found the cupboard for 1,000 days. I will give the member for Burdekin a hint: cupboards are sometimes in the kitchen; it might be too hot in there given some of the shenanigans that are going on on that side of the House and all the drama around candidates and who is taking which position.

We would have thought that maybe they could have updated their plans for a plan, but that is about as far as they go. The QPU police journal will probably be on the *New York Times* reading list soon as there are great columns in the winter 2023 edition. I might use this a few times this week because there is so much material in it. They talk about a question and answer session. The member for Burdekin was asked about plans and things. Remember that in 2021 he said that they would have a plan. It is now 2023 and what is he saying? He is saying, 'We are still working through the process and we will have a comprehensive policy around youth crime.'

They cannot find the cupboard. They cannot come up with a plan. It is weak leadership from the Leader of the Opposition—the fake Leader of the Opposition. It is a shambles over there. There are no plans, no commitment to community safety and no priority for Queenslanders.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired. Minister, it is important that we use correct titles and not apply suggestions around their role, real or otherwise.

MOTION

Business Program



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 am): I move—

1. That the following business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Property Law Bill, to complete all stages by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 26 October 2023;
 - (b) the Tow Truck Bill, to complete all stages by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 26 October 2023.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in 1. apply:
 - (a) the minister to be called on in reply:
 - (i) for the Tow Truck Bill by 5.25 pm on Thursday, 26 October 2023.
3. If all stages of the bills listed in 1. have not been completed by the specified times in 2. respectively, 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.

The motion before the House is straightforward. It contains time frames for the Property Law Bill and the Tow Truck Bill. As members will note, these bills were slated for debate this week, with a cut-off time of 5.55 pm on Thursday, 26 October. This will mean that the House will manage the debate of bills within that time period. If they are completed before that time, we will move on to the next bill on the *Notice Paper*. It should be noted that if the Tow Truck Bill goes the full week, the minister will commence reply 30 minutes before the 5.55 pm cut-off. I look forward to seeing how the process goes this week, with no individual times being prescribed but the House managing its own time through the week for these bills.

While on my feet, I want to take the opportunity to briefly thank the member for Sandgate, Minister Hinchliffe, for his support during my absence last sitting week. As members will know, the member for Sandgate stepped in and performed the duties of Acting Leader of the House at very short notice as I was ill and could not attend last sitting week. I note that during my absence the member for Sandgate made a personal announcement. While I know that there will be other opportunities, I wanted to place on record my personal thanks to the member for Sandgate for his public service, not only to the people of Queensland but also as a staff member in the federal parliament, where we worked together. Many people come through these doors and are politicians, but the member for Sandgate is truly a parliamentarian. I look forward to continuing to work around the cabinet table with him for the remainder of this term. I commend the motion to the House.



Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (11.19 am): I rise to make a very brief statement with regard to the business program motion moved by the Leader of the House. Whilst the motion itself may seem straightforward and the Leader of the House may be looking forward to seeing how unallocated time frames work in this instance, the opposition will be opposing it. The reason for that is not what is in the motion; rather, it is what is not in the motion. As we saw last week, this motion is really not worth the paper it is written on. The government can at any time, as it did last week, move motions that are extraneous to the *Notice Paper*, that are extraneous to the debate of the day, that are extraneous to the priorities of Queenslanders. As we saw, all it does is waste the time of this House—time that we could be spending speaking to the various pieces of legislation. For that reason alone, we will be opposing this motion.

I also make the point that I suspect what we are trialling this week is not because the Leader of the House has finally discovered that the member for Noosa's suggestion that we should try this is worth having a go at. Rather, it is actually because there are only four bills on the *Notice Paper* and if we did not allow a longer speaking time for the two bills listed—the Property Law Bill and the Tow Truck Bill—we would quickly run out of legislation and the government would be left with egg on its face. Therefore, for those reasons, the LNP will be opposing this motion.



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business, Minister for Training and Skills Development and Minister for Youth Justice) (11.20 am): I rise to speak in support of the motion. I stood in for the minister yesterday and it all seemed to be very agreeable. What the

Leader of the House has put up is an excellent way of making sure that members get to speak on some really important bills. I know that in my own electorate the issues that are going to be debated are incredibly important and I want to make sure that I have enough time to speak about them.

As always, the Leader of the Opposition—in fact, you can pick anyone from the opposition—just talks for the sake of it. Those opposite are just absolute whingers, and here we go—blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. It does not really matter what they say. It is a bit like this document that they put out. I reckon their campaign manager said to them, ‘Okay, David. You’ve got to write 10,000 words’—

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have two points of order. Firstly, I ask that the Deputy Speaker direct the minister to call members by their correct title. Secondly, I would ask you to bring the member back to the motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): I am just going to take some advice. Member for Nanango, in terms of how you phrased that point of order, directing the Deputy Speaker to do anything is not within the standing orders, I would think. You certainly can raise those points of order. I agree with your points of order. I would ask the minister to come back to the substance of the motion.

Ms FARMER: I thank the Deputy Speaker for his guidance. The point I am making is that we have an orderly way to make sure we are debating some very important bills this week. The opposition is whingeing just for the sake of it. Its members just talk and talk and talk. They are taking up the time of the House by whingeing. They whinge on principle. Whingeing is in their DNA. Let us get on with the business of this House. That is what Queenslanders want us to do. They want us to get on with the business of the House, the business of government. How about we just get on with it instead of whingeing? They just whinge on principle.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! I shall remind the House of those members who are on a warning. We have the members for Southern Downs, Logan, Maryborough, Glass House, Nanango, Everton, Scenic Rim, Coomera, Kawana, Murrumba and Oodgeroo.

Mrs D’ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. While the member was just on her feet speaking, the member for Bonney, as I understand—and he was not in his seat—was holding up the same material that the Speaker has already commented on as far as props. I ask that there be consideration of a general warning across this chamber about using the same prop that has already been—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! I will hear the point of order in silence.

Mrs D’ATH:—raised a number of times during question time.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will take some advice, and I will take that advice in silence. Thank you, Leader of the House. The Speaker has already issued a general warning in relation to the use of any props in the chamber and so we will keep a careful eye out for that. We did not see that, so we will not be acting on that at this particular juncture, but I will repeat that general warning.

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

AYES, 48:

ALP, 48—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Kelly, A. King, S. King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Madden, Martin, McCallum, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Mullen, Palaszczuk, Pease, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Skelton, Smith, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Whiting.

NOES, 33:

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

Grn, 2—Berkman, MacMahon.

Pairs: Healy, Stevens; McMahon, Robinson; O’Rourke, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

ENERGY (RENEWABLE TRANSFORMATION AND JOBS) BILL

Message from Governor



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement) (11.29 am): I present a message from Her Excellency the Governor.

Mr SPEAKER: The message from Her Excellency the Governor recommends the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

ENERGY (RENEWABLE TRANSFORMATION AND JOBS) BILL 2023

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, DR JEANNETTE ROSITA YOUNG AC PSM, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled-

A Bill for an Act to transform the energy sector in Queensland by facilitating the increased generation of electricity from renewable energy sources and supporting affected workers and communities, and to amend this Act, the Electricity Act 1994, the Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) Act 1997, the National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 for particular purposes

GOVERNOR

Date: 24 October 2023

Tabled paper: Message, dated 24 October 2023, from Her Excellency the Governor, recommending the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023 [\[1730\]](#).

Introduction



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement) (11.30 am): I present a bill for an act to transform the energy sector in Queensland by facilitating the increased generation of electricity from renewable energy sources and supporting affected workers and communities, and to amend this act, the Electricity Act 1994, the Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) Act 1997, the National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 for particular purposes. I table the bill, the explanatory notes and a statement of compatibility with human rights. I nominate the Transport and Resources Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023 [\[1731\]](#).

Tabled paper: Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023, explanatory notes [\[1732\]](#).

Tabled paper: Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023, statement of compatibility with human rights [\[1733\]](#).

Today we introduce a bill of global significance, and it is going to take some time and some technical language to outline. Before I start, I want to relate some words from the heart—not my heart but the heart of my own now teenage daughter Scarlett, who took the time and the compassion to express her concerns for her cousins who at the time were living in North Queensland. She did this not long after we took office. In her finest handwriting, writing of her cousins in North Queensland, she said in her message—

For Dad from Scarlett. We are polluting our faraway cousins' homes. If we keep doing this pollution we'll not have our cousins. We need to stop polluting in our world.

Her point was well made and it was that we need to act. As I speak today I will be keeping Scarlett's words in my mind. I would urge us all to remember them, because young Queenslanders today have something that we did not: they have the opportunity to inherit from us a climate, a planet, a local environment that can actually improve. The next generation of Queenslanders will be the first to inherit that if we get this right and we take action now. This is not our chance; this is their chance. Let's not take it away from them. The choice to support these laws we introduce today is a moment in history when we choose to gift the next generation a better future than they have been at risk of inheriting.

For over 65,000 years the First Peoples of this nation have used and prospered from an outstanding abundance of natural resources. Sometimes we have done it well, such as by adopting the fire and water management practices of First Nations Australians. Those practices were embedded in harmony with the land and its climate and passed down through generations for us to take example from. They are now a huge part of the way Queensland's fire management authorities work. Sometimes

we have grown rich from our resources, such as the gold rushes in places like Gympie and out at Kidston, and in turn we saw the vast agricultural expansion of the Downs and the Tablelands and we developed a truly Queensland culture which recognised and relied on respect for the climate and the land.

Queenslanders have always used our natural resources to be bold and visionary and world beating. From producing the mighty industrialised mineral exports, our manufacturing, our agriculture and the processing of our commodities, including coal, copper, aluminium and sugar, we have built cities, towns and communities across the most decentralised state in the nation. We have endured a radical climate but, in fact, we have damaged it. Our Great Barrier Reef has been put at risk and the rate of land clearing has been too high in the past. Across our state we have a complex history. It is one of immense pride—sometimes of tragedy and injustice, sometimes of bending down before that magnificent and bewildering climate that is our own. The world around us is changing; it is changing fast and changing in ways we cannot call anything less than disastrous.

I want to pause and acknowledge those who even today are threatened by or fighting bushfires and all those who are watching the weather system in the Coral Sea which just last week threatened to turn into an early-season cyclone. The CSIRO has confirmed an El Nino weather system this year, meaning a hotter, drier summer with all its inherent risks. The chances are that, without action, this may in fact be the coolest summer that we will ever experience again.

I acknowledge everyone who is preparing their properties and their livestock and their emergency plans for whatever this summer brings. Queenslanders know that summer can turn deadly all too quickly. Some of what we are seeing and have seen in recent years is the undeniable result of climate change. That terrible firestorm near Coolumb in 2017, the Townsville flood in 2019 or the inundation right here in Brisbane in 2022 produced images that none of us can ever forget. Those who lived through them and those who watched gained a horrific new understanding of what we are facing. For too long we have been burning fossil fuels at a rate that is not just unsustainable but also fatally dangerous. We know that energy production is our No. 1 source of emissions, making up 33.6 per cent, and therefore it is the greatest threat to our natural environment. For too long our exposure to global commodity markets has driven energy prices and rising household bills, only made worse by global conflicts.

This bill, however, supports Queensland's transition to a clean, reliable and affordable power system where we achieve greater independence from those volatile global markets. It will protect Queenslanders from world events such as the war on Ukraine, sanctions or overseas disasters and their effects on world markets that can push up the power bills of Queensland households. Every extra unit of renewable power we build into Queensland's system lowers wholesale prices.

Consumers around the world are walking away from carbon-intensive products, too. Our trading partners in Europe, Asia and the US are all beginning their walk away, using methods including the EU's Carbon Border Adjustment Mechanism which risks Australian exports becoming less competitive. Our competitors are no longer just the people who produce the same as what we do; they are those who can do it cleaner and greener. Queensland's agriculture, mining and manufacturing sectors have moved, are moving and will continue to move to do that. Companies from the giant Rio Tinto to the beloved brewery XXXX are making vital shifts to lower their emissions, and Labor today is shoring up support for them to stay here in Queensland, protecting tens of thousands of Queensland jobs.

Each day that we continue to burn fossil fuels is a day longer we are stealing the prosperity of future generations. In years to come, when our children and our grandchildren—Queenslanders like Scarlett—ask us what we did, what real action we took and what we did to leave them with a world worth inheriting, we owe it to them to say honestly that we took the very best action we could. We will point to this moment, the 57th Parliament, and note that it marked a monumental pivot in shaping Queensland's future, Australia's future and a global future. This is not just our bill; it is also theirs—the next generation's—and we simply must not let them down.

Under the leadership of our Premier we are breaking away from our reliance on fossil fuel and instead building on what has been our strength—that is, Queensland's diversity. It is a vision that means we will harness Queensland's mighty sun, winds and water to navigate our future. We will leverage our existing strengths and build on that diversity. By the time we are hosting the Olympic and Paralympic Games in 2032 they will be climate positive.

Queenslanders voted to keep ownership of the energy system, and that means that by 2035, through Labor, we will have no regular reliance on coal for power. There is not a day to waste, so we are taking action right here and right now. We are already building the Queensland SuperGrid—Australia's largest—to transport renewable energy from our regions to power our state towards a proud

future. It will mean that wherever energy is generated we will capture it, send it, store it and deliver it wherever and whenever it is needed. Every home will be able to run their air conditioning, their plug-in car, their swimming pool or their medical aids with clean, cheap, Queensland-made power. Every business will have new confidence in the security of supply. The Queensland SuperGrid will support you where you shop, where you eat, where you sleep, where your kids go to school and where your emergency services are, and it will be there when it is needed.

By transforming Queensland's electricity supply, Labor is putting regional communities at the very centre of our clean energy industrial transformation. Those regional communities will have a say in the scope and pace of the change in areas to be declared as renewable energy zones. They will work to ensure their local communities are true beneficiaries. We have already committed \$6 million to undertake strategic REZ readiness assessments of the three broad renewable energy zone regions and are working on implementing this as we speak. This work mobilises a range of critical enablers for renewable energy development and ensures communities can seize the opportunities in their local area. All government agencies will have a role in renewable energy zone readiness assessments to cover a range of service delivery matters. Substantial energy infrastructure, including renewable energy zones, will be delivered. This is a real investment into regional Queensland. Regional Queensland will benefit from 96 per cent of the investment. Our REZ assessments will ensure that each community is ready and that they have a role in shaping outcomes according to their local priorities.

Labor is protecting existing jobs in one of the most highly skilled workforces in the world and we are supporting the creation of 100,000 new Queensland jobs. There will be new jobs, there will be retraining, there will be real financial support in real back pockets and there will be a decent, cleaner, better future for our kids. We guarantee it. This is futureproofing. This is nation building. This is world beating. Describe it any way that you like, but this is what a really powerful plan looks like in law.

The bill does three important things. One, it enshrines in law key commitments from the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. These commitments are the renewable energy targets, the Job Security Guarantee and the retention of public ownership of the energy system. Two, it establishes the legal frameworks needed to build the Queensland SuperGrid, the transmission infrastructure to unlock and transport Queensland's renewable energy to our state's large industries, its businesses and its homes. These are called priority transmission investments and renewable energy zone frameworks. Three, it establishes the governance and advisory functions to facilitate a smooth, coordinated and lowest cost transformation that ensures workers and communities are supported. These are the Queensland Energy System Advisory Board, the Energy Industry Council and the Queensland Renewable Energy Jobs Advocate.

These changes to our laws mean Queensland can leverage its natural advantages to build certainty, confidence and trust. Upon that foundation our state can build a clean and competitive energy system for the economy and our industries as a platform for accelerating growth. It can deliver affordable energy for households and businesses and support more rooftop solar and batteries. It can drive better outcomes for workers and communities as genuine partners in the energy transformation.

By transforming Queensland's electricity supply, our state will deliver jobs in the energy sector and across the Queensland economy, including 64,000 jobs in clean energy infrastructure, including new skilled direct jobs in the construction of transmission and renewable energy projects as part of building the Queensland SuperGrid. There will be indirect jobs in the services industry too, which supports the energy sector. There will be 36,000 more jobs than without a plan, in green growth opportunities including direct and indirect jobs across key sectors such as renewable hydrogen, battery manufacturing, resources mining and metal refining.

Through this bill, the Palaszczuk government is legislating commitments made in the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan. We want the values and the commitments that we have made to all Queenslanders, the people and the businesses that took the time to share with us that they wanted renewable energy on fair terms and on just terms, to be front and centre during all stages of Queensland's transition to clean renewable energy. That is why the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill enshrines in law three important commitments: to achieve three renewable energy targets, to maintain public ownership in our energy assets and to deliver the Job Security Guarantee through the Job Security Guarantee Fund. The enactment of these commitments through the bill will provide certainty to industry, business, households, workers and Queensland communities about how the state will manage the decarbonisation of the electricity system.

The Queensland government has a longstanding policy commitment to achieve 50 per cent renewable energy by 2030. Since 2015, we have worked to establish a strong investment environment to facilitate progress towards that target. We are passed halfway there and there is seven years to go.

We are very much on track. The plan reaffirms the government's commitment to the 50 per cent renewable energy target by 2030 and it sets two new renewable energy targets of 70 per cent renewable energy by 2032 and 80 per cent by 2035. The bill enshrines in legislation our commitment to the three renewable energy targets and creates reporting and review mechanisms that implement the plan's commitments. That delivers on accountability and on transparency.

The public ownership of energy assets has served Queensland well. It has enabled the Queensland government to deliver dividends and rebates to electricity consumers and place downward pressure on household bills. It is because Queenslanders chose to keep energy assets in public hands that the state has the control and the ability necessary to guide the transformation of our energy system. Today Queensland's energy system serves Queenslanders and under Labor that is the way it will stay. Queensland's existing ownership of these essential assets has given Queensland the right levers to deliver a coordinated, sequenced and well-managed energy transformation while also ensuring the lights stay on and our system remains stable. This stability is Queensland's unique competitive advantage and one that is attracting welcome private investment to our state. Public ownership means any returns on Queensland's efforts and investments belong to Queenslanders, not invisible overseas shareholders.

The plan states that commitment to publicly owning energy assets will continue throughout and beyond the energy transformation. The bill formalises this commitment by requiring the minister to prepare and publish a public ownership strategy. The strategy will set public ownership targets to be achieved by 2035. These targets must be 100 per cent ownership of transmission and distribution assets, 100 per cent ownership by the public of deep storage assets and at least 54 per cent ownership of generation assets by Queenslanders.

The public ownership strategy will be a road map for how the Queensland government and its publicly owned energy businesses will work together with the private sector to deliver the 22 gigawatts of new large-scale wind and solar generation that we need to transform the energy system. This is a significant task. The transformation will require the biggest energy investment program in the state's history. This means substantial state investment in generation, transmission, distribution and storage. Like today, Queensland will continue to have blended ownership in its generation sector. This means a mix but a clear and ongoing majority government ownership, with government underpinning private sector investment through long-term offtake arrangements and some private projects. As the system transforms, there will continue to be a role for private sector investment in generation alongside or in partnership with the state's publicly owned energy businesses.

The transformation of our energy system will also bring about additional opportunities in relation to generation intended for export and in storage and firming. Further, as the system has more and more renewables, the importance of storage and firming generation will play an increasingly important role. The future system will need a mix of short, medium and long-term duration storage and firming generation. There are already private sector investments in storage, for example, the Bouldercombe and Wandoan batteries and the Kidston pumped hydro scheme. It will be essential that this investment in storage continues in concert with public investment in deep storage through our foundational pumped hydro assets, committed to in the plan: the Borumba and Pioneer-Burdekin pumped energy storage schemes, which will be 100 per cent publicly owned.

To make it clear, Queensland is open for business—and we will continually be looking for ways we can work together with private investors to deliver the energy transformation—but Queenslanders will own the energy system and it will be operated in the best interests of Queenslanders. Enshrining this government's longstanding commitment to public ownership of energy assets means we are delivering certainty and transparency to the market. Our approach to achieving the public ownership target for generation will create private sector opportunities, too. By increasing public investment in generation over time, as the public generation pipeline comes to fruition and the capacity in our publicly owned businesses expands, we can plan for and we can maximise local content and supply chain outcomes. We can manufacture more here in Queensland.

We are increasing our public investment in generation. The private sector can be building their capacity in the supply chain in lock step. We can create the pipeline and confidence that investors need to invest in that supply chain, gear up their workforces and be ready to participate in Queensland supply chain opportunities. The public ownership strategy, where we lay out our approach to achieving the targets, will be critical to unlocking these supply chain opportunities. It will be the mechanism that gives industry confidence, clear signals and early notice. We will use these new tools—our legislated public ownership commitments—in tandem with existing mechanisms and work programs across government to drive local supply chain outcomes from the energy transformation.

Importantly, the public ownership provisions also require the publication of a public ownership report, which will provide information on progress made towards achieving the targets and detail how this progress is calculated. This is again key for providing the transparency needed by Queenslanders and investors in this state.

The Palaszczuk government also remains committed to maintaining public ownership of its existing power stations. As committed to in the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, these power stations—Callide, Kogan Creek, Stanwell and Tarong—will be progressively converted to clean energy hubs. Retaining these power stations as clean energy hubs makes sense. They are ideally located, with excellent network connections. They have an existing workforce with highly sought-after skills. The dedicated women and men who maintain and operate Queensland's power stations live in and contribute to their regional communities—regional communities that will thrive and prosper from the renewable transformation. For all these reasons, keeping these sites in public hands and converting them to clean energy hubs is a smart move for Queensland and is enabled by this bill. The public ownership strategy will describe the state's commitment to maintaining ownership of each publicly owned power station. The public ownership report must then report on adherence to that commitment.

The commitment to public ownership of energy assets in the bill ensures Queenslanders continue to reap the benefits of public ownership, including a smooth, coordinated energy transformation. Generations of Queenslanders in our traditional power-generating assets have helped keep the lights on in Queensland and they have helped build this great state. We respect their efforts and their contributions whilst also looking ahead to the future and the next generation of energy workers. Transforming our coal power stations will not mean our workers at these publicly owned sites will be left; instead, we are putting in place the right mechanisms to ensure they have secure choices, opportunities and pathways through the transformation. We will not close the gates on those power stations; we will ensure they remain as hubs of employment and economic activity.

The Palaszczuk government will always support Queensland workers and their families and will ensure that workers are able to capture the many job opportunities that the energy transformation will bring to them. Our existing skilled workforce, including those working in our state's traditional power-generating assets, are well placed to seize the exciting future opportunities supported by the commitments contained in this bill. A world-leading element of the plan commits to ensuring workers in Queensland's publicly owned power stations and associated publicly owned mines have a secure future, choices and clear employment pathways and opportunities. This is to be achieved through the Job Security Guarantee, which is backed by \$150 million of funding and a tripartite Queensland Energy Workers' Charter between government, publicly owned energy businesses and Queensland trade unions.

The bill achieves the policy objectives by establishing the Job Security Guarantee Fund to support the implementation of the guarantee. The Job Security Guarantee Fund will provide necessary support to be provided to affected energy workers in relation to employment matters including support for training or access to employment opportunities or by providing other benefits and opportunities. The Job Security Guarantee implemented through the Job Security Guarantee Fund will empower affected energy workers to make informed choices and will ensure the right support and assistance is in place to help those workers pursue their preferred pathways. These are the commitments and the values that this and future Labor governments will be held accountable to, because they are the right commitments and they are the right values for our state.

Electricity infrastructure projects are major, often intergenerational investments—they should last for lifetimes—and they can take years to plan and to build. Queensland requires the right legal frameworks to ensure that the electricity infrastructure developed to support the transition to renewables is in the long-term interests of all Queenslanders. The bill contains three infrastructure frameworks to do just that. The infrastructure blueprint provisions will ensure Queensland's transitions pathway remains up to date, responsive to changes in the electricity market and technological progress and is founded on advice from technical experts.

The infrastructure blueprint is a technical document that describes the optimal infrastructure pathway for Queensland. It contains the key timings and sequence for the delivery of the significant energy infrastructure that Queensland needs. This includes backbone transmission, the renewable energy zone transmission network and large-scale energy storage such as the pumped hydros. It also outlines changes in the operations of publicly owned coal power stations as they convert to clean energy hubs; estimates of the amount of installed large-scale renewable generation and dispatchable capacity;

and estimates of the anticipated contribution of customer energy resources. The bill establishes a framework which provides for biennial updates to the infrastructure blueprint, with the first update in 2025, and the matters the minister must consider when updating the document.

As I have mentioned, Queenslanders want the energy transformation and they care about how this transformation takes place. Queenslanders want to benefit from the transformation and use it to spur on a new energy economy that delivers jobs and economic prosperity for local communities. I know that the Premier has heard directly from landowners, as have I, how important it is that they benefit from the renewable energy future. Our government is there to support them to do this, with important initiatives like the new Local Energy Partnerships initiative announced by the Premier this month. Local Energy Partnerships is a valuable initiative to help landholders and communities ensure local benefits flow from the energy projects in their region. Local Energy Partnerships is backed by a \$9.25 million government contribution. It is the result of months of consultation with regional communities on the best ways to supercharge local outcomes from the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan.

Through the partnerships initiative, the Queensland government will establish the first Community Leader Energy Councils to formalise channels for engagement on the renewable energy zones and ensure energy providers and local councils work collaboratively to deliver the best outcomes for locals. This government will continue to invest in good jobs and new industries while working with landholders over the life of energy projects. We will do that because we understand that local voices need to be heard. That is what Local Energy Partnerships is all about.

The second infrastructure framework of the bill is the renewable energy zones themselves. A transition to renewable energy requires Queensland to maximise its rich renewable resources, attract investment and deliver efficient infrastructure. It also requires careful consideration of the needs of Queensland communities so that they can embrace the opportunities of the energy transformation. This is what the renewable energy zone framework under this bill has been designed to do. It will ensure the best generation sites benefit every Queenslander by delivering clean energy, bright economic prospects and affordable electricity prices.

A renewable energy zone, REZ, under the bill is an area of Queensland identified as having ideal conditions for the development of renewable energy projects such as wind and solar. Potential REZ areas are identified by a new body, the REZ delivery body, which will recommend the area declared a REZ. The other key feature of REZs is the management of access to resources in that REZ. The framework allows access to be managed in a coordinated way. This maximises efficiency and will increase the amount of renewable energy in our grid while putting downward pressure on electricity prices.

REZs will deliver the right mix of renewable energy in the right locations for the least cost. Coordinated management of access to the REZ area will also ensure more efficient network development, resulting in a lower infrastructure footprint, helping to manage social and environmental impacts. This coordinated approach is implemented by way of a REZ management plan for each REZ. Each plan identifies the most suitable generation for the REZ and the network infrastructure needed to connect the generation to the grid. These plans are subject to stakeholder engagement and play a crucial role in the government's engagement with industry and community.

The REZ framework is also designed to attract renewable generation investment to Queensland. The REZ framework uses a market-led model to enable a declaration of a REZ where investors show interest. Once established, a REZ provides the means to provide for REZ projects to have greater investment certainty. Regulation of connection and access in and around a REZ will afford the opportunity to provide generation projects locating in a REZ with greater certainty as to the amount of electricity they can dispatch into the grid when compared with projects connecting to the grid under the existing open access regime. This reduces the risk that a REZ project's network access will be cannibalised or constrained by a downstream project.

The bill facilitates an innovative approach to streamline the negotiation of generator performance standards. This can minimise the time and cost faced by projects when connecting to the grid as compared to arrangements under the existing regime.

Finally, REZs provide for the coordination of social licence activities via pathways such as the new REZ assessment process. Government agencies are also working closely to ensure coordinated REZ development and infrastructure like roads and ports support the renewable build out. REZs will be some of the best investment destinations in the country. This means that all the required infrastructure—transmission, roads and ports—will be ready for development. Combined, these measures are designed to provide greater certainty for projects, creating incentives for investment here in

Queensland. Powerlink, Queensland's publicly owned network service provider, will negotiate access to the REZ in the best interests of Queenslanders. This will ensure investors are incentivised to develop in the renewable energy zone whilst ensuring they pay a fair share of REZ development costs.

The REZ framework in the bill also recognises the critical importance of support from our regions, local communities, landholders, First Nations peoples and industry. Those key stakeholders will have opportunities for meaningful engagement throughout the process. Firstly, the management plan for each and every REZ will be consulted on publicly in draft form, thus ensuring local communities and businesses will always have a say in how a renewable energy zone is managed. A management plan will not be approved unless the government is satisfied that public submissions have been appropriately dealt with. Secondly, the framework provides for REZ assessments of potential REZ areas. REZ assessments are capable of looking at the suitability of an area to host a REZ. This means understanding important factors such as existing infrastructure in the area like roads and ports as well as social infrastructure like childcare and medical centres.

REZ assessments can also examine the impact a potential development will have on communities, including Aboriginal peoples and Torres Strait Islander peoples. These assessments will allow the government to take a coordinated approach to REZ development. This will allow local communities to be heard and help to ensure communities and regions see the benefit of REZ developments in their area. The proposed new laws allow Queensland to deviate from the open access approach in place under the national electricity laws. This is necessary to ensure REZs can be implemented in a way that will result in better coordination of new renewable projects and better outcomes for Queenslanders.

The transition to renewables needs a strong transmission backbone—one that enables Queensland's vision of being a world leading exporter of clean energy by efficiently transporting renewable energy from where it is produced, such as Queensland's new pumped hydros and renewable energy zones, to where it is used by every home, business and major industrial user. The priority transmission investment framework, PTI, outlines how Queensland will deliver the Queensland SuperGrid transmission backbone. It will enable us to deliver this in an efficient yet robust way to ensure that we can connect the renewable energy and storage where and when we need it.

Existing national frameworks—the National Electricity Rules and National Electricity Laws—are not designed to support Queensland's ambitions. As such, the bill allows the state to identify and assess transmission projects that Queensland needs to achieve its renewable energy goals. The assessment required under the PTI framework will be undertaken using the same regulatory investment test for transmission applied under the national framework but adapted in a way that is appropriate and with changes that are as minimal as practical to adapt it for the Queensland context. This means that Queensland can build the infrastructure it needs when it needs it with established and tested efficiency checks and balances.

The bill also requires the PTI responsible ministers, that is, the Queensland energy minister and the Queensland treasurer of the day, to direct Powerlink to construct these projects. The bill contains a regulation-making power that will create derogations from the National Electricity Rules. These derogations will be contained in a supporting regulation and will enable Powerlink to recover costs associated with the infrastructure in the way directed by the responsible ministers.

To support the achievement of the optimal infrastructure pathway the Energy (Renewable Transformation and Jobs) Bill 2023 also proposes to amend the Electricity Act 1994 to clarify the term 'operating works' and creates a new definition of 'battery storage device'. These amendments will provide clarity around the integration of new grid-supporting technologies with the existing electricity grid.

The bill amends the National Energy Retail Law (Queensland) Act 2014 to correct a minor error. The bill also adds a clarifying note to the Electricity—National Scheme (Queensland) Act 1997 that points readers of the act to provisions under this bill that also interact with the application of the National Electricity Rules in Queensland. Collectively, these infrastructure elements of the bill mean Queensland will have the infrastructure it needs when it needs it and that the infrastructure will be delivered in an efficient way according to a sequenced implementation plan.

Engagement with stakeholders is part of the development of the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan, and a consultation draft of the bill impressed upon the government both the need to transition to renewables and the enormity of that task. Global changes across the energy industry are occurring at an unprecedented scale, and it is vital that Queensland industry, businesses and households continue to have an affordable, reliable and secure supply of electricity through this transformation.

Queenslanders do not want to simply transition to cleaner energy: they want the transition to deliver long-term benefits for them and their communities. The Palaszczuk government recognises that achieving this holistic transformation can only happen with ongoing expert advice, diverse perspectives and a dedication to genuine partnership with stakeholders. To achieve this the bill establishes three new governance and advisory functions: the Queensland Energy System Advisory Board, the Energy Industry Council and the Queensland Renewable Energy Jobs Advocate.

The Queensland Energy System Advisory Board will have a minimum of five and a maximum of seven appointed members plus an independent chair. The chief executives of the Department of Energy and Public Works and Queensland Treasury will also be ex officio members of the board. Members will be appointed by the Governor in Council. The bill requires appointed members to have knowledge, qualifications or skills in the operation of the Australian energy sector, investment in energy infrastructure, or delivery of energy infrastructure projects. In addition, there must be at least one appointed board member with knowledge, qualifications or skills in relation to advocacy or support for consumers of energy; and at least one appointed board member with knowledge, qualifications or skills in relation to advocacy for workers in the energy sector or manufacturing industry. At least one appointed board member must be an Aboriginal person or Torres Strait Islander person. These requirements will ensure there is a diversity of views represented on the board.

The main functions of the board are to: prepare an annual progress statement on the progress towards achieving the renewable energy targets and the optimal infrastructure pathway; and provide advice to support government's biennial updates to the infrastructure blueprint. These functions will support achievement of the renewable energy targets and the ongoing delivery of safe, secure, reliable and affordable electricity to Queensland consumers. It will also support a smooth, coordinated energy transformation that is based on robust advice and expertise.

The Energy Industry Council will have tripartite representation, reflective of the Queensland Energy Workers' Charter. It will include five representatives from relevant energy unions, five from Queensland's publicly owned energy businesses, a government representative and an independent chair. Those members will be appointed by the Governor in Council.

The main functions of the council are to provide advice to the minister on the following matters involving affected energy workers and their communities: how implementation of the infrastructure blueprint will impact affected energy workers and their communities; opportunities for employment, workforce development, education and training in the renewable energy industry for affected energy workers and their communities; the skills and training the council anticipate will be needed to build and deliver workforce capacity and capability for the future of the energy industry; and the purposes of the Job Security Guarantee Fund related to the implementation of the Job Security Guarantee, and to maintaining enough workers to ensure safe and reliable operation of publicly owned power stations to the extent required to support the optimal infrastructure pathway objectives.

The bill provides for the creation of a Queensland Renewable Energy Jobs Advocate to provide advice to the minister on opportunities to increase employment opportunities in the energy industry, including on any barriers and strategies to encourage investors and/or employers to create such opportunities. The jobs advocate will also engage with businesses as well as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people on how to increase their employment opportunities in or related to the energy industry. The jobs advocate will also foster relationships and facilitate information sharing between members of the community and those involved with carrying out electricity infrastructure projects in the area and promote the benefits of electricity infrastructure projects. The jobs advocate may also consult with any entity they consider appropriate to assist in performing their functions and attend meetings of the Energy Industry Council when requested to provide an update on the activities they are carrying out.

Establishing the jobs advocate in the bill helps to achieve the policy objectives of the plan and creates the framework to appoint and empower the jobs advocate. Access to a skilled workforce is essential to the successful delivery of the energy transformation. The functions of the jobs advocate will be key to ensuring there is a pipeline of skilled workers necessary to deliver this unprecedented transformation of our energy system.

The bill also makes a minor update to a term in the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 to reflect changes in national gas law terminology. This change will preserve the Queensland government's ability to recover the gas portion of Queensland's contribution to the Australian Energy Market Commission costs.

All this is happening because Queenslanders have been clear about what they want, and they now expect government to deliver. They want cleaner, cheaper power. Labor has delivered a plan for real action. We have funded that plan, including from progressive coal royalties. A plan this important, this ambitious, with this level of unlimited potential, with this level of discipline and enshrined in legislation could only be envisaged and delivered by a Labor government.

On the other hand, we know the LNP do not care. They would sell this state's energy system to the highest bidder—or, given their woeful economic record, they would auction it off for some woeful price. Labor's legislation will make sure Queensland's energy system remains owned by Queenslanders. On that side of the House, they cannot even read the science on climate change. They are wilfully blind and at the same time recklessly dangerous on this issue. The LNP have denied climate change for decades, from bizarre fantasies of diverting rivers to under-researched nuclear schemes—decades of denial.

History shows us the LNP have never been known to care about the real cost of living. History shows us they have never cared for public ownership of the state's assets. We know that the LNP has plans for every bodgie shonk and no plans for Queenslanders. The LNP's approach to climate change and energy security and reliability can be summed up as one of delay, division and denial. Queenslanders see the LNP stuck between their trenchant refusal to see the evidence of climate change and their frankly absurd aversion to facts and science. Queenslanders recognise the LNP's twin obsessions of the Liberal Party's nuclear fantasy and the National Party's moratorium on climate action.

On this side of the House, we set ourselves a challenge to go as far as we can on decarbonisation as fast as we can, whilst protecting jobs and caring for communities, the environment and the economy. Using the best science, the most rigorous and compassionate economic modelling and the intimate knowledge of the uniquely Queensland factors at play, Labor will ensure every Queensland can be part of a cleaner, more affordable and more secure energy grid.

Here is what this bill represents, put simply: real action on climate change; public ownership not privatisation; more jobs in more industries and a Job Security Guarantee; and more affordable power for generations to come. Queenslanders have a big decision to make in 12 months. When they do, they will have a plan from this Labor government that is based on science, goodwill and foresight. This plan does not lecture our regions and is not based on inadequate information. What this plan does is move this state forward, as and when Queenslanders are ready. This plan, like the majority of the energy system, will remain the property of every Queensland.

Queenslanders can be proud that we are doing both the work to lead the nation and the work necessary so the nation itself can succeed. Because Queenslanders kept their energy network in public hands, Queenslanders have the power like nowhere else in the nation. Queenslanders have the power to take real action on climate change, whilst energy power is made more affordable. Queenslanders have the power to grow our regions by decarbonising the world's economy with locally made clean energy, with our ever-growing decarbonised mining and manufacturing sectors.

Queenslanders have the power to do all of this with a secure transition to firmed renewable energy delivered only by a Labor government. Only Labor could deliver a genuine transition for Queensland. It is a big challenge. This bill is how Queensland will meet it. We are proud on this side of the House to say that we did not delay because action was too hard.

Finally, this bill belongs to the workers and those who have fought for Queensland's future. It belongs to their unions that gave them the power to keep Queensland's assets in Queensland's hands. It belongs to the landholders, the conservationists, the economists, the policy leaders, the scientists, the public servants and the community groups who were determined to find a common way forward. Together we are taking real action through an informed and achievable plan—the Queensland Energy and Jobs Plan.

First Reading

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Energy, Renewables and Hydrogen and Minister for Public Works and Procurement) (12.18 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.


Referral to Transport and Resources Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport and Resources Committee.

PROPERTY LAW BILL

Resumed from 23 February (see p. 278).

Second Reading

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (12.19 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for its detailed consideration of the Property Law Bill 2023. A total of 30 submissions were received by the committee in the course of its inquiry. The committee tabled its report on 14 April 2023, making four recommendations. I table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Legal Affairs and Safety Committee: Report No. 45, 57th Parliament—Property Law Bill 2023, government response [1734].

I will address the recommendations made by the committee in detail shortly, but I can foreshadow that I propose to move amendments during consideration in detail of the bill to address issues raised during the committee process. I extend my thanks to those stakeholders comprising members of the legal profession; the property and real estate sector; various advocacy groups representing search agents, property owners and local government; as well as individual members of the public who have particular experience of, and interest in, Queensland's property laws.

The current Property Law Act 1974 governs many aspects of Queensland's property law, such as general rules for dealing with property, creating and disposing of land interests, co-ownership of property, deeds, leases, covenants and mortgages. The bill will replace the current Property Law Act 1974 with modernised property legislation, drafted in line with contemporary practice and using plain English to simplify Queensland's property laws. The bill will also enact a new statutory seller disclosure scheme that will consolidate seller disclosure obligations and empower buyers to make well-informed decisions when purchasing property. The bill honours the Palaszczuk government's election commitment to review and modernise the current Property Law Act.

The bill is based largely on the recommendations of the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology, following its broad-ranging, independent review of Queensland's property laws from 2013 to 2018. The research centre looked at equivalent provisions in other jurisdictions and undertook substantial consultation with a wide range of stakeholders. The final report of the research centre made 232 recommendations to modernise Queensland's property law framework. In line with these recommendations, the bill largely retains and re-enacts in modern drafting many of the existing provisions in the current Property Law Act, continuing the application of well-known and settled property law provisions. The bill also provides some incremental and minor changes for clarity or to address areas of uncertainty in the existing law, notably for leases, covenants and neighbouring property rights. Further, new rights and obligations are introduced to provide fairer outcomes.

Additionally, the bill repeals many outdated or unnecessary provisions in the current Property Law Act. For example, it removes the provisions in relation to 'old system' unregistered land which no longer operate in Queensland, as well as the state-based de facto property provisions which have been overtaken by the federal Family Law Act 1975.

The research centre also released the *Seller disclosure in Queensland* report, recommending the enactment of a statutory seller disclosure scheme. The bill will implement a seller disclosure scheme broadly in line with the recommendations in that report. The scheme will consolidate and simplify the disclosure obligations for sellers and ensure that buyers are given relevant information about the property before making a decision to purchase.

Turning to the recommendations of the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, I thank the committee for its first recommendation that the bill be passed. The committee's second and fourth recommendations proposed that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General review certain

provisions within 12 months of the act commencing. The committee's third recommendation proposed a change to a standard term implied into lease agreements in Queensland. I will take some time to discuss the committee's recommendations 2, 3 and 4 and the government's response.

In relation to recommendation 2, the committee recommended that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General engage with stakeholders to review the provisions for providing disclosure documents for properties sold by auction, giving consideration to bidders who register before and during an auction. The review is recommended to be conducted within 12 months of the act commencing. The government supports this recommendation. If the bill is passed, the Department of Justice and Attorney-General will conduct the proposed review into the relevant seller disclosure scheme provisions by engaging with stakeholders, particularly legal and real estate stakeholders, to determine whether the provisions are operating as intended and if any operational issues are arising. Further, the committee noted views from some stakeholders that the relevant provisions are not sufficiently clear about when a seller is required to comply with the requirements for giving the disclosure documents during an auction. I intend to move an amendment during consideration in detail to further clarify that a seller is only required to comply with the tailored provisions for giving disclosure documents during auctions if a bidder registers after the auction has started and the bidder has not already received the documents before the start of the auction.

In relation to recommendation 3, the committee recommended that the standard lease term in schedule 1 of the bill that deals with maintenance and repair obligations be amended to require a tenant to surrender the premises to the landlord in the same condition it was when the tenant first took possession. The government does not support this recommendation. Currently, the standard term in the bill requires the tenant to surrender the premises in at least the same repair and condition as at the start of the lease. The standard terms in schedule 1 of the bill that are implied into lease agreements are the default terms that apply only if the landlord and the tenant have not agreed otherwise. In circumstances where a lease does not specify how the premises are to be left at the end of the lease, it is appropriate that regard is had to the condition of the premises at the start of the lease subject to reasonable wear and tear. Specifying the start of the lease balances the interests of landlords and tenants. It provides a simple point of reference for both parties. Referring to the start of the lease avoids the need to consider the condition of the premises at historical points in time under previous lease agreements which can extend over a significant period of time and how reasonable wear and tear should also be applied over an extended period. In any event, it is only a default standard term and can be contracted out of to suit the circumstances of a particular lease.

In relation to recommendation 4, the committee recommended that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General review the easement and covenant provisions within 12 months of the act commencing to ensure that all covenants found in modern easements that are reasonably expected to relate to the use, ownership and maintenance of the land are binding on successors in title.

Further, in the body of the committee's report, the committee noted stakeholder views that the words 'use, ownership and maintenance' may not be broad enough to cover all covenants in modern easements, particularly covenants relating to insurance and indemnities. The government supports this recommendation. If the bill is passed, my department will conduct the suggested review within 12 months of the act commencing, by engaging with stakeholders to determine whether the provision is operating as intended. Additionally, I intend to move an amendment during consideration in detail to insert additional examples in clause 65 to clarify that insurance and indemnity covenants that relate to the use of the burdened land will be in scope of the clause.

I note the committee also made several other comments in the report in relation to important issues raised by stakeholders. Clause 144 of the bill will provide for a tenant to be released from liability for breaches of the lease by a subsequent assignee. A subsequent assignee occurs when a tenant assigns the lease to a new tenant, who then assigns the lease again to another tenant, known as the subsequent assignee. The bill provides that the release from liability is despite any agreement to the contrary, meaning it cannot be contracted out of. The committee referenced the Real Estate Institute of Queensland's submission that the provision should be subject to agreement to allow the parties to negotiate the terms of any release. However, the committee noted that the provision was based on the relationship between landlord and tenant not being one of equal power and control and that it is unjust to hold a tenant potentially liable for breaches by a subsequent assignee of a lease. Accordingly, it is not proposed that any amendment will be made to clause 144.

I am aware that some stakeholders, including the Local Government Association of Queensland, advocated for the mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risk information under the seller disclosure scheme. This was specifically considered by the committee during its inquiry into the bill. The committee

noted that since there is no consistent standard of records held by councils, it cannot be guaranteed that disclosure would consistently be of value to the buyer. The committee also noted that councils charge vastly different fees, and councils with a high density of ratepayers may offer a service more easily than councils with a low density of ratepayers. I note that the committee was satisfied with the ability to warn prospective buyers to carry out their own inquiries as provided under the draft property law regulations that were tabled during the explanatory speech for the bill.

I also acknowledge the statement of reservation by the member for Noosa provided with the committee's report which noted the Local Government Association of Queensland's recommendation to include flood and other natural disaster information as part of the seller disclosure statement as well as highlighted the impact of coastal hazard adaption plans. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the important work being conducted by Queensland agencies to improve access to natural disaster risk information, in particular the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, which is working to improve the availability of flood information for many local government areas in Queensland.

The draft property law regulations are subject to ongoing stakeholder consultation and I am committed to continuing to work with stakeholders to ensure that an appropriate balance is struck between the information that sellers are required to provide and the information that buyers need to make informed decisions before they purchase.

The statement of reservation by the member for Noosa also noted the Unit Owners Association of Queensland's comments that seller disclosure should contain a simple statement of the lawful use of the land and the building drawn from the development approval given by the local government under the Planning Act 2016. The member for Noosa recommended that the planning system be reformed to ensure that, when a building is approved under the Planning Act for a specific purpose, relevant information is recorded and maintained so that building owners understand any restrictions of use and that these restrictions are enforced over time. Consideration was given to whether a statement of lawful use could occur as part of the seller disclosure scheme, specifically as part of the body corporate certificate. However, it was determined that this would not align with the guiding principles for the seller disclosure scheme, particularly given in some circumstances it may be difficult, time consuming and expensive for a body corporate to obtain development approval documents. It may also be difficult for a body corporate to outline lawful use of a lot in a short and simple way, given the complexities of the regulation of planning and lawful use under the various applicable planning laws, instruments and documents.

However, it is intended to include a statement in the body corporate certificate that short-term letting of lots in the scheme may be occurring or could occur in the future and advise that whether a lot can lawfully be used for short-term letting is determined by the relevant local government and that buyers should seek advice in this regard. This will alert buyers that they are able to undertake their own inquiries based on their own needs to obtain accurate information about lawful use of a property, for instance, from the relevant local government or a solicitor.

Additionally, the core issue being raised in the member's statement of reservation appears to relate to alleged failures by local governments to enforce relevant planning laws and approvals resulting in short-term letting occurring in circumstances where it is not permitted or appropriate. This is fundamentally a planning issue. Seller disclosure is not the right lever to address this issue as it will not provide any additional ability to enforce lawful use. If the alleged breaches are occurring, enforcement has to happen under relevant planning frameworks and processes.

As the concerns were specifically raised by the member for Noosa in relation to the planning system under the Planning Act 2016, I have referred the matter to the Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister Assisting the Premier on Olympic and Paralympic Games Infrastructure for his consideration. I also note the Deputy Premier's announcement in August 2023 that a review commissioned by the government into the impact of short-term rental accommodation has been completed and that the government will be consulting with the Short Term Residential Accommodation Industry Reference Group and the Local Government Association of Queensland on the review's findings and recommendations.

In addition to amendments that relate to the committee's report, I also intend to move amendments during consideration in detail of the bill which address other issues raised in stakeholder submissions to the committee. Firstly, some stakeholders noted that certain provisions in the bill no longer include express references to an authorised agent being permitted to act on behalf of a person. For example, clauses 7 and 8 of the bill retain the current requirement under sections 11 and 59 of the Property Law Act that certain dealings with land must be in writing. However, sections 11 and 59 of the

Property Law Act currently include express references to an authorised agent being permitted to sign a document and those express references are not retained in clauses 7 and 8 of the bill. The reason for not including these references is to achieve a modernised and simplified drafting approach throughout the bill. The general law of agency will apply to authorise an agent to act on behalf of the person and it is not necessary to explicitly state this in every circumstance where it might be relevant throughout the bill. However, acknowledging that some stakeholders were concerned that omitting the express references to an authorised agent may lead to an interpretation that certain clauses in the bill will limit the general law of agency, a new provision will be inserted to remove any doubt about how the general law of agency will apply.

Secondly, I note the submission to the committee from the Wide Bay Burnett Community Legal Service in relation to a potential adverse outcome that may arise under clause 68 of the bill. If a third party commences legal proceedings to enforce the contractual promise under clause 68, then it is a requirement for every party to the contract to be joined as a party to the proceeding. On review, it is instead sufficient to require that all parties to the contract are served with a copy of the proceeding rather than a requirement to be joined to the proceeding. I will be moving an amendment to clause 68 to this effect.

Finally, I note the submission from the Queensland Law Society in relation to whether clause 80 of the bill could be clarified to ensure that for the avoidance of doubt, the section can be used on a rolling basis to continue to delay settlement if a computer system continues to be inoperative on the next business day and so on. While it is likely the provision will already apply in this way, I propose to move an amendment that will remove any doubt about this effect.


I would also like to take this opportunity to note stakeholder comments regarding a sufficient lead time for commencement of the bill. The bill will commence on proclamation and the government understands there needs to be a generous lead time for commencement of both the property law reforms and the new seller disclosure scheme to allow for the necessary education and preparation activities by affected legal, financial, property sector and community titles sector participants. I confirm that the government will have regard to stakeholder advice regarding an appropriate commencement date to ensure that there is sufficient time for these necessary preparatory activities.

I end my contribution today by thanking stakeholders for their submissions to the committee's inquiry and also for their engagement in the many consultation processes throughout the bill's development. Their continued engagement and expertise has played an important part in ensuring that the final form of the bill will serve Queenslanders for another generation to come.

I would also like to take this opportunity to again thank the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology led by Professor Bill Duncan, Professor Sharon Christensen and Professor William Dixon for their work in conducting such a thorough and comprehensive review of Queensland's property laws and for their continued engagement since the review concluded, providing valuable expertise during the bill's development.

I would also like to thank the Community Titles Legislation Working Group and other invited stakeholders for input provided in relation to the statutory seller disclosure scheme as it relates to community titles scheme properties.

I am pleased that the bill has received such widespread support for the positive improvements and clarifications to Queensland's property laws. As noted by the committee, many stakeholders also expressed their broad support for the introduction of a statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland, and this scheme will be a significant improvement for Queensland's property marketplace. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (12.37 pm): I rise to speak to the Property Law Bill 2023. I note that I have been asked to stand in the shadow Attorney-General's stead for the passing of this bill. I thank the shadow Attorney-General for the work he has done to date in relation to the Property Law Bill 2023. I also note the hard work and dedication by the member for Currumbin and the member for Beaudesert in relation to the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, which examined this bill.

We know that Queensland is in the grips of a housing crisis impacting people at all stages of the market. On Sunday the LNP announced our first shadow minister for home ownership because we know it is a value of Queenslanders to have an aspiration which many people have but so few get to achieve, and that is to own their own home. As a mother of three daughters I certainly hope they can all get an opportunity to own their own home in Queensland. In Queensland we have the lowest home

ownership rate in the nation. That is not because Queenslanders do not value home ownership; it is because the Palaszczuk government has systematically overseen a drop in residential lot approvals and rising cost-of-living pressures.

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): I am listening closely. Member for Nanango, I will give you a little bit of latitude but I ask you to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I look forward to continuing an in-depth discussion in relation to the bill, but I am talking about the Property Law Act in Queensland and home ownership that will be affected by the Property Law Act 2023.

Owning a home is a great source of pride for many people and we do take that right very seriously. Just last month an article was posted in the *Courier-Mail* with the headline 'Housing affordability in Qld now worse than GFC, mining boom'. I table that article.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 2 September 2023, titled 'Housing affordability in Qld now worse than GFC, mining boom' [1735].

The article states—

Buying a home in Queensland is officially the toughest it has been in 16 years, with housing affordability at its worst since the depths of the mining boom.

It also found that it now takes Queensland buyers an average 5.4 years to save a deposit. None of this has been helped by the government's slow action to free up new lots for residential builds, with residential lot approvals decreasing across the state by close to 40 per cent between 2014-15 and 2019-20. For the first time buyer, they are now facing an uphill battle to enter the housing market. While this government continues to try to live by their announcements rather than their actions, it is actually the people on the ground who can feel the difference. They know how hard it has become to get into the housing market.

The bill before us cannot, unfortunately, fix the government's housing crisis. Realistically we need a change of government for that. However, the need to update and rewrite the Property Law Act is a long time coming and its modernisation is long overdue. The rewriting of this act, and particularly the introduction of a seller disclosure scheme, make the process of purchasing a property a little more easy, enabling buyers to have more clarity around what they are buying and their rights and responsibilities in that process.

As a former property lawyer, I have naturally dealt with many simple and complex property transactions and leases. It is imperative as legislators that we do all we can to simplify that process and reduce the cost to both the seller and buyer. How fortunate it is for all law students that they will now get to look at more simplified property law—whether it is property law A or B. I am not sure that was ever my favourite subject. I am not sure property law is ever anyone's favourite subject, but I am quite sure law students will appreciate the more simplified and modernised language.

Most of the changes in the bill before us flow out of the QUT review—and I was looking forward to stating this in the House—that was started by the LNP's attorney-general, the Hon. Jarrod Bleijie, the member for Kawana. The final report of the property law review was given to the government in 2018 and here we are in 2023—

Mrs Gerber: 2017.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: 2017, I apologise. I will correct the record that it was 2017. Like so many other landmark reviews, it has gathered dust while this government has dragged its heels in taking action. That QUT review final report stated—

Since enactment—

that is, enactment of the Property Law Act 1974—

there have been very few substantive amendments to the Act and no overall review in the forty years since its commencement. Real property law draws heavily upon historical concepts which have their roots in the 18th and 19th century.

Had the shadow Attorney-General been here, I note that he would have given us a history lesson on this starting from the 18th century. I will not be doing that. It continues—

Consequently many provisions of the Property Law Act 1974 (Qld) are based upon the Law of Property Act 1925 (UK) ... which repealed the effects of Imperial Statutes and other provisions. Many sections of the Property Law Act 1974 (Qld) remain in the same language as the 1925 Act, or are direct transcripts of the Conveyancing Act 1919(NSW). At this point in time, such provisions are at least 90 years old.

Given this history, it is unsurprising that we need to replace the Property Law Act through this bill. I should have noted at the outset that the LNP will be supporting this bill.

Before I go much further I want to note the Attorney-General's comments in relation to the amendments that she will move. At first glance, the LNP will be supporting these amendments. I note the amendment that the Attorney-General talked about in relation to proposed section 65. I note that Brian Noble, a submitter to the committee inquiry, suggested an amendment in relation to that proposed section. I support that amendment because it acknowledges the need in relation to infrastructure easements. I believe that is a commonsense amendment.

The amendment with regard to auctions was raised in the committee report. In first reviewing this bill when taking over as the lead for the opposition, that was of concern to me. I am very pleased to see that the Attorney-General has looked at that and has had an amendment drafted to address those concerns so that disclosure documents are given before the start of an auction.

Many of the clauses concern the modernisation of language and the repeal of unnecessary sections. I will address the modernisation of the act around easements. Queensland, particularly Brisbane, has many heritage suburbs—for example, Paddington, Red Hill and Hamilton. Many of those areas have issues with overhanging lots—and I note the member for Cooper, who is in the chamber, would have certainly come across this. This creates many issues. This bill will amend the Property Law Act in relation to overhanging lots and make major changes in relation to compensation and how it is calculated by referencing market value rather than what was in the original which was unimproved capital value. It also allows the court to make orders regarding any land reasonably required as curtilage and for access to the encroachment.

Part 19A of the Property Law Act also refers back to the de facto relationship two-year limitation rule. That period is obviously not required now because of the superseded Family Law Act. There are many other outdated and unnecessary sections in the previous act. I had to read this one into the record as an example. It reads—

Rights of husband and wife (section 15), which overtook the common law that held a husband and wife were treated as one entity as a wife had no separate legal entity from her husband after marriage ...

I know that many wives in this chamber are very pleased to see that out of the act. I have been married to my husband for 29 years as of the weekend. Happy anniversary, Jason. That is very outdated. We are definitely two people. I just wanted to get in happy anniversary, Jason.

I turn my attention to the clauses concerned with the implementation of the statutory seller disclosure scheme. The introduction of the seller disclosure scheme comes from the 2017 QUT report, with the aim to have a consistent and transparent regime and to simplify the current matrix of obligations. The report put forward four guiding principles: one, the information to be provided by the seller to the buyer pre contract should be within the seller's knowledge or readily available by a search at reasonable cost to the seller; two, information should be of value to the buyer in making a decision to purchase; three, the information should be in an accessible form; and, four, a single legal framework should be established providing consistency in the content and timing of disclosure remedies available for the failure to comply.

These principles highlight the risks and advantages of a seller disclosure scheme. We must ensure that there is not an unnecessary cost burden to the seller and we must remember that the information given to the buyer should be of a practical level and in a helpful form. As the report stated, there is a limit to the information a buyer will read—we all know that—and take into account when buying a property. There is also obviously buyer beware. It is of no use if the seller disclosure scheme results in thousands of pages of documents being handed to a buyer who is then completely overwhelmed and understands very little of it and therefore does not take any of it in. Many of us would have experienced the overwhelming nature of the documents put before you when buying a house, unit or block of land and getting your head around that process and what you need to go through. It is hoped that this scheme will enable buyers to have the confidence to trust and understand the information before them. Currently, as the explanatory notes acknowledge, there is no formal statutory seller disclosure framework in Queensland. Rather than easing the burden on sellers, this increases the regulatory burden due to the complex mix of obligations between common-law, statutory and contractual obligation. It also means buyers are receiving different documents throughout different stages of the sale process and that is why a scheme is hoped to lead to a better outcome for all parties.

There were several issues raised with the proposed disclosure scheme and questions were raised as to why disclosure over natural hazard risks was not mandated. At present the draft regulation attached to the bill specifically excludes disclosure of flooding or other natural hazard history in a disclosure statement and instead contains a statement that a buyer should inquire with the relevant local government as to whether a property is affected by flooding or other natural hazard or within the

natural hazard overlay. We live in the most disaster-prone state and not to acknowledge this is taking a real risk. However, it is important to raise because the royal commission into natural disaster arrangements recommended that state and territory governments should, one, each have a process or a mechanism in place to communicate the natural hazard risk information to households in hazard-prone areas and, two, work together with the Australian government, where appropriate, to explore the development of a national mechanism to do the same. The royal commission report also noted—

The Queensland Government questioned whether there is a need to directly communicate risk to people when they can access government websites that already host this information. The answer is simple: many people do not.

The LGAQ raised concerns over this decision and recommended that the draft Property Law Regulation be amended prior to commencement of the bill. Both the 2018 and the 2022 LGAQ conferences passed regulations regarding disclosure of natural hazard risks. While it is acknowledged, the QUT *Seller disclosure in Queensland* report found—

The Centre does not recommend the imposition of a statutory obligation on a seller to disclose flooding information at this time. This view is influenced heavily by the difficulties associated with clearly articulating the meaning of 'flood information' or for the seller to state whether the property is 'flood prone' together with inconsistency in the information available ...

A little while ago I did searches in relation to one of the properties owned by myself and my husband in Brisbane and I note the difference between the two websites in flood notifications. FloodCheck by the department of natural resources showed no flood zone anywhere near that property but the Brisbane City Council Flood Awareness Map showed that it was quite obvious that the flood map goes into an adjoining street. Whilst I know that this is not within the ambit of the Attorney-General, I note that it would be good for the minister for natural resources to look at the overlay maps because that is one of the biggest concerns that buyers have—that is, that they get different information. In her introductory speech the Attorney-General detailed that the decision not to include a full natural hazard risk statement or overlay was due to practical and legal difficulties, including the difference of the level of information various councils hold and the fees they charge. Therefore, I do put to this House that it is understandable why this position was taken. However, there is a clear need to improve our systems statewide so there is less disparity between local government areas in terms of accessibility to that very important information.

With regard to lots in community titles schemes, the bill brings in a new requirement for a body corporate certificate generated by the body corporate rather than a copy of body corporate records. This was opposed by a number of strata research agents who argued that this would not give the objective information, creating a conflict of interest. The fear conveyed is that this is more likely to be more of a 'press the button' exercise rather than a genuine search that they conduct on behalf of clients. This industry has said that the passing of this bill is likely to have a significant impact on its workforce and it is important that this is acknowledged. It has suggested a certificate of inspection of body corporate records rather than the body corporate certificate.

The bill proposes that if the lot is in a community titles scheme a community management statement must be provided. This statement was not part of the QUT recommendations and several stakeholders opposed the inclusion given the abundance of information it could result in the buyer receiving. The information the QUT report recommended providing is an exclusive-use plan and relevant by-laws including smoking, pets and noise. This would be included as part of the community management statement. However, the extra information could be quite voluminous and overwhelm the everyday buyer. The bill provides that if the seller fails to provide the disclosure statement or a prescribed certificate a buyer will have the right to terminate the contract and will not be required to prove that the non-disclosure related to a material matter. This is designed to incentivise disclosure by sellers. This position departs from the recommendation in the seller disclosure report. The REIQ has suggested the seller disclosure should not come into effect until at least 12 months after the commencement of the act to allow for ample education around the changes. In fact, the LGAQ stated that there is a critical need for the state government to deliver extensive education, training and guidance for all affected stakeholders in the lead-up to, during and following the commencement of the bill, should it be passed. This must be followed through to ensure schemes are fairly and effectively rolled out.

As I stated earlier in my speech, the LNP wants to see more people in homes and will support any effort towards that goal. While this bill is unlikely to bring about any real change in home ownership, we hope it brings more openness into the system. I note that it is one of the LNP's priorities for Queensland's future to make sure that we do secure our housing foundations. It is really important. I note that our priorities to secure housing foundations include improving housing affordability with more

land supply and helping Queenslanders realise the dream of owning their own home, and this can be done through the Property Law Act where we look at that more modernised language and make it easier; developing timely plans for the future of every Queensland region to identify what infrastructure and services are needed to accommodate that growth; working closely with local governments to plan and deliver our regional plans for more housing for Queenslanders; improving project management to deliver infrastructure on time and on budget; strengthening public services project management capabilities—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I am sure the LNP wants to run through its apparent policies, but that is not the purpose of this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Member for Nanango, I draw you back to the long title of the bill.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. We are just so proud of having those right priorities for Queensland's future.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I am happy to take that interjection and read more content into—

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Maryborough, I just remind you that you are on a warning.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: In relation to the Property Law Act, I again note that this was a process that was very ably started by the member for Kawana when he was the former attorney-general of Queensland. It was the LNP in government that commenced the much needed and long-awaited review into the Property Law Act 1974. For many of us who have a law degree—I note that the member for Currumbin has a law degree, the member for Ipswich West has a law degree and the Attorney-General has a law degree—those of us who studied for that law degree under the Property Law Act 1974 have been long waiting and it took an LNP government to ensure there was a review into the Property Law Act. Almost a decade later we are thankfully debating this bill before the House, but it is something that should have happened many years ago. When the Attorney-General was the former attorney-general maybe she could have brought it in then. It did not happen then, but I do welcome the changes and the modernisation of the Property Law Act. It is important that the next generation of Queenslanders do get an opportunity to get into their own homes and the process of buying their first home is made simpler by the seller ensuring the right and correct information is disclosed. That is important. Ultimately, whilst these changes will not resolve the housing crisis, we do hope that they lead to better outcomes for Queenslanders.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Frecklington, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance



Mr CRISAFULLI (Broadwater—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): The LNP has the right priorities for Queensland's future. We have the right priorities because we have spent time listening to Queenslanders. Every member of this team has been in every part of this state and we have listened to brave Queenslanders as they have told us their stories. Their stories have formed what will be the blueprint for shaping the right priorities for years to come in Queensland.

In contrast, what we have seen from the government has been a period of chaos and crisis, of undermining, of backstabbing, of a complete and utter void of leadership. What disappointed me most was when I heard the Premier refer to our document as 'the wrong priorities'. I want to ask the Premier: what in this document are the wrong priorities? Is it 'making our communities safer'? Is that what the Premier believes is a wrong priority? Youth crime is out of control. There are fewer police and weaker laws. That is why there is a youth crime crisis.

The Premier no longer has the priority of keeping Queenslanders safe. Today we heard from Jen, a constituent from Arana Hills, who told her story about what it was like to have her home invaded, to have to follow it on social media, to see a system where there are no consequences for actions. Jen

is just one of thousands of Queenslanders impacted. Since the government's knee-jerk reaction, over 50 cars have been stolen every day, over 130 properties have been broken into every day. Our priority is about increasing the number of police on the beat and giving them the laws to do their job.

What other priorities does the Premier believe are wrong? Is it 'easier access to health services'? Is that what the Premier says is a wrong priority? Ambulance ramping in this state is the worst in the nation. It was 15 per cent when this government came to office. It had already doubled before COVID. It is at 45 per cent. The latest data is now 24 days overdue. We still do not know the latest data. Is it back to 15 per cent? Is it no longer the worst in the country? Our priority is to heal this crisis. Our priority is to enable young women to have their baby where, when and how they choose. That is what priorities look like: empowering local decision-making and ensuring that healthcare professionals are in charge at the coalface.

What about 'saving you paying for Labor's failures'? Does the Premier not believe that should be a priority? Queenslanders are tired of seeing their hard-earned taxpayer dollars frittered away by a government that has given up treating their money with respect, a government that has introduced 15 new taxes and a government that has spent billions of dollars in cost overruns on projects. I have said it before and I will say it again: the Minister for Transport would not make smoko time in a government where the Premier had not checked out. That a minister can survive like this one has would be laughable if Queenslanders were not paying for it. The LNP's priorities ensure reducing Labor government waste rather than hitting Queenslanders with higher taxes and fees and delivering better services and infrastructure for every taxpayer dollar invested. That is what our priorities are for Queensland. For the minister, who nearly three months ago deliberately withheld a \$2.4 billion cost overrun—

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

Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw. Like a cup that has been re-used too many times, that excuse is wilting. For the minister to somehow believe that you can withhold information like that from Queenslanders and not be held accountable just shows that this government has given up on ensuring Queenslanders do not have to pay for Labor's—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at those comments. The member knows that they are inaccurate and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): I will take some advice. Member for Miller, I only heard a reference to the government. I did not hear a reference to you personally. At this point I will not be ruling that there is a point of order.

Mr CRISAFULLI: A \$2.4 billion momentary lapse of concentration? It was deliberate, it was calculated and no-one has been held accountable. The LNP intends to ensure that Queenslanders do not have to pay for Labor's failures. What about 'securing our housing foundations'? Is that a wrong priority? Is it a wrong priority to want vulnerable Queenslanders to have a roof over their head? Is it a wrong priority to not want to see the community housing sector continue to go backwards—the only state in the nation that has? Is it a wrong priority to want Queenslanders to own their own home? When I see a generation of Queenslanders who have given up on the great Australian dream—it has become a nightmare for them—I know that this state could do so much better. At 64 per cent, Queensland's home ownership is the lowest in the country. We want to have ambition in this state. We want kids to believe in aspiration. Within 10 years we intend to go from last place to first place. I sat in a room with the member for Southport and listened to young Queenslanders say that they do not believe they have any hope of owning their own home within 10 years. I know that there is a better way in this state. These were young people, either studying at university or employed, and the vast majority of them did not believe they would ever be able to own their own home. They should be able to. I am pleased to say that there will be a single point of accountability to make sure that everything is on the table when it comes to fixing the housing crisis. When it comes to taxation and incentives, we will make sure that every option is analysed.

Here is a prediction: by budget time we will watch the Treasurer skulk in here and talk about thresholds and incentives. I ask members to remember this prediction. We will watch it happen because we have—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr CRISAFULLI: Watch another humiliating backdown, because this is a Treasurer—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, Treasurer!

Mr CRISAFULLI: What is wrong about making it a priority to work harder for Queenslanders? How is it that the Premier can say that wanting to re-establish integrity in government is a bad thing? When you have a report from Professor Coaldrake that talks about a culture of entrenched fear, of ministerial advisers walking around like little generals and of independent public servants being bullied, you know that government is broken in this state. The LNP has a focus to make sure that we are working harder for Queenslanders, to give them integrity in government and the government they deserve.

In question time today we saw a government with the wrong priorities. We saw a government scrambling to make an announcement. We now know that 'Steven M' is the Deputy Premier—shock reveal. What did we see in those text messages from the highest level of government? We saw no plan and no strategy—and do you know what is worse? We saw no compassion—absolutely none! That was in the shadow of one of the most horrific crimes that could ever occur in somebody's home, and the response was about an advertising campaign—and the Premier did not even bother to look at that when she got it. That shows how this government views everything. This is a government that views everything through the optics of its survival and has nothing for the priorities of Queenslanders' survival. There is only one side of this House that has been listening and there is only one side of this House that has the right priorities for Queensland's future, and it is the LNP.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I recognise that we have been joined in the gallery by the former member for Indooroopilly.

Liberal National Party, Performance



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.11 pm): Over the weekend we saw the Leader of the Opposition release his fake priorities for Queensland and it did not even last three days. Today in his MPI statement we had the auto babble turned up to 11, but at question time he could not ask even one question of the Premier about these fake priorities. That is what he thinks about it. It is absolutely—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. Treasurer, resume your seat. Member for Nanango, you are warned. This is a general warning to everybody: anybody else who holds up a prop will be asked to leave the chamber immediately. Member for Currumbin, you are skating close to the edge as well.

Mr DICK: The big announcement came to nothing because LNP promises are not worth the paper they are written on. Queenslanders want to know what kind of government the LNP is proposing. I say: do not listen to what the LNP says; look at what the LNP does.

Queenslanders need to look no further than at what Adrian Schrinner is doing to shred the Brisbane City Council budget. It is the largest local government in not just Queensland but also Australia. A 10 per cent cut across the board is a devastating blow to workers, contractors, investors and ratepayers across the city. I have read that even bus drivers are worried. In a cost-of-living crisis, when we are trying to grow our economy and when people are trying to get around the city, that is the last thing we need. What is worse, Mayor Schrinner did that less than five months after he handed down his budget. It is a broken promise and a total reversal, just like this LNP leader's commitment to treaty.

When it comes to treaty I will say this: the LNP leader has set a new world record for shameful behaviour. He has broken an election promise before an election, not only withdrawing his support for reconciliation in this state but also becoming an absolute wrecker of the process by promising to repeal the legislation he just voted for.

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Resume your seat, please, Treasurer. Member for Buderim and member for Southern Downs, you are both warned under the standing orders.

Mr DICK: What these events show is that you cannot trust a single word that Adrian Schrinner and David Crisafulli say. Queenslanders cannot trust a single word they say. The only thing you can trust them to do—the only thing you can rely on them to do—is to make budget cuts. For the LNP, it is always the same answer on any issue. Campbell Newman said that the economy was weak, revenues

were down and the budget had to be cut. Adrian Schrinner said that the economy is too strong and the budget must be cut. Now, in his fake priorities document, the Leader of the Opposition says that the tax burden is too high and—guess what? The budget must be cut!

The actions of Campbell Newman, Adrian Schrinner and the Leader of the Opposition prove one thing: the LNP have not learned their lesson. They are determined to cut, sack and sell. Just look at their record. Adrian Schrinner cuts taxes on property developers in August and in October says that the City of Brisbane now has a budget crisis that forces cuts. Before the 2012 budget, Campbell Newman cut taxes on property, blowing a \$1 billion hole in the state budget and creating a budget crisis. What did he have to do? Cut! You can bet your bottom dollar that the LNP leader will do exactly the same thing when he cuts royalties to create a budget crisis.

What did the Leader of the Opposition say when Campbell Newman started to destroy the front line? He said—

I am also profoundly grateful to be part of a government which had the courage to assess the threat that was posed to each and every Queenslander by enormous debt and deficit, the resolve to do something about it ...


Scrapping 14,000 workers' jobs! That is the courage that the Leader of the Opposition likes. We all know exactly how they will do it. They will sacrifice progressive coal royalties. What did David Crisafulli discuss with Ian Macfarlane when up at that mine? He promised to cut progressive coal royalties!

Mr POWELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. That is the second time that the Treasurer has not used correct titles in his contribution.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Manager of Opposition Business. Treasurer, I ask you to use correct titles.

Mr DICK: It is a grubby, sneaky deal that has been done by the Leader of the Opposition and Ian Macfarlane. The Leader of the Opposition will cut royalties in exchange for financial support from the mining lobby. When the Leader of the Opposition holds up his end of the secret bargain, I know who will suffer: every single Queenslander. They have their secret plan. They dress it up with sneaky language like 'debt strategy' and 'intergenerational equity'. They complain about taxes. They use wise words to try to hide the fact that they have a secret plan for cuts. The member for Broadwater is trying to trick Queenslanders with his slippery priorities. We know what they will do. They will cut, sack and sell. It is only a Labor government that will protect jobs, investment and infrastructure in this state.

Premier and Minister for the Olympic and Paralympic Games; Redlands Electorate, LNP Candidate

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.17 pm): For a big announcement that has apparently come to nothing, the Labor Party spent a fair amount of time talking about it this morning. In fact, I think they spent all of the time for ministerial statements and question time talking about the LNP's right priorities for Queensland's future.

An opposition member: Thank you.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. I thank the Labor Party for all the free publicity. They know they have no record to speak about. They do not have a positive record to speak about. One would think that, after nearly 10 years in office, they would be able to come in here, acknowledge the LNP's plans and say, 'This is what we have done for the past 10 years,' but no. This is the Labor Party's gutter politics. It is their attack politics. We will see a lot more of it in the next 12 months.

On the weekend, the Premier held a morning tea for all of her Facebook friends. There was a big sign that said 'Annastacia' and 'Spend time with the Premier'. It was very Oprah-istic. I was waiting for the Premier to say, 'You get a car! You get a car!'; 'You get a book! You get a book!' It was very much like that. They then posted the Premier's video, which is not about Queenslanders; it is all about the Premier. It is a very arrogant video, I might say, that she posted on her Facebook page. Interestingly, I looked at it a couple of hours ago. There were 132 comments on the Premier's own Facebook page but only 15 visible comments. One hundred and thirty-two comments had been made about the video but only 15 were visible. Two of those 15 were from Minister de Brenni and Treasurer Cameron Dick. Good on you, Premier, and well done! The Premier put up this very arrogant video and Queenslanders have had a say. Unfortunately, the Premier does not like what they are saying so the Premier's office is hiding 117 comments on the Premier's Facebook. In fact, there were more laughing emojis than love heart emojis on this Facebook post. This is not a media website, because that is a different kettle of fish. This is actually—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. Queenslanders have worked out the Premier. She has checked out. She does not have time for Queenslanders. She is not interested. She is only interested in the red carpet and announcements. That is all she is interested in. The chaos and crisis of the Palaszczuk government continues. Only a few days ago we saw in a news article

Annastacia Palaszczuk's weakening grip on power in Queensland has slipped again, with news that her favoured candidate for the red-ribbon electorate of Ipswich West has been bounced out of the box seat by a union-preferred replacement ...

... union boss, Gary 'Blocker' Bullock, took an interest and gave the nod to his preferred candidate, the partner of long-standing ETU official, Stuart Trill.

Not even the Premier's hand-picked candidates can now survive, because Gary Bullock is making all of the decisions in Queensland. The article continues—


But Bullock's choice is also massively significant to the future of Premier Palaszczuk herself. When sudden fractures appeared in the Premier's leadership and she left the state for a period last month, nervous MPs expected Bullock to rally in support of the Premier.

No chance!

Finally, I want to thank the Redland community and Redlands candidate Rebecca Young, who had me out in that wonderful electorate a few weeks ago. We met with Gayle and Lindsay from Our Parking Spots in the Weinam Creek PDA. This is a massive issue for Southern Moreton Bay Island residents. The island residents do not have sufficient parking on the mainland. They have attempted to get the government and the council to fix this. It has not been happening. I thank Gayle and Lindsay for meeting with me to talk about these issues. I toured the area. I looked at all the parking spots. The PDA application that the council has handed over as trustees will not provide reliable, affordable or efficient parking for island residents on the mainland. Why do island residents need affordable and reliable parking? It is because they have to go to doctors, do their grocery shopping, visit family and friends and go to other appointments on the mainland. Why should they be denied? Why should Southern Moreton Bay Island residents be denied the reliable and affordable parking that other residents have on the mainland? I call on the state government to take an active interest in this and to fix it. Island residents need affordable parking. The government is planning only an extra 100 or so parking spots. It will not be sufficient for the island residents in that area. I thank the group and I thank Rebecca Young for taking this issue seriously, because the Labor Party has not.

(Time expired)

Liberal National Party, Performance

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads and Minister for Digital Services) (2.22 pm): After those two contributions from members opposite, it is hard to tell whether it is 2013 or 2023! It is the same old stuff from the same old people from the same old Newman government. That is what we are getting from those opposite. Let us look at the record of the Leader of the Opposition—a lifelong professional politician, other than the three years he was in purgatory after being kicked out by the people of Mundingburra. He went down to the Gold Coast and did over the youngest ever elected female in this parliament for preselection. We remember his record. He was in the thick of it in the Newman government—the VLAD laws, the NGR train order from overseas, the billions in cuts and the 14,000 people who lost their jobs. The Leader of the Opposition was right in there. What do we see in the 44-page whinge of those opposite? There is absolutely no policy and no projects—just rhetoric. That is how substantial the Leader of the Opposition is.

When we look at the record of the Leader of the Opposition, we know that that is who he is. Do members remember during the pandemic when nobody was vaccinated? He equated our health response to putting a doona over your head. When people's lives were at stake, he did not understand the threat and just backed in his mate in Canberra. That is on the record. It is on YouTube; members can look at it. It is the absolute opposite of leadership. Do members remember the laptop? It was a conspiracy and all of these things were happening—until an investigation showed that it was nothing. Did he stand up and say, 'I was wrong.' No. He hid. He went to the regions. He never accepts responsibility for his small and short agenda.

Let's look at the current situation, where his front bench are out there aspiring to be the Newman government on health policy. Doesn't that send a shiver down the spine of every person in the health industry? He is putting the staff in the health sector on notice. I refer to the recent comments by the shadow health minister, the member for Mudgeeraba, who was part of the Newman government and

has the same agenda. The member for Chatsworth talks about 'tough love' in terms of the Newman government. That is not what the people of Queensland thought. They saw it for what it was: cuts. We see current shadow frontbenchers talking about billions in cuts. 'Pruning' they say. They have a new, cute little word for cuts; it is called 'pruning'. We know that it is the same thing.


When we look at the recent document from the lightweight Leader of the Opposition we see that there is no policy, no projects, no commitment to building trains in Queensland, no commitment to road funding, no commitment to rail funding, no commitment to the hospital plan of this government and no commitment to the Energy and Jobs Plan. That is real policy. Our policy is very clear. It is the most comprehensive energy transition plan in the nation, if not the western world, and those opposite will not support it.

Those opposite are lightweight. Why are they lightweight? It is the same old faces over there: the members for Kawana, Broadwater—formerly the member for Mundingburra—Everton, Mudgeeraba, Nanango, Glass House, Surfers Paradise and Chatsworth. It goes on and on. They have learned nothing. They did not clean themselves out after losing, because they never accepted the reason they were tossed out—that is, they were an incompetent government. They were a savage government. They junked their election commitments from day one. They said that public servants would be safe but started sacking them within six months of coming to power. That is their record. When we look at that 44-page document we see that there is nothing in it.

The Leader of the Opposition is lightweight. Five months ago he made a virtue of standing on his principles. They are his own words: 'I stand on my principles.' What did he do? As soon as the wind changed, he folded like a pack of playing cards. Weak, weak, weak—that is the Leader of the Opposition. Those opposite know it. When Amanda Stoker joins their party room, watch that front bench get cleaned out. She will take someone's place and we will see the hard-right agenda. She is not coming in here to do nothing. Voluntary assisted dying laws are on the chopping block. Abortion laws are on the chopping block. There are right-wing priorities in that document, not right priorities.

(Time expired)

Home Ownership

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (2.27 pm): Home ownership has been declining in Queensland for decades. The 2021 Census reveals that Queensland has the lowest rate of home ownership compared to other Australian states. We sit at 64 per cent. New South Wales is at 65 per cent. Victoria and South Australia are at 69 per cent. Western Australia is at 70 per cent and Tasmania is at 71 per cent. They all came in higher.

Many young Queenslanders now believe that they will never be able to purchase their own home. In fact, a Resolve survey found that two-thirds of young Australians are giving up hope of ever owning their own home. The numbers across the decades tell the story. Some 53 per cent of 25- to 29-year-olds owned a house in 1971 compared to just 35 per cent in 2021. Those aged 30 to 34 saw a similar decline, from 63 per cent to 49 per cent in that same time. There are a range of reasons for the decline and it is time they were discussed openly: increasing property prices, the rise in the cost of money and steepening rents which make it near impossible to save a deposit. The nation's fifth biggest lender is the bank of mum and dad, and if you do not have the privilege of access to parental generosity or another source of funds, home ownership is nearly a mountain too daunting to climb.


By the time of the election, Labor will have governed Queensland for 35 of the past 40 years. I can barely recall anyone in the Palaszczuk government even raising home ownership in the House in the seven years I have been here. Just look at Labor's record in the last year alone. Federally, since Chalmers and Albanese took charge there have been 16 meetings of the Reserve Bank and 11 have resulted in cash rate increases. In the previous 96 meetings, under the coalition, there was only one. It is worse for the Palaszczuk Labor government: a Treasurer who plotted a renters tax in the middle of a housing crisis and who disdainfully dismisses housing affordability concerns in press conferences. If you think back over the last year, after the Housing Summit, we have seen: \$2 million down the drain on Griffith University student accommodation with nothing but favours banked for Labor mates; a Productivity Commission report which has shown that, per capita, social housing in Queensland is less than the rest of the nation; and a doubling of the Housing Investment Fund that has not delivered a single new house.

For too long there has been failure or, even worse, silence. There has been silence from the Premier and Treasurer as Queensland has become the lowest home ownership state in Australia. We are not going to stand for it. We will give Queenslanders hope that home ownership is achievable by setting a goal: by 2035 our state will have the highest home ownership rate in the nation. It is an opportunity to get Queensland on top and provide young Queenslanders with the pathway to home ownership. I thank the leader for the opportunity to take up the shadow portfolio, which will be based in Treasury if we form government next year.

I have dedicated the majority of my professional life as part of a Queensland mutual bank helping Queenslanders achieve their dream of buying their piece of our great state. It is an honour to now help influence policy settings so that home ownership is more accessible for those who choose to buy. We will shine a light on three key areas: taxation arrangements, including transfer duty concessions for first home buyers and other threshold implications; creating an incentive framework to support home ownership with a review of the first home owner grant and shared responsibility schemes similar to those adopted in other Australian jurisdictions; and land supply to meet Queensland's need for a genuine plan to deliver land where it is most needed by our growing population.

Home ownership may not be the desire of every young Queenslanders; they may wish to prioritise travel, financial freedom or career advancement. They are all legitimate choices, but for those who choose to buy it must be possible for them. Restoring a belief that home ownership is achievable will drive aspiration. That will not only lead to a stronger and more prosperous Queensland; it will lead to a state where one side of the House will be focusing on the right priorities for Queensland's future.

Freight Retail Discount Scheme

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (2.32 pm): During the community cabinet held in the Torres Strait in September 2022 the government was able to hear directly from community about the cost-of-living challenges communities face every day. The concerns raised by communities were heard loud and clear, and I want to acknowledge the strong advocacy from the region. The Palaszczuk government heard their voices loud and clear, and before cabinet departed the region the Premier made a bold commitment to host a cost-of-living summit in the Torres Strait.


In March this year I had the privilege of returning to the Torres Strait to co-chair the summit with Minister Mark Bailey at the Thursday Island sports complex. We were joined by Minister Enoch, Minister de Brenni and Queensland Government Champion for the Torres Strait, Minister Shannon Fentiman. The summit was attended by an estimated 100 participants from the Torres Strait region and Northern Peninsula Area region, including local community people, government and non-government agencies and the private sector. At the summit the Queensland government announced a \$64 million freight subsidy to help ease cost-of-living pressures in the Torres Strait, Cape York and gulf regions.

The Queensland government wasted no time getting to work on the best way forward that would directly impact consumers. Following the cost-of-living summit the Queensland government, through TMR, worked with independent adviser Deloitte Access Economics to identify how to most effectively deliver a freight funding package to address freight related cost-of-living pressures in the Northern Peninsula Area region, Torres Strait and gulf. TMR consulted with stakeholders including local councils, state and federal agencies, representative bodies, industry groups, Indigenous groups, freight and transport service providers and some retail stores to identify views about how the freight funding package may be most effectively applied to address freight related cost-of-living pressures in the regions. Common themes and feedback provided by stakeholders informed consideration of possible approaches to implement freight subsidy funding. These themes included a strong preference for freight subsidy funding to be applied as close as possible to the end customer to try to pass on the benefit to local residents in the community.

We recently announced that the freight retail discount scheme will be implemented in early 2024. The freight retail discount scheme will be delivered at participating stores in the Northern Peninsula Area, Torres Strait and the gulf region. This means that people shopping at participating stores will see a 5.2 per cent discount automatically applied to the price of eligible goods at the cash register. The eligible essential goods list includes groceries sold by participating retail outlets but does not include ineligible goods. Groceries are everyday food and household items that individuals or households regularly purchase for basic sustenance and domestic needs, including fresh and non-perishable food products, beverages, household cleaning supplies, toiletries and other essential goods for daily living. It does not include ineligible goods such as alcohol, tobacco and tobacco-like products including nicotine and vaping products, full-sugar soft drinks, confectionery, furniture, hardware, fuel, electrical appliances, clothing, white goods, furnishings, Manchester, bathroom equipment and kitchen utensils.

I would like to thank the Palaszczuk government, and in particular Minister Bailey, his department and ministerial staff, for all of their hard work behind the scenes to ease cost-of-living pressures in the Torres Strait, Cape York and gulf regions, where we continue to work towards improving outcomes for our most disadvantaged and vulnerable communities.

Mental Health Services

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (2.36 pm): Our frontline workers, whether public sector staff, not-for-profits, support organisations or volunteers, continue to be overwhelmed in their daily roles. There is a recurring theme. In Noosa, violent incidents this year—one resulting in a fatality—involved individuals experiencing mental health issues who have been within the system. We have residents who portray themselves as being homeless yet who have social housing units nearby, one with an NDIS carer, without follow-through after hospitalisations or avenues to assist. This is creating angst in communities.

Our weekends are spent responding to Facebook tags and messages without breaking confidentiality, making calls to services that have no answers. Those sleeping rough who have been offered help refuse as they battle with mental health challenges, creating greater workloads for all as residents continue to report to numbers provided—over and over. We have non-verbal residents, who live with carers, becoming homeless due to complaints from neighbours about uncontrollable noise impacts. Being continually moved on, they do not have the stable home they need and deserve. Planning laws, which include group housing on acreage, do not keep up with these needs. Department of Housing complexes at times have at least one tenant with a mental health condition that severely impacts other tenants, creating further trauma. There is an increased workload as a result of complaints, with little to offer by way of solutions.

Statistics that are not public domain—and should be—would clearly indicate the increasing amount of time being spent by police in this space. They are already overloaded as a result of increases in domestic and family violence, with data again not being made publicly available. Attending to incidents relating to mental health and escorting patients or ensuring paramedics and mental health co-responders are kept safe at callouts contributes to the lack of visibility of policing, and that is adding to the concern of communities. This is, in effect, a hidden demand—even though it is not classified as such—and resourcing allocations must accommodate this. As our hospitals' mental health wards battle with an increasing number of Queenslanders who are involuntarily admitted or seeking assistance that cannot be provided, our emergency departments are the next stop for the release of those not meeting the criteria for admission, which causes further impacts to themselves, their families and communities.

Parents trying to access mental support for their teenagers is one of the most heartbreaking, as unless their teens want help no avenues appear available to assist until a major escalation with impacts that are devastating, including suicide. The fact that parents cannot access information about the status of their children who are admitted once they hit 16 years old is furthering the heartbreak, impacting the mental health of these parents.


Just last week the *Courier-Mail* reported the increase in abuse directed to Queensland MPs. However, unacknowledged is that our electorate staff are experiencing residents fixated on them—something once reserved for those of us elected—and this is impacting on their mental health. The Queensland Fixated Threat Assessment Centre is an incredible resource. It is often able to arrange mental health assistance when all other avenues have failed. However, it is sad that these cases have to escalate to this level before receiving help.

Previous inquiries into youth crime have shown that many perpetrators are impacted by mental health issues, including fetal alcohol syndrome, unresolved childhood traumas and multiple comorbidities, leading to diminished capacity for their actions. I have written to the minister saying that much more needs to be done, including insuring more support and services are available after 4 pm on Fridays. Mental health does not operate to business hours and we urgently need localised co-responders in our communities with funding streams that can be accessed by volunteer organisations so they can provide in-person assistance at night and on weekends.

We have come a long way in removing the stigma surrounding our mental health and fitness. However, we need to address the reality being experienced. With outreach services not coping, support not easily accessible, particularly over weekends, and our frontliners overloaded, there are important conversations to be had. Many decades ago we replaced institutional care for those who cannot care for themselves with outreach support and independent living, which is failing for many. We need to look

at what options can be developed to keep communities and those with mental health challenges safe. This is a conversation that needs to be had, as without it we are increasing the trauma through a domino effect instead of diminishing it.

Central Queensland, Health Services

 **Ms LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.41 pm): Every Queenslanders deserves access to world-class health care no matter where they live, but Central Queenslanders were shocked last Friday when Mandalay Medical Centre in Rockhampton announced the centre is closing in December. Mandalay have serviced our local community for many years, and their decision to close will have an impact. I thank the doctors, nurses and staff for their work looking after our community for so many years. I am concerned about the closure of Mandalay Medical Centre because we need more GPs in our community, not fewer.

Since Mandalay's announcement, I have raised the community's concern with the Minister for Health and have attempted a number of times to contact Mandalay's management to no avail. The Queensland government is aware of the potential impact that the decision to close the Mandalay Medical Centre will have. The Queensland government has started working closely with the federal government and the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service to ensure the hospital is resourced appropriately to meet the community's health needs. I am advised the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service is prepared to manage any increase in demand and is also working with local general practices to provide timely care for patients.

The previous federal government completely underfunded Medicare and the decade-long underinvestment in primary care has made it harder for Queenslanders to see a GP, especially bulk-billing GPs. I am particularly disappointed to see the LNP member for Capricornia attempt to play politics with this closure, given that she sat by as a member of the federal government for eight years and did absolutely nothing to increase bulk-billing doctors in Central Queensland. We saw bulk-billing sink to historic lows in Central Queensland. This was an issue I petitioned the member for Capricornia about, but what did she do? She did absolutely nothing.

I am pleased that the federal Labor government has increased bulk-billing incentives in this year's budget. It is a great start but there is more to do. The combination of Medicare indexation—the first from this financial year of 3.6 per cent—plus the federal Strengthening Medicare grants that came through in July, plus the tripling of the bulk-billing from November is genuinely a shot in the arm for general practice. Federal Labor's increase in the bulk-billing incentives for doctors to continue or restart bulk-billing concession card holders, pension card holders and children is welcome news to locals in my community. Over the past eight years we have seen a significant decline in bulk-billing rates as a result of the neglect of the federal LNP government. Let us not forget that the Leader of the Opposition, Peter Dutton, wanted to get rid of bulk-billing altogether. Federal Labor's investment will certainly help stem the flow of bulk-billing back to general practice right across the country.

Mrs Gerber interjected.


Ms LAUGA: The alternative prime minister wanted to scrap bulk-billing rates altogether. I wonder if the member for Currumbin had any opinion about the proposal by her federal leader to scrap bulk-billing altogether, which would have had a devastating impact on general practice right across the country. I know that people in my community would be absolutely devastated if the federal government was to scrap bulk-billing altogether. We need more bulk-billing and more incentives for bulk-billing, not fewer—as the member for Currumbin is arguing here.

Our regional and rural hospitals continue to do an excellent job providing health care to the people across the state, often in difficult and challenging circumstances. The establishment of the Rockhampton urgent care clinic, being delivered by the state and federal governments, will play a vital role for our community. The urgent care clinic will offer treatment for non-life-threatening conditions, a significant proportion of which may otherwise end up seeking care in Queensland emergency departments. Services will be bulk-billed and the clinics will be open for extended hours every day of the week.

I am pleased to report that, at the request of the health minister, the director-general, Michael Walsh, will be travelling to Rockhampton to engage with local stakeholders and work through what potential solutions are available to ensure care can continue to be provided to patients from the Mandalay Medical Centre. I am working to be with the director-general when he visits. A letter has also

been sent to the federal Minister for Health requesting a senior official from his department attend the meetings. I will always stand up and fight for better health care for Central Queenslanders. It is disappointing that the Mandalay Medical Centre have announced that they are closing in December, but the federal government, the state director-general for health, the Minister for Health and I are all looking at ways in which we can move forward to provide better healthcare outcomes for Central Queenslanders.

Home Ownership

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (2.46 pm): I rise to firstly congratulate the opposition leader on his vision to increase home ownership in this state.

Government members interjected.

Mr MANDER: The fact that Queensland is at the bottom of the list of home ownership in this country is a disgrace. The bold vision that we will be on top in 10 years time is a vision that is worth fighting for, not laughing about. Those opposite are laughing about that vision of our young people achieving home ownership. The LNP is all about aspiration; it is all about rewarding effort. What we want is for our young people to have the opportunity to own a home.

I want to congratulate the opposition leader on that vision and on appointing the shadow Treasurer as the first shadow minister for home ownership in this nation. In a year's time, the shadow Treasurer will become the first minister for home ownership in this country. That is visionary. That shows that we work as a total government, not department by department. We realise that every department must work together to secure the housing foundations that we require. We need the Treasurer, the housing minister, the state planning minister and the local government minister all working together. This side of the House can work together—not like the Labor Party, which is full of factions where the left will not speak to the right and the right will not speak to the old guard and they are speaking at odds with each other and contradicting each other. This is a vision worth fighting for and a vision that every shadow minister and every member on this side is totally committed to. We are determined to actually achieve that.

Over the weekend we celebrated—and 'celebrated' is a moot word—that it has been one year since the Housing Summit. We have to question whether vulnerable Queenslanders are better off than they were a year ago. The answer is that they are not—because this government is all about announcements and not about reality. There is no greater example of that than the latest announcement which was made at Northshore Hamilton of supposedly about 1,500 homes, including 200 social housing properties and 1,300 privately owned properties. This was announced 14 months ago, then reannounced in August and promoted recently by the Premier with those beautiful drone shots of Northshore. This government have more drones than you could imagine, and we are not talking about Labor ministers. They have drones coming out of their ears. They have big production numbers, but for what?

Let's talk about that project. That project, despite all these promises, has no proponent, no contract, no funding, no development applications and no hope of being realised in the next 10 years. That is consistent with every other announcement the government has made over this last year. The shadow Treasurer mentioned some of those before: the Griffith University debacle, cobbled together in 24 hours between Labor mates; the War Widows were supposed to get special properties; the Catholic Church donated 90 properties and we still do not know what is happening with that; the great granny flat announcement where we still do not know whether there is one person in a granny flat because of the so-called announcements that they made; and the HIF, the Housing Investment Fund, doubled in size to \$2 billion, but they may as well make it \$20 billion because it has been three years since that announcement and there is not one person in a house because of the Housing Investment Fund. The projects that have been announced have been delayed and delayed and delayed.

Then they talk about their record investment. The independent Productivity Commission has told us that for the last two years running this state government has had the lowest investment per capita in social housing in the nation. Government members come in here and crow about their achievements. They change ministers. They have a new minister in there at the moment who is doing the same policies the same way, announcement after announcement, and it is vulnerable Queenslanders who are suffering.

Redland City Council



Ms RICHARDS (Redlands—ALP) (2.51 pm): Deputy Speaker, I think you need to stop the press for a second because—I cannot believe I am about to say this—the member for Kawana and I have found something we agree on: the Weinam Creek PDA is an absolute disaster. It is an absolute disaster being led by Redland City Council. I have never seen a project roll out so slowly. Obviously what the LNP candidate for Redlands forgot to tell the member for Kawana is that her mate and mentor, the LNP Mayor for Redlands, Karen Williams, and the Redland City Council are the ones who are delaying it. They have it out at the moment through their Redlands Investment Corporation for an EOI for a private development partner. Clearly, they do not have the information correct. It is the LNP that is delaying that project, which is of critical importance to those island communities.

I would ask the member for Kawana to pick up the phone to his friend the LNP mayor and ask her to accelerate that project. Even better, I am happy to sit down with the member for Kawana this afternoon and prepare a joint letter on our behalf, calling on the Redland City Council to accelerate the project, to get on with the job, and to also commit to maintaining Redland City Council ownership of that car park to make sure private operators do not come in and impose parking fees, because we know that privatisation is the LNP's DNA. We need to make sure the car park remains council owned and operated to ensure we can get the best cost benefit to island community residents who live over there. Redland City Council has been pushing growth over on those islands for years now. I am happy to go on a unity ticket with the member for Kawana and prepare that letter with him—

Mrs Gerber: For more parking?

Ms RICHARDS: Have you had a look at the PDA, member for Currumbin? Deputy Speaker, I would ask the member for Currumbin, before she shoots from the hip, to look at the PDA that is available online at Weinam Creek—

Mrs Gerber interjected.

Ms Pease interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Member for Currumbin and member for Lytton, you will cease your quarrelling across the chamber.

Ms RICHARDS: Honestly! Do your homework first, member for Currumbin. We have delivered in the Weinam Creek area in the PDA—the first piece of catalytic infrastructure down there in our satellite hospital. It is a fantastic asset and we have been able to deliver that completed, open and operational this year, yet council cannot deliver a simple car park. Honestly! It is absolutely crazy.

In his contribution the member for Kawana said to talk about what we have done. I would need hours and hours to talk about the number of projects we have delivered down there. I hope he had the chance to check out our beautiful new ferry terminals—\$46 million worth of ferry terminals for Russell Island, MacLeay Island, Lamb Island and Karragarra Island. They are absolutely fantastic.

There is work at Redland Hospital with the ICU sod turn with ADCO and the new ward to be opened in November with Hutchinson Builders. There is a heap of work going on in the healthcare space. The commitment for the design and planning work and the construction of a new \$150 million mental health facility are all part of the stage 2 development.

The Palaszczuk government has consistently delivered in my term—2,159 days I have had the privilege of representing this community—in the healthcare space and in education. There has been air conditioning installed in every school classroom, new school precincts at the Redlands District Special School and new classrooms in nearly every school. There is the new school underway in Redland Bay because we are planning for growth. We do have a vision for our region. We have had to jump in and sort out the delivery of a housing strategy that the Redland City Council refused to do multiple times. That is an LNP-run council. They would not know priorities if they came up and bit them.


The Palaszczuk government will continue to deliver for my Redlands community. The assets and infrastructure that have been delivered in the last six years are simply incredible. Again, I look forward to hearing from the member for Kawana. I really hope that he wants to be on a joint ticket, because that car park is critical for the 10,000 people who live across those four islands.

PROPERTY LAW BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3123, on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (2.56 pm): I rise to speak to the Property Law Bill 2023 and support the passing of the legislation and amendments to be moved during consideration in detail by the Attorney-General. The amendments are of a minor, clarifying and correcting nature and will ensure the bill meets its objectives. The Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, in its report No. 45, tabled in this Assembly on 14 April 2023, has recommended to the Assembly that the bill be passed. Our committee made a total of four recommendations as a result of our consideration into the proposed bill.

The purpose of the bill is to replace the current Property Law Act with new, modernised property legislation drafted broadly in accordance with the recommendations of the *Final report: Property Law Act 1974*. The Property Law Act report was released by the Queensland University of Technology's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre in 2018. The primary objectives of the bill are to: replace the Property Law Act with new, modernised property legislation; simplify and streamline Queensland's property laws; redraft existing provisions in plain English; better facilitate e-conveyancing and electronic transactions; remove outdated or unnecessary provisions; and implement a statutory seller disclosure scheme for sales of freehold land.

The key issues raised during the committee's examination of the bill included: scope of the bill and the proposed statutory seller disclosure scheme; disclosure for lots and community titles scheme; the proposed new body corporate certificate; the inclusion of a community management statement in disclosure documents; lease return conditions; disclosure during auctions; mandating disclosure of natural hazard risks; compliance with the Legislative Standards Act; and compliance with the Human Rights Act.

The Property Law Act came into force on 1 December 1975. Since its commencement there have been very few structural amendments to the act, and the first overall review was the Property Law Act report published in 2018. The Property Law Act report stated that many provisions in Queensland's Property Law Act are based on the United Kingdom's Law of Property Act 1925, which draws on historical land law concepts from the 18th and 19th centuries. Sections of the Property Law Act contain dated language and use concepts that are not reasonably applicable to Queensland. The Property Law Act report recommended that the Property Law Act be repealed and replaced with a new act drafted with modern legislative wording and in line with the Property Law Act report's other recommendations.

The creation of a seller disclosure scheme has been proposed that would apply to all sales of freehold land. The scheme would require sellers to give the buyer a disclosure statement and prescribed documents before the buyer signs a contract for sale. Currently, there is no statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland and property sellers disclose information to prospective buyers under a mix of legislative, common-law and contract-law obligations.

QUT's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre examined the feasibility of a statutory seller's disclosure scheme alongside its review of the Property Law Act. The seller disclosure scheme report recommended the scheme be underpinned by four guiding principles including: clarifying the disclosure obligations of a seller, requiring a transparent and effective form of disclosure, providing information of value to the decision of a buyer to purchase and balancing the information cost between buyer and seller.

Many stakeholders expressed support for the introduction of a statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland with the Strata Community Association stating that an appropriate balance has been found in terms of the amount of disclosure required. The Real Estate Institute of Queensland stated that they have advocated for the introduction of a seller disclosure scheme and supported the four guiding principles of the proposed scheme. The committee noted the seller's disclosure scheme will involve changes to the way business is done in the real estate sector and were pleased to note that the department will work with and educate stakeholders during the implementation of the scheme.

The proposed disclosure for the sale of a lot in a community titles scheme was supported by the Strata Community Association of Queensland, which recommended that the newly required body corporate certificates include a brief summary of the duties and functions of the Office of the Commissioner for Body Corporate and the Community Management. The Strata Community Association of Queensland stated that advising buyers about the commissioner's office and its dispute resolution and education services would benefit consumers.

Other stakeholders were not as supportive of the change in their proposed form. The advice from the department noted that many buyers currently do not obtain a body corporate information certificate or search of body corporate records. It was further noted by the department that there is no current legislative requirement for sellers to hire agents or third parties to prepare disclosure statements. The department advised that sellers and buyers will still be able to use search agents under the proposed seller disclosure scheme and stated that the new legislative framework does not prevent or restrict bodies corporate and search agents from entering into relationships whereby a search agent is authorised to prepare a body corporate certificate on the body corporate's behalf.

The bill proposes creating a statutory seller disclosure scheme for the sale of freehold land. The department stated that the purpose of a seller disclosure scheme is to introduce transparency and provide valuable information to a buyer to inform their decision of whether or not to purchase. The bill proposes the seller disclosure scheme have different options for buyers who register as bidders before the start of an auction and buyers who register after an auction starts. The REIQ expressed several concerns regarding the auction requirements in clause 103 of the bill. The department stated in its response to submissions that—


... the new disclosure provisions for auctions 'provide a tailored approach for giving disclosure documents for an auction' ensuring sellers can provide disclosure documents to all bidders before the end of an auction.

For bidders who register before the auction starts, sellers are required to provide disclosure documents before the auction starts, consistent with the requirements for an ordinary sale. For bidders who register after the auction starts, the seller is only required to make the disclosure documents available in accordance with cl 103.

The department said it would be impossible to comply with the disclosure requirement for a buyer who registered after the start of an auction. If the late registering buyer was successful at the auction, that buyer could terminate the contract because the disclosure documents were not given prior to the contract being entered into. Accordingly, the bill seeks to avoid an unintended change to existing auction processes and to provide a method for giving disclosure to a buyer who registers after the start of an auction. Under the bill's seller disclosure scheme, a prospective buyer is warned about matters not covered by the seller disclosure statement and encouraged to make their own inquiries before signing the contract of sale. One of these matters is a property's history regarding flooding and other natural disasters.

The Local Government Association of Queensland provided substantial feedback to the committee on natural hazard risk information for lots. The Local Government Association of Queensland stated that 'a minimum level of information on natural hazard risk provided by the seller will help to drive greater community awareness of potential risks and enable buyers to make better informed decisions'. The department stated that the draft regulation proposes to prescribe a warning statement in the disclosure statement advising the buyer to inquire with the relevant local authority about whether the property is affected by flooding or other natural hazard.

The committee noted, as was raised in the Attorney-General's introductory speech, that there is no consistent standard of natural hazard risk records for local authorities across Queensland and that local councils charge vastly different fees for members of the public to access this information. It will be easier for councils with a high density of ratepayers across a smaller area such as Brisbane. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mrs GERBER** (Currumbin—LNP) (3.06 pm): The bill before the House today, the Property Law Bill 2023, will replace the 1974 Property Law Act which, somewhat incredibly, has not been substantially amended since 1975. The Property Law Bill 2023 seeks to repeal outdated or unnecessary provisions in the Property Law Act. It seeks to redraft the provisions in modernising some language. It seeks to provide a legal framework that is updated to better reflect changes associated with electronic dealings in property, law and electronic service as well as reflecting current property and conveyancing practices. It will simplify and update various provisions, for example, the rule against perpetuities, leases and covenants. It seeks to minimise the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts and it seeks to implement—and this is one of the parts that I think most of the submitters raised concerns about—a statutory seller disclosure scheme. That statutory seller disclosure scheme puts disclosure obligations on a seller, requires a transparent and consolidated form of disclosure and provides information of value to the buyer purchasing a property. There were some concerns raised about that point.

Before I get to that, I want this House to note that the Palaszczuk Labor government has taken an inordinate amount of time to bring about this reform. Our property laws play a critical role in shaping the dynamics of the Queensland real estate market, affecting both buyers and sellers. Ten years ago the LNP commissioned the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at QUT to conduct an

independent and broad-ranging review of Queensland's property laws. The results of QUT's review were delivered to the state Labor government in 2018 but, like this government has done with many other recommendations and reports that were delivered to it in relation to systematic reform—and blue card comes to mind here when the government back in 2017 received 81 recommendations and six years down the track 53 of them remain outstanding. It is a bit of a pattern with this state Labor government and the property law review is no different. It has taken this government five long years to bring this bill for reform to the Queensland parliament.

The QUT report, delivered to the government back in 2018, gave the Palaszczuk government all it needed to bring about necessary reform to our property laws. The LNP knows that it is critical that these laws are effective and efficient, hence why the report was originally commissioned under an LNP government. While the LNP intended for this review to propel Queensland's property laws into the 21st century, the Labor government seems to be content to move at a snail's pace, determined to do as little work as possible, no matter how helpful property law reform would have been to the people of Queensland five years ago.

Those opposite love to crow about their so-called commitment to openness, transparency or accountability, but they do the exact opposite—ignoring critical reform that could have helped Queenslanders for the five long years that they failed to implement it. Nevertheless, here we are, several years later, thanks to the inaction of the Palaszczuk Labor government. The majority of the Property Law Bill is administrative in nature and seeks to modernise the language and provisions of the Property Law Act to better provide for current technology and practice.

The proposed changes are largely aligned with the recommendations contained within the QUT report. However, there is one aspect of the bill that is not, and I will get to that shortly. While a good portion of the proposed changes are largely uncontroversial, there were submissions on a number of clauses within the bill raising concerns and substantive submissions were made in relation to the mandatory seller disclosure scheme.

The seller disclosure scheme seeks to, in essence, address the current practices when purchasing property in Queensland, which are argued to disproportionately disadvantage buyers by forcing them to navigate quality issues by themselves, without any onus on the seller to disclose these issues. In short, the Queensland property market operates largely on a system of caveat emptor—let the buyer beware—which, as many Queenslanders have discovered when trying to buy, is certainly not ideal. Buyers need the right information to make informed decisions, but equally sellers should definitely not be unfairly burdened with unreasonable volumes of paperwork. Striking the right balance here is critical to creating a transparent and fair property market.

As mentioned earlier, the proposed seller disclosure scheme model has attracted criticism, despite general support for the overarching principles of the scheme. For example, if the lot is in a community titles scheme it is now proposed that a community management statement be provided as part of the seller disclosure. This is part of the bill that was not part of the QUT review or one of their recommendations. It is outside of that. This is the part of the bill that drew most criticism from industry stakeholders, including a strong submission from the REIQ that a community management statement requirement would be regressive given the requirement was previously introduced in Queensland in 2011 and repealed shortly thereafter.

The REIQ also highlighted the practicality, or lack thereof, of the community management statement, suggesting that the community management statement might not achieve its intended purpose because it is voluminous. It contains so much information and requires so much paperwork that purchasers might miss the important parts, thereby defeating the entire exercise. Other stakeholders also raised this specific concern regarding the sheer volume of material likely to be contained within a community management statement.

None of these concerns have been adequately addressed by the Labor government. As I stated, the amendments are a departure from the QUT review and recommendations. The Attorney-General should be listening to the stakeholders' concerns in this regard, but, as always, this Labor government's approach to consultation leaves much to be desired.

I also wish to draw the attention of this House to the concerns raised by the REIQ regarding the discrepancies in property information infrastructure across local government areas. During the committee process serious questions were raised as to why disclosure of natural hazard risks, including flooding, has not been mandated. At present, the disclosure of flooding or other natural hazard history is specifically excluded from the disclosure statement. Instead, the bill requires the following: that the buyer should inquire with relevant local government as to whether the property is affected by flooding or another material hazard or within a natural hazard overlay.

The LGAQ provided substantial feedback on this issue. They provided substantial feedback on natural hazard risk information for lots, stating that the disclosure regulations ‘do not go far enough in meeting the recommendations of the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements’ to ‘introduce mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks at a point of sale and prior to property purchase’. This is a very valid concern that this government should be addressing head on.

Sadly, my community knows firsthand the risk and impact of flooding. In February 2022 the residents of Tallebudgera Valley, Currumbin Valley and Elanora experienced devastating localised flooding—the likes of which we have never seen before. Homes in Elanora, particularly in the streets around Avocado Street and Nineteenth Avenue, were completely inundated. Locals had to be evacuated from their homes. They lost their homes. They lost their possessions. Valleys were cut off by landslides and flooding. We need to do everything possible to protect our constituents from natural disasters and they must be informed of any potential risks because no family should lose their home or a loved one from an avoidable situation or a flood risk.

I want to turn the attention of the House to a critical issue facing our communities. Queensland is in the grips of a housing crisis. Buying a home in Queensland is officially the toughest it has ever been in 16 years. First time homebuyers are facing an uphill battle to be able to realise the dream of owning their own home. Sadly, none of this will be fixed by the current bill that is before this House. This bill could have been an opportunity for the Labor government to correct their failures—for example, their failure to free up new lots for residential builds. We know that residential lot approvals have decreased across this state by 40 per cent.

In contrast the LNP is committed to the right priorities for the future of Queensland homebuyers. In contrast, the LNP—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Bush): Pause the clock. Member, you have already alluded in your statement to the fact that this is out of the scope of the bill so I will bring you back to the bill.


Mr WHITING: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. In terms of anticipating debate, we currently have a bill on housing availability and affordability before the House. I would certainly bring that to your attention and to the attention of other members. If they want to talk about housing affordability and availability they may need—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I have already directed the member to come back to the long title of the bill.

Mrs GERBER: The Property Law Bill, in my view, was an opportunity for this state Labor government to correct some of its wrong priorities. Some of the priorities it should have corrected include—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, I am not debating this with you. I have directed that this is out of the scope of the long title of the bill. You have 40 seconds to go. If you would like to finish your contribution being relevant to the bill, I am happy to hear that.

Mrs GERBER: While I hope that this bill provides more transparency in relation to buyers, it does create disclosure obligations for sellers and there was an opportunity to make reforms. There was an opportunity to go further. I simply wish this House to know that I think this state Labor government has failed in that opportunity to take this Property Law Bill where they should have. Realistically, we know that what we need is to address the housing crisis in Queensland. Sadly, it took this state Labor government more than five years to bring the Property Law Bill to the House. It has sat on its hands, but that is what we have come to expect from a state Labor government that does not care about Queenslanders anymore.

 **Mr HUNT** (Caloundra—ALP) (3.17 pm): I rise to make this contribution to the Property Law Bill 2023. As ever, I thank my fellow committee members: the illuminating Peter Russo, the member for Toohey; Jonty Bush, the member for Cooper; Sandy Bolton, the member for Noosa; Laura Gerber, the member for Currumbin; and Jon Krause, the member for Scenic Rim. Our hardworking and ever-accommodating secretariat made the process easier, as they always do—especially for the more technologically challenged members of the committee. In this instance, I am speaking specifically about myself.

While it is true that this bill will not set the heart racing and the debate will probably not generate a fiery and spirited oration, make no mistake: this bill is about fairness and providing protection to the financial interests of Queenslanders. I am not sure if the LNP actually do support this bill, despite the assurances of the member for Currumbin. Very recent history has shown that their principles, such as they are, are so elastic that they can support any bill and then explicitly not support it sometime later.

The committee has made four very straightforward recommendations after the bill was referred to it in February this year. The recommendations were: one, that the Property Law Bill 2023 be passed; two, that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General engage with stakeholders and review the provisions of the Property Law Act 2023 for providing disclosure statements at auctions within 12 months of commencing, giving consideration to the provision of disclosure documents to buyers registering before and during an auction; three, that the lease provisions of the Property Law Bill be amended to require a lessee to surrender the premise to the lessor in the same condition it was when the lessee first took possession; and, four, that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General review the easement and covenant provisions of the Property Law Act 2023 within 12 months of the act commencing to ensure that all non-abusive covenants found in modern easements will still bind successors in title.

The bill generally adopts the recommendations contained in the Property Law Act report to simplify, streamline and modernise Queensland's property laws to better facilitate e-conveyancing and electronic transactions and remove outdated provisions. Significant changes include the repeal of outdated or unnecessary provisions, for example those in relation to unregistered land and property matters arising from de facto relationships; the redrafting of existing property law provisions in plain English with modernised language; establishing a legal framework to recognise and facilitate e-conveyancing and electronic property transactions; simplifying and updating the common-law rule against perpetuities and rules relating to leases and covenants; and minimising the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts. Riveting stuff!

Of particular note was the introduction of a seller disclosure clause. QUT's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre examined the feasibility of a statutory seller disclosure scheme alongside its review of the Property Law Act. Currently, there is no statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland and property sellers disclose information as required by a mix of legislative common-law and contract-law obligations. The *Final report: seller disclosure in Queensland*, the seller disclosure scheme report, recommended introducing a seller disclosure scheme for all sales of freehold land. The reform objectives of the scheme included clarifying the disclosure obligations of a seller, requiring a transparent and effective form of disclosure and providing information of value to the decision of a buyer to purchase, all of which should balance the information costs between the buyer and the seller. The explanatory notes continue by making the point that—

There is currently no formal statutory seller disclosure framework in Queensland. Sellers are required to disclose certain information to comply with a complex mix of common law ... and contractual obligations. This multi-layered and disparate approach imposes a significant regulatory burden on a seller (and advisers) in identifying those obligations which apply to a particular conveyance transaction. It also results in buyers receiving a variety of different disclosure documents at different stages of the sale process including before contracts are formed ...

Mercifully, the QUT seller disclosure report has identified that—

information to be provided by the seller to the buyer pre-contract should be within the seller's knowledge or readily available by search at reasonable cost to the seller;

information should be of value to a buyer in making a decision to purchase. Primarily this will be information impacting on title to the property or ongoing financial liability of ownership;

the information should be in an accessible form, easily understood and capable of being relied upon by the buyer; and


a single legal framework should be established providing consistency in the content and timing of disclosure and remedies available for a failure to comply.

Anyone who has ever purchased property in the state or indeed any state will agree that anything that streamlines the location, the language and the timeliness of obligatory reporting and legal requirements will be a godsend, and the stakeholders consulted in the report agreed. The Strata Community Association Queensland stated that an appropriate balance has been found in terms of the volume of disclosure required. The Real Estate Institute of Queensland stated that it has advocated for the introduction of a seller disclosure scheme and supports the four guiding principles of the proposed scheme. Support was also expressed by the Strata Search Agents Association Queensland, the Queensland Law Society and the Local Government Association of Queensland.

In the same way, there was significant but perhaps not universal support for consolidating the disclosure requirements for the sale of a lot in a community title scheme under the Body Corporate and Community Management Act or a lot included in a plan under the Building Units and Group Titles Act. The bill replaces the old copy of a body corporate record with a new body corporate certificate provided by the body corporate manager. DJAG stated that the introduction of a seller disclosure scheme is to transparently and effectively provide information of value to a buyer. Under the new scheme, a buyer

of a lot in a community titles scheme will receive a seller disclosure statement under the new Property Law Act 2023 and a body corporate certificate from the seller. DJAG stated that currently many buyers do not obtain a body corporate information certificate or search of body corporate records and that most buyers will now likely receive more useful information when deciding to purchase.

For many of my Brisbane-based colleagues, the most significant part of the seller disclosure changes revolve around natural hazard risks. In early 2022 I watched weather events like many others with a mix of shock and genuine admiration while so many of my Brisbane-based colleagues went above and beyond in support of their communities. There was extensive property damage and now this government is working to provide extra reassurance and I am sure our government MPs in the Brisbane and Ipswich LGAs will gladly take this news back to their communities. 'Caveat emptor' is the Latin term for let the buyer beware, the idea being that the purchaser alone is responsible for checking the quality and suitability of goods before purchase. Those days are gone and it seems after last week that the LNP can support legislation on one day and then abandon its own principles the next, so for the voters of Queensland it really is a case of caveat emptor in 2024. This government at least has ensured that everyone, both buyer and seller, are operating on a more level playing field, and for that reason I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (3.26 pm): The Property Law Bill 2023, as we have heard, replaces the older Property Law Act 1974 with a modernised piece of legislation based on recommendations in the 2018 report on the act completed by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at QUT. Through the inquiry by our Legal Affairs and Safety Committee it was apparent that there was very broad support for the changes which will bring this important area of law into the 21st century by repealing old and out-of-date provisions, redrafting in plain English—and we always like that—and updating provisions for the modern world, including e-conveyancing.

There were a couple of issues raised during the committee's inquiry. One related to the provisions for leases which the bill works to simplify and modernise. The standard terms for leases in the bill include a requirement for a tenant to return a property to the condition it was in at the start of the lease. In practice, as the Shopping Centre Council of Australia stated, many leases are renewed multiple times, effectively starting a new lease each time, meaning that a premises would only be required to be returned to the condition at the beginning of the latest lease rather than when it was occupied. To address this, the committee recommended the bill be amended so that when the tenant surrenders the premises it is in the same condition as when they first took possession which, disappointingly, the government has not supported.

The second significant concern was in relation to the requirements for seller disclosure. These are provided by sellers of property to potential buyers and disclose relevant facts about the property. The Unit Owners Association of Queensland raised an important issue that the seller disclosure should contain a simple statement of the lawful use of the land and the building drawn from the development approval given by local government under the Planning Act 2016. This is extremely relevant given the short-term accommodation issues being experienced, including in my own community, with buildings approved for residential use being used unlawfully for short-term stays. The department's response was not to support this, with the argument that the recording of development approvals has varied over time, hence obtaining a full development approval document is likely to be difficult, time consuming and expensive in many cases. In addition, it would be difficult to outline the lawful use of a lot in a development approval in a short and simple way that may be easily understood by buyers, particularly given the complexities of the regulation of planning and lawful usage under the various applicable planning laws. The third argument was that planning is enforced by local government and disclosing planning approvals would not provide any additional pathways for enforcement.

These three points are as succinct a summary of the failures in the planning scheme as you are likely to get, and they are outlined in my statement of reservation. They demonstrate a system that is failing to achieve its own objectives and should be acknowledged as such. What is the point of a planning scheme if it does not, and seemingly cannot, achieve the goal of ensuring buildings and lands are used for the lawful purpose for which they were approved? Queensland deserves and should expect a planning system that works. A principle set out in the review QUT undertook for the seller disclosure scheme states—


Information to be provided by the seller to the buyer pre-contract should be within the seller's knowledge or readily available by search at reasonable cost to the seller.

Apparently, it is not. Ultimately it needs to be provided, and I do appreciate that the Attorney-General has referred this to the Deputy Premier to look at because it is so important. The same principle applies when the Local Government Association of Queensland recommended that

disclosure statements should include flood and other natural disaster information. The department responded that the level of information held by local government can differ quite considerably and that councils across Queensland charge vastly different fees to access this kind of information, which I understand. Again this highlights how problematic it is for people to access information, including on natural hazards. In this case the Attorney-General stated that the government is committed to continuing to work with stakeholders to develop a mandatory scheme using uniform information, and this is very welcomed.

These efforts need to include the issues being faced by landowners impacted by coastal hazard adaptation plans, or CHAPs, with ongoing concerns around methodologies and insurance ramifications. Given the reports from within my own community of outrageous increases in insurance premiums, the state needs to seek from the federal government a Productivity Commission inquiry or royal commission into what is actually happening, as there is something very wrong when insurers refuse residents for flood coverage when they have taken their money for many years or treble their premiums to do so, even when there has not been water through their house. These properties were purchased in good faith and they need clarity and transparency around climate change related mapping and projections and their implications, including in insurance premiums.

I thank our chair, the member for Toohey, and fellow committee members for their work, as well as our incredible secretariat for their hard work. I thank the Attorney-General and departmental staff. I thank also all of the organisations, entities and individuals who lent their expertise and experience to the committee through submissions and hearings. This inquiry was conducted in the standard two-month time frame while the committee was conducting three other inquiries. As expected, this puts significant pressure on all. For many inquiries this time frame may have been appropriate; however, for such a major undertaking as this, which included a complete rewrite of such a large act, it was not appropriate. Again this demonstrates the not-fit-for-purpose nature of the current committee system and I look forward to the determinations of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly regarding a review.

 **Ms BUSH** (Cooper—ALP) (3.33 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Property Law Bill 2023, a bill that will replace the current Property Law Act with new, modernised property legislation. The bill has been drafted broadly in accordance with the recommendations of the QUT final report into the Property Law Act and, following the committee inquiry, I would say broadly had support from the stakeholders consulted.

The bill advances a few reforms. Notably, it creates a statutory seller disclosure scheme for sales of freehold land, as recommended by the final report. As noted by the REIQ, the implementation of a seller disclosure scheme will change the way that property is transacted in Queensland. Currently there is no statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland and property sellers disclose information as required by a mix of legislative, common-law and contract-law obligations. This makes the process clunky and frustrating at best and, at worst, people are either entering into huge financial investments without being completely apprised of important information regarding their property or they are spending a lot of money on having to pay others to find out that important information for them.

I have spoken with real estate agents in my electorate, many of whom do take it upon themselves to provide that full seller disclosure, who are in full support of the seller disclosure scheme in Queensland in that it will certainly offer all parties much greater protection. We heard through the committee process that more can be done to support purchasers to feel confident in their decision-making, particularly on one of the greatest financial decisions they will make in their life.

The Strata Community Association stated that they believe that efficient consumer protection is best achieved through summary disclosure that is accessible and easily read by a layperson. They reiterated that excessive disclosure confuses rather than informs and can frequently lead to disputes and that summary disclosure is the best way of transferring critical information. The SCA said they were pleased with this element of the bill as drafted, believing it achieves a happy medium in terms of the volume of disclosure required.

The REIQ highlighted the importance of streamlining systems between all levels of government and the importance of transparency and that purchasers moving into a home know what they are moving into. I could not agree more. In my office, one of the busiest areas of inquiries is in relation to neighbourhood zoning and development. Brisbane is the fastest growing city in Australia and my electorate really is ground zero for that. Our inner-city suburb of Milton in particular is under pressure, and the need for vision and planning in Milton by Brisbane City Council is clear and desperately needed. We have a neighbourhood plan that was developed in 2014. It has not been followed since the day it

was drafted. It talks about vibrant, mixed-use design. What we have is wall-to-wall development, a substantial lack of community infrastructure, no deep planting and no flood mitigation, and it certainly does not reflect the character of the suburb at all. Despite Milton being one of the fastest growing suburbs, the neighbourhood plan is not scheduled to be reviewed until 2025.

What this bill achieves in its proposed seller disclosure scheme is: to clarify the disclosure obligations of a seller so that all parties are aware of those; to require a transparent and effective form of disclosure so there can be no dispute; to provide information of value and relevance to the buyer; and to balance the information costs between the buyer and the seller. We heard through the committee hearings that the proposed scheme also benefits the seller, providing a streamlined and articulated process whereas currently sellers are required to disclose information to prospective buyers under a complex mix of law, creating a significant regulatory burden on the seller as well as buyers receiving a variety of different disclosure documents at different stages of the process.

The bill also speaks to disclosing around natural hazard risks. Queensland is the country's most disaster-prone state, yet without a statutory seller disclosure scheme it is currently a case of buyer beware, as we have heard. By including an onus on the vendor in the provision of due diligence information in legislation governing conveyancing in Queensland, there is that opportunity for purchasers to avoid purchasing a property that proves to be adversely affected by factors that they might have been unaware of and that impact their insurance, their liability and their property value.


Under the bill's seller disclosure scheme, a prospective buyer will be made aware of and potentially warned about matters not covered by the seller disclosure statement and encouraged to make their own inquiries before signing a contract of sale. One of the matters is a property's history regarding flooding and other natural disasters. Again, this is a really important issue for many of us. Certainly it is for me. We had 15,000 homes in Brisbane impacted by our most recent flooding event. I remember speaking with local authorities at the time and seeking information on evacuation. There was a general tone amongst a lot of us in the community that people have lived here through several floods and they will know what to do. That certainly was not the case. I was involved in doorknocking homes at the time of the floods and shortly after, wanting to offer assistance, and was struck by the number of people who had recently moved up during COVID. In one in three homes was someone who had recently arrived, and many had no idea they had moved into an area prone to flooding. To be fair, in our electorate we did have a lot of impacted areas that had never flooded before. I accept that it is essential that people inform themselves prior to moving into an area—not only conducting property searches but also asking around, knocking on a neighbour's door or putting up a post in a local Facebook group to ask if there is anything going on in the street that they should be aware of.

Human nature, of course, is that we are optimistic. Many of us would know that feeling of falling in love with a property: when we close our eyes we imagine ourselves on the deck, the kids playing in the backyard and the dogs tearing up the garden. It is a huge financial investment, but buying a home is also an incredibly emotional purchase. Ensuring that buyers have information about hazards and issues in an accessible and transparent way is really vital, and I firmly support this aspect of the bill.

The Local Government Association of Queensland stated that a minimum level of information on natural hazard risk provided by the seller will help to drive greater community awareness of potential risks and enable buyers to make better informed decisions. Our committee noted that the LGAQ felt the disclosure did not go far enough and that natural hazard risks ought to be disclosed, which I have to say I do appreciate. However, I also understand that there is no consistent standard of natural hazard risk records for local councils across Queensland, which really makes that challenging.

The LGAQ expressed a desire to work with local governments to identify solutions to enable the mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks, which I welcome. The REIQ was in favour of the disclosure in its current form, supporting a warning that seller disclosure statements do not include natural hazard information and that the buyer should conduct their own inquiries.

We should do anything we can to improve the process for people getting into homes swiftly and safely. I want to thank my parliamentary colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, the secretariat for their support and all of the submitters, particularly those who are unaccustomed to engaging with parliamentary committees. It is something that our committee always appreciates and we were certainly aided by their contributions. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (3.40 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Property Law Bill 2023. I will disclose up-front that I am a member of the Australian Property Institute. I am a valuer, although not a practising valuer. Many years ago, when I had a little bit of hair, I did a master's degree in property economics at QUT. Some of the contributions that I will raise today come from lecturers and

prominent city valuers who have reached out to me with concerns about the bill. While it has been stated up-front that the LNP will not oppose the bill, it is opportune to go through certain aspects of it—the good, the bad and the ugly, so to speak. I intend to do that with my time remaining.

It has been noted that in 2013 the then LNP government commissioned the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at QUT to conduct an independent and broad-ranging review of Queensland's property laws. As has been said by other speakers, it might be a dry topic for most people if they are making a contribution to the bill but, at the end of the day, the Property Law Act and all the instruments it contains materially affect people's economic choices and, in fact, the price points when they make what is undoubtedly the biggest investment of most people's lives, that is, buying the little patch of paradise that they call home. QUT finished the review in 2018 and here we are in 2023, a mere five years later.

This is a pattern. No matter what we look at with the government, if anyone wants to say that they are not tied up for three terms then let us consider this: we have been waiting for five years. This is a habitual pattern, whether it be the digital driver's licence that was promised five years or this review of the Property Law Act. This is something that seems to drag on and on. That is something I could not help but make mention of.

I want to go through a few aspects of the bill, some of which have been touched on. The seller disclosure scheme was clearly the most notable section of the bill for many submitters. We urge the Attorney-General to work with stakeholders on ensuring the regulation is clear, realistic and effective to give buyers the necessary information without overwhelming them or unnecessarily burdening the seller. The REIQ made points about the infrastructure for property information varying between local government areas. That is worthy of further attention by the government so that investment can be made to ensure that all Queenslanders, regardless of where they live, have the same ability to access key information.

In relation to the background, the Property Law Bill 2023 will replace the current Property Law Act 1974, which has not been substantially amended since I was in grade 5 in 1975, when I certainly did have hair. I am not misleading the House; I had plenty back in 1975. The bill achieves the policy objectives by: repealing outdated or unnecessary provisions in the PLA; redrafting the provisions in modernised language, which is absolutely welcome; providing a legal framework that is updated to reflect changes associated with electronic dealings in property and electronic service as well as reflecting current property, titling and modern-day contemporary conveyancing practice; simplifying and updating various provisions, for example, the rules against perpetuities, leases and covenants; furthermore, minimising the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts; and implementing a statutory seller disclosure scheme that clarifies the disclosure obligations of a seller, requires a transparent and consolidated form of disclosure and provides information of value to the decision of a buyer to purchase.

The positions in the PLA that will be altered by this bill are set out in the explanatory notes. Unless otherwise stated, these changes are consistent with the recommendations contained in the PLA report and the seller disclosure report prepared all those years ago by QUT.

I will turn to some of the issues. The majority of the bill is administrative in nature and seeks to modernise the language and provisions of the Property Law Act to better provide for current technology and practice, as I just alluded to. While there are a number of submissions on various clauses, the substantive submissions were received in relation to introducing a mandatory seller disclosure scheme, which I might come back to. First, I would like to put my old valuer's hat on and talk about an area that is still of concern to many professionals in the industry. It pertains to agreements for lease. Removing the added value of agreements to lease will have a significant impact on rates, land tax and land rent. The reasoning behind removing the agreements for lease from the Land Valuation Act is clear from a certain point of view, which is that the guidelines need to be consistent with the LVA and the only intangible improvement defined in the act is an agreement for lease.

To put this in terms of less complex property, let us envisage a hypothetical service station that is leased at a rent of \$300,000 per annum and the tenant is responsible for all outgoings. Let us then envisage three different scenarios where all the terms and conditions of the lease are absolutely identical other than the lessee and the term of the lease. In hypothetical example 1, the tenant might be with Ampol on a 20-year term; in example 2, the tenant is with Ampol on a five-year term; in example 3, the tenant is John Citizen on a 20-year term. The market value of the service station in example 1 could be in the order of \$6½ million, in example 2 it could be around \$5 million and in example 3 it could be \$4½ million.

Now let us envisage that they were not leases but agreements for lease negotiated by the vendor prior to selling the vacant land subject to the agreements for lease. Assume the land in example 3, that is, John Citizen on a 20-year term, has a market value of \$1 million. Here is the rub: there is no reason the prudent purchaser would not pay the premium of potentially \$2 million if the tenant was Ampol in each case so identical parcels of land would have vastly different values dependent on the proposed tenant and the term of the lease. Hence the consternation of a lot of property professionals, specifically valuers.


Alternatively, there is a danger that, if the proposed amendment proceeds, the value of an agreement for lease on the sale of a property will then be included in similar property that has absolutely no such benefit. This is something that could be a particular red flag going forward with this bill.

Many people spoke about one particular aspect of the bill, the seller disclosure scheme. I refer to QUT's *Final report: Seller disclosure in Queensland*, which recommended the introduction of a statutory seller disclosure regime. There were positives to this. It would clearly identify the seller disclosure obligations, create a coordinated and transparent regime and establish a certain and consistent matrix of obligations. One of the risks was that the buyer could be presented with too much information and may not understand what was put before them.

The report developed four guiding principles. Firstly, the information to be provided by the seller to the buyer pre contract should be within the seller's knowledge or readily available by search at a reasonable cost to the seller. Secondly, information should be of value to a buyer in making a decision to purchase, and primarily this will be information impacting on the title to the property or ongoing financial liability of ownership. Thirdly, the information should be in an accessible form, easily understood and capable of being relied upon by the everyday buyer. Fourthly, a single legal framework should be established providing consistency in the content and timing of disclosure and remedies available for a failure to comply.

At the end of the day, the scheme provides that the buyer is entitled to terminate the contract for one of the two following reasons: (a) if the seller fails to give the disclosure statement and any applicable prescribed certificate; or (b) the statement or disclosure statement contains inaccuracies about a material matter and the buyer would not have entered into the contract if they had known of the current state of affairs. In fact, the Attorney-General tabled the draft regulation of the scheme under the Property Law Regulation 2023, which will be put to stakeholders following the passage of the bill to refine as needed.

I do realise that the wonderful world of valuation and property economics can be very dry to many people. However, I go back to a comment I made earlier in my contribution: the most significant purchase that the average Queenslanders will ever make in their lifetime is the purchase of their home, that is, their real estate. The LNP will be supporting the bill, as has been outlined by the shadow minister. However, given the fact that there have been five long years to get this right, I find it incredulous that we still have some burrs and wrinkles that may prove to be problematic.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (3.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill which other members have called 'dry'. I specifically want to deal with the parts of the legislation which impact electorates such as mine that get wet. As we know, the draft regulations tabled with the bill propose to prescribe a warning that a buyer should inquire with the local government in their area about whether a property is affected by flooding, another natural hazard or is within a natural hazard overlay. The warning also notes that flood information may be available at the FloodCheck Queensland portal on the Australian Flood Risk information portal. Of course, for those who reside locally, the Brisbane City Council has its own website as well.

Some stakeholders advocated for the mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risk information, specifically flood information for the property. However, there is a range of practical and legal difficulties in mandating the disclosure of this information, including that the level of information held by different councils can differ quite considerably and, of course, applicable fees vary across councils. As I mentioned earlier, in my area it is quite easy to search whether or not a property you are interested in purchasing has some kind of water risk or flood overlay. It is all available on the Brisbane City Council mapping. In Brisbane that is quite an easy search to make; however, there are over 70 local government areas in Queensland and we have to make sure every single Queenslanders has the same access to information. We legislate for all of Queensland, so it is appropriate that we make sure the legislation deals with the information that all local governments have and not just Brisbane City Council.

I note that in its report the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee was satisfied with the decision to warn prospective buyers to carry out their own inquiries because of those limitations I just outlined. I also acknowledge the statement of reservation by the member for Noosa, Sandy Bolton, provided with

the committee's report, which noted the Local Government Association of Queensland's recommendation to include flood and other natural disaster information as part of the seller disclosure statement as well as highlight the impact of coastal hazard adaptation plans. I also note the important work currently being conducted by Queensland agencies to improve access to natural disaster risk information. In particular, I pay tribute to the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, which is working to improve the availability of flood information for many local government areas across Queensland.

I particularly want to draw out this point: the volume of physical work that is occurring under these agencies in my community right now—and that will continue to occur over the years to come under the retrofit and raise program—means that the condition of a property when it is sold may not be a fair or accurate depiction of the damage that a property would sustain with a future flooding event. In terms of the last time mapping was done and then the work conducted under the retrofit and raise program, we could be talking about a very different set of circumstances because of significant changes that could be made to a property to, for example, lift it out of the flooded area or retrofit it.

I am sure that members of the House would be aware that in my community of Mount Ommaney at least 400 properties were impacted in the 2022 floods, particularly in the suburbs of Oxley and Corinda in addition to some homes in Jindalee, most of which were located around low-lying creek areas. In the year and a half since this devastating event, my community has had around 80 properties bought back. Some homes are still in the final stages of being purchased. When Major Jake Ellwood visited my community last year, one issue raised by people impacted by flood concerned buyers being informed about the flood risk of the property they were interested in buying and the correct mechanism for that to be done. It should be noted that some residents were naturally concerned about the impact disclosing flooding may have on the price of their property. This is understandable, but by not having some kind of scheme for future buyers of flooded homes to be informed of that event we are simply moving the problem on to the next potential home owner, and that benefits no-one. That is why the Palaszczuk government has undertaken the historic buyback program, with hundreds of houses throughout Queensland purchased, alongside the raise and retrofit program, which has benefited hundreds if not thousands more home owners throughout Queensland since the 2022 floods.

In the aftermath of the 2022 floods, as I moved through my community many people raised with me the mechanism by which future buyers would be made aware of any flooding impacts on a property they might buy. A number of different kinds of mechanisms were raised with me. Some people were happy for it to be caveat emptor—buyer beware—but, as other speakers including the member for Nanango have noted, Queensland is the single most disaster impacted state in Australia and it is incredibly important that buyers know what they are getting and that they make their offer on that property according to the facts of the impacts that property might experience from weather events.


Home owners who are concerned that their property values may be negatively impacted by the recent floods have had that opportunity, therefore, to apply for a retrofit or to raise their property out of the ground. The retrofit enables properties that cannot be lifted, such as low-set brick, to be refitted using marine-grade materials so that in the event of a future flood they can have the furniture moved out and the house cleaned out rather than stripped out. Alternatively, the raise-up aspect of the Resilient Homes Fund allows home owners to raise suitable homes such as Queenslanders out of the floodwaters. Importantly, home owners are not meant to then build in underneath their properties—a practice that has become increasingly popular with old-school Queenslanders. Home owners build in underneath those properties to create additional space. Raising all of the livable areas out of the floodwaters will allow home owners to hose out the underside of their house. I will give an example of how that occurred in my community between the 2011 floods and the 2022 floods.

I was doorknocking in a busy street in Oxley where most houses were low-set timber homes. Residents were taking all of the furniture out of their properties. It was really sad. I came across a newer set of houses, including one where a young couple were hosing off the concrete under their high-set timber home. I asked them if they needed anything and if they had lost anything. The young man who owned the house said, 'Oh, no. Don't worry about us. We have stilt guilt.' I said, 'What's that?' He said, 'We've raised our property. All of my neighbours are putting all of their worldly possessions out on the kerb, and here I am hosing the concrete, which is the only real damage I have experienced.' Putting the house on stilts completely changed the experience of flood for that household. That is what the RHF program will do for hundreds more Queensland families. That is a really fantastic thing to see.

When it comes to 'buyer beware' and getting information, the member for Cooper talked about community Facebook pages. In addition to those community Facebook pages, I would like to observe the importance of community groups such as the Benarrawa group. I also mention the flood markers that are going up all around the Oxley community. We do have some colloquial ones that locals have

done and now the Brisbane City Council is putting some in as well. They are very easy to see as you drive down some of our main streets in the Oxley district. It will certainly prompt buyers to undertake checks and consider what they should factor in when they are making an offer on a property that has potentially flooded.

Time is going to beat me, but I simply want to say that the change around this aspect is such welcome news for my community. A home is an emotional purchase, so this legislation is going to ensure it is emotional for all of the right reasons and not all of the wrong ones. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (4.00 pm): I rise to speak on the Property Law Bill 2023. As we have heard from other members, including the member for Nanango, the member for Chatsworth and the member for Kawana, it serves as a much needed replacement for the Property Law Act 1974—a piece of legislation that has seen few substantial changes since December 1975.

It should be noted that in 2013 the LNP government took a pivotal step by initiating the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology to undertake a comprehensive and impartial review of Queensland's property laws. I have certainly had lots of inquiries from constituents and visitors to the Gold Coast about that review over the last decade, especially about something in a subsequent bill that I will not comment on because I am not pre-empting debate. The review was intended to address various aspects and ensure that our property laws were up to date, just and responsive to the needs of Queenslanders.

Fast-forward to 2018—QUT had diligently completed their extensive review, the findings were in, the recommendations were laid out, and a promising opportunity for reform presented itself. As I mentioned, I have received queries from my constituents, as I am sure many others have, asking about the result of that review. We have witnessed a notable lack of progress or clarity from the government regarding the changes they intend to introduce based on this review. I think in about March the former attorney-general announced that she was going to bring in some changes. We have had many people come to my office, including one JP to whom I gave a 40-year acknowledgment certificate from the Attorney-General. I said, 'There are some changes coming to property law.' He said, 'Great! I've got to get to my office and make some money.' In other words, he was referring to the unscrupulous types of activities we have seen by people seeking to take advantage of potential changes simply because they have been announced with no specific time frame.

Key features of this bill include: the repeal of outdated or redundant provisions in the Property Law Act; an update of legal language to ensure clarity; and the incorporation of electronic property dealings. The bill also simplifies various provisions such as the rule against perpetuities, leases and covenants to make the law more practical and user-friendly.

The recommendations for this bill are primarily drawn from the Property Law Act report and seller disclosure report by QUT. Feedback from various stakeholders focused on the introduction of a mandatory seller disclosure scheme. This scheme aims to clarify seller disclosure obligations, promote transparency and provide buyers with valuable information relevant to their purchase decisions.

As we have heard from many others, purchasing a house is one of the biggest decisions that most people will make, and this valuable information is something people should be able to access. Depending on the quality of the conveyancing lawyer, sometimes these reports are not always made obvious. That is something people should be careful about. We have heard the Latin principle *caveat emptor*, or buyer beware.

Four guiding principles underpin the seller disclosure scheme: firstly, sellers must provide information that is within their knowledge or readily available through reasonable searches; secondly, information should focus on matters affecting property title and financial obligations; thirdly, the information should be accessible, easily understood and reliable; and finally, the scheme should establish a single consistent framework for disclosure, content and remedies.

Under this scheme buyers can terminate a contract for two primary reasons: firstly, if the seller fails to provide the required disclosure statement and related certificates; and secondly, if the statement or disclosure contains inaccuracies about material matters that would have affected the buyer's decision.

Whilst the seller disclosure scheme enjoys substantial support, some concerns have been raised, notably regarding the disclosure of natural hazard risks and recognition. Buyers are encouraged to inquire with their local government regarding flooding and natural hazard history, with a proposed warning statement to be included in disclosure documents directing buyers to resources like Flood Check Queensland and the Australian Flood Risk Information Portal. I noted with interest the

contribution of the member for Nanango about variations between flood maps done by the state government and flood maps done by Brisbane City Council. Those sorts of things need to be resolved so that people can be confident about the information they are trying to draw on before they make a purchasing decision.

One area of significant discussion by stakeholders was the requirement for seller disclosure. It again highlights the government's consultative approach—or lack thereof—when it comes to experts in the field. I table an article from *Australian Property Investor* dated 24 February 2023 titled 'Queensland real estate transaction reform bill comes under fire'.

Tabled paper: Article from the REIQ, dated 24 February 2023, titled 'Queensland real estate transaction reform bill comes under fire' [\[1736\]](#).

In this article REIQ CEO Antonia Mercorella said—


We are the peak body for real estate professionals in Queensland, with an unparalleled understanding of the way real estate transactions are facilitated in this State, so it's alarming that the proposed legislation has been introduced into Parliament whilst we are still in the process of working through key stakeholder consultation.

We should not forget about the uncertainty introduced to the property market by this government earlier this year with the now scrapped land tax. We saw investors flee the Queensland property market in droves, only to have the planned changes scrapped 98 days after they were first announced following severe backlash.

Seller disclosures are provided by the sellers of property to potential buyers and disclose salient facts about the property such as information about a body corporate if one exists. The Unit Owners Association of Queensland raised an important issue for disclosure: seller disclosure should contain a simple statement of the lawful use of the land and the building drawn from the development approval given by local government under the Planning Act 2016. This is particularly relevant given the short-term accommodation issues experienced with buildings approved for residential use being utilised unlawfully for short-term stays. This is a significant issue on the Gold Coast. In my electorate, buildings in Paradise Waters and Broadbeach that were originally only meant for residential living are now being used by short-term letting portals like Airbnb and others, and that is frustrating for owners who cannot get clarity on whether any action is going to be taken against people using their properties for things which are not approved.

I note the Main Beach Association's support for the Unit Owners Association of Queensland's submission that the bill should require that the seller disclosure contain simple English around the lawful use of land, particularly the rules on short-term letting. My office regularly receives complaints from residents in properties that have short-term letting issues such as loud music, late-night parties and damage to common area facilities. Any clarity on rules surrounding short-term letting would be welcomed by my community in Surfers Paradise. Concerns about the impact on strata search agents are noted; however, the bill aims to eliminate unnecessary services and reduce costs for real estate agents, with updated legislation ultimately resulting in more informed and efficient property transactions.

The Property Law Bill 2023 represents a significant step towards modernising our property laws, making them more accessible and relevant to the current property landscape in Queensland. As the shadow Attorney-General has said, the opposition will not oppose the bill.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (4.08 pm): I am pleased to speak in support of the Property Law Bill 2023. Property law is something that will affect every Queenslanders at some point in their lives, so it is important that the law reflects modern standards. Having commenced in December 1975, the current act is outdated and is no longer fit for purpose. While the act has been amended dozens of times over the years, it has been clear for some time that a new piece of legislation is required. The Queensland University of Technology's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre undertook a broad-ranging, independent review of Queensland's property laws and prepared a total of 18 papers which inform this legislation. Their review's final report made a total of 232 recommendations to modernise Queensland's property law framework. This bill will replace the current Property Law Act, simplify and streamline the state's property laws, redraft existing laws into plain English, better facilitate e-conveyancing and electronic transactions, and remove outdated and unnecessary provisions.

The bill will also create a statutory seller disclosure scheme for the sale of freehold land. This will simplify and consolidate the disclosure process for land sales and empower prospective buyers to make informed decisions. In simple terms, the new scheme will make it mandatory for a seller of freehold land to disclose relevant information to the buyer in a single document, along with any prescribed certificates, including a body corporate certificate where relevant. Importantly, the bill amends the Limitation of

Actions Act 1974 to provide that the limitation period for taking legal action in relation to a deed entered into after the commencement will be six years, which is consistent with the limitation period for other contracts.

In addition, this bill substantially clarifies, modernises and updates the existing provisions relating to leases in a way that retains long-established legal concepts but also clarifies areas of uncertainty and seeks to better balance rights between landlords and tenants, including by harmonising the existing time frames with other legislation to provide consistency in leasing practices in Queensland. The scheme will ensure that buyers are alerted to undertake their own due diligence on flood information and other natural hazard risks. It will direct buyers to resources that provide information about these risks.

As we have heard from many members in this chamber, Queensland is the most disaster prone state in Australia and we certainly received our fair share of floods last year. Those floods impacted Queenslanders all over the state, including in my electorate of Ipswich. In the two years leading up to December 2022, over 147,000 newcomers from overseas or interstate moved to Queensland and many of those newcomers would have moved into homes that had flooded in the past. Some of those newcomers may not have been given prior warning—as, Madam Deputy Speaker Bush, you said in your own speech. They did not have the research available about the flood risks to their new homes and they had no familiarity with the area they were buying in.

When the flood event of February-March 2022 hit East Queensland, there were quite a few new Queenslanders who were caught off guard, especially in Ipswich. I will never forget the faces of one young family I was talking to at the evacuation centre. They were quite clearly in shock. They had moved to Ipswich from New South Wales and thought they had their dream home, not having any idea that it was in a flood area, and they lost everything. They were expecting a new baby any day and they already had a toddler. I will never forget their faces. It was very hard to see what they had gone through.

Like the Deputy Speaker, I doorknocked the areas and saw the seasoned Ipswich people who had been through many floods. A lot of them took it on the chin. They understood the risks and they took it as the price they paid to live where they lived. It does not change the fact that it is absolutely devastating and traumatic for these families. There are people in Ipswich who have lived there for generations and they know the parts of Ipswich that are prone to flooding. They know where not to buy and what areas are best to raise a family in. Our personal experiences of the 1974 and 2011 floods in Ipswich are deeply ingrained in the local cultural memory and that knowledge is passed down to younger generations, but most newcomers do not have that knowledge. That is when the law needs to step up and establish a provision that gives people fair warning that they need to do their due diligence regarding flood risks and other natural risks, like bushfires.


The trauma that has been experienced by Queenslanders whose homes were flooded or impacted by bushfires is something we do not want to have to put people through ever again. It is the reason why the Palaszczuk government established the Resilient Homes Fund. It was set up to buy back homes that flooded regularly or to provide funding to home owners so they could flood-proof their homes through retrofitting and house raising. That scheme has been a massive success in Ipswich, with 148 home owners accepting offers for a home buyback while 57 homes have already been demolished or removed. The green space that is remaining is a reminder that no future residents will ever have to suffer the devastating effects of flooding.

Following the 2022 floods, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority also recommended policies be developed so Queenslanders understand the flood risks of potential home purchases. The seller disclosure scheme will give ample warning to potential buyers to perform their due diligence before signing a contract. The scheme will empower buyers to make well-informed decisions before they make one of the biggest and most important purchases of their lives—their home.

We have all heard stories about people who have bought properties—some of them their dream homes—only to learn later about certain liabilities to their property which reduce their home's resale value or even make their homes uninhabitable. The seller disclosure scheme will give buyers confidence that they can invest in Queensland. Property law underpins almost everything in our society and economy. When people are confident that their property rights are protected, they have more confidence to invest in the economy in general. That in turn stimulates wealth creation, innovation and productivity. Property rights also contribute to the stabilisation of our society by reducing disputes and conflicts.

Countries with weak or corrupt property laws generally do not function well and usually experience higher rates of inequality due to their unfair distribution or arbitrary dispossession of property. Updating Queensland's Property Law Act ensures that our laws are up to date and fit for purpose, assuring potential buyers that they can invest confidently in our state.

I wish to thank the Attorney-General, Yvette D'Ath, and the former attorney-general, Shannon Fentiman. The former attorney-general introduced the bill in February 2023, a year after those floods. The bill then went to the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee and I want to thank the committee members for the work they did on the bill. It has been described as a bit of a dry bill but I know it is incredibly important work so I thank the committee for their work. I also want to acknowledge QUT's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre for their comprehensive review into Queensland's property law. The feedback they gave us served us very well in preparing this bill. It is incredibly important that we support this bill in this House. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (4.17 pm): I rise to speak on the Property Law Bill 2023. The Property Law Act 1974 has not been substantially amended since December 1975. In consideration of this, 10 years ago the LNP government commissioned the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at QUT to conduct an independent and broad-ranging review into the laws. That review was finished in 2018, five years ago. We are now at the end of 2023. It is not surprising that the government has taken five years to introduce the necessary changes. It rarely has control of the agenda because it is so consumed by its self-inflicted chaos and crisis. The government has moved at a glacial pace to introduce the necessary legislative reforms.

This bill seeks to update and modernise the language and provisions in the Property Law Act and make changes which account for modern technology and practices. It will also repeal outdated or unnecessary provisions, simplify and update others, and minimise the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts. A statutory seller disclosure scheme aims to clarify the disclosure obligations of the seller, requires a transparent and consolidated form of disclosure and provides valuable information for the buyer.

The QUT report recommended the introduction of a statutory seller disclosure scheme which clearly identifies the obligations of a seller. It is to be coordinated, transparent, consistent and streamlined. The QUT report identified that currently one of the risks was where the buyer was presented with too much information and does not understand what is put before them. A streamlined scheme which is transparent and clear has the potential to remove many of the unknowns. The government says the draft regulations for the disclosure scheme which were tabled with this bill will be refined after it is passed.

It is imperative that the Attorney-General ensures the regulation is clear, realistic and effective to give buyers the necessary information without overwhelming them or unnecessarily burdening the seller. This is important in regions such as Gympie, which is not only susceptible to floods but also has vegetation covenants and management laws, and PMAVs are a constant source of concern. I am often contacted by residents who have discovered their properties have been overlaid with vegetation covenants that they had no knowledge about.

Sellers also need to know when any level of government, government agencies and bodies have made decisions about their properties. A 74-year-old pensioner constituent recently contacted me distressed that the Gympie Regional Council had a covenant on her property. The constituent had a number of falls and was selling because she had to move into a retirement place for safety reasons. She wrote—

I was shocked to discover from my real estate agent that GRC have put a 'Covering' on my property ... I was totally unaware that GRC had put this 'Covering' ... and I was never informed or given any official warning ... I have visited GRC offices and been informed that it was placed on the GRC website—but what about those of us who do not use this website?

Surely it could have been put on our Rates Notices (we get those regularly twice a year) or some sort of official notification?

Whether it is notification about advices, rebates, grants or emergency alerts, ministers need to remember that not everyone uses the internet and not everyone uses social media. The government's rebate scheme for purchasing white goods can only be accessed through a website. My office has had numerous pensioners and elderly people come in seeking help to apply. They cannot apply because they do not have an email address, have no access to the internet, cannot do it at the library because they do not know how to use a computer or cannot negotiate the website. Assuming that everyone does is indifferent, ignorant or deliberately designed to minimise applications.

It is telling that the 2020 Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements had to push back against the Queensland government, which objected to directly communicating with people. It stated—

The Queensland Government questioned whether there is a need to directly communicate risk to people when they can access government websites that already host this information. The answer is simple: Many people do not. However, the person who goes out of their way to understand their risk and the person who does nothing face the same risk. Further, there may be differences in the extent to which different people can understand risk, even where some information may be available.

Currently, the draft regulations for the strategy disclosure scheme exclude the disclosure of flooding or natural hazard history. The QUT recommended against imposing an obligation to disclose flooding information, saying—

This view is influenced heavily by the difficulties associated with clearly articulating the meaning of 'flood information' or for the seller to state whether the property is 'flood prone' together with inconsistency in the information available from official sources.

The natural disaster royal commission had an alternative view. It recommended that state and territory governments should have a process or mechanism to communicate natural hazard risk information to households, including prospective purchasers, in hazard-prone areas and explore a natural approach to this.

As the report notes under the proposed disclosure scheme, a buyer is warned about matters not covered by the disclosure statements, one of which is the property's history about flood and other natural disasters. The department's submission stated that—

... the draft PL Regulation proposes to prescribe a warning statement that must be included in the disclosure statement advising the buyer to enquire with the relevant local government about whether the property is affected by flooding or another natural hazard or is within a natural hazard overlay. The warning statement also advises the buyer that flood information for the property may be available at the FloodCheck Queensland portal or the Australian Flood Risk Information portal.

The REIQ requested that buyers be directed to other sources if the FloodCheck Queensland portal or the Australian Flood Risk Information portal did not hold the relevant information. It called for investment to improve and expand the current state information systems, such as the Queensland Globe and State Planning Policy Interactive Mapping System, to ensure sellers throughout the state have the same ability to access information they may need. The LGAQ recommended including the mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks.

Property information varies greatly across local governments. Many have limited resources and they should not be made to carry the burden of ensuring information is consistent across the state. The Queensland Law Society suggested the government provide funding to local governments to develop mapping to show the anticipated impact of flooding events for developed land and undertake appropriately detailed research of historical flood events. It proposed that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, in consultation with the Department of Resources, develop a standard property flood information form which can be used by all local governments to respond to flood inquiries from the public. I do not oppose the bill.



Hon. DE FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business, Minister for Training and Skills Development and Minister for Youth Justice) (4.24 pm): I rise to support the Property Law Bill 2023. It is great to hear that the opposition is also supporting the bill. I want to congratulate the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee. It was obviously quite a complex bill with a number of decisions to be made. I also wish to congratulate the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology. I know that many speakers have acknowledged the really erudite people who were involved with this work, which has happened over quite a number of years. I understand there were 18 different papers produced and much consultation with stakeholders through several rounds, before the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee even got to it, and also to look at equivalent provisions in other jurisdictions. It is an extremely thorough piece of work, as it should be, because, as many speakers before me have said and I think the former attorney-general identified in her introductory speech, this is something that affects pretty much every Queenslanders. It is so important that a law such as this is modern and reflective of community expectations.

We know that the current act, along with common-law, is foundational for property law in Queensland, with general rules affecting property, creation and disposition of interest in land, co-ownership, deeds, covenants, mortgages, leases, the rules against perpetuities and old system land. It has obviously been amended a number of times over a period of years, but it is clearly time for new legislation to be in place. I understand that some of the language, in fact, was still from the early 1900s.

The bill obviously provides for a number of things which I will speak to—I will not speak to all of them—but one can read the part about modernising the use of technology and providing a legal framework to recognise and facilitate electronic dealings in property. Then when one sees what that

will enable, it is about sending a document to a buyer's electronic address and a buyer consenting for that to be sent to their address. In 1975 that would have been unheard of; however, it is absolutely fundamental to the way people communicate these days.


We talk about how important this is because it will affect most Queenslanders at some time throughout their lives. In fact, I have just sold my family home after 30 years and am in the process of buying a new one. I am looking through this bill saying, 'This is actually really good stuff.' I am looking at it through the lens of not only my constituents as they raise these issues but also firsthand.

Obviously there are a few things that this act is going to address. It will repeal the outdated provisions. We have talked about modernising the language and the electronic dealings, simplifying the common-law rule against perpetuities and rules relating to covenants, minimising the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts and also the statutory seller disclosure scheme.

I want to go to one part of the work that has been undertaken which is about leasing. I understand that the Shopping Centre Council of Australia submitted that standard lease term 3 in schedule 1 of the bill is needlessly unfavourable to landlords. The committee made some recommendations which the government has not accepted.

While we are speaking about that, I do want to pay tribute to the Queensland Small Business Commissioner. Madam Deputy Speaker, as you know, the position was originally set up to assist with leasing disputes. I want to acknowledge that the Small Business Commissioner's office is doing a lot of work in this space and is really supporting people. It is important for members to know that when it comes to commercial leases between small businesses and landlords for instance, the Queensland Small Business Commissioner is taking calls about the very issues that are raised in this report. For instance, the disputes in this category take up approximately 21 per cent—that is one in five of the matters that the commission deals with on an annual basis. The combined request for dispute assistance and applications for mediation make up 37 per cent. Often they are about bond return. Overall, the QSBC resolves these at a rate of 71 per cent for under \$200 per matter. They are so good. They do this and they prevent businesses and landlords needing to go to QCAT, which is a long and expensive process. We estimate the commission has saved small businesses approximately \$17.6 million just because of that very service over these particular issues and they are going to continue to provide these vital services to small business.

There are so many other really important things to talk about, but I really want to shine a light on that and make sure that members are aware of that. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (4.31 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the Property Law Bill 2023. I must commend the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for taking the time to consider this bill and recommend that it be passed. It is pretty dry legislation. It is probably as dry as eating a packet of Arrowroot biscuits without butter. However, this is important legislation around property law in Queensland, ensuring that conveyancing into the future will be kept up to date with how modern times are moving. The legislation we are amending was enacted in 1974 and it is my understanding that it has not been amended since 1975. A lot has happened since 1975. We live in a very different world. The internet was not even a consideration back then and places were run on paper instead of digital and internet connectivity.

The bill takes some pretty simple but important steps to modernise the current legislation. It replaces the Property Law Act 1974 with new, modernised property legislation, which is important for 2023. It simplifies and streamlines Queensland property law to ensure that it is modernised, easy to use and up to date with how property is bought, sold and traded in this state. It is also important to keep up with other states and jurisdictions. It also redrafts existing provisions in plain English. I had a bit of a look through the previous legislation. A lot of the language contained within it is not used in modern times. It can be a bit baffling to a modern-day person.

The bill also better facilitates e-commerce and electronic transactions which, as I said, is all important in this day and age when we have a fast paced, quick-acting society that want to do things via the internet. People do not want to wait around for snail mail or to either view documents in person or fly across the country to sign something. We are ensuring that is modernised.

The bill also removes the outdated and unnecessary provisions in the previous act. It implements a statutory seller disclosure scheme for sales of freehold land, which is the point I will spend most of my time talking to. The reality is in North Queensland and Queensland in general we see an influx of people from down south, whether from the south-east corner to North Queensland or people moving interstate into Queensland. Those people do not always have the historical knowledge of the area about flooding, natural disasters, cyclones and those things that locals understand. The bill will place an

obligation on the seller to ensure they have taken reasonable steps to inform a potential buyer of the property they have on the market about those things that may affect their decision-making about whether or not they move forward with the property purchase.

The Hinchinbrook electorate in particular is prone to floods, especially the Herbert district and Ingham, the small town I grew up in. Nearly every two to three years we would have a flood. Most locals will understand the flooding that happens in that area. A lot of the houses are built in such a way—they are on stilts—that floodwater goes underneath. It is easy to see what areas flood and what areas do not around town. One hundred kilometres further south in Townsville large flooding events seem to occur on average every 20 years. The most recent ones in modern history were the ‘Night of Noah’ in 1998 and the 2019 floods.

The difference between places like Ingham and Townsville is that a lot can change in a short period. In Townsville, for example, large developments are going forward at the moment and there is work going on in adjacent areas. When there is a quite flat, low-lying area, having as much information for potential buyers is very important. If this legislation were not passed and there was not an onus on the seller to provide this information to purchasers about the property they are potentially going to buy, they could end up with a property in Fairfield Waters, for example, that may have had three or four feet of floodwaters run through the house five or six years ago before the insurance company did the good work of finally rebuilding those premises.

The old buyer beware advice does not stack up anymore. We need to do more to make sure those potential buyers are properly informed.

Mrs Frecklington: It is common-law.

Mr DAMETTO: I do not know what you are saying. I will not take the interjection.

An honourable member: Caveat emptor.

Mr DAMETTO: They are interesting observations. Obviously not every situation can be foreseen, and property and road developments in areas need to be considered. The submission from the LGAQ states that more support needs to be given to councils to ensure that flood modelling and the available information is up to date. The fact is some small regional councils do not have the same ability to do flood modelling as larger cities with bigger back pockets. More needs to be done to ensure they are kept up to date.

The LGAQ made a number of recommendations. The first states—

... the proposed seller disclosure scheme for Queensland be broadened to align vendor obligations for provision of due diligence information at point of sale, with those of other jurisdictions that already require detailed property sale disclosure statements, including flood and other natural hazard information.

The second states—

The LGAQ recommends the State Government continue working with the LGAQ and Queensland councils to identify workable solutions that will enable mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks in Queensland, prior to commencement of the Bill should it be passed.

The KAP will not be opposing this bill. We think it is good legislation. It tidies up a number of parts of the previous act which needed to be modernised. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr WHITING (Bancroft—ALP) (4.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill before the House. As many have said, it is important that this bill replaces the 1974 act. It has done well; it has served the state well and so it is time for it to be updated. One of the things I really like about this bill is it makes changes or improvements to an act that affects all Queenslanders. This act, more than just about any other act, impacts Queenslanders' lives. It is probably one of the only acts that normal Queenslanders besides us would actually read and take a look at. I think it is absolutely important that this bill makes sure the act is in plain English. It is essential that these provisions can be easily understood by every Queenslanders.

I also commend the process in terms of how we got here with the Property Law Bill. We have heard that from 2013 to 2018 the QUT Commercial and Property Law Research Centre did research. It produced 18 papers—that is enormous—and 232 recommendations. It conducted a decade's worth of consultation. We have heard the LNP criticise us for taking some time to get to this point. When we had 18 papers making 232 recommendations on an act that is a fundamental part of our legal system and the everyday lives of Queenslanders, it is absolutely crucial that we get this right. I am happy with where we have arrived at today.

I will talk briefly about the issue of natural hazard disclosure. I had always thought that a mandatory disclosure system was a pretty good idea. I thought that when I was a councillor. What I also discovered as a councillor is that there are different standards of information on flood hazards held by councils across the state. If we made it a mandatory system I would be concerned that residents across Queensland would be paying for a service and expecting a standard of research and information that is the same and that could not be delivered given the different levels of research and information on flood hazards held by local governments.

I will give members one example. In the first term of the Moreton Bay regional council there was an excellent level of research and information produced by their flooding study. It showed exactly where the hazards would be. I know that was in stark contrast to some other councils that had a very different standard. I would constantly refer people to the mapping and say, 'If you're thinking of moving into the area, have a look at this mapping.' I believe that the research that went into this mapping was funded by the state government at the time. The member for Gympie was saying that this should be funded by the state. I know that the Moreton Bay regional council talked to the state government about getting funding to produce the mapping at that time.


In talking about natural hazards and recognising natural hazards and the impact of climate change, can I reiterate what the member for Mount Ommaney talked about, which was the huge beneficial impact of the world-leading Resilient Homes Fund that we introduced. When talking about natural hazards, this is something that we need to be talking about all the time. This fund has had a beneficial impact in my area. It has changed people's lives.

I have seen major floods come through Major Street in my area. Members have heard me say before that since my first elected position in 2000 I have seen three one-in-1,000-year rain events come through our area. I have seen two of those impact Major Street. We have had 1½ metres of water racing through the whole street and racing through people's houses. I have seen people sell up and new people move in. Those people get flooded as well and they say to me, 'I did not know it flooded here. They did not tell me. I only found out after I moved in.'

It is very clear when talking about flooding and natural hazards that something had to change. I commend the Labor government on bringing in this fund to help people make a change and get a new start in life. One gentleman I talked to in a street around that area—and who has since moved out because his home has been bought back—was paying \$27,000 a year in insurance to live in his home. He had had eight floods through his home. Approvals had only been given 20 or 30 years before. That was before we really saw the impacts of climate change.

It is important that we emphasise to buyers that they get from council a natural hazards disclosure, but that they be aware that the standards may vary across the state. We encourage people to be fully aware of what they are buying.

There are a couple of other provisions in this bill that I support. It is quite an extensive bill. It is a thick bill. I appreciate that a feature of this bill is promoting electronic dealings in property, the electronic service of documents and the digital creation and signing of contracts and deeds. These are all things that this bill is promoting and allowing. It also provides for modern terms to be put into lease agreements. There is a whole range of improvements and reforms that are included in this bill. It is a bill that will amend an act that affects the lives of just about every Queenslanders. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (4.45 pm): I will make a short contribution to the debate on the Property Law Bill. I will cut straight to the chase in terms of the designation of flood areas, as the member for Hinchinbrook pointed out. There are a lot of implications with flooding maps and zonings and how they are treated. I draw on my 15 years of experience as a property valuer and my current experience as a home owner.

A flood map will be done for an area, which is fairly precise these days, but the house on the hill will get whacked the same as the house on the other end of the street that is in a low-lying area next to a gully. We have people paying 12 grand for insurance. I received a new insurance bill for our Townsville house the other day and it went from two grand to four grand and it is on top of the hill. It costs that because of the risk of flooding.

Mr McDonald: Postcode discrimination.


Mr KATTER: I take that interjection from the member for Lockyer. It is postcode discrimination. We are paying the price. I guess the insurance companies can quite rightly say, 'We are going off the information we have.' There needs to be a proactive response and there needs to be a role for

government in enforcing zonings and the flooding information and synthesising that through to the insurance companies so that there is no excuse for them to use a broad stick approach. There is no question that insurance is, you might say, beyond a crisis.

A year or two ago they were estimating that 20 per cent of North Queensland was uninsured. I can see why people are making that decision because my wife and I are right now looking at the bills we are paying for insurance and questioning how we do it. I can understand why people on lower incomes are exiting the market. That is now becoming a problem for all of us.

When there is legislation like this coming before us, there needs to be consideration given to places like North Queensland and perhaps the Lockyer Valley where they have had multiple flooding events. We are getting smashed from pillar to post with the broadbrush approach of insurance companies. We need that detail fed in and, we might say, enforced on the insurance companies in terms of how they categorise us.

We need to see some meaningful change on premiums. If someone is on a hill at the top of the street, that needs to be reflected in the person's insurance. They have to assess the real risk so that we know that we are being treated fairly, which is not the case at present. These are the sorts of opportunities we have to do that. This bill does not go that far. We need an effort beyond this legislation in terms of insurance. This is definitely an appeal from those of us representing high-flood areas—members might say a cry for help—to use this sort of legislation to address this very bad problem.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.48 pm): I rise to support the Property Law Bill 2023. Some of the less romantic legal eagles in the room might note that one of the key functions of marriage is managing property, and, Mr Deputy Speaker Hart, that is probably a very weak attempt at trying to bring the next part of my speech into the realm of relevance. Today my wife and I celebrate 25 years of marriage. I thank my wonderful wife, Susan, for 25 great years of marriage.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Hart): Hear, hear!

Mr KELLY: What better way, member for Nanango, to celebrate 25 years of marriage than to be in parliament debating the Property Law Bill. I see the nods of agreement furiously happening right around the chamber, but I will come back to the bill.

Housing and the purchase of housing is an incredibly important matter and it has a huge impact on people's lives, so it is important that we get the legislation around this area right. I want to acknowledge the good work of the Attorney-General and the former attorney-general in terms of taking this matter forward and picking up the review that was done by QUT. As many submitters have noted, this is a relatively routine bill updating this important piece of legislation that guides that most important aspect of life—that is, purchasing property. For optimal functioning of a market in any area of market activity it is necessary for all buyers and sellers to have access to the best possible information that they can. In fact, if you have perfect information you will apparently have a perfect market. This bill seeks to make improvements to the information available to buyers which hopefully will lead to better market outcomes.

The bill introduces a seller disclosure scheme which aims to make sure that a buyer can make an informed purchase. The scheme formalises disclosure which already takes place in most sales in Queensland, consolidating disclosure obligations prior to contracts being signed. As we know, this legislation is updating the former Property Law Act, which is 50 years old, so it is bringing this part of the disclosure into modern parlance.

I read through quite a number of the submissions, but I noted the concerns raised by the Wide Bay Burnett Community Legal Service about section 68 of the bill. I noted the concerns that it had particularly in relation to tying up the limited resources allocated to people who might be utilising NDIS funding and tying that funding that might be otherwise used for supports for those people into legal processes. I want to thank the Attorney-General for taking that matter into consideration and bringing in amendments that will be moved during consideration in detail. I do believe that those amendments will deal with those concerns.

I also want to note the general improvements around e-conveyancing. I have to admit that I had very little understanding of conveyancing and had a limited understanding of just how far behind we were in terms of e-conveyancing until a few years ago when I did some work with Stephen and his team from Monkey Conveyancing to make representations around this issue to the then attorney-general. I note that the vast majority of work around this matter has been done elsewhere, but the provisions in this bill do generally continue this positive trend. With that, I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: And happy anniversary, member for Greenslopes.

Mr KELLY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Forty-two years myself.

Mr KELLY: Congratulations!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have a bit to go yet.



Mr KRAUSE (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.53 pm): It was a pleasure to be a part of the committee reviewing the Property Law Bill, noting, as other members have noted, that it replaces the Property Law Act 1974. Before I came to work in this place I worked as a solicitor in private practice and also in a bank and we dealt with many of the things being dealt with in this bill on a daily basis. As others have noted, the Property Law Act really applies to everyone in everyday life, whether you are buying a property, buying a business place or leasing somewhere. It has huge application, whether it is through easements, covenants, mortgages or the powers of attorneys in the way things are executed. There were simplifications made to that through the time of COVID which have been retained through this bill. It also deals with trusts and the rule against perpetuities which I am sure all lawyers love talking about but no-one else really cares about, but it can be quite an interesting conversation in some company I suppose. Then there are priority agreements, equitable mortgages and guarantees and indemnities as well as instalment contracts.

In all law there is always a need to modernise things, and this bill does a lot of modernising. There is provision made through the disclosure regime for the disclosure of natural hazards. Others have spoken about the need for that to occur when there is a known history of flooding and that that should be disclosed to potential purchasers of properties, and the bill deals with that, although there are always questions of degree about whether the disclosure requirements are great enough. That is the way it will always be, I think, when it comes to those types of hazards. You can never guard against them absolutely because there are always unprecedented events at times. When it comes to the Scenic Rim electorate, we have been fortunate over the years not to have witnessed many natural disasters but to have learnt from them in the very early days of the towns being built. In Boonah in particular there is a lot of local lore about how the 1893 floods resulted in that town being shifted out of the flood plain, and they were at that stage of settlement where that could still occur, although in other parts of Queensland things had gone way too far by then, including in Ipswich where much of it is still, unfortunately, in a flood-prone area.

The bill is modernising the Property Law Act 1974. I note that this process started in 2014 under the former government and the former attorney-general the member for Kawana. We should always take care in modernising or changing laws such as the Property Law Act because of the fact that it is a bedrock of property law in this state and of much value to people in business and, as I said before, everyone's homes. We should always take care and be cautious about amending these laws, but there is taking caution and then there is just being plain tardy as well. The fact that this process started in 2014 and then there was a change of government in 2015 and we are now only dealing with the outcome of that process eight years later speaks to the priorities being wrong for this government in many respects. This bill should have come about earlier than it has. However, it is good to see that it is here finally and the committee's examination of it was largely uncontroversial in many respects.

There were some submissions made by a gentleman by the name of Brian Noble in relation to registered easements, and I note that the Attorney-General is intending to move some amendments to the Property Law Bill to deal with easements. I would ask if the Attorney could consider in summing-up telling the House how the amendments address the submissions by Mr Noble, whether they do or if they are directed at other issues that were raised during the committee process.

I want to touch briefly on a couple of the issues that were raised through the committee process, firstly in relation to the disclosure for the sale of a lot in a community titles scheme. Under the present law, the seller of a lot in a community titles scheme must produce a copy of the body corporate records for the lot and also comply with disclosure requirements under the Body Corporate and Community Management Act 1997. The bill changes that in some ways. In particular, it requires the body corporate manager to provide a copy of body corporate records to a buyer—that is, a disclosure requirement where the body corporate manager, not the seller, is making disclosure to a buyer. During the committee process there were some concerns raised about this provision. Whilst it might appear dry to some, it is a good point because it is not beyond the realms of possibility that contracts can fail because of disclosure being made in an incorrect way or that legal action could arise because of wrong disclosure being made after a contract has completed. At the moment where the seller is the party that makes disclosure, people will have rights at law to litigate against the seller. When these amendments


come into place—and this was ventilated through the committee process—the body corporate manager is going to be the person who has made disclosure, so the question arises about whether litigation will need to be taken against the body corporate manager.

If a contract falls over because of defective disclosure, will the seller of a lot have to sue their own body corporate manager? On the other side, if an issue arises after a sale is completed, will the buyer have to sue their new body corporate manager for defective disclosure? It is much tidier, in the view of many, if the seller remains as the party giving disclosure to a sale because they are the ones ultimately responsible for passing on title—not the body corporate manager, who has been placed in the middle of a commercial transaction and potentially having liability put on them as a result of that position. Notwithstanding that, those considerations were not taken on board by the government. We will see how it progresses into the future.

The other issue I want to talk about is the community management statement, in particular in relation to the disclosure regime for sales in a community titles scheme and the fact that many stakeholders do not support the inclusion of a community management statement as part of the disclosure documentation. We have been here in the past. Before 2012 there was a requirement for this CMS to be provided. It was removed during the term of the LNP government. No-one has missed it. No-one at all has missed receiving the voluminous community management statement when they buy a unit. They can be very large documents. They rack up the printing costs and the document distribution costs at the point of sale and no-one reads those documents because they are too big.

Less is more when it comes to disclosure. Putting that CMS back into the process is a lazy reversion to red tape under this Labor government. We should recognise that when people are buying a unit, receiving that huge amount of documentation, which can be a couple of hundred pages long, is not going to protect them. They get bogged down in too much information. There were a lot of submitters who agreed with that position, but here we are with that CMS coming back. It was removed in 2012 through the red-tape-reduction bill, but here we are 11 years later and those documents are going to be back into the sale process, clogging up real estate agents' desks across the state.

The LNP supports the modernisation of the Property Law Act in general. It needed to be done with caution, but it has been done with extreme tardiness by this government. I congratulate the member for Kawana for starting this process back in 2014. It is good to see it coming to a conclusion now.

 **Ms LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (5.03 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Property Law Bill 2023, a bill which will replace Queensland's outdated property laws. The Property Law Bill 2023 will replace the current Property Law Act 1974, which has not been comprehensively reformed since it was introduced almost 50 years ago. I am pleased that the Palaszczuk Labor government is taking action to ensure our state's property laws are modern and fit for purpose.

The bill has been developed to modernise property laws in Queensland with contemporary language that reflects current commercial practice. It is incredibly important that homebuyers know more about the property that they are buying, and this bill will support buyers with new disclosure rules to make it easier. The bill is based largely on the recommendations of the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology following its broad-ranging independent review of Queensland's property law. I thank the QUT research centre led by Professor William Duncan, Professor Sharon Christensen and Associate Professor William Dixon, whose recommendations have guided the preparation of this bill.

This bill will implement a statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland broadly in line with the recommendations of the QUT Commercial and Property Law Research Centre's *Final report: Seller disclosure in Queensland* 2017. The new scheme will make it mandatory for a seller of freehold land to disclose relevant information to the buyer in a single document, along with any prescribed certificates, including a body corporate certificate where relevant. The scheme will also prominently alert buyers to the need to undertake their own due diligence on flood information and direct buyers to appropriate resources to access a property's flood information.


This is legislation that will most likely affect everyone at some stage of their lives when they own or deal with property. Owning and dealing with property, establishing co-ownership arrangements, signing and enforcing lease agreements and managing mortgages are major transactions that affect Queenslanders everywhere. The new seller disclosure scheme will simplify disclosure for freehold land sales and empower buyers to make well-informed decisions when purchasing property.

The new seller disclosure scheme will not, however, disclose information about the land use or any existing approvals over freehold land. The requirement of investigating lawful use of land rests with the buyer, and that is something which I stress as important for all property transactions. As a town

planning consultant, I all too often came across situations where people had purchased property to use for a specific purpose but the land use was not approved. As a result, the property owner was required to go through the DA process. Sometimes the use that the property owner was seeking to use the land for was not likely to be approved by the council and, in turn, the property buyer was not able to use the land for the purpose for which they purchased the property in the first place.

Over my time as a consultant I had a range of clients who experienced this. A number of cases involved uses like motor vehicle workshops and a range of industrial uses. Clients would enter into a contract and purchase a property with an existing use. They assumed that they would be able to continue that use after the property was purchased, only to be hit with a compliance notice from council down the track. They were informed that that actually was not a lawful use and that they were required to submit a development application. Sometimes those DAs were approved and the owner could continue that use once that approval was in place, but on a number of occasions people had purchased property and continued the existing use on the site but then were not able to secure a development approval for that particular use to continue. They had to close their business and had to sell the land. They may not have purchased the land in the first place if they had known that that approval was not in place. There is an element of 'buyer beware', but to anyone who is going to enter into a contract for a property and seeking to continue a use on that site I stress the importance of doing their due diligence—to find out whether approvals are in place before they enter into that contract.

I also suggest that in the development of the disclosure implementation process it be made clear that the disclosure form does not include information about the land use and any council approvals over that land. It is also particularly important to consider whether the use will increase in scale or intensity. That can be by way of, for example, an existing motor vehicle workshop that might not have an existing approval, but the new buyer might seek to extend the operating hours or build additional infrastructure or grow the business physically on the site. The increase in scale or intensity may actually trigger more approvals and it is critical for buyers to understand that before entering into contracts. You cannot assume that an existing use on a site is a lawful use. That is why it is incredibly important for buyers to be aware of existing approvals or the lack thereof. The development of the bill has been the subject of extensive consultation with stakeholders over several years and I want to thank them for their ongoing involvement and valuable expertise. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (5.08 pm): I rise to speak to the Property Law Bill 2023. As the explanatory notes state, the bill is largely in response to two reports. The bill creates a statutory seller disclosure scheme for the sale of freehold land as recommended in the *Final report: Seller disclosure in Queensland*, the seller disclosure scheme report of 2017. The explanatory notes also state that the bill is drafted broadly in accordance with the recommendations of the *Final report: Property Law Act 1974*. The PLA report was released by the Queensland University of Technology's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre in 2018. The Palaszczuk government has now leapt into action following the release of those reports, one released six years ago and the other released five years ago. The committee report was tabled on 1 April, earlier this year. The 2017 seller disclosure scheme report recommended introducing a seller disclosure scheme for all sales of freehold land. The reform objectives of the scheme include clarifying the disclosure obligations of a seller, requiring a transparent and effective form of disclosure, providing information of value to the decision of a buyer to purchase and balancing the information costs between buyer and seller.

Whilst most submitters were largely supportive of the bill, the LGAQ raised concerns that there was a lack of natural hazard risks mandated in the seller disclosure scheme. The committee report states—

LGAQ provided substantial feedback on natural hazard risk information for lots, stating that the disclosure regulations 'do not go far enough in meeting the recommendations of the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements' to 'introduce mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks at point of sale and prior to property purchase'.

LGAQ recommended the Bill broaden the seller disclosure scheme to include the mandatory disclosure of natural hazard risks, similar to the approaches of New South Wales and Victoria.

The LGAQ went on to state that this report predated the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements 2020 and there have been several other disasters since that time. That is the aspect of the bill that I want to speak to.


The report recommended that each state has a process or mechanism in place to communicate natural hazard risk information to households, including prospective purchasers in hazard prone areas. This is the part of the bill that is of interest to my seat of Condamine. Whilst the department stated that prospective purchasers could access this information through the local government or a natural hazard

outlay, it is the inconsistency of the mapping that frustrates many home owners in Condamine. I have received emails regarding flood mapping in a number of regional towns, but I want to highlight Oakey and Cambooya in particular.

Flood maps can have a significant impact on the value of a property depending on where it lies on the map. I know of owners whose properties have never been subject to flooding, and due to their location never will be, but they have been declared to be within a flood area. They face a protracted battle to attempt to have their properties removed from that high-risk area. All properties declared to be in a high-risk area are faced with very high insurance bills.

Buyers need to be able to have confidence that those maps can be relied upon, hence the need for prospective buyers to be made aware of the flooding potential and we have to include bushfires in that. At this very moment, as we speak, a number of fires are burning across Queensland. I am sure the member for Warrego will discuss that in her contribution because there have been a number of fires in her area. In Southern Downs, a fire is threatening homes as we speak. Fire is another of these hazards. The department outlined some of the challenges regarding high-risk mapping, particularly regarding some of the cost impacts on smaller councils. However, this mapping must be done better.

Purchasing a home is usually the largest investment a family will make. The more disclosure that is available to the new home owner, the better. As my colleagues have stated, we will not be opposing the bill. That is the only part of the bill that is of interest to me. Like the member for Scenic Rim, I do not get excited by property law. I will leave that to others.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (5.14 pm): I rise to speak to the Property Law Bill 2023, which represents a significant step forward in modernising property legislation in Queensland. It is the culmination of diligent efforts and a comprehensive review conducted by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology. In February 2023, the bill was introduced into the assembly with the objective of replacing the outdated Property Law Act 1974. Much has changed in the 50 years since the Property Law Act was enacted, including the use of technology.

The current act, along with common-law, is foundational for property law in Queensland, with provisions including general rules affecting property, the creation and disposition of interests in land, co-ownership of property, deeds, covenants, mortgages, leases, the rule against perpetuities and unregistered or old system land. While the current act has been amended a number of times during the past 50 years, it is clear that a new piece of legislation is required. As I have already said, this modernisation process was initiated after a rigorous independent review of Queensland property law, led by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at QUT. The bill primarily preserves the effect of existing provisions in the Property Law Act that are well established and understood. What it does re-enact is in modern language and plain English. Many of the existing provisions in the Property Law Act remain.

The Property Law Bill 2023 will bring about significant changes to Queensland law. Significantly, the bill removes outdated provisions such as those relating to the old system, unregistered land and the provisions dealing with property settlement in de facto relationships, which have been overtaken by the Commonwealth Family Law Act 1975. The bill simplifies the rules relating to court ordered sales of co-owned property, giving a court wide discretion to make orders for the sale and division of co-owned property. Further, the bill continues the operations of provisions relating to electronically creating and signing deeds that were first enacted as a response to the COVID-19 public health emergency.

The bill amends the Limitation of Actions Act 1974 to provide that the limitation period for taking legal action in relation to a deed entered into after commencement will be six years, which is consistent with the limitation period for contracts. The bill substantially clarifies, modernises and updates the existing provisions relating to leases in a way that retains long-established legal concepts but also clarifies areas of uncertainty and seeks to better balance rights between landlords and tenants, including by harmonising existing time frames with other legislation to provide consistency in leasing practice in Queensland.

The bill will also establish a statutory seller disclosure scheme for sales for freehold land, as recommended by QUT. The seller disclosure scheme will simplify and streamline the disclosure process and empower buyers to make informed decisions about property dealings. While ensuring requirements are not overly onerous on the seller, this will enable the buyer to make an informed decision regarding the property being considered for purchase. The scheme formalises disclosures that already take place in most sales in Queensland, consolidating disclosure obligations prior to signing a contract. The information to be disclosed under the seller disclosure scheme will be prescribed by regulation, meaning

that the government will be able to readily update with emerging trends and available information. The disclosure can be made physically or electronically and via an agent, giving sellers flexibility to provide disclosure documents in a variety of ways.

In the case of auctions, the bill provides a tailored approach. Simply put, if a bidder registers before the start of the auction a seller is required to give the disclosure document before the start of the auction. That is consistent with the requirements for an ordinary private treaty sale. However, if a bidder registers after the start of the auction and was not previously given the disclosure documents, such as through a previous interaction with the seller or agent, the seller is only required to make the disclosure document available by displaying the document at the auction or displaying an electronic link to view the documents.

Like many of my colleagues who have spoken before me, I know that buying a property is an exciting time and undertaking the purchase of a home is probably one of the largest investments that any of us can be involved in. That is why, regardless of all of the other pieces of legislation that are in place, it is important that each and every one of us who wishes to purchase a property undertakes good due diligence and seeks good legal advice before proceeding with the purchase.

May I acknowledge the work of the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for the consideration and work undertaken in the review of this bill. Of course, I note the assistance of the secretariat staff and their work on this bill. This bill will provide further protections for Queenslanders as we modernise the way we contribute to a more efficient and transparent property law system for Queensland. I am delighted to hear that those opposite will be supporting the bill. In conclusion, the Property Law Bill 2023 represents a pivotal step towards modernising Queensland property laws. It is sensible and timely. I commend the Property Law Bill 2023 to the House.



Dr MacMAHON (South Brisbane—Grn) (5.20 pm): I rise to speak to the Property Law Bill 2023. The Greens will be supporting this bill, but there are some huge missed opportunities here to address major issues affecting Queenslanders which the government has somewhat acknowledged and considered but then decided not to act on. I will be moving amendments to ensure the actual disclosure of a property owner's knowledge of past natural disasters to prospective buyers and prospective tenants and amendments to ensure the disclosure of building management statements extends to buyers of existing properties, not just off-the-plan properties.

As climate change intensifies, our homes are more under threat than ever before from extreme weather events like floods, fires and storms. In my electorate of South Brisbane, thousands of locals live in apartments and houses that flooded during the February 2022 floods. Residents spent days trapped in apartments without power or in emergency accommodation, weeks cleaning out mud and damaged furniture, and months repairing flooded homes and infrastructure. Many residents struggled to recover financially and emotionally. Many of these residents moved into the area after the 2011 floods. For the vast majority of these new residents, when they bought or rented their home no-one told them that the property had flooded in 2011. Perhaps worse still, just months after the 2022 floods homes in my electorate that local volunteers and I had spent hours hauling muddy furniture out of and cleaning out were listed for sale or for rent without a single mention of the devastation that had occurred just months earlier.

I wrote to the housing minister at the time alerting the minister that, with vacancy rates extremely low in Brisbane, with the price of rent rapidly increasing and with our concerns that prospective tenants may not have the time to review flood maps nor have the choice to wait for other safer properties, the lack of information puts people, their lives, pets and possessions at risk. Tenants and buyers deserve up-front information regarding the properties they are moving into. The minister's reply at the time was to encourage people to look at the flood information that is available. Flood maps and hydrology reports are useful tools but, frankly, they cannot provide the same kind of firsthand knowledge that a property owner has when they are selling or leasing a property. To give just one example, 8 Flower Street in Woolloongabba is currently being advertised for rent by Ray White. The property flooded in 1974, 2011 and 2022. The BCC flood maps show the property in an area of high likelihood of flooding, yet nowhere on any of the rental ads does it mention that the property has been subject to flooding; nor do they have a link to the BCC flood maps.

It is crucial that we do everything we can to prepare Queenslanders for climate fuelled disasters. A small but important step towards this is mandating the disclosure of any past natural disasters that have impacted a property to purchasers or prospective tenants. It is disappointing that the government has come so close to this but then backed away. That is why we will be moving amendments today that would mean sellers and lessors, or their agents, would have to disclose any knowledge they have of past natural disaster impacts on a property.

Clearly, Queensland needs a robust disaster risk assessment and disclosure scheme. As serious bushfire and cyclone events become more frequent and intense, Queensland needs standardised disaster reporting and risk information across council areas. In the absence of this, this should not stop us from moving ahead to make sure that information is disclosed to buyers and to tenants. The Greens' amendments are simple: if you own a property and you know it has been flooded or affected by bushfire, you need to be transparent and tell prospective buyers or tenants about the impacts and repairs that have taken place.

The amendments also touch on another important missed opportunity in this bill: expanding disclosure requirements for building management schemes to existing lots, not just off-the-plan properties. Building management statements, BMSs, are an obscure feature of Queensland's body corporate legislation that sit outside and above the rest of the legislation regime, allowing developers to retain control of body corporate schemes for up to 25 years without the knowledge or consent of residents, who are often kept in the dark. There is a number of apartment blocks in South Brisbane under BMSs, and my office and I have been doing our best to help residents navigate a system that gives developers ongoing power and residents very little.

Under a building management statement, developers are able to lock in pricey services to individual units, insurance contracts, rights of access, property maintenance fees, dispute resolution processes, intrusive rules for common facilities, future changes to the building and a range of other matters. BMSs can almost wholly supersede traditional body corporate arrangements and can render the body corporate and its legislated protections for residents largely redundant. BMSs also fall outside the remit of the Commissioner of Body Corporate and Community Management. BMSs are, on the whole, undemocratic. They lock owners and residents out of decision-making about their homes and are being used to circumvent and undermine the integrity of Queensland's body corporate and community titles regime. This is a serious policy failure that is hurting many Queenslanders right now.

I am pleased that the bill finally creates requirements for sellers to disclose proposed BMSs for off-the-plan lots, but it misses an opportunity to extend these disclosure requirements to existing lots. That is why we are moving an important but simple amendment to this bill that will require the disclosure of existing BMSs to prospective buyers of existing lots. The government already understands the necessity to disclose BMSs for off-the-plan purchases. I urge all members to correct the oversight and extend this protection to purchasers of existing properties that are subject to BMSs.

It is worth noting that this disclosure is required because of just how problematic BMSs are. There are no requirements for fairness before a BMS can be registered. Many developers can include any kind of oppressive terms they want in a BMS. Developers can and have used BMSs for their own financial benefit at the expense of residents. A disclosure requirement for off-the-plan lots as this bill requires is a good step but does not go far enough. It fails to protect buyers of existing lots and it does nothing to address the actual problem with BMSs.

We need a whole range of changes to the way that BMSs work: requirements for BMSs to allocate costs fairly; to bring BMSs into body corporate and community management regimes; to allow disputes within BMSs to be resolved through the same processes as body corporate disputes; to create a mechanism for challenging BMSs; to allow the commissioner to adjudicate disputes as well as amend and extinguish BMSs in a just and equitable manner; and to reduce the amount of time that BMSs can be in place. Twenty-five years is ludicrous. Of course, this would require taking on the property developers and we know what both sides of this place think about that.

Again, these are simple amendments requiring property owners to disclose BMSs as well as their knowledge of past natural disaster impacts. It is fairly straightforward and it is really the bare minimum that we could be doing to protect tenants and prospective homebuyers. It is the bare minimum we should expect of property owners, developers and real estate agents to honestly disclose those matters that will impact future owners and tenants down the track. I encourage all members to support our straightforward amendments.



Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (5.28 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Property Law Bill 2023 and the amendment proposed by the Attorney-General. The object of the Property Law Bill 2023 introduced to the Legislative Assembly by the former attorney-general on 23 February 2023 is to create a new, modernised Property Law Act drafted broadly in accordance with the recommendations in the 2018 *Final report: Property Law Act 1974*, prepared by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology, which made 232 recommendations. The bill is the culmination of many years of policy development and consultation and will provide a modernised, plain English framework for property law in Queensland.

The current Property Law Act has been in place for almost 50 years, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly in 1974. As the member for Scenic Rim said, the Property Law Act is very important. I recall that when I studied law at QUT this one single act was a standalone subject.

The Property Law Bill 2023 largely retains the effect of many existing provisions in the act that are well known and settled, but the bill does make several significant changes to the 1974 act. These changes include: the repeal of outdated and unnecessary provisions such as the provisions relating to de facto relationships; redrafting existing property law provisions in plain English with modernised language; establishing a legal framework to recognise and facilitate e-conveyancing and electronic property transactions; simplifying and updating the common-law rule against perpetuities and rules relating to leases and covenants; and minimising the inadvertent creation of instalment contracts. Some of these changes, if introduced, would align Queensland with certain disclosure obligations currently required at law in Victoria for the sale of real property. The bill amends the Limitation of Actions Act 1974 to provide that the limitation period for taking legal action in relation to a deed entered into after the commencement will be six years, which is consistent with the limitation period for contracts.

The bill also seeks to significantly modify conveyancing in Queensland with the inclusion of a seller disclosure regime. The introduction of this regime aims to mandate sellers to disclose certain information about the property to prospective buyers. The prescribed disclosure statement requirements include: a title search; a copy of the registered plan of survey; and, in the case of community titles schemes, a copy of the community management statement. The bill will also make it mandatory—with some exceptions—for the seller of freehold land to disclose to the buyer, before the buyer signs the contract, relevant information in a single document along with prescribed certificates, including a body corporate certificate where relevant. The buyer will have termination rights in case of the seller's noncompliance or where the disclosure is inaccurate or incomplete. The disclosure statement must be signed by the seller or their authorised representative as a true statement at the time of signing. It must be given to the buyer and contain information on any unregistered encumbrance, zoning under the local government scheme, information about contamination or pest infestation that the vendor is aware of, financial information about rates and water charges, and details such as whether the property is heritage listed. These changes will introduce significant obligations on the vendor to disclose information about the property. Conversely, the changes will provide buyers with greater understanding of the risks associated with a certain property but the ability to make a more informed decision about their purchase. The information to be disclosed under the seller disclosure scheme will be prescribed by regulation.

Time is usually of the essence in contracts of sale. Under the proposed bill the concept of time being of the essence will no longer apply in certain adverse events that occur beyond a party's control. This will offer protection to parties who are unable to complete settlement due to no fault of their own; however, the affected party must provide notice as soon as possible and should not intentionally cause undue delay. The proposed bill also incorporates electronic conveyancing provisions that were not reflected in the 1974 act. This change is particularly timely given that the electronic conveyancing mandate commenced 20 February 2023. The bill, once enacted, will change the way property transactions occur in Queensland. It will be of even more importance that the vendors obtain professional advice on the new disclosure requirements to ensure compliance with the new bill and to safeguard their property transaction.

The bill provides for the statutory release of liability for tenants and/or guarantors who assign their interest under a lease, specifically where an assignee further assigns their interest to a third party. This means that post assignment a tenant and/or guarantors will not be responsible for any breach to the subsequent assignee; furthermore, these provisions cannot be excluded by parties involved in a lease assignment. The bill also gives tenants the right to apply to the courts to recover damages when a landlord unreasonably withholds consent to a lease dealing.

After being introduced to the Legislative Assembly the bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, chaired by the member for Toohey. The committee tabled report No. 45 of the 57th Parliament in April 2023. The committee made various recommendations, including that the bill be passed. In closing, I would like to thank the members of the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee, the committee secretariat, Hansard and submitters. I commend the bill and the amendments proposed by the Attorney-General to the Legislative Assembly.



Ms LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (5.35 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Property Law Bill. I would like to thank the members of the committee from both sides of the House and committee staff for their consideration of the legislation. I would also like to thank the 30 organisations and individuals who made submissions on the bill through the committee process. It is substantial and important

legislation. The Property Law Act 1974 governs many aspects of Queensland's property law. Those members of the community who own or intend to purchase a home or land will certainly encounter the workings of the Queensland Property Law Act, and hopefully their interaction will be a positive one. Those people who wish to sell a home will also work with this piece of legislation and their appropriate legal representatives.

The Property Law Act deals with general rules affecting property, the creation and disposition of interests in land, co-ownership of property, deeds, covenants, mortgages, leases and the rule against perpetuities and unregistered or 'old system' land. The Property Law Act commenced December 1975 and has not been substantially amended since that time. The objective of this bill is to replace the 1974 act with new, modernised property legislation. The bill is broadly drafted in accordance with the recommendations of the 2018 property law review *Final report: Property Law Act 1974* prepared by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology. Generally, the bill adopts the recommendations contained in the Property Law Act report: to simplify, streamline and modernise Queensland's property laws; better facilitate e-conveyancing—which did not exist in 1975—and electronic transactions; and remove outdated provisions. QUT finished its review back in 2018. Unfortunately, since then there has been little progress or clarity from the current Labor government on the changes they will bring forward, so we are pleased to see this legislation currently in the House. As the opposition indicated earlier, we will be supporting the legislation.

The part of the bill I will focus on surrounds the seller disclosure scheme, which has drawn much interest from submitters. It is also very topical because of what we have seen in recent times with natural disasters. Speaking of natural disasters, there are currently two major bushfires in and near my electorate: one at Tara, and another which has a perimeter of over 600 kilometres in the Carnarvon National Park. I note there has been a lot of comment in this bill about flood as a natural disaster; however, there has not been as much comment relating to bushfire hazards. These are equally important to home owners and landowners because of the impacts these natural disasters have not only on land but also on homes and property.

The bill implements a statutory seller disclosure scheme for the sale of freehold land. The QUT's *Final report: Seller disclosure in Queensland* recommended that a statutory seller disclosure scheme be implemented to simplify and consolidate the disclosure process for the sale of freehold land and empower prospective buyers to make informed decisions in relation to their purchase. I am advised that the seller disclosure scheme implemented by the bill is broadly drafted in accordance with the recommendations of the seller disclosure report.

The positives of this were to clearly identify the seller disclosure obligations—therefore creating a coordinated, transparent regime to establish a certain and consistent regime and simplify the current matrix of obligations. One of the risks was that the buyer would be presented with so much information that they did not understand what was put before them. I can understand this because many first home buyers have not been exposed to the complexities of conveyancing and they rely very heavily on their solicitors for advice and for ensuring that appropriate due diligence is undertaken prior to their purchase.

The Attorney-General tabled the draft regulation for the scheme under the Property Law Regulation 2023 which will be put to stakeholders following the passage of the bill to refine as needed. At present, schedule 1, section 1 of the draft regulation specifically excludes the disclosure of flooding or other natural hazard history in the disclosure statement. The QUT *Seller Disclosure in Queensland* report found—

The Centre does not recommend the imposition of a statutory obligation on a seller to disclose flooding information at this time. I think that is the very important bit—'at this time'. It does not say that it should be excluded in the future. It continued—

This view is influenced heavily by the difficulties associated with clearly articulating the meaning of 'flood information' or for the seller to state whether the property is 'flood prone' together with inconsistency in the information available from official sources.

I will come to that later. The LGAQ in their submission argued that this predates the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements in 2020 and since that time there have been several more serious natural disasters in Queensland. I hope we do not see too many more bushfire disasters in this season. Recommendation 19.1 of the royal commission provided—

State and territory governments should:

- (1) each have a process or mechanism in place to communicate natural hazard risk information to households (including prospective purchasers) in 'hazard prone' areas, and
- (2) work together, and with the Australian Government where appropriate, to explore the development of a national mechanism to do the same.

It also noted—

The Queensland Government questioned whether there is a need to directly communicate risk to people when they can access government websites that already host this information.

Unfortunately, the simple fact is that many people do not access that information and they do not always find it is very easy to interpret. In its current drafting, schedule 1, section 3(2) only suggests that a prospective purchaser—

... enquires with the relevant local government as to whether a property is affected by flooding or another natural hazard or within a natural hazard overlay

In response to the LGAQ submission, the department noted that the draft property law regulation—

... proposes to prescribe a warning statement that must be included in the disclosure statement advising the buyer to enquire with the relevant local government about whether the property is affected by flooding or another natural hazard or is within a natural hazard overlay. The warning statement also advises the buyer that flood information for the property may be available at the FloodCheck Queensland portal or the Australian Flood Risk Information portal.

I went to FloodCheck and I found it a bit clunky. I looked for information in my local street in Roma, which I know has had about three successive flood events. Unfortunately, the information was not accurate when it came to the historical information about the 2012 flood. I found that rather disappointing. I also found that FloodCheck clearly does not advise that there is now a levee bank which protects many of the residential streets in Roma, and I found that disappointing as well. I think the Department of Resources could do well to make FloodCheck much more user friendly and much more accurate.

I also tried to search Roma on the Australian Flood Risk Information Portal but it kept taking me to Roma Street, Brisbane, which is not much use if you want to live in Roma in the Maranoa in South-West Queensland. I put in a couple of local streets in the 4455 postcode but it did not provide any information. I find that somewhat disappointing because I know that flood studies have been done in the 4455 postcode. I question why this information is not available on this site when other information actually came up from that search in relation to places like Tara where flood studies have been done by the Western Downs Regional Council. They were quite accessible on that Australian government portal.

The Attorney-General detailed the decision to not include a full natural hazard risk statement or overlay due to practical and legal difficulties, including the difference in the level of information that various councils hold and the fees they charge. However, I think that is a bit of finger-pointing at councils. From the searches I have done, I found there is no leading example in the referenced flood checks from state or federal governments so I think there is a need for improvement from all levels of government.

It is the government's role to help Queenslanders experiencing housing stress and crisis and to drive down the cost of living. There are many people who are fighting to simply buy a home in their price range. That is why one of the LNP's priorities is to help Queenslanders to realise their dream of owning their own home, and that is where they will interact with this legislation in the future. Further, the LNP will prioritise flood mitigation projects and ensure investment in natural disaster mitigation happens to drive down the cost of insurance and the cost of living. Queenslanders certainly deserve better than this state Labor government.



Mr SMITH (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.45 pm): I would like to begin by thanking the committee for the work they have done in the lead-up to this bill being presented to the House for debate. I would like to thank the chair, the member for Toohey, Peter Russo. I also thank the member for Cooper, the member for Caloundra—and I would say something in Latin about him but I have not had time—the member for Currumbin, the member for Scenic Rim and the member for Noosa.

As we have heard, this legislation has largely come out of the QUT report on the Property Law Act 1974. The intent of this bill is to modernise an act that is nearly 50 years old and that weighs very heavily on a longstanding common-law history throughout the Westminster system. I will speak to that a bit more especially when I get to the outdated and unnecessary provisions. It is something of great interest the way that the concept of property and ownership of property has shaped what you would call European civilisation and how it has impact on our social regard and therefore our legal frameworks throughout the centuries. That is something I will get to soon.

I will touch on the natural hazard risks component of the bill. Under the bill's seller disclosure scheme, a prospective buyer is warned about matters not covered by the seller disclosure statement and encouraged to make their own inquiries before signing a contract of sale. One of these matters is

a property's history regarding flooding and other natural disasters. We have heard how Queensland is prone to a lot of natural disasters. The electorate that I represent experienced that in 2011 and also during the disastrous flood of 2013.

In the Bundaberg electorate, when someone says, 'I've moved over north,' or 'I've moved over east,' the first thing you ask them is, 'Have you checked if your house gets flooded? Where did it get flooded in 2013 and 2011?' It is not just the property itself when we are talking about an electorate like Bundaberg where the river divides the city; it is also making sure home owners know whether or not they will be at risk of not being able to evacuate in time. Will the roads be cut off? Will they be surrounded and unable to escape? It is important that we provide as much information as we can to homebuyers so they are aware of the property.

I note the LGAQ would like this bill to go further, but I believe the department's responses as outlined in the committee report are valid especially when they said that the level of information held by different councils can differ quite considerably and that councils across Queensland charge vastly different fees for access to that information. However, we want to ensure that all Queenslanders are as safe as possible.

I will move to the outdated and unnecessary provisions related to this bill. This is very important, because, as has been stated by all sides of the House, this is about modernising a piece of legislation that came about in 1974 which is largely based on common-law provisions throughout Westminster. One particular part I want to note is section 15 of the Property Law Act which relates to the rights of husband and wife. I will read from section 15 of the Property Law Act 1974. It states—

A husband and wife shall, for all purposes of acquisition of any interest in property, under a disposition made or coming into operation after the commencement of the Act, be treated as 2 persons.

The explanatory notes state—

Rights of husband and wife (section 15), which overtook the common law that held that a husband and wife were treated as one entity as a wife had no separate legal identity from her husband after marriage, is no longer required as it has been adequately provided for by other legislative intervention—

It is important to address how the common-law has come to be to create this particular section in the Property Law Act 1974 that we are now removing with the debate before the House. It relates back to property that women owned and that men owned, and how women actually lost any property to men prior to the Married Women's Property Act 1870. It is important to note that Mr Russell Gurney, who was a member of the House of Commons in 1870, referred to the then member for Sheffield. He took the member for Sheffield's quotes when he appeared before the committee on a particular note around women engaging into marriage and losing their property. The member for Sheffield was quoted as saying—

One is that of a woman who married a widower having one child. She took that child and has been very kind to it and brought it up.

Of course, very different language back then. He went on to say—

She had a good home of her own when she married this man and yet this man has persecuted her, neglected her and his drunken conduct has been so bad that she was obliged to take her furniture and go away with his child. That man has taken her articles of furniture out of her house while she has been at work and would repeatedly have sold the whole but for the neighbours interposing some obstacles to prevent him from making off with all of her property.

We can see how this particular bill is spreading back through common-law in the Westminster system, back to 1870, addressing that women who had earned property prior to marriage were able to maintain that property after marriage. As we then move forward to the Property Law Act 1925, which the Property Law Act 1974 is based on, we see that quite clearly in the QUT report. It is important to reflect on that particular legislation which forms the current legislation that we are talking about.

Moving to the House of Lords in 1922, then solicitor-general, Sir Leslie Scott, talking of the Law of Property Act 1925, which this legislation is based on, said—

The Bill is not a brand-new invention. It is not a new-fangled, ready-made scheme of law. It is not revolution; it is evolution. It is also, I hope, full of wisdom but it is not like Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, born fully grown. It is the slow and gradual product of half a century's work by legal reformers ...

Of course, he is referring directly back to the Married Women's Property Act 1870, as this is some 50 years following.

It is also important to reflect on Sir Thomas Bramsdon. As we know from the 1870 law, at this time a woman could own property obtained before marriage, however, there was then a question of the inheritance around that property and the transferring of property, especially around inheritance. Most of us may not necessarily agree with Sir Thomas Bramsdon's words, but we will find out. On the bill being debated before the House of Lords, which forms this current legislation, he said—


Tucked up in the Bill is a Clause which provides that where two people die by accident, and it is not possible to say which is the survivor, as in the case of a shipwreck, the younger will be declared to have survived. Lawyers often have these cases cropping up, and a great deal of litigation follows in order to ascertain who is the survivor, but our friends the ladies will, perhaps, be pleased with this proposal because generally in those cases the survivors will be women, as the younger of the two, and so we may have land going in a direction which we did not anticipate.

Of course, if you were listening keenly, you would not agree with the propositions of Sir Thomas Bramsdon. It is quite outdated. Obviously, we are talking about 1922 House of Lords, so would you expect anything less? He is raising the matter of inheritance which is in this particular Law of Property Act 1925, which our Queensland Property Law Act 1974 is based on, hence why it is so important to remove section 15.

I will comment on Colonel Sir J Greig who said—

The assimilation of the law of real and personal property is good. I am certain that the Amendment made as regards to intestacy and so on, which will put men and women on the same footing, is a fair and proper one. When we have had experience of this Bill we shall come to the conclusion that it is a sound, reliable measure.

I think we can probably agree with Colonel Sir J Greig a little more on that. Of course, as we know, through that history of the Married Women's Property Act 1870 and then onto the Property of Law Act 1925, which then formed the Queensland Property Law Act 1974, we now see the reason it is time we got rid of section 15 once and for all. I have been talking about this for a long time in caucus. It is about time we got rid of section 15 and let 1870 stay in the past where it belongs.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.55 pm): Wow! Did anyone anticipate such an impassioned contribution as that from the member for Bundaberg? I can only plead with the Leader of the House to please afford us more time in the business program motions in coming weeks so that we might be taken on such extraordinary, historical, discursive journeys in the future. Phew!

I rise to give my contribution on the Property Law Bill 2023. It will include far fewer references to the House of Lords than we have just heard from the member for Bundaberg. As my colleague from South Brisbane has already indicated, we will be supporting this bill because it contains largely positive administrative changes to the property law regime and takes small steps towards properly regulating building management statements, or BMSs as they are known. As is often the case, there is a lot this bill does not do, in our view, particularly when it comes to disclosure requirements. As the member for South Brisbane has indicated, she will be moving amendments to ensure prospective owners and renters are informed of flood risks and to require the disclosure of BMSs that remain unregulated and often incredibly dodgy and unfair for the residents they affect.

Last year, my electorate, as so many other members in Brisbane can relate to, experienced catastrophic, deadly flooding. Many people lost virtually all their possessions and had their homes destroyed or cut off from power for weeks. The clean-up and recovery effort was a heartwarming demonstration of community solidarity and community spirit, but it is not something that any of us would like to go through again, obviously. For some people, if they had known that this was a possibility in their residences—for example, if they had known the impacts of the 2011 floods on their home before they moved in—they may have chosen to take mitigation measures to prevent that level of damage or to simply avoid that residence all together. However, places that were completely inundated 18 months ago now can be advertised and sold or rented without any disclosure of historical flooding, or any previous impacts of natural disasters like bushfires or storm surge, for example. For the government and their mates in the Real Estate Institute of Queensland to justify this by placing the onus on renters to do their due diligence is, in my view, unacceptable, especially when we are talking about people's lives and livelihoods.

While the government develops a robust uniform risk assessment and disclosure scheme, which it says it is doing as recommended by the Royal Commission into National Natural Disaster Arrangements, it is not difficult or unreasonable to expect that this historical information is included as part of mandatory disclosure processes. That is why my colleague, the member for South Brisbane, will move an amendment to this effect. Her amendment also ensures renters will get this information, too, because, as the major parties seem often to forget, a rented home is a renter's home. They equally deserve to know the risks they face there.

I just very briefly observe that this is not new. I can reflect back more than 10 years ago now when I was working in the Office of Climate Change—pre-Newman, of course, before it was gutted—when the Premier's Council on Climate Change did some excellent work in the wake of the 2011 floods and Cyclone Yasi, looking at natural hazard risk preparedness within the planning system. Disclosure of these risks was considered in some detail there. Recommendations were made to the Premier's Council on Climate Change, but we still see no meaningful progress in this space. I would say it is well overdue now.

The member for South Brisbane will also move an amendment requiring that building management standards, BMSs, be disclosed to potential buyers of any unit, new or existing. A few years ago, I started hearing from residents in apartment buildings around my electorate who had, as it turned out, these incredibly unfair and rigged BMSs in place. For those of us who are lucky enough to be unfamiliar with BMSs, here is a snapshot of how they work.

Decisions about the building under a BMS are made by a building management group whose members and voting procedures are determined entirely by the BMS itself. Before a developer sells units, they can register the legally binding BMS under the Land Title Act. That gives them almost total control over everything that happens in that building by retaining a veto on the building management group, which supersedes the body corporate. The developer under a BMS can exclude residents from decisions about the building including fire and safety upgrades and other maintenance. They can avoid obligations to remedy defects and can set up deals to enrich themselves and their associates under a BMS. If they cut corners with construction, which we know dodgy developers do—and the government still refuses to rein them in with a development licensing scheme—they can simply ignore the problems including until warranty periods expire. They can even void the building insurance by failing to address defects or do proper maintenance, leaving the residents themselves exposed to millions of dollars in repairs.

In my electorate the developer of a mixed-use building in Toowong has given itself that kind of absolute power—complete power over all votes on the building management group. This developer owns all the commercial spaces and a single residential unit but has not paid a cent in maintenance for the commercial spaces. Instead, this BMS forces the residential unit owners to cover all the maintenance costs for the entire building, including the developer's commercial holdings. God only knows where their money is going because the developer refuses to conduct even basic maintenance at the property.

While residents pay around \$6,000 in levies each year, the developer has leased dedicated visitor car parks in the building to themselves for \$1 and then presumably sublets them privately for significant profit in the middle of Toowong. Lily and Carlos, two neighbours in this building, are still fighting to get out of their ridiculously unfair BMS that gives the developer effectively dictatorial power over the management of their homes. If unamended, this bill will do practically nothing to help them and the countless other Queenslanders stuck in their position. There is currently no requirement for BMSs to be disclosed to potential buyers nor is there any requirement to share building management group records or financial statements.

Although this bill finally creates a requirement to disclose proposed BMSs for lots sold off the plan, it does not propose disclosure requirements for existing lots. Far too many unit owners across Queensland have discovered these unfair agreements only when they find themselves in a dispute with the building management group and are then told they have no recourse to challenge the BMS because it is not covered by the BCCM commissioner or the courts, and that will remain the case under this bill.


Under the government's bill there are still no fairness requirements to register a BMS, meaning that developers can include any oppressive term they choose. This is especially dangerous when combined with the lack of statutory disclosure obligations for sellers and stands in stark contrast to analogous provisions for fairness under the BCCM Act. That is why the Greens will be moving these amendments to require disclosure of existing BMSs to prospective buyers.

Although it might be outside the scope of this bill, I am once again urging the government, for the sake of my constituents and no doubt thousands more like them across the state, to properly regulate BMSs like other jurisdictions have done. There should be a requirement for BMSs to fairly allocate costs, a process for disputes within BMSs to be resolved just like body corporate disputes, and the ability for owners to challenge an unfair BMS.

Very briefly, this bill also shifts the burden of providing disclosure documentation for community titles schemes to body corporate managers. While I welcome the clarity that this provides around responsibility for disclosure, I am concerned about this change being made in the absence of any

accreditation requirements for body corporate managers. As many submissions noted, we have no guarantee that body corporate managers are competent in the responsibilities they currently hold, let alone these new disclosure responsibilities. I think many people will have had an experience dealing with a dodgy or ineffective body corporate manager despite the significant power they hold over unit owners' homes and lives. If the government is going to make body corporate managers responsible for disclosures to unit buyers then I agree with the Strata Community Association of Queensland's recommendation that the government should create a regulatory regime to ensure that body corporate managers meet certain professional standards and can perform all of their responsibilities properly.

In closing, there are plenty of reasonable amendments in this bill, hence our support for it. However, it should do more to ensure prospective tenants and buyers are informed of important information about a property that includes any building management statements on a property, whether new or existing, and especially while many of these arrangements are unregulated and deeply unfair. It should also include the history and risk of weather and disaster impacts like flooding.

 **Mr SULLIVAN** (Stafford—ALP) (6.04 pm): I rise to support the Property Law Bill 2023. This is about modernising Queensland's entire property law framework. This could be read as a fairly dry and perhaps legalistic piece of legislation. However, it is important to modernise the sector and property law legislation. I believe it will make a real difference for Queenslanders in my beautiful community of Stafford and indeed right across our great state.

Locally, this will impact constituents in a variety of ways, whether people are leasing or trying to sell or purchase existing properties or indeed supporting the rights of those trying to get into the market for the first time. In terms of my experience—and I refer to the contribution of the member for Nanango—it has been a while since studying Property Law A and B at university. I have PTSD just talking about it. Upon graduation, I did not perform the duties of a conveyancing clerk like the member for Kawana pursued. I think the member for Nanango said it was not any of our favourite subjects, but I think that is one exception. I do have respect for the consultation and research that went into this reform package both before the legislative process and throughout it. I want to give a particular shout-out to the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and, of course, in partnership with the Queensland University of Technology.

I also appreciate that this reform has involved extensive consultation with key legal and property stakeholders. I commend the Attorney-General for that approach. In fact, I note even in the Attorney-General's contribution today that she made it clear that she intends to move a technical amendment in consideration in detail—I believe she said it was at the suggestion of the Queensland Law Society—to clarify details around clause 80 of the bill and the rolling nature of a delay in certain circumstances. It is one that we believe is already covered, but the purpose of the amendment is for clarification purposes. I think that is a good example of how this system can work.

I suggest that what I do bring to this debate is a perspective that comes from my personal experience being a renter as a younger person—I got into the market by buying a townhouse with my sister and her partner—then later as a mortgagee as a single parent for many years, then as a seller of that home and simultaneously experiencing the excitement, the real estate ups and downs and the eventual joy of looking for, inspecting, negotiating, bidding on and ultimately being successful in purchasing what is now a family home with my wife. So I get it. These reforms, while legalistic and administrative in nature, will make a real difference in the lives of local constituents in my community.

I think we need to look at the human side of that as well. There is a double-edged sword when it comes to this sort of transfer of property. It can be a very, very exciting time, but it also hits people in different ways. It could come about because of the death of a parent and then selling the estate. It could come from people moving at different times in their life. As I said earlier, it could be renters or first home owners or anything in between. I think we need to recognise that while it can be a time of excitement and great joy, it can also be a time of stress. I think anything that this parliament can do to clarify and simplify that process for all people in those circumstances is a good thing.

Let me turn to some provisions of the seller disclosure scheme. The implementation of a seller disclosure scheme will change the way property is transacted in Queensland. Currently, there is no statutory seller disclosure scheme in Queensland and property sellers disclose information as required by a complex mixture of legislative, common-law and contract-law obligations. We saw throughout the committee process that more can be done to support purchasers to feel confident in their decision-making time—and let's be honest—in what is one of the most important decisions that they are likely to make in their lives.

For the local families and constituents of Stafford, this scheme will provide a structure that is less clunky and in a form more easily read and understood. This is particularly the case when it comes to clarifying the need and nature of seller disclosure. Let us recognise that the purchase of a home is usually the greatest investment that any of us will make in our life.

Even when there is excitement, it can be a stressful process finding the right home and sorting financing, negotiating with a variety of parties or dealing with an auction. In all these scenarios great joy can still be somewhat stressful. The easier we make it for people at these particular points in their lives, the better it is for all of us. The same is true for renters—that is, simplifying disclosure for them. The bill also removes outdated language and clauses, including clauses like recognising de facto relationships—and the property rights that come with that—that have been overtaken by more modern family law provisions.

I associate myself with the detailed history set out by the member for Bundaberg. I find myself referring to the member for Nanango's contribution again—it is a compliment, member. In standing in for her colleague, the member for Clayfield, she put on the record that she was resisting the urge to continue his tradition of giving us a long legal history of this. I think the member for Nanango, on behalf of the member for Clayfield, should be glad that the member for Bundaberg strongly filled that void in this chamber. Combined with the contribution in Latin from the member for Caloundra, I think we have ticked the legal professor box.

I note, though—considering where I am standing and the room up the other end of the corridor—that the member for Bundaberg was quoting outdated and fairly offensive language from the House of Lords in 1922. I think history shows that the Queensland in 1922 showed the world how you should deal with those types of progressive reforms when it came to the upper house. Well done to our predecessors.

In terms of natural disasters, I note the Attorney-General's contribution in her second reading speech around the disclosure of natural disaster information. As the Attorney-General said, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority is looking to improve information about disasters like flood history.

We saw locally in Stafford in the 2022 floods—commonly referred to as the rain bomb—that this information is not only relevant to those properties adjacent to rivers or suburban waterways, although obviously it is, but also crucial for those areas where properties flooded and were damaged in circumstances where they had never been flooded like that before. Across the north side from Wilston, Newmarket and Grange to the hills of Stafford, Stafford Heights and Kedron and up to Chermside, there were many pockets where the rain just parked itself and the water could not get away. We saw major roads that have never flooded in the past go under, including main arterial roads like Gympie Road, the main entrance to the Prince Charles Hospital, the entry roads to Westfield Chermside and the Kedron-Wavell RSL intersection. That was quite significant in my patch.

I thank the officials of the Queensland disaster management authority for their hard work in the aftermath of that event, including senior officials conducting joint inspections and meetings with me and many of my local residents. I also thank retired Major General Elwood, in his coordination role, for coming out to meet with residents. He came out several times, met with businesses and inspected the damage caused right across the north side. This included damage to homes, businesses and sporting clubs along the Kedron Brook, Enoggera Creek as well as the suburban streets I have listed.

I also thank the Premier, Deputy Premier and others for coming out several times to inspect that damage, including the war scene that was Kedron Brook. On behalf of the humans of Stafford, I would like to apologise for the behaviour of the birdlife of Stafford towards poor old Mikey who was signing for the Premier and the Deputy Premier. He did not miss a beat. He wiped—insert unparliamentary words—off his face and jacket and got straight on with the job. Do yourself a favour and look it up on TikTok. He is an absolute pro.

In conclusion, I thank the Attorney-General and her team and the departmental officers for these historic changes. Well done to the member for Toohey, as chair, and the other members of the Legal Affairs and Safety Committee for getting us to where we are today—progressing the legislation through the chamber. Particular thanks go to the academics, researchers, legal and property stakeholders and experts who contributed so much throughout this process.

With the indulgence of the House, I give a shout-out, welcome and congratulations to those gathered in parliament tonight from the Elizabeth Reid Network, supporting and recognising up-and-coming talented women staffers who do so much for our cause. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr McDONALD (Lockyer—LNP) (6.14 pm): It is a pleasure to speak on the Property Bill 2023 which will replace the Property Act 1974. I commend our shadow minister for her contribution today—a real property lawyer who brought with her a wealth of experience and sense to the debate.

For Queenslanders, a home is one of our biggest investments. It is important for us all to make sure we get that decision right. The only way we can do that is by getting good information. Good information does not necessarily mean getting more information, as many submitters have said, but certainly getting the best information allows you to make a sensible decision around that big decision. Like many in the House, I am a property owner. I had good information to make that big decision. I understood the different opportunities and liabilities associated with the property that we chose.

I commend this modernisation of the property law. As we have heard in the House, this was originally asked for in 2014 by then attorney-general Jarrod Bleijie, the member for Kawana. It has taken a long time for this bill to get to the House. The QUT review was undertaken in 2017. It has taken a long time to get the legislation to the House. I have spoken to a number of people who contributed to that 2017 QUT review. I understand why a number of the issues were included in that review. I look forward to the minister answering the questions that have already been asked as to why a number of the issues have not been included in this bill.

I understand from the flooding that we have experienced in Lockyer why there are concerns around the disclosure of natural hazards, particularly flooding and the flood hazard overlay. In Lockyer we have a number of classes in our—I would say world's best; it is certainly one of Australia's best—flood information on the Lockyer Valley Regional Council portal. It is one of the best because we have had floods in 2010, 2011, 2017 and 2022 and those floods have been mapped. Fortunately, SEQ catchments, as it was at the time, had purchased data back in 2010 that gave us a baseline when mapping future floods.

In Lockyer we now have a flood hazard overlay which has high- and medium- and low-risk flood. There is also a flood investigation area which we are getting some further information about. High risk and medium risk is where the water is a real challenge for the community and which the insurance companies might look at to consider making it a higher risk. Where it is a low-risk flood area or flood investigation area the insurance company need not fear flood in those areas and should be well-informed about it.

I recognise that some of the insurance companies are applying a postcode type assessment to different areas across the state. Lockyer was certainly one of those. I have been encouraging members of the community for a long time to shop around and make sure they talk to different insurance companies to get the best deal they can. Whilst we have that flood mapping—and, as I said, it is high quality and tested with a number of large floods—we have certainty around the higher risk areas. We are using that as a tool and encouraging insurance companies to assess that and make good decisions for our community with regard to floods.


I pay tribute to the Lockyer Valley Regional Council. As late as these last two weeks I have been talking with Mayor Tanya Milligan, who was writing to the Insurance Council. It had not got an answer from the Insurance Council about some of these issues around flood assessment and hazard risk for our community, but I know that as of today the Insurance Council is now engaging with the Lockyer council and I look forward to having further conversations about that to ensure that our community can get sensible insurance knowing the risk of flooding across our different areas.

When people make a decision about buying a home, there are a lot of concerns. I have had people in my office talking about their concerns regarding koala mapping and other mapping overlays that have been applied to their property. Some of these properties do not even have a tree on them, but they fit under koala mapping. We have been able to help them through some of those concerns and engage natural resource managers to assess their property and put in place a management plan over it if needed or to make an application to change the koala map in that location because it was not applicable, because some of that koala mapping was done with a very broad brush. We all love koalas and we want to see them prosper. I recognise that there is a great project in Helidon Hills that has been counting koalas and they are in very high numbers there, which is a great thing.

I recognise the changes in this bill in terms of modernising processes with regard to e-commerce and electronic opportunities with the signing of documents that will bring some of these real estate processes into the modern world, and that is certainly very much a welcome change. However, when it comes down to the essential concerns that many submitters had around this bill, it was about the disclosure issues for the seller in terms of making that simple and giving good information. As I said at the outset, it is not about getting more information for people but getting good and sensible information that is applicable to the property.

I also recognise the body corporate scheme and the provision of body corporate information. There are some concerns whether that should remain with the seller or come from the body corporate manager and the legal challenges that could come from good decisions or bad decisions or a decision by a buyer to pull out of a contract because they have something from the body corporate manager as a third party as opposed to getting it straight from the seller and making it a more legalistic problem than it possibly needs to be. I ask the minister to reconsider some of those areas and ensure that we do not put in a legalistic process that is going to confuse many purchasers at what can sometimes be the very stressful time of purchasing a property and getting good body corporate information through the sellers. As my colleague the member for Scenic Rim mentioned from his experience in property law, it was going back to the future and pulling out some of the things that used to be in place that we moved away from.

I support my colleagues and commend the bill to the House, but we need to do a lot more work as a state with regard to ensuring that those hazard risk overlays, as I talked about with Lockyer, are known and which are a big issue when you are buying a house and that they are understood by insurance companies and that they are treating Queenslanders with respect and assessing the real risk of flood overlay. I caution the government about not providing some of that information or just referring it to some of the councils that do not have as robust a flood information portal like the Lockyer and Somerset councils do. Because of the number of floods we have had we have learnt from that and have some great information, so with people who come to my office I have every confidence in being able to show them through that portal or refer them to the council and the website to make some good decisions around that for both the Lockyer and Somerset council areas. If you know what the risk is, then there is absolutely no reason those insurance companies should be assessing the risks of that flood issue for that home owner at a worse case than it should be. They certainly should not be assessing it on a postcode basis. If anybody is, I encourage those property owners to shop elsewhere because there are many people in the insurance game that will give you good value for money insurance in the Lockyer.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (6.24 pm): I rise to make a contribution in relation to the Property Law Bill 2023. While property law is an incredibly complex and substantial area of law, the core intent of this bill is relatively simple—to replace the Property Law Act 1974 with a new act drafted in line with modern practice and using plain English. Members may be interested to know that the Property Law Bill 1974, which on its passage became the current act, was first introduced into this place exactly 49 years ago and one day. In his first reading speech, the then attorney-general and member for Nundah, Sir William Knox, stated—

Property law in Queensland is at present stated in numerous Queensland Acts, some Acts inherited from New South Wales on separation, approximately 45 old Imperial Acts dating back to the year 1266 and many common law rules and judicial decisions.

The Property Law Bill is designed to codify and reform all of the laws relating to property rights and liabilities and to provide a permanent code of principles of property law, simplified and expressed in modern language all in the one statute.


The current act has served Queensland well in those 49 years and has been the keystone of property law legislation in this state, but what was considered simplified and modern language in 1974 is of course now quite dated which is why it is pleasing to see the focus on plain English drafting for the bill now before the House.

Property law affects everyone in this state, whether they are renters, home owners or business owners. That is why it is crucial that the written law be broadly accessible to everyone and not just those with a law degree. It must also be noted that property law has changed significantly since 1974, with countless amendments to the act made and a large body of case law shaping our understanding of the act's provisions. A new Property Law Act as proposed by this bill will allow us to do what our predecessors did in 1974 which is to update, distil and modernise the law for the present day. I understand that this bill has been in the works for nearly a decade, starting with the QUT property law review followed by years of consultation, consideration and drafting. I pass on my appreciation for the great deal of effort that has gone into this legislation both from the Public Service and from the Queensland property sector.

As is clear from other members' contributions so far, the bill covers a wide range of issues across the spectrum of property law. One area in particular that I want to highlight is the new statutory seller disclosure scheme for sales of freehold land. Buying a house is generally the largest purchase a family will ever make. It is a huge event and comes with a certain level of built-in risk and stress. For my constituents in the Mansfield electorate, which has a higher percentage of mortgaged home owners than the Queensland average, I want to ensure that we do everything we can to give them the information they need to make an informed purchase when buying their homes.

The seller disclosure scheme in the bill will apply to most sales of freehold land, including by auction. Under the scheme, the seller must give the buyer a disclosure statement in the approved form and copies of any prescribed certificates before the contract is signed by the buyer. This allows the buyer to have key information about the property to inform their decision to enter into the contract. The information that will be required will be contained in regulation which will allow government to be responsive if changes or updates to the scheme are required. I note that a draft of the Property Law Regulation was tabled with the bill and I am pleased to see the extent of disclosure proposed by that draft regulation.

I also note the range of other positive reforms in this bill which will impact my community of Mansfield, such as removing outdated provisions relating to 'old system' land; removing provisions dealing with property settlements in de facto relationships which have been superseded by Commonwealth legislation; simplifying rules relating to court ordered sales of co-owned property; continuing provisions relating to electronically creating and signing of deeds that were made during the pandemic; amending the Limitations of Actions Act 1974 to align the action limitation period for a deed with that of a contract; clarifying and updating the existing provisions relating to leases to better balance rights between landlords and tenants, including by harmonising time frames with other legislation to provide consistency in leasing practice; improving provisions for neighbouring land, including by abolishing the nuisance-based cause of action in relation to support of land and imposing a duty of care in negligence on the owners of supporting and supported lands; and, finally, abolishing the common-law rule against perpetuities and imposing a statutory 125-year period. The Property Law Bill 2023 is a key piece of reforming legislation. I acknowledge the former attorney-general for bringing the bill to the House and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (6.30 pm): I rise to talk to the Property Law Bill 2023. It is interesting that this bill replaces a bill that was first tabled in 1974 and amended in 1975—almost 50 years ago—yet things have moved on dramatically in those 50 years. The world is not the same place it was. The process of buying and selling is not the same process that it was in those days so this is long overdue. How long overdue is it? In 2014 the member for Kawana sent the 1974 act to QUT's Commercial and Property Law Research Centre for review. The LNP identified that the act needed to be updated. QUT received many submissions. Property and body corporate law is very complicated. It took QUT four years—until 2018—to finalise its report. The government has rushed ahead—from 2018 to 2023—to bring this very important bill to the parliament after a mere five years of thinking about it. If you think that is sarcasm, you are exactly right.

There are a number of issues that I will talk to. Other members have raised that the LGAQ had issues with disclosure around natural hazard issues. I would like to add to that debate. There are issues with the process of disclosing natural hazard issues, should the government have gone down that path. There are costs involved and there are problems, for example in relation to flooding, as to exactly where this information should be obtained, how accurate it is and what it is that needs to be disclosed should we go down that path. On the Gold Coast, for instance, in the area that I live, Palm Beach, the Gold Coast City council has a very extensive flood-mapping program. You can go online and look at it. A few years ago the government mandated that councils needed to add 0.8 of a metre for climate change in the future. That has completely changed the flood mapping and made many parts of Palm Beach now apparently affected by floods even though ground-truthing would probably tell you a different story.

It is a case of seller beware. They need to do their own due diligence, and that is a problem. The committee heard from some companies involved in disclosures that their companies may in fact close down because of these changes that the government is making. It is a double-edged sword as to whether we should look for more disclosure in a process that takes out these companies that are acting professionally to provide this information as far as disclosure and warranties to real estate agents go.

We have moved on from going into a solicitor's office and signing a document to buy or sell a property. During COVID we saw some very sensible changes made that allowed for electronic signatures. I am fully supportive of continuing those processes now that we have moved past COVID and we do not really need them. It made sense at the time and it makes sense to keep those things going.


The main issue I want to talk about is the changes to disclosures for off-the-plan sales as far as building management statements, or BMSs, are concerned. I have some firsthand experience of purchasing off the plan in the last few years. An off-the-plan contract is very big and it takes quite a bit of reading to get through it. I am hesitant to say that a lot of people may not read them. Some of these building management statements are put in place after you sign a contract for an off-the-plan sale and you do not know what is in them. In the case of my wife and me buying a unit, that is exactly what

happened. We saw a building management statement put in place that gave the developer 25 or 30 years of management of our building with conditions set that they were to do item 1, 2, 3—take the garbage out, polish the windows, clean things in the place—and they were paid a certain amount of money for it. In the first 12 months of us moving into that unit, because the developer is still controlling the body corporate, they changed that management statement completely. They left their money in there, but they took out all the conditions and the work they had to do and shifted that to the body corporate. Basically, the body corporate was paying a huge amount of money for something they were no longer getting, which was what they had agreed to right at the start. That is something that definitely needs attention.

Something we as a parliament could think of in the future is making it so that the developer does not actually sell the management plans; we have a temporary management plan put in place for the first 12 months, until the owners form their own body corporate and they decide what they want to do with regard to selling the management plan moving forward. It could be that they decide there is a whole list of things they want done by the manager of the building and they are willing to pay a certain amount of money for it. It should be up to the owners of those lots to make that decision and not for a developer to make a profit from them. Again, that is a double-edged sword because we would be taking away some of the profit that developers make and therefore possibly making the sale of the project uneconomical for the developer. I would far rather know that I am paying for something right at the start than find out later that I am paying for something I am not getting.

Returning to disclosure of a natural hazard risk, I think there could be some disclosures put in place. It would not be too hard, especially in a place like the Gold Coast, to allocate a number for each lot on the Gold Coast and determine whether they are faced with natural disasters such as flooding, fire or anything else. That is what you disclose to people so that they know in advance what they are buying. In the last year a number of houses have flooded in my electorate and in the electorate of Currumbin, and these houses are now up for sale. I would like to think that the people who are buying those houses are fully aware of what has happened in the past and what could happen in the future. There are some advantages in moving towards that sort of system, but we have to be careful how we do it. Tonight the Greens have come in here and foreshadowed some amendments, but we cannot support those amendments because they have been rushed and are not thought through. We really need to make sure there are no unintended consequences to such things.

The LNP supports the bill. I support the bill. Do I think it could be better? Yes, I think it could be better. Given that we have been looking at this for over nine years, we probably had time to make it better but we have not, so let us think about it in the future.

 **Mr McCALLUM** (Bundamba—ALP) (6.40 pm): I rise in support of the Property Law Bill and the amendments that have been moved by the Attorney-General. This bill will provide Queensland with a new and modernised property legislation framework. As many speakers have noted, it follows a very broad and wideranging independent review of our property laws, which was conducted by the Commercial and Property Law Research Centre at the Queensland University of Technology. The bill builds upon our existing legal requirements and framework, but substantially simplifies or amends our existing framework to address the issues that were brought up through the QUT review. Those include things such as putting property law—which can be very dense, detailed and to people who are not lawyers very obtuse—into plain English, which will improve the ability of people to clearly understand what is a very important yet complex and, at times, incredibly detailed legal framework.

Some of the changes contained in this bill are quite significant. They include the repeal of somewhat outdated provisions, for example, those in relation to what is referred to as the old system of unregistered land. They provide a legal framework to recognise and facilitate electronic dealings in property. This goes right to the very heart of modernising the property law framework that we have in Queensland to make sure that it is fit for purpose not only in providing a strong and reliable framework for property law itself but also in relation to making sure that it is in line with and able to use current technologies. The bill also updates the neighbouring property provisions to reflect modern property practice and community expectations.

It is particularly important that the bill establishes a statutory seller disclosure scheme for the sale of freehold land. The seller disclosure scheme simplifies and streamlines the existing disclosure process and empowers buyers to make informed decisions about property dealings. The bill will make it mandatory, with a few exceptional circumstances, for a seller of freehold land to disclose relevant information to the buyer before the buyer signs the contract. That can be disclosed in a single document along with any required certificates, including body corporate certificates where that might be relevant to the conveyance. The buyer will have termination rights in the case of a vendor's noncompliance or

where the disclosure under the new scheme is inaccurate or incomplete. The information to be disclosed under the seller disclosure scheme will be prescribed by regulation. I will come to that in more detail a little later.

I think the disclosure scheme is an excellent step forward. Many previous speakers have mentioned the new scheme and the disclosure requirements applying where properties might have been affected by natural disasters. The Bundamba community was impacted tragically by the 2022 floods, particularly in Goodna along low-lying areas of Woogaroo Creek and in the suburb of Bundamba along Bundamba Creek. I want to pay tribute to the strength and resilience of our community in responding to that natural extreme weather event and bouncing back. We are still on the road to recovery. There are many people for whom that will go on for many years and may be a journey that never comes to a complete end. However, with things such as the Resilient Homes Fund, the buy-back scheme and some of the other options, people are getting on with their lives, which is fantastic to see.

Our current Property Law Act is almost 50 years old. While the act has been amended dozens of times over those decades, for some time it has been clear that there needs to be a step change in the legislation and that new legislation is required. Frankly, that is because in those 50 years so much has changed in relation to property law itself, property transactions and, of course, the use of technology. This bill is really a culmination of the many years of policy development and all of the previous changes that have led to this moment in Queensland's property law, including all of the consultation and stakeholder engagement, which have all led to the bill that is currently before the House and will result in a modernised system.

As I mentioned previously, the bill removes outdated and unnecessary provisions such as those relating to old system land and the provisions dealing with property settlement in de facto relationships because those provisions have been overtaken by the federal Family Law Act. The changes in this bill simplify the rules relating to court ordered sales of co-owned property, giving courts a wide discretion to make orders for the sale and division of property that is co-owned.

It is really good to see that the bill continues the operation of the provisions relating to electronically creating and signing deeds, which were first brought forward in Queensland during the COVID-19 pandemic. We as a society, this parliament as a place of legislation and the Palaszczuk government worked together to respond to the challenges that were presented through the pandemic.

It is great to see that the practical and sometimes novel measures that were introduced, such as using electronic systems, are being kept because they work. They save time; they save money. We should be using technology in a practical way that delivers real improvements.

Overall, this bill is a great bill that will modernise what is a very important legal framework for Queensland. The conveyancing of property is one of the most important things that many of us will ever deal with in our professional and personal lives. I commend the bill to the House.

(Time expired)



Ms KING (Pumicestone—ALP) (6.50 pm): Today I rise in support of the Property Law Bill 2023, possibly dull at times but undeniably important legislation which will modernise our nearly 50-year-old Property Law Act. The bill, as we know, arose out of a 2020 election commitment to modernise Queensland's property law framework and has been the subject of extensive consultation over a decade, particularly with stakeholders in the property industry and the legal and community titles sectors.

The provisions of this bill respond to the drastic changes in property schemes, transactions and property technologies since the current act was introduced in 1974. Casting back to 1974, the property system of the time had land still commonly measured in perches, a single woman could not get approval for a mortgage and banks would not take a married woman's income into account in calculating the capacity of a couple to repay a mortgage because it made the assumption, of course, that she would invariably have children and leave the workforce. There were few if any women in parliament. It was like something out of a contemporary LNP wonderland!

While the historic 1974 floods had occurred only the year before, climate change was of course unrecognised. Certainly, the rolling severe impacts of cascading natural disasters that property buyers must now consider when they are making what is likely to be the most important purchase of their lives were not on the agenda. The existing Property Law Act was a creature of its era and it has served Queensland well—unlike the LNP—but times have changed. The bill before the House carries forward time-honoured and well-accepted aspects of the act, but it substitutes clear, modern language and

concepts to improve the comprehensibility and workability of modern property systems. Outdated provisions related to old system land registration and clauses that have been overtaken by the Commonwealth Family Law Act 1975 have been excluded to improve clarity and relevance.

Importantly—and something that has not been touched on greatly in the debate before this House—the bill also simplifies the rules for court ordered sales of co-owned property, making the process fairer and more straightforward. With, as we have heard, increasing property prices and our growing and ageing population, families and even unrelated groups of people are increasingly entering into creative co-ownership arrangements, so these changes are important and timely.

Importantly, this bill embraces technological change and the significant systems reforms that were brought about by the COVID-19 pandemic. It formalises emergency changes that were introduced to allow for electronic creation and signing of deeds during lockdown and social distancing. As yet another ex-property lawyer, I can well remember as a clerk lining up with my piles and piles of folders and trotting around town trying to get to all of my settlements in time. If there was a delay at one location then that cascaded on, and your settlements may have been delayed for a day or more. I know that in the recent purchase of my home—two years ago now—there were really substantial delays in settlement. That was not happening just in my own purchase; it happens routinely in many people's purchases. It creates untold difficulties for them with lining up their finance and with getting handover of their property. The changes contained in this bill will take some steps towards ameliorating those issues. I know that electronic conveyancing has been well accepted in other jurisdictions and I am sure that the conveyancers of now, as opposed to the conveyancers of nearly 25 years ago, will welcome these changes heartily.

Possibly, though, the most important changes contained in this bill relate to the seller disclosure requirements. Currently sellers are required to disclose information under a complex mix of common-law, statutory and contractual obligations. Sometimes those disclosures do not occur at all, particularly in pressured or low-information settings. Buyers therefore at present receive a variety of different disclosure documents at different stages of the sale process, including before contracts are formed, before settlement and at settlement. The consequences of failing to disclose information can vary, and it can create some very complicated legal tangles for people to deal with at a vulnerable moment when they might be poised between their previous home and their next home. It is significant that the Property Law Bill 2023 introduces Queensland's first statutory seller disclosure scheme.

This standardised disclosure requirement requires provision of information to buyers that will assist them in their decision of whether to purchase a property. That empowers buyers by ensuring transparent, streamlined access to key information about the property they are purchasing. I note the Attorney-General's amendments clarifying requirements for the provision of property disclosure specifically to buyers participating in auctions. Any of us who have done that know that it is a high-pressure environment. Having provisions of this bill that respond to the different time frames within an auction environment is really important. Importantly, sellers will have the flexibility to provide necessary disclosure documents physically or electronically.

These disclosures will go a long way to reduce the inefficiencies of the current property purchase process, where so much seller disclosure is left to the discretion of vendors. Multiple potential purchasers may find themselves each in turn paying hundreds upon hundreds of dollars in searches in order to make a good and informed decision. Anyone who has ever been through a house-purchasing process recognises the frustration of taking on the burden of those property searches only to expose a flaw in the title or a flaw in the property that means they do not proceed with the purchase and then leaving the property on the market knowing that the next potential buyer will themselves again have to engage in those purchaser searches or may choose not to and be stuck with a flawed property.

It is problematic to know, as you spend that money, that there is no way to ensure the money you have invested in those searches is not replicated by the next potential purchaser. That is inefficient. The changes in this bill go some way toward improving that situation. These are the kinds of barriers that dishearten people and make home ownership harder than it needs to be. I welcome the reforms in this bill for the benefits that they offer, particularly to first home buyers and people operating in a low-information setting.

When it comes to purchasing property in Queensland, though, given our particular susceptibility to natural hazards, knowledge is absolutely power. As we have heard, we are Australia's most disaster-prone state. That means that special attention has been paid to the issue of natural hazards in the process of purchasing property, as outlined in this bill. We have heard from the members for Mount Ommaney and Stafford. Similarly, when I visited impacted communities in my electorate of

Pumicestone along with Major General Jake Ellwood I heard from multiple residents who struggled to prepare for the unprecedented flood events of 2021 because, in some cases, despite having lived in their homes for years, they simply had no idea of the potential for flooding at their location. I will never forget the trauma that those families experienced, especially people who may have lost documents having had metres of muddy water go through their homes. They could not even access their insurance documents—if they had insurance—to know whether they would be covered.

I often reflect that with water peaking around midnight and the SES and emergency services unable to get through to most properties—volunteers were rescuing elderly and frail people in the dark from neck-deep water—we are simply incredibly fortunate not to have faced significant fatalities in Pumicestone. I am so grateful to the emergency services personnel, to all of those volunteers and to my community for their resilience and capacity to rebuild because, of course, many of those residents in my community are those who financially have the very least capacity to rebuild.

Even without loss of life, when those waters dropped they left heartbreak behind. Following last year's floods the Queensland Reconstruction Authority recommended that policies be developed so that Queenslanders can understand the flood risks they face. Under the framework proposed in this bill it will be a requirement that disclosure certificates include a warning statement alerting buyers to the need to do their due diligence in relation to flood and other natural hazards. While we heard from the LGAQ in particular that they would have liked additional safeguards in relation to disclosure, there are real practical and legal difficulties in mandating disclosure of natural hazard information. I welcome the commitment of the government to continue to work towards stronger and better disclosure of natural hazards through the property process. I will conclude by commending the work of the minister, the committee and all those who contributed to the bill.

Debate, on motion of Mr Krause, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Scenic Rim Electorate, Bushfires



Mr KRAUSE (Scenic Rim—LNP) (7.00 pm): There have been quite a few fires around the Scenic Rim electorate in the past weeks, and with hot and dry conditions continuing there surely will be more to come. I cannot say enough thank yous on behalf of our communities in the Scenic Rim electorate for the rural fire volunteers who have been called out many times recently. There are too many brigades that have stood up recently to name them all, but I thank them because they have been very busy. I also know that quite a few of them have answered the call for fires in other parts of South-East Queensland. From Mundoolun and Veresdale Scrub to Birnam and Oak Creek, Mount French and beyond, there have been incidents all over the place. I would also thank those auxiliary firefighters who have worked to protect property.


We should all thank our rural fires, but this government should also redouble its efforts to ensure hazard reduction measures are taken in the national park estate. I am concerned to hear from local residents about excessive fuel loads still sitting in national parks some four years after the last catastrophic fires in Scenic Rim. The lessons from then must be learned, and I urge the government to quickly do absolutely everything possible to reduce those fuel loads, because when fires in national parks spread into neighbouring properties they can create huge amounts of damage.

It is extremely dry in our region right now, and this presents a fire risk for not only rural areas but also places like Tamborine Mountain and Canungra. There are lots of trees and vegetation around those areas. I note that rural fire warning signs have been removed on the Mount Tamborine-Oxenford Road and also on Mystery Road around Tamborine Mountain and they have not been replaced. I call on the Rural Fire Service and QFES to get on to replacing those warning signs so that the community can be informed at all times about the fire risk in their area.

The big dry also affects agriculture, and the onset of drought is taking its toll on farmers and their families right now. Agriculture is a huge part of our local economy, and many right now are hurting with the dry, depressed cattle prices and soaring costs. While dairy farmers might be receiving more for their milk than they have for quite a few years, their costs have sky-rocketed too. Beef producers cannot catch a break. While dry conditions are good for some horticultural producers, it sends electricity bills soaring as more irrigation is required to keep up food for our national markets. Every lettuce and tomato, onion and carrot that you purchase from a supermarket or other shop comes from a farmer, and when they hurt it can impact supply and price. We saw that with lettuce in the past couple of years.

I recently spoke to a farmer who said that 15 years ago he could irrigate at night for seven cents per kilowatt hour and during the day it was 18 cents per kilowatt hour. Now he is paying 35 cents per kilowatt hour night and day. A local dairy farmer informed me that on some days electricity costs \$1,000 when they have everything going. That is a huge impost from electricity. They have solar as well, but still there is no protection for farmers and the government needs to address this.

Moreton Bay Says No to Violence March


 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (7.04 pm): Last week I marched with my community in the Moreton Bay Says No to Violence annual march. This peaceful march is an opportunity for individuals, businesses and community organisations to join together to raise awareness and raise our voices against domestic and family violence in our communities. I have marched many times as the member for Redcliffe, but this year I felt privileged to march as the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The march is now in its fifth year. We had hundreds of people join us on the march including police officers, representatives from local businesses, schools, churches and not-for-profit organisations. There was a great representation from Queensland Corrective Services as well as a banner. It was great to see the turnout for them.

In particular, it was great to see the large number of schools and young people who attended the march. It was great to hear from speakers, including: Holly Brennan from the Centre Against Domestic Abuse; Acting Assistance Commissioner John Hallam from the Queensland Police Service; Natalie Hinton from the Tara Brown Foundation; Dean Cooper from the Mates Bystander Program at Griffith University; Issy Preece and Jack Perkins, who are student leaders at Grace Lutheran College; the powerful welcome to country from Auntie Sharyn Malone; and CEO Chris from Encircle.

The impacts of domestic and family violence are far-reaching for victims and their families, as we all know. We know that tragically one in six women and one in 18 men have experienced physical or sexual violence from a partner they are living with, and of course that is only the ones that are reported. I know that many people were marching for themselves, a colleague, friend or family member, and I could see that emotion during the ceremony. I was pleased there were support people on hand for anyone needing assistance. As those in this chamber know, the Palaszczuk government has invested more than \$1.5 billion already to combat domestic, family and sexual violence. It is Sexual Violence Awareness Month this month, so it is timely to also lift that awareness. In the Moreton Bay region we are investing \$9.3 million in domestic and family violence services, an increase of \$2.5 million from the previous year.

Can I extend my gratitude to Encircle Community Services for organising this event and the invaluable work they perform every day. I would also like to thank CADA for the work they do in our community to support victim-survivors of abuse. Organisations such as Encircle and CADA provide essential frontline services, but they also provide victims with an opportunity for their voices to be heard. It is crucial that we continue to raise community awareness around the many behaviours that may constitute domestic, family and sexual violence, including coercive control, and to help provide victims with the support they need. I would also like to thank the victim-survivors and those who attended on behalf of everybody for joining us last week. I see so many members of our community who are raising awareness and saying 'enough is enough'.

'The Right Priorities for Queensland's Future'

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (7.07 pm): 'The Right Priorities for Queensland's Future' outlines five key priorities for an LNP government, focusing on the issues that thousands of Queenslanders from all walks of life have told us matter to them: community safety, health, cost of living, economy, finance, housing, integrity and much more. When Labor criticise these priorities as wrong and fake, they are criticising Queenslanders and showing that they have stopped listening.

The local team in the Redlands that will deliver on these LNP priorities is taking shape already. Amanda Stoker was recently preselected as the LNP candidate for Oodgeroo, and this news has been welcomed locally. Amanda joins a united team that has its priorities right—unlike this divided and chaotic Labor government that is chasing all kinds of things not supported by Queenslanders. LNP women, like Amanda Stoker and Rebecca Young, are bringing new energy and vision to the Redlands Coast, and there are more to come.

I will outline the five priorities. The first priority is 'safer communities'. Redlands is in the grip of a youth crime crisis. Redlanders feel scared in greater numbers than ever before, living in fear in their own homes. At a Thornlands park recently, Amanda Stoker, Rebecca Young and I, together with David

Crisafulli and Dale Last, heard about violent machete attacks, the ram raid of an IGA store, homes being broken into, and record numbers of car thefts. Astonishingly, Labor—from the Premier down—believes that this youth crime crisis is a media beat-up.

The second priority is 'easier access to health services'. Redlanders have endured the worst health service at Redland Hospital in our history because of Labor's mismanagement—with the worst ever ambulance ramping, at a record high 73 per cent, 24-hour ED waits for a bed and no ICU in '22. The reason for that is priorities. Labor built a medical centre and a car park instead of fixing the hospital.

The third priority is 'saving you paying for Labor's failures' by eliminating Labor waste and driving down the cost of living. Billions of dollars have been wasted on Labor fails like the \$220 million Wellcamp white elephant and the \$2.4 billion train blowouts. Then there is the priority of 'securing our housing foundations'. Many young Redlanders cannot afford to buy a home but want to, and many cannot even rent. We will focus on helping aspiring young people to get into their first home, among other things. Then there is the priority of 'working harder for Queenslanders'. We will restore integrity and govern for all Queenslanders.

Only the LNP is listening to Redlanders and is committed to what matters to them. I say to Redlanders: with no ICU in '22, show Labor the door in '24.

Ipswich, Odour Issues



Mr McCALLUM (Bundamba—ALP) (7.10 pm): Our Bundamba community and Ipswich more broadly is being impacted by odours from waste operators, and composters in particular. These companies have zero social licence in our community because they show zero respect. There is another stench that is impacting our community, and that is the stench of hypocrisy from the LNP. At a recent community meeting, the member for Bonney, Senator Paul Scarr and the mayor of Ipswich—all LNP members—had plenty to say but they left out a few key details. They neglected to mention that the LNP scrapped the waste levy under the Newman government. They never mentioned that it was the Palaszczuk Labor government that reinstated it—saving hundreds of thousands of tonnes from going to landfill in Ipswich. They neglected to mention that the Electoral Commission of Queensland public donation disclosures reveal that the LNP has accepted over \$150,000 in donations from waste companies since 2016. This includes companies that operate in Swanbank—like Cleanaway, NuGrow and BMI. I table those electoral donation disclosures.

Tabled paper: Bundle of electoral disclosure statements relating to donations made to the Liberal National Party by Cleanaway Pty Ltd, Nugrow Pty Ltd and BMI Group [\[1737\]](#).

It is rank hypocrisy by the LNP to talk tough at our public meeting whilst they have been taking donations from the very same companies that are responsible for these odours. The LNP are clearly trying to take our community for mugs, and every elected member of the LNP in Ipswich should hang their heads in shame.

What is needed is real action. We need every level of government to step up, and that includes the Ipswich City Council. I urge the Ipswich City Council to rethink their multimillion dollar contract with NuGrow and their recent approval of a new compost dump. Ipswich Labor MPs and Palaszczuk government members are getting on with the job. We passed laws earlier this year with stronger penalties and powers. We are consulting right now on reforms which include hardwiring health and human safety into the legal definition of environmental harm, as well as introducing things like the precautionary principle and polluter pays. We have always said that we should be throwing the book at these companies if they are doing the wrong thing, and we are actually writing a bigger book. As local MPs and members of this government, we will always step up to meet our responsibilities. We will always call out LNP hypocrisy, bad decisions from local government and appalling behaviour from waste companies.

Dig Deep Competitive Boxing



Mr LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (7.13 pm): 'If you want nothing, do what you want. If you want everything, develop discipline.' Those wise words come from one of Australia's greats in the sport of boxing, Kostya Tszyu. Hundreds of kilometres from the bright lights of the big cities, there is a group whose determination and discipline will not just help them achieve as individuals; it is helping an entire town. I speak proudly of the town of Dysart and more specifically of Dig Deep Competitive Boxing. Dysart is home to around 3,000 people and a club full of champions. Led by Craig Storch, boxers of all ages come together and train at what was formerly the town's tennis courts. From the nine-degree winter nights to the 34-degree summer days, it is the tight-knit club environment, discipline and dreams

that bring them together. Like people throughout regional Queensland, perhaps the biggest challenge for the young boxers, their families and their supporters is the tyranny of distance, but this is a club that will not let a few kilometres hold them back.

Holding an incredible eight golden gloves titles and eight Queensland titles between them, four boxers from Dig Deep were selected to compete at the Australian Schools Boxing Championships in July. By the end of the championships, Ciara Storch had been named the female youth boxer of the tournament and had her eyes firmly set on her next challenge—a trip to the United States as part of Team Australia. I am happy to advise the House that Ciara came away from her bout in Portland as a champion and followed that effort with a two-day training camp. Just a few days later, Ciara was back in Dysart and back at training at Dig Deep.

As Jim Rohn said, 'Discipline is the bridge between goals and accomplishment,' and results are certainly what this club is achieving. None of this would be possible without the team behind the boxers. Their efforts extend beyond training and the long hours of travel to events and competitions. In recent months, Craig and the team behind the scenes have transformed the tennis courts into a training facility that would be the envy of clubs in the big cities through both their own hard work and the support of the broader Dysart community.

I am proud to support Dig Deep Competitive Boxing. On behalf of the Burdekin electorate, I want to wish Ciara and the rest of the Dig Deep team at Dysart all the best for the future. Members have heard it here first in the chamber. Keep an eye on this young lady because she is going places. At the 2032 Olympics, I reckon that girl will be standing on the dais doing us all proud. Well done, Ciara. Well done to Dig Deep Competitive Boxing. May the future hold many more trophies for that club.

Nicklin Electorate, Events



Mr SKELTON (Nicklin—ALP) (7.16 pm): I rise in support of the magnificent region of Nicklin. There is always so much going on I can barely keep up. Last Saturday I was delighted to attend the Nambour Museum's 30th anniversary. Clive Plater OAM, the museum's president, was my esteemed host and we talked about legacy and future. What I saw were loads of local families enjoying a day out whilst listening to the lively music played by the Noosa brass band. Later that day I ventured to Gemfest at the Nambour Showgrounds. Ably led by Keith Millington and organised by the Nambour Lapidary club, Gemfest attracted stalls and visitors from miles around. It was a great success and a great day for Nambour.

On Sunday I had the pleasure of being in Mapleton for the Blackall100. Runners from across the country contested this gruelling event. It contributes so much to the community and is the biggest event held there. Later that day I checked out some classic cars and automobile history at the Cooroy Car Show. It was hosted by the Combined Coastal Car Club and enjoyed by many from across the region and afar. It was a fantastic day out for all.

On the weekend just gone at the Nambour Showgrounds was DogFest—an initiative from the Sunshine Coast Council. It was a showcase for all things canine. In Beerwah, the Festuri multicultural event was staged. Starting in 1999 in Nambour by Dominique B Cisse, it has grown all over the coast over the years. In the afternoon I joined with the STUFFit Student Film Festival. It is now in its 12th year, having been started by Bernadette Natoli at St John's College in Nambour. This festival now reaches students from around the globe. Thank you to Robyn Cook and the volunteers, Black Box Theatre and the many sponsors. In another coup, we had the delightful Rosanna Natoli from Channel 7 Sunshine Coast and Dan Munday, producer of TV shows like *Survivor*, to present awards to the lucky winners.

During the week, I received the great honour of becoming the patron of the Cooroy-Eumundi Cricket Club. I was gifted my 'baggy green' from John, Rob and Dave. I look forward to a bumper summer of cricket across the coast.

Lastly, I would like to thank the Woombye Snakes Football Club for their mentorship of our young people. I mention Andy, Col and Matt but there are a great many volunteers who contribute so much. I was invited to the presentation on Saturday night which was to recognise the achievements of the club for the season. It also marked the unveiling of the Amber Stokes memorial viewing deck. Amber was a dearly loved club stalwart and community champion but more importantly mother, daughter, aunty and partner. Vale, Amber.

Youth Crime



Mr DAMETTO (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (7.19 pm): It has been 12 days since I stood in the House to address the Queensland parliament with regard to the crime crisis that we have in Townsville right now. In those 12 days we have lost 57 cars. There have been 52 charges of unlawful use of a motor vehicle laid in the last seven days. There have been 102 charges of unlawful entry laid in the last seven days. In the last 30 days we have seen 157 charges of unlawful use of a motor vehicle laid. Over the last 24 hours, up until 9.41 am, there have been 10 cars stolen in Townsville, running rampant on the streets. By this afternoon, 13 stolen cars were running around the streets of Townsville—just today! This is a shame. There is something funny going on in the Labor Party that is not addressing this, but no-one is laughing. The only people laughing right now are the young criminals who are getting away with what is going on in Queensland. The Youth Justice Act is failing this state.

The Minister for Police must do something with regard to motivating Queensland police. Police morale is at an all-time low because they do not believe they are being supported. We have had carjackings and bricks hurled at cars, police officers and motorists. We have had cars stolen from houses this week. We have had people's houses and businesses broken into.

Last week in Townsville I had a chance to speak with a mother. The occupants of a stolen vehicle being chased by police were hurling bricks and rocks from the vehicle. One of them hit her car. When she finally got a chance to pull up and talk to the police officers, their morale had been crushed so much that they just said to this lady, 'Welcome to Townsville crime.' She said, 'Welcome to Townsville crime? It's nearly 12 months to the day since kids broke into my house, stole the keys to my car, lifted my garage door and drove off. I know very well about Townsville crime!' She was absolutely furious about this.

It is a joke. We have the Premier coming up to Townsville this Sunday, 29 October. She is going to be meeting with around 16 people for 15 minutes to listen to Townsville's problems. I can tell her right now what Townsville's problems are. Those 16 people will probably be hand-picked by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to speak with the Premier to give her the version of what she needs to hear. Guess what: there will be a rally on the steps of Queensland Country Bank Stadium. In front of the Johnathan Thurston statue, there will be hundreds of Townsvilleans letting this government know what they have wrong.

A youth justice taskforce has been slapped together. It is a select committee that will basically drag out to the next state election. It actually ceases to exist at next year's election, yet there are no set dates required for reporting. It is an open-ended process to basically have a talkfest for the next year. Queenslanders demand change now.

Ipswich Business Excellence Awards



Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (7.22 pm): Ipswich loves a celebration. A few Saturdays ago the city rolled out the red carpet for our successful businesses at the Ipswich Region Chamber of Commerce 2023 Business Excellence Awards. It was fantastic to see an amazing line-up of local businesses, big and small, recognised for their achievements and outstanding contributions to Ipswich commerce. I want to acknowledge all of the finalists in each of the award categories and take a moment to congratulate some of the winners on the night: River 94.9 FM for Business of the Year Award; Matt Bull Window Tinting for Small Business of the Year Award; Jason Hannay from Imbibis Craft Distillery who won Business Person of the Year Award; Luke Frederick from Quest Ipswich who won Young Business Person of the Year; and Marty Branigan, Bank of Queensland Winston Glades, who won the President's Award. They are just the big winners of the night. I want to congratulate all of the winners throughout the night. They are testament to the innovation, hard work and dedication that drives the success of Ipswich's local business community.


Running a business in Ipswich can be challenging, but I am inspired every day by the energy and resourcefulness of our local business community. There are over 10,600 businesses in Ipswich, the majority of which are small businesses. No-one understands our community better than small business. They provide that personalised customer service that Ipswich people appreciate and support. The Ipswich community has been there to support our local businesses in the face of major challenges over the years, such as the COVID pandemic and the 2022 floods as well as the 2011 floods—I remember how much that affected our local businesses.

Nothing makes me more proud than being part of a Queensland Labor government that backs our small businesses all the way. Since 2015, the Palaszczuk government has set up a range of initiatives designed to help Queensland businesses succeed. Last year we appointed a permanent

Small Business Commissioner, who provided advocacy and support for Queensland small businesses. At the beginning of the COVID pandemic, our government delivered the Small Business COVID-19 Adaption Grant, which supported local small businesses during the tough lockdown phase of the pandemic.

Our disaster recovery grants to businesses in 2022 were essential in helping our flood-affected businesses get back on their feet. We reformed our payroll tax system to provide payroll tax cuts to more than 12,000 small- to medium-sized businesses with payrolls under \$10.4 million. We have guaranteed the continuing funding of the successful Mentoring for Growth program, now in its 21st year. Last year we invested \$6.75 million in the Small Business Wellness Package, which provides support and links wellness coaches with small businesses that have been hit hard by the pandemic and by the recent floods. This year we are delivering cost-of-living relief to eligible small businesses, with a \$650 rebate on their power bills. We have recently rolled out the Queensland Business Energy Saving and Transformation program that will provide rebates of up to \$12,500 for eligible small businesses to install energy-efficient equipment. When we support our small business community we create a thriving economy that supports jobs, innovation and trade opportunities.

Biloela, Health Services


 **Mr HEAD** (Callide—LNP) (7.25 pm): Today I was proud to table on behalf of my community a petition to save the Biloela maternity ward. That petition contained 3,936 signatures. That is nearly 4,000 people who want the Biloela maternity ward returned. That is a marvellous feat given there are only about 5,500 people who live in that community directly. People from Biloela and surrounds certainly fell in behind to support the petition to save the Biloela maternity ward because they want local health services in their community. They do not want to have to travel down a highway and risk giving birth on the side of the road; they want access to what is a basic health service.

We here in the LNP opposition understand the importance of local health services. I am certainly fighting for more local health services in Callide every single day that I am representing my community as the member for Callide. It is an absolute priority of the LNP that every Queenslanders has easier access to health services. Every Queenslanders deserves access to health services, no matter where they live. That is something that we here in the LNP have been saying for a very long time. I note the health minister this morning was trying to claim it was a statement that the Labor Party came up with, but we know that here in the LNP we have been talking about it for a very long time. Previously in government we delivered it. We know that this Labor government has been cutting our services, and there are fewer services in my community than there used to be. That is a matter of fact.

We know that talking about services and making announcements is not delivering them. We need services delivered. We do not need announcements of things that never come. We need physical services delivered. The health minister talks about safety and that decisions are made in the interest of safety, but giving birth on the side of a highway is not safe.

I also want to touch on a question I asked of the Minister for Health. I asked her whether the surgical theatre at the Biloela Hospital is compliant with all standards—a pretty simple question. You would think a yes or no answer could be provided by the health minister. I followed on with a few questions to the government as to what their plans are if it is not compliant. Rather than saying, 'Yes, it is compliant with all standards,' she could not answer the question. This suggests that she is hiding the truth from the community of Biloela. I asked: if she cannot say that it is compliant with all standards, how long have they known about it? What are they hiding from the community of Biloela? I note that they have announced a new Biloela hospital in response, which is fantastic—I welcome investment—but in the same statement she talked about an upgraded hospital. Are we getting a new hospital or are we getting an upgraded one? The health minister needs to be honest with Queenslanders, and I will keep fighting for more services in our communities. A CT scanner should be part of that hospital, as well as a helipad and many other services.

Caloundra State High School, Performing Arts

 **Mr HUNT** (Caloundra—ALP) (7.28 pm): If you have not seen the super talented Caloundra State High School student Aimee Trego dance classical ballet dressed as a pirate queen, you really are letting life pass you by. The Caloundra State High School Edge dancers have put on another performing arts spectacular. Under the guidance of staff Anita Hounslow, Fiona Royter and Amber Williams, and with the help of choreographer Paige Wharton, the Edge dancers have had a hugely successful competition at the Dance X Championships that included schools competing from all over Queensland.

With the incredibly talented dance captains, Camille Flaherty, Ava-Ling David and Zerah Wildman leading the way, the senior Edge dancers gained first place in jazz and musical theatre, plus silver medals in contemporary dance and a bronze medal in senior student choreography, thanks to the incredible talents of student Zerah Wildman, who, I might add, has not even graduated yet but has already started her own choreography business. Find her on Instagram at Wildz Choreography. How good is that! But wait, there is more. The junior Edge dancers came away from the same championships with a gold in the lyrical section and a bronze in musical theatre. The Caloundra Edge dancers are now amongst the best in the state.

Government members: Bravo!

Mr HUNT: I will take all of those bravos.

Wasn't that obvious on Saturday, 7 October when I took my family to watch the Edge Dance night performance. Dancers from year 7 to year 12 put on such a high-quality performance that my special guest, Mr Daniel Gaudiello, formerly of the Australian Ballet company, was blown away by their energy and talent. Naturally, I do not have time to name all of the dancers individually but, my goodness, all of the group dancers were amazing.

Then came the group and individual performances. Paige Carter's, Rojan Mardens' and Ruby Jordan's performance of *Body Ache*—bravo! The raw emotion of Shae Prescott and Milla Oliver performing *Control*—bravo! The compelling Meiling Wyre performing *Power*—bravo! The previously mentioned and impressive Zerah Wildman performing *Denial*—bravo! Rhylee Lawrence and Lucy Laurie, from year 7 mind you, performing *Elastic Heart*—bravo! The effervescent Rojan Mardens performing *Dance the Night* despite a complete blowout in one tap shoe—bravo! The most excellent dancing ballet pirate queen, Aimee Trego—bravo!

I am exhausted just describing these dancers. The Edge dancers put on 26 individual and group performances that evening, and that would not have been possible without the love and support of family and friends and teachers. To all of the Edge dance crew—front of stage, backstage, onstage—I say a resounding and heartfelt thankyou. I cannot wait to see where the new dance captains, Meiling Wyre and Rojan Mardens, take Edge next year.

The House adjourned at 7.31 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Bates, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Bush, Butcher, Camm, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gerber, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Head, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Katter, Kelly, King A, King S, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, MacMahon, Madden, Mander, Martin, McCallum, McDonald, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, O'Connor, Palaszcuk, Pease, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Skelton, Smith, Stevens, Stewart, Sullivan, Tantari, Walker, Watts, Weir, Whiting