




Speech By
Ali King

MEMBER FOR PUMICESTONE

Record of Proceedings, 25 May 2022

MOTION

Revocation and Dedication of Protected Areas

 **Ms KING** (Pumicestone—ALP) (3.05 pm): It is again such a pleasure to speak following on from the member for Bonney—the self-appointed champion of the environment within the LNP. I have said it once before and I will say it again: who would want to be the LNP’s environment spokesperson? It is a sad and sorry job as they are stretched across the barbed wire fence of actually delivering for the environment and pandering to their increasingly right wing base.

Mr O’Connor interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Lui): Order, member for Bonney!

Ms KING: We saw that more than ever before—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members to my left, order!

Ms KING: We saw that more than ever before coming out of the recent federal election results, where area after area turned teal and the LNP experienced their biggest federal election wipe-out since 1983.

An opposition member: Is there any relevance at all to this?

Ms KING: I take that interjection. My contribution is incredibly relevant to this point.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members to my left, order!

Mr O’Connor interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Bonney!

Ms KING: The member for Bonney—the faux environment spokesperson—is over there brushing up on his teal credentials. I think we have a new subfaction in the LNP—the teal subfaction—with a membership of one, or perhaps two. I note the member for Clayfield sitting here.

He is busily and pettily going through our minister’s social media trying to justify his own reason for existing. Goodness knows his party room does not give him much reason for existing. The member for Bonney gets to talk about the occasional fluffy animal. He gets to make the occasional pointed remark about emissions. But is he allowed to really go into bat to deliver improved environmental outcomes for Queensland? He is absolutely on the leash when it comes to that point. He is allowed to play in the sand box, and that is about it. It was an incredibly petty contribution from the member for Bonney.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Bonney, I have given you multiple warnings. I ask you to come to order.

Ms KING: Thank you for your protection, Madam Deputy Speaker. The member for Bonney's double standards gleam with the burnish of his LNP heritage. He talked about what our minister is selling. What is the LNP selling? They have absolutely nothing on the shelf when it comes to the environment. What is their record? There was the axing of Labor's strong tree-clearing laws, which I note the member for Bonney attempted to vote down. That appalling display of double standards in the member's contribution earlier on this motion in relation to—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am sure the advice from the table is exactly what I am about to say, and that is on the matter of relevance. We have heard now some almost four minutes and we have not yet heard one thing about the motion that is being debated—which is the revocation motion. I ask you to bring the speaker back to relevance.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, can I ask you to get back to the motion.

Ms KING: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker. We have these very important revocations and incorporations into our protected area estates, but I will reflect briefly on the contribution of the LNP when it comes to our protected areas over their period of time in government: the cutting of 60 frontline ranger positions, the positions that time after time allowed—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. It is the same point of order; that is, relevance as to the actual motion under debate. That is not a relevant contribution to the debate currently underway.

Mrs D'ATH: In relation to the point of order, the member is directly responding to the member for Bonney's contribution on this motion, so she is being directly relevant to the debate that has already been allowed in this chamber.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will seek advice. I will give the member some latitude, but can I ask the member to stay within the bounds of the motion.

Ms KING: I do rise in support of the motion. I seek to commend the proposal to upgrade parts of Yurol and Ringtail state forests to national park status and incorporate them into Tewantin National Park. That will add a total of 664 hectares from those state forest areas to Tewantin National Park and grow Tewantin to over 5,500 hectares.

I do note again the contribution of the LNP when it comes to safeguarding our protected areas: they cut 60 frontline ranger positions. Those essential frontline ranger positions going into the future would permit the appropriate and careful management of national parks like the newly increased Tewantin National Park. With this revocation motion we are delivering on a range of our Palaszczuk Labor government's commitments to grow our protected area estate. Since 2015 Labor has increased our protected area estate by over 1.12 million hectares to now cover over 14 million hectares of Queensland. I think that all members across this House would agree that that is an enormous land mass that is covered by our protected area estate. I do want to offer a note of contrast and advise the House that in 2021 at the LNP's state conference the central region branch moved a motion against increasing—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As interesting as the LNP convention is, and I am glad the member took such interest in it, it is certainly not relevant to the topic under debate. It is certainly not mentioned in the motion that is currently being considered. I would ask you to bring the speaker back to relevance.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, can I ask you to advise how what you just said is relevant to the motion?

Ms KING: Absolutely. Through this motion the Palaszczuk Labor government is increasing the size of our protected area estates in the face of sustained criticism from the member for Bonney and the LNP. In contrast, the LNP's values include reducing the size of our protected area estates in Queensland or failing to sanction and improve the size of our protected area estates. I reflect on the values of our Labor Party within the Queensland parliament and contrast them to the values demonstrated within the LNP at their state conference in 2021 when a motion was moved by the central region branch not to sanction any increase—

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The relevance issue goes to the motion under debate. I would again rise to a point of order that the member's debate is not directly relevant to the revocation motion that is currently being considered by the House, the terms of which are quite clear and quite straightforward.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have been listening intently to the member's contribution. She is within the bounds of the motion, so I will ask the member to proceed.

Ms KING: It certainly does seem that the LNP is somewhat sensitive on the issue of their own branch members seeking to limit any future increase in the size of Queensland's protected area estates.

Mr O'Connor interjected.

Ms KING: I note, member, that our Deputy Speaker has provided guidance as to the relevance of my contribution.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Through the chair, member.

Ms KING: Protecting Queensland's biodiversity and safeguarding our threatened species by increasing the size of our protected area estate is a key goal of the Palaszczuk Labor government. In the last 18 months we have added properties at Mon Repos near Bundaberg, Wild Duck Island north-east of St Lawrence, and The Lakes north of Hughenden to our magnificent protected areas. These new additions to Tewantin National Park are simply stage 2 of what has been a really impressive and innovative partnership model that accommodates existing land uses and partners across government, across industry and with traditional owners to grow, better manage and back in our protected area estates for the future.

I particularly want to acknowledge the minister and former minister's leadership in fostering these relationships to allow for this progressive rollout of increases to the size of Tewantin National Park. We have heard at some length about the really important advantages and benefits that will be provided to our threatened species, biodiversity and land connectivity that will permit the increased flourishing of not just koalas but other threatened species as well.

I note that Greenfleet Australia's role will be twofold: they will not only be selling the carbon that has been sequestered by the project in its voluntary carbon market to offset carbon emissions—and I note that over the next 30 years more than 680,000 tonnes of carbon will be abated by this project—but they will also be working with the Kabi Kabi to grow jobs and provide training to Kabi Kabi people around the revegetation and monitoring of the carbon abatement process.

As I reflect on the breadth of the debate we have seen here, our minister's social media and a whole range of matters, I will note once more that the LNP has set no targets whatsoever for emissions reduction, no targets for renewable energy and no targets for greenhouse gas reduction. That is in stark contrast to the Palaszczuk Labor government and our ongoing, continued and dedicated commitment to better environmental outcomes across all our protected areas and throughout our economy. I think that is to be commended. It is a remarkable model that we have seen rolled out here through the increase to the size of the Tewantin National Park. I look forward to that model becoming a blueprint for further increases in our protected area estates to continue the good work that our Palaszczuk Labor government is doing in this area. With that, I conclude my remarks.