




Speech By
Mark Furner

MEMBER FOR FERNY GROVE

Record of Proceedings, 17 March 2016

**VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (REINSTATEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION
AMENDMENT BILL, REPORTING DATE**

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferry Grove—ALP) (10.19 pm): I rise this evening to oppose the amendment moved by the Leader of Opposition Business and support the Deputy Premier's motion. I will put forward arguments as to why we should support the motion moved by the Deputy Premier.

I have listened to the arguments that have been presented by speakers on both sides of the chamber tonight with regard to whether this matter should be considered imminently or whether the committee should be given until 30 June to consider the matter. I was pleased to hear the contribution of the member for Callide where he indicated the process that was set up for hearing matters before this chamber. It is only proper that there be thorough examination of legislation before this chamber because we are a unicameral parliament. We do not have an upper house to consider legislation.

Notwithstanding that, there have been times in this parliament and in the parliament before when legislation has needed to be presented to the House and expediently put through as an urgent matter. I recall early last year the former attorney-general put forward a bill which, from memory, failed to endorse magistrates and failed to endorse senior court judges. This government had to rush legislation through this House to make sure those judges were formally endorsed to ensure that for people who had been convicted of a charge and sentenced the process was done in the proper manner. I use that as an example of many cases where urgent matters, such as that particular bill, have to be considered by this chamber.

I always impartially present the case for either side. Last year there was a bill presented by the opposition dealing with the issue of additional seats in this House that we considered. It was followed very shortly thereafter by a bill introduced by the member for Mount Isa. The committee had heard the evidence in relation to the non-government's bill not long before the member for Mount Isa's bill was presented. On that occasion, the committee agreed that it did not warrant the waste of time or processes to go out and hear further evidence on a bill that was similar, if not identical, to the one that had been presented earlier. The committee structure that has been set up should not waste the time of taxpayers or the chamber when other urgent matters are up for consideration.

The other argument I would like to present is around the issue of climate change. The issue has been around for some time. It was around when I entered the Senate in 2008. It was debated in 2009. I was fortunate at that stage—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I would urge you to come back to the matter before the House which is the time frame.

Mr FURNER: I am getting to the point, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow you some latitude.

Mr FURNER: I am getting to the point about urgency and why we need to consider the motion we have discussed tonight—

Mr WATTS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member keeps referencing a matter of urgency. This has not been moved as an urgent matter.

Mr SPEAKER: That is acknowledged.

Mr FURNER: At no time did I claim that this was an urgent matter. I was referring to urgent issues. Just recently it has been indicated by the World Meteorological Organisation that for the first time on record the temperature in 2015 was one degree Celsius above the pre-industrial era, according to their analysis. We are at a point in history where the issue is imminent. We are at a point where we need to act on the matters before us, whether it be in respect of managing vegetation or managing climate change. We as a parliament have a responsibility to act on behalf of Queenslanders in respect of this matter.

I think there are considerable reasonable arguments to present to this chamber as to why a short period for the committee to consider the legislation is acceptable. I do not believe it is a short period. I believe a month is adequate for the committee to consider evidence that is presented to it, whether that be through submissions or otherwise. There have been many occasions where bills have been presented to the House on the basis of submissions only and without going out. I am not suggesting for one moment that that would be the case for this particular bill.

I believe one month is adequate enough time to get out there and talk to stakeholders in this state based on the submissions and make informed decisions on the introduction and provisions of this particular bill. On that basis, I urge those opposite to give consideration to proceeding forthwith on the basis of the motion moved by the Deputy Premier.