



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 Fax (07) 3553 6369

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 3 December 2015

Subject	Page
REPORTS	3147
Auditor-General	3147
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 6: 2015-16—State public sector entities: 2014-15 financial statements.....	3147
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 7: 2015-16—Public non-financial corporations: 2014-15 financial statements.....	3147
PETITIONS	3147
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3147
Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill, Referral to Australian Competition and Consumer Commission	3147
Queen's Wharf Brisbane Integrated Resort Development	3148
Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill	3148
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 9 June 2015, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon. Julie Bishop, to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing, Hon. Bill Byrne, in relation to the Sugar (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill 2015.	3149
Queensland Economy	3149
Racing Industry	3150
Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs	3151
Great Barrier Reef	3151
Human Rights Legislation	3152
International Day of People with Disability	3153
Inskip Point	3153
Advance Queensland	3154
Syrian and Iraqi Refugees	3154
Renewable Energy	3155
MOTIONS	3155
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	3155
Referral to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly	3156

Table of Contents – Thursday, 3 December 2015

ETHICS COMMITTEE	3156
Reports	3156
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 158—Report on a right of reply No. 28.....	3156
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 159—Inquiry into matters relating to the evidence of the former Acting Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Dr Ken Levy, to the former Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee.....	3156
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE	3157
Report	3157
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 18, 55th Parliament—Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 14 July 2015 and 15 September 2015.....	3157
ETHICS COMMITTEE	3157
Report	3157
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 160—Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged failure by a member to follow an order of the previous PCCC and alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings.....	3157
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	3157
Alleged Unauthorised Release of Committee Information	3157
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT	3157
Alleged Unauthorised Release of Committee Information	3157
PRIVILEGE	3157
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member	3157
UTILITIES, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE	3158
Reports	3158
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 55th Parliament—Inquiry into Auditor-General Report to Parliament 14: 2012-13—Maintenance of water infrastructure assets.....	3158
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee: Report No. 10, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 July 2015 and 13 October 2015.....	3158
NOTICE OF MOTION	3158
Department of Education and Training, Security Breach	3158
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	3158
CFMEU Rally, Security Breach	3158
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph, undated, of a union march.....	3159
Liberal National Party	3159
Queen's Wharf Development	3160
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Echo Entertainment Group—A Message to Our Shareholders'.....	3160
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Queens Wharf Brisbane: Project Description'.....	3160
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, undated, joint statement by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham, titled 'Echo consortium wins Queen's Wharf Brisbane prize'.....	3160
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, undated, by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham, titled 'Queens Wharf Delivers—jobs, public spaces, dollars'.....	3160
Liberal National Party	3160
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3161
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3161
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3161
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3162
Taxation Reform	3162
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3163
Gladstone Electorate	3163
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3163
Commonwealth-State Financial Relations	3164
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3164
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	3164
Sugar Industry, Marketing	3164
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3165
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	3165
Public Hospitals, Waiting Times	3166
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3167
State Schools, Capital Works	3167
Mareeba Bypass	3168
National Disability Insurance Scheme	3168
Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services	3168
Economic Development	3169
Public Hospitals, Auditor-General's Report	3170
TAFE Queensland	3170
PRIVILEGE	3171
Auditor-General's Report	3171
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3171
Queensland Government Crest	3171
Cycling Infrastructure	3172

Table of Contents – Thursday, 3 December 2015

Independent Public Schools	3172
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Partnership	3173
PRIVILEGE	3174
CFMEU Rally, Security Breach	3174
MOTION	3174
Order of Business	3174
ETHICS COMMITTEE	3174
Citizen's Right of Reply	3174
RELATIONSHIPS (CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS) AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL	3175
Second Reading	3175
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	3189
Fernvale, Severe Weather Event	3189
Body Corporate Legislation	3190
Townsville Hospital Foundation.....	3190
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee	3191
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from the <i>Record of Proceedings</i> , undated, regarding the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee.	3191
Pacific Motorway	3192
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Map, undated, titled 'Urban National Land Transport Network Road—Brisbane'	3192
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Map, undated, titled 'South East Queensland—Key Freight Routes (Road)'.....	3192
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Graph, undated, titled 'M1 Pacific Motorway—Gateway Merge'	3192
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letters, dated 7 October 2015, from the member for Springwood, Mr Mick de Brenni MP, to the member for Currumbin, Mrs Jann Stuckey MP, the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, the member for Surfers Paradise, Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP, the member for Southport, Mr Rob Molhoek MP, the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, the member for Mermaid Beach, Mr Ray Stevens MP, the member for Gaven, Mr Sid Cramp MP, the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, the member for Albert, Mr Mark Boothman MP, and the member for Broadwater, Miss Verity Barton MP, regarding infrastructure funding for Queensland...3192	3192
Royalties for the Regions	3193
Domestic and Family Violence	3193
Shed West	3194
Murrumba Electorate	3195
Zipline Australia	3195
RELATIONSHIPS (CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS) AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL	3196
Second Reading	3196
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	3203
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3203
Consideration in Detail	3203
Clauses 1 to 19, as read, agreed to.	3203
Clause 20—.....	3203
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D'Ath's amendment.	3203
Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.	3203
Clauses 21 to 52, as read, agreed to.	3203
Schedule, as read, agreed to	3203
Third Reading	3203
Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.	3203
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3203
Long Title	3203
QUEEN'S WHARF BRISBANE BILL	3204
Introduction	3204
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queens Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015.	3204
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queens Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015, explanatory notes.....	3204
First Reading	3205
Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee	3205
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	3205
PRIVILEGE	3205
Ethics Committee Report	3205
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	3205
Queensland Times Article	3205
ETHICS COMMITTEE	3206
Membership	3206
RACING INTEGRITY BILL	3206
Introduction	3206
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Racing Integrity Bill 2015.	3206
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Racing Integrity Bill 2015, explanatory notes.....	3206
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry: Final Report, 1 June 2015, government response.....	3208
First Reading	3208
Referral to the Agriculture and Environment Committee	3208
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	3208
DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3208
Visitor to Public Gallery	3208

Table of Contents – Thursday, 3 December 2015

NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.....	3209
Introduction	3209
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015.....	3209
<i>Tabled paper:</i> North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes.....	3209
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland government: North Stradbroke Island Sand Mining Workers Assistance Scheme, December 2015.....	3210
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland government: Draft North Stradbroke Island Economic Transition Strategy, December 2015.....	3210
First Reading	3211
Referral to the Finance and Administration Committee.....	3211
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	3211
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE	3211
Reporting Date.....	3211
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.....	3211
Second Reading	3211
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 10, 55th Parliament—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015, government response.....	3211
MOTION	3226
Department of Education and Training, Security Breach	3226
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Emails, dated November 2015, between the member for Everton, Mr Tim Mander MP, and chief of staff to Hon. Kate Jones, Ms Verena McCarthy, regarding a briefing from the Department of Education and Training [1848].....	3229
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	3232
Resolved in the negative.....	3232
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3232
Local Government Administration	3232
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member	3233
DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL.....	3234
Second Reading	3234
Consideration in Detail.....	3249
Clauses 1 to 20, as read, agreed to.....	3249
Third Reading	3249
Long Title.....	3249
ADDRESS-IN-REPLY	3250
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	3265
Resolved in the negative.....	3265
Non-government amendment (Mr Springborg) negatived.....	3265
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT	3265
ADJOURNMENT	3265
Fuller, Mr G	3266
Coomera Springs State School	3266
Mount Ommaney Electorate	3267
Hampson, Mr T	3267
Palaszcuk Labor Government, Performance	3268
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Queensland's 100 Days of Hard Labor Under Lynham—A Report Card: for the Minister for State Development, Natural Resources and Mines in the Palaszcuk Government'.....	3268
Ainsworth, Mr H.....	3269
Gaven Electorate, Police Resources	3269
Algester Electorate.....	3270
Nanango Electorate, School Bus Services	3271
Woodridge Electorate, Year 12 Graduations	3271
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	3272
Error in Division Tally	3272
ATTENDANCE	3272

THURSDAY, 3 DECEMBER 2015



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Peter Wellington, Nicklin) read prayers and took the chair.

REPORTS

Auditor-General



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General two reports: report No. 6 for 2015-16 titled *State public sector entities: 2014-15 financial statements* and report No. 7 for 2015-16 titled *Public non-financial corporations: 2014-15 financial statements*. I table the reports for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 6: 2015-16—State public sector entities: 2014-15 financial statements [[1813](#)].

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 7: 2015-16—Public non-financial corporations: 2014-15 financial statements [[1814](#)].

PETITIONS

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

Rockville State School, School Zone Flashing Lights

Mr Watts, from 64 petitioners, requesting the House to prioritise the installation of school flashing lights along Holberton Street within the Rockville State School zone [[1815](#)].

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

Moreton Bay

Hon. D'Ath, from 549 petitioners, requesting the House to conduct a comprehensive audit of Moreton Bay's natural resources and assets and make findings available to the general community in the form of accessible, accurate and understandable information [[1816](#), [1817](#)].

Hire Vehicles, Decorating

Ms Howard, from 914 petitioners, requesting the House to pass legislation to render unlawful the decorating of camper vans with slogans that vilify women; and proprietors who hire out vans with slogans that vilify women or incite violence against women be liable to prosecution [[1818](#), [1819](#)].

Petitions received.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill, Referral to Australian Competition and Consumer Commission



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.32 am): Last night in this House, in what must be seen as an act of economic vandalism, a private member's bill was passed that strikes at the very heart of the Queensland economy. The Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill 2015 substantially re-regulates the sugar industry. It significantly degrades ownership rights of the sugar industry's newest investors from overseas. It directly puts at risk 16,000 jobs in the sugar industry, future foreign investment and a billion dollar sugar industry. And this was a risk fully endorsed by the Liberal National Party members sitting opposite. Those opposite are more concerned about wreaking havoc and scoring cheap points than they are about representing the people of Queensland.

Honourable member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. Member for Mermaid Beach, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The editorial in today's *Courier-Mail* sums it up, stating—

It just beggars belief that the Parliament would even consider such a move in a modern 21st century economy, and in a country that urgently needs to lift productivity and efficiency.

Given the billions of dollars of investment at stake and the serious reputational damage—

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. Member for Hinchinbrook, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A or 253(2).

Ms PALASZCZUK: Given the billions of dollars of investment at stake and the serious reputational damage that this legislation would do to Queensland, I must act. My government is now referring this legislation to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission for assessment. The Treasurer sent this referral last night. I have also written to the Prime Minister, advising him of this course of action and the dire circumstances that provoked it. I intend to speak directly to the Prime Minister about it as well. I hope that the ACCC will recognise this legislation for what it is: anticompetitive behaviour. I hope the ACCC will take action to protect Queensland's interests in a way that the LNP has not.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. Member for Lockyer, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A. You will all have an opportunity to speak later today.

Queen's Wharf Brisbane Integrated Resort Development

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.35 am): Today my government will introduce to the House a bill that will give the go-ahead to a project that will transform Brisbane and deliver huge economic benefits to our state. The Destination Brisbane Consortium is now the official contractor for the \$3 billion Queen's Wharf Brisbane Integrated Resort Development, which will be a world-class tourism, leisure and entertainment precinct. The transformation of the Queen's Wharf precinct will provide significant economic development opportunities. The project will deliver \$1 billion to the state, that is, \$272 million in staged payments and \$880 million from casino taxes over the first 10 years of operations. The project will turn a neglected part of our CBD into a major tourist attraction. It will include 12 football fields of enhanced public open space, a new pedestrian bridge from the CBD to South Bank, 1,100 hotel rooms within five luxury hotels and 2,000 apartments. Crucially, it will generate more than 2,000 construction jobs and 8,000 operational jobs. Construction will begin in 2017 and is expected to be completed in 2022.

Today, my government will introduce the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015, which will allow for the redevelopment of the Queen's Wharf precinct by excluding property and planning provisions not intended for such large-scale developments, give effect to the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Casino Agreement as required under the Casino Control Act 1982 and maintain the integrity of casino operations and those involved in the conduct of those operations. Queen's Wharf Brisbane will be a unique and vibrant new world-city development. It will attract visitors and investors, reconnect the Brisbane city centre to the river, preserve and celebrate Brisbane's heritage and deliver high-quality public spaces. My government is committed to supporting the growth of the tourism sector and will continue to facilitate key initiatives, such as this one, which create jobs and economic development opportunities for Queensland.

Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (9.37 am): Last night this parliament voted to pass the Sugar Industry (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill, which is a decision that will have significant ramifications for our state's reputation as a safe place for investment.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, the day is early. You will all have an opportunity to speak.

Ms TRAD: For the first time, this parliament has voted to re-regulate a major industry in Queensland, turning our backs on economic reform in favour of economic nostalgia. In doing this, it puts at risk future foreign direct investment in Queensland, which amounts to \$2 billion in Queensland's sugar industry alone over the past 10 years. The passage of this bill not only puts future investment at risk; it threatens Australia's reputable standing as an effective and reliable partner in global trade.

Even the federal foreign affairs minister, Julie Bishop, was sufficiently concerned about this legislation to write to the Queensland government about its implications on our trading relationship. I table a copy of the letter for the purpose of this House.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 June 2015, from the Minister for Foreign Affairs, Hon. Julie Bishop, to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing, Hon. Bill Byrne, in relation to the Sugar (Real Choice in Marketing) Amendment Bill 2015 [1826].

Trade means jobs. Here in Queensland, one in five jobs are trade related; in regional Queensland it is one in four jobs. However, at a time when both sides of the federal parliament are pursuing new international trade deals, this bill is likely to put Australia in breach of our existing international trading agreements. In fact, any or all of the international firms investing in Queensland's sugar industry could now approach their national governments and seek to initiate the investor-state dispute mechanisms under provisions in the free trade agreements between their country and ours. This is a matter of grave consequence. Australia has always had an exceptional record of compliance with our international trade agreements, but those opposite now seem willing to trash this reputation with no regard for the consequences.

Our state has always relied on foreign investment to grow—always—generating jobs and prosperity along the way, and the attraction of more investment has been pursued by successive governments regardless of political persuasion. The passage of this bill shatters this economic consensus. It draws a clear line in this parliament between those who stand for prosperity and those willing to pursue expediency; between those who believe we should be open for business and those who would slam our doors shut; between those who want to take Queensland forward and those who would take us back.

In every parliament in this country we see bipartisan consensus around growing the economy, boosting investment and delivering more jobs, but no longer here in Queensland. Our Premier and this Queensland Labor government stands ready to work with the federal government to ensure that we remain a competitive, secure and reputable state in which to do business.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Treasurer, I notify the member for Nanango and the member for Burleigh that if they persist with their interjections they will be warned under standing order 253A.

Queensland Economy

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.40 am): As the Premier mentioned, I have written to the chair of the ACCC, Rod Sims, to make him aware that the bill that was passed by the House last night may indeed breach various sections of the Competition and Consumer Act 2010. The bill authorises anticompetitive behaviour, particularly with regard to sections 45 and 47 of the CCA. I drew his attention particularly—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I apologise for interrupting your speech, Treasurer. Member for Clayfield and member for Glass House, if you persist with interjecting you will join the other members I have mentioned.

Mr PITT: I am not sure some of those opposite who are heckling this morning—

Mr SPEAKER: Please do not provoke the opposition, Minister.

Mr PITT: I drew Mr Sims's attention particularly to the fact that the Queensland Productivity Commission found in its assessment of the bill overall that there was no evidence to support a case of market failure in the Queensland sugar industry that would indicate the need for additional intervention.

The Queensland economy has improved—despite the efforts of those opposite—significantly under the Palaszczuk government and our economic plan. The budget I delivered in July set us on a pathway toward recovery from the low-growth legacy of the LNP's disastrous austerity budgets. As a result of our economic plan, we are on track for nation-leading growth not just this year but next financial year as well.

The shadow Treasurer this week has taken great delight in talking down the Queensland economy by focusing on the state final demand for the September quarter. What he neglected to mention was that yesterday's figures were a marked improvement on the state final demand seen under the LNP. In the September quarter last year, state final demand fell by 1.9 per cent, followed by a further 0.6 per cent fall in the December quarter last year.

When exports are included, Queensland Treasury's own trend gross state product figures from October show the state economy grew at 1.3 per cent in the June quarter 2015. This is the highest quarterly growth—

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr PITT: For the benefit of the member for Clayfield, this is the highest quarterly growth since the December quarter 2011—since Labor was last in office. We are implementing the policies that are driving confidence and creating economic opportunities across the state.

Just yesterday the CCIQ released an analysis of Queensland's gross state product, with the headline 'Apprentices hold key to Queensland's economic revitalisation'. CCIQ concluded by stating—

CCIQ welcomes the State Government's payroll tax rebate initiative for apprentices and trainees with hope that it can pave a way for Queensland to achieve a highly qualified workforce, meet our skills demand, and raise economic outputs of small businesses across the state.

Here is a rundown of some more of our economic indicators as we close in on the end of the calendar year. The NAB monthly business survey saw business confidence in Queensland climb to be the highest of all mainland states, with the latest figure being plus seven points in the month of October. For the fourth month in a row, the survey has found that we have the highest business confidence of any mainland state. The Sensis Business Index showed confidence for small-to-medium businesses in Queensland was plus 25 points in the August quarter, up seven points from the June quarter—the second highest increase of any Australian state and Queensland's highest level in over a year.

ABS unemployment is down from 6.5 per cent to 6.3 per cent on trend terms since the election, with more than 43,800 jobs created since Labor was elected, including more than 9,000 full-time jobs. Growth is improving, jobs are being created and business confidence is strong.

The Deloitte business outlook, released in late October, says that Queensland is on track to experience the strongest economic growth of all Australian jurisdictions in 2015-16 at 3.8 per cent. The value of merchandise exports is up 15.7 per cent in the August quarter compared to the same period last year. This includes a 9.7 per cent increase in coal exports, \$1.4 billion in LNG exports and a 33.4 per cent increase in beef exports. ABS housing investor finance remains at near record highs and housing approvals are up 12.9 per cent over the year.

According to last week's Queensland index released by the *Courier-Mail*, optimists outweigh pessimists when it comes to whether Queensland is heading in the right direction. This delivered a net positive reading of plus 27 per cent, the highest Queensland index reading since August 2012 and the third highest reading since 2009. Across the vast majority of indicators, the Queensland economy has been well served by the Palaszczuk government's economic plan in 2015. We will continue this good work going into 2016.

Racing Industry

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (9.45 am): The year 2015 has been a very challenging year when it comes to the racing industry in Queensland. The challenges were sparked back in February when news broke on the ABC's *Four Corners* program about animal cruelty within the greyhound industry. Since that time we have identified that Racing Queensland posted a \$12 million loss in 2014-15 and is forecasting a bigger loss of \$28 million in 2015-16.

This was clearly a situation that could not continue and nor should the Queensland taxpayer have to underwrite an industry year on year that should be self-sustainable. This was a situation we inherited from those opposite. This government has underwritten Racing Queensland for their losses in 2014-15 in a demonstration of practical confidence and leadership. There needs to be some hard decisions taken to get the industry back on track and back in the black.

In the process of getting the industry back on its feet, Racing Queensland has been consulting with community and industry groups across the state to identify the best possible solutions to move racing to a sustainable future. During the consultation, Racing Queensland engaged over 182 industry stakeholders in forums whilst also receiving over 120 written submissions.

Later today the interim CEO of Racing Queensland, Mr Ian Hall, and I will be releasing a plan titled *Tracking towards sustainability*. The plan sets out the steps that need to be taken to achieve operating surpluses. While I will be going into greater detail on the plan with Mr Hall later, I would like now to reassure people in regional Queensland who have raised concerns about country racing.

Country race meets are the lifeblood of many Queensland towns and play an important role in bringing these communities together, particularly in times of drought. That is why I am also announcing today that the Queensland government will contribute \$21 million over four years to support and strengthen country racing clubs. Some \$13 million will go towards compensating for the loss of funding from Racing Queensland. It will also fully replace the funding withdrawn by Racing Queensland by providing around \$4 million per year for two years from July 2016, when Racing Queensland's other measures were planned to start. It will then drop to \$3 million in year 3 and \$2 million in year 4. This will give clubs time to adjust to the lower level of subsidy provided by Racing Queensland.

To help them do that, and hopefully grow beyond their current situation, the Queensland government will provide a further \$8 million in capacity building funding to help clubs improve their management, to review and change their business models and to either find new revenue sources or improve existing ones. This will set clubs up with greater financial independence in the longer term and reduce their need to rely on Racing Queensland for subsidies. I really hope that this announcement today of \$21 million for country racing will now start to ease some of the concerns across the industry and allow our regional communities to continue to enjoy their regular race meets.

This announcement will also put a stop to the unjustified scaremongering campaign being run by those opposite. With more than 86 per cent of Queensland impacted severely by the ongoing drought, the last thing our regional communities need is be caught up in political spin by the Liberal National Party. Despite the protests of the member for Currumbin, the LNP does not have a plan for the sustainability of the racing industry or country racing; we hear only complaint and innuendo. They left racing in the moribund state that it is in, and we have to fix it.

Cardiac Rehabilitation Programs

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.49 am): In an era when the Queensland health system will come under pressure because of projected funding cuts from the federal government, it is important that we make our hospitals as efficient as possible to help Queenslanders avoid admission and readmission to hospital. In that light, earlier in November, along with the member for Greenslopes, I launched an initiative to help people who have suffered a heart attack or angina.

In Queensland, about 33,000 people a year are admitted to hospital suffering from heart attack or angina. The cost to the Queensland healthcare system of coronary vascular disease is estimated to be \$1.2 billion a year. We know that one-third of these are repeat heart attacks that possibly could have been prevented with cardiac rehabilitation. That is why the Palaszczuk Labor government is investing \$5 million this financial year to get more patients into cardiac rehabilitation programs after their heart attack.

Cardiac rehabilitation can reduce readmission to hospital within the first year by as much as 45 per cent. It can also reduce the chance of death within the first year by as much as 25 per cent. This program will provide an incentive for our hospital and health services to implement the right systems to boost referrals to cardiac rehabilitation services and ensure that more patients can and do attend these services.

These programs have been developed in partnership with the Heart Foundation. I thank the Heart Foundation for their involvement and contribution. These programs aim to help people with heart disease return to a full, active and satisfying life as quickly as possible. The program focuses on heart disease, providing tailored exercise programs and encouraging healthy eating and lifestyle choices. By boosting cardiac rehabilitation participation, we can help ensure every person who survives a heart attack in our state can access the support they need.

Great Barrier Reef

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (9.51 am): Overnight a sand carpet was rolled out in London for the premier of global environmental icon David Attenborough's latest documentary series *Great Barrier Reef with David Attenborough*. This documentary puts our iconic Great Barrier Reef on the international stage like never before.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Ms JONES: What have you got against the reef? It marks the return of David Attenborough to our greatest natural wonder nearly 60 years after his first visit. Our reef is a place that inspired David Attenborough—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: I just want to talk about how great the Great Barrier Reef is! Our reef is a place that inspired David Attenborough to say, 'The most exciting natural history experience of my life was the first time I dived on a coral reef.' This documentary will inspire people from around the world to visit our Great Barrier Reef for a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity.

The Great Barrier Reef supports around 70,000 jobs and is worth more than \$5 billion to the Queensland economy. It is crucial to the future tourism prospects of Queensland. It comes off the back of the Palaszczuk government's \$100 million commitment to protect the Great Barrier Reef. This is something I know our regional tourism organisations welcome, because they understand the vital role that the reef plays in Queensland tourism.

Late last month I was pleased to confirm funding for all regional tourism organisations of \$21 million over the next three years to support the great work that they do to promote tourism and, indeed, our reef. Capricorn Enterprise, who are on the southern Great Barrier Reef, said—

... the long term funding assurance for regional tourism organisations recently announced by [the] Minister ... is greatly appreciated.

...

Moving from an annual budget to a three year budget will allow us to plan longer term marketing strategies with our Southern Great Barrier Reef partners and local tourism industry; and the Minister should be congratulated for that.

This government is committed to protecting and promoting the Great Barrier Reef because we know that it is vital to growing tourism and tourism jobs in Queensland.

Human Rights Legislation

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.53 am): It is with great pleasure that I inform the House that today the Leader of the House will be moving a motion to refer to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee the consideration of the possible implementation of a human rights act in Queensland. I have consulted widely on this issue and there is a very broad cross-section of the community who are very interested in this area, and there are very diverse views. I know, Mr Speaker, you are one of the many Queenslanders who are very interested in this issue and referring the matter to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee will enable the public to have input, and allow analysis and consideration of possible models for Queensland.

It is a reminder of the continuing commitment this government has to the fundamental rights of Queenslanders to be shown respect and decency, to be treated fairly and honourably, not just by each other but by the government of the day. The protection of human rights is central to the Palaszczuk government's values, and it is an issue that many people in Queensland are passionate about and have advocated in favour of.

Labor has a long and proud tradition of supporting human rights: through decency and fairness in industrial relations; through our commitment to public education and health care; through our partnership with Indigenous Queenslanders; through ongoing progress for gender equality; through anti-discrimination legislation and support for multicultural affairs; and through supporting an independent, fair and accessible justice system. This next step will consider whether a human rights act is the best way to protect human rights into the future.

The Palaszczuk government is pleased to be examining the possibility of a human rights act for Queensland and promoting public discussion on this important issue. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee will consider all aspects of the appropriateness of such an act for Queensland. Of prime consideration will be the effectiveness of Queensland's current laws and processes in protecting human rights. Possible improvements to existing laws and processes will also be carefully considered.

The committee will consider similar legislation in other jurisdictions as part of its review. It should be noted that the terms of reference are not designed to create an American style constitutional model. That would not be appropriate in our system of government. The committee is invited to consider how human rights regimes operate across a range of jurisdictions including Victoria, the ACT and New Zealand. This is the latest step in the continuing efforts of Labor governments to ensure the protection of human rights for all Queenslanders. I look forward to seeing the work of the committee.

International Day of People with Disability

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (9.55 am): Today is International Day of People with Disability—a day to increase public awareness, understanding and acceptance of people with disability; a day to acknowledge the vast and rich contributions that people with disability bring to our community. This year's theme is 'Inclusion matters: access and empowerment for people of all abilities'. It challenges our attitudes towards people with disability and how our perception of their abilities may limit them from achieving their goals.

People with disability can achieve amazing things if they are given the right support and the opportunity. This often means that we need to do things a little bit differently—whether it be in our workplaces, our schools or our social activities. What we need to do is be a flexible and inclusive society, because this benefits not only people with disability but our community as a whole.

Last month I was privileged to attend the dress rehearsal of an incredible theatre production called *Look Mum ... No Hands!* presented by Indel-Ability Arts. The production was written and performed by actors with disability who told their personal stories about social issues such as inclusion and independence. I was blown away by the performance and in particular by a young woman named Maddie Little. Maddie spoke openly and honestly about having a disability and the real challenges that she faces every day, and all she wanted was the same opportunities as everyone else.

I am proud to be part of a government committed to building an inclusive Queensland. There are a number of events being held across the state to encourage the community to look past disabilities and to see abilities instead. I attended one of those events this morning, where I rowed in a relay rowing competition in the Queen Street Mall, organised by Urban Rowing and supported by Vision Australia, Sporting Wheelies and Life Stream. All the rowers did a fantastic job showing everyone that people with disability can do incredible things. I encourage all Queenslanders to get involved in today's activities.

However, while today here in Australia we are marking International Day of People with Disability, it is with a heavy heart that I woke to hear reports this morning of a shooting in California at a centre for people with disability. This is an absolute tragedy and my thoughts are with everyone involved during this most difficult time.

Inskip Point

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (9.58 am): I am pleased to announce that the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service has reopened Inskip Peninsula Recreation Area campsites in time for the busy holiday camping season. This comes after a sinkhole opened up on the beach in late September. We now know from our geotechnical engineers that it was technically a retrogressive breach flow slide. This is where a large body of sand moves quickly, forming a small cliff that moves rapidly inshore as the sand debris moves out to sea. Although in this instance we do not know what caused it, we have put measures in place to make sure holiday-makers stay safe this Christmas. Safety is always our first priority, and QPWS has established a no-camping buffer zone and a no-drive zone along sections of beach in high-risk areas after considering the engineer's report.

Rainbow Beach is well known to Queenslanders as the gateway to some of the most amazing natural attractions found anywhere in the world. I recognise the importance of camping to the many families who make their annual pilgrimage to Inskip over the Christmas holidays and contribute to the local Rainbow Beach economy. I can assure both local businesses and visitors that there will be plenty of capacity at Inskip Point Recreation Area throughout summer, with space available for up to 2,400 campers at Inskip and further capacity for campers in nearby areas at Teewah Beach and on Fraser Island. The previous maximum camper booking capacity at Inskip has rarely been approached, with only approximately three days in a good year exceeding 2,400 campers.

My message to the campers who will spend their holidays there is to have a great time but please remember to follow all warning signs. In front of the buffer zone we have temporarily closed high-risk beach areas where people should not drive or park, pending further consultation. People can still walk along that section of beach, and keeping it free of vehicle traffic will improve visitor safety on the beach. There is a temporary barrier in place defining the buffer zone, and QPWS expects to have installed a permanent low fence as well as safety, regulatory and interpretive signage by Christmas. The buffer zone will have minimal impact on the number of campers who love Inskip, and we are looking forward to another great summer camping season.

Advance Queensland

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (10.01 am): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on the awarding of just over \$1 million through the Advance Queensland Knowledge Transfer Partnerships program. The Queensland government understands the importance of collaboration and skills to a vibrant, world-class innovation system. That is why on 3 September the Premier launched the Advance Queensland Knowledge Transfer Partnerships program, or KTP for short.

My announcement today creates 22 partnerships across six Queensland universities and small to medium sized enterprises. This is part of our suite of programs to drive greater collaboration between businesses and the research base and to help to create the knowledge based jobs of the future. These grants of up to \$50,000 allow small and medium sized enterprises to take on a graduate, bringing new ideas and technologies to projects designed to grow the business. Since we launched the program, the Australian Council of Learned Academies in its November report, *Translating research for economic and social benefit*, recommended that Australia adopt a version of the United Kingdom's knowledge transfer partnerships program. This program was identified globally as a leading practice measure to improve links between businesses and universities. Queensland is ahead of the game when it comes to encouraging innovation.

The first round of our KTP program closed on 6 November. We received 31 applications from across Queensland and they have been assessed by an external expert panel. The 22 successful partnerships will share in \$1.16 million worth of awards, excluding GST, in this first round of the KTP program. Of this, more than \$930,000 will go directly to businesses, with the remainder shared by universities for their mentoring and coordinating role. These companies will be progressing projects across a range of industry sectors including health care, agriculture, ICT and the digital economy, manufacturing, energy storage, education, property and construction, and resources. I look forward to sharing their outcomes with the House as the projects progress.

This program is a great example of how this government is working to strengthen Queensland's knowledge economy: harnessing opportunities to create jobs through science and innovation, and supporting businesses to develop new products and services that could help them remain globally competitive. Universities are continuing to work with SMEs across Queensland to form partnerships and applications for the upcoming rounds of this program. The next funding round closes on 29 January 2016. This is the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland initiative, delivering jobs now and jobs for the future.

Syrian and Iraqi Refugees

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.04 am): Growing our economy and creating jobs is the Palaszczuk government's No. 1 priority. As Minister for Multicultural Affairs, I know that employment is a key pathway to success for members of our multicultural and multifaith communities and, in particular, our newly arrived refugees. In October I was proud to see our government show leadership and compassion when the Premier announced that we stand willing and able to accept up to 3,500 refugees fleeing conflict in Syria and Iraq. The reception of this decision has been overwhelmingly positive. Queenslanders have spoken up loudly and proudly in recent months to say that they are keen to help Syrian refugees start a new life. I am proud of the way our community has responded, and our offer to settle up to 3,500 refugees reflects the Queensland spirit of generosity.

We have had communities, religious groups, local mayors and others all speaking up to ask how they can help, and in some cases families wanting to offer rooms in their own homes. The unfolding human tragedy in Syria and Iraq reminds us that, no matter who we are or where we come from, we all share a common dream of stability, family and a place to call home. Of course that includes the dignity of having a job. Employment is not just about bringing in an income. It creates a purpose, the feeling of being a part of community and a stake in society.

As we welcome additional refugees from Syria and Iraq to our state, this provides an opportunity to focus on the need to provide employment opportunities for all refugees and migrants. That is why it is important that we work in partnership with local industries and businesses to achieve the employment outcomes we want and need to see. I was honoured to be asked by settlement service provider MDA

to be a patron of their recently launched Work & Welcome 500 program. This program recognises that navigating the Australian jobs market and understanding Australian workplace culture are important in finding a job.

Workplaces signing up to be part of this initiative help to ensure that their experience is positive and supportive. Work & Welcome 500 improves future employment outcomes beyond the initial work experience because participants begin to build networks and have a reference at the end from an Australian employer. I am delighted to announce that my department is committed to being a corporate partner of Work & Welcome 500, immediately offering two workplaces within the department. We will also be working to promote the initiative across government and generate opportunities for paid work experience in Australia for newly arrived refugees.

I commend MDA for its innovation and commitment to Work & Welcome. It has been heartening to see so many schools, businesses and individuals come forward to be involved in such a fantastic program that will make a real difference to people's lives. I am not surprised by the number of people reaching out to help, because I know Queenslanders are generous of spirit and our multicultural state is one of our greatest strengths.

Renewable Energy

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (10.07 am): The Palaszczuk government is surging forward, building Queensland's renewable energy sector and the jobs that go with it after the neglect of the Newman years. Ergon is expanding its commitment to sourcing renewable energy for its customers with a strong response for detailed submissions from companies that can help us to meet this goal.

As I told the House last sitting, Ergon's expression of interest for renewable energy project developments yielded 22 organisations representing 2,000 megawatts of capacity. Ergon received strong interest from renewable energy project developers in regional Queensland, and today I can release a list of seven projects that have been short-listed. The short-listed projects comprise two wind farms, four solar farms and a biomass project. Companies and projects selected for the short list comprises over 500 megawatts of renewable energy capacity and include the Mount Emerald Wind Farm, 50 per cent Ratch and 50 per cent Port Bajool; the Ratch Australia Corporation's Collinsville solar farm; Infigen's Forsayth wind farm; the Cleveland Power-Darwalla group's Mount Cotton biomass project; FRV Services' Clare Solar Farm and Lilyvale; and Lyon Infrastructure Investments' Cooktown solar.

Ergon will now work with each of the short-listed proponents with a view to entering into commercial power purchasing agreements with the successful companies. They plan to have that completed by early next year contingent on final terms and conditions to meet the 150 megawatt target. Ergon will partner with new renewable energy projects with companies which have demonstrated that their projects will contribute significantly to Ergon meeting its renewable energy requirements. Companies that have not been successful may have an opportunity through subsequent Ergon initiatives or other renewable programs being run by the Queensland government and ARENA.

This is just the latest development in Queensland's renewable energy sector after a huge year of recovery. The Solar 60 project that we are partnering with ARENA on will deliver 60 megawatts of renewable energy. We have battery trials going on now in partnership with ARENA, Sunverge and Ergon. We are testing and working out the best interface with customers for batteries and solar PV. We are on the cutting edge. We also have industrial batteries going out on the Ergon network right across Queensland in 20 different locations, in comparison to the 1,300 jobs that were lost under the Newman government and three years of inaction, three years of—

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I think you have exhausted your time.

MOTIONS

Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.09 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee inquire into whether it is appropriate and desirable to legislate for a Human Rights Act (HR Act) in Queensland, other than through a constitutionally entrenched model.

2. That, in undertaking the inquiry, the committee consider:
 - a. the effectiveness of current laws and mechanisms for protecting human rights in Queensland and possible improvements to these mechanisms;
 - b. the operation and effectiveness of human rights legislation in Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory and by ordinary statute internationally;
 - c. the costs and benefits of adopting a HR Act (including financial, legal, social and otherwise); and
 - d. previous and current reviews and inquiries (in Australia and internationally) on the issue of human rights legislation.
3. That, if the committee decides it would be appropriate and desirable to legislate for a HR Act in Queensland, the committee consider:
 - a. the objectives of the legislation and rights to be protected;
 - b. how the legislation would apply to: the making of laws, courts and tribunals, public authorities and other entities;
 - c. the implications of laws and decisions not being consistent with the legislation;
 - d. the implications of the legislation for existing statutory complaints processes; and
 - e. the functions and responsibilities under the legislation.
4. That the committee invite public submissions, consult with the community and key stakeholders and report to the Legislative Assembly by 30 June 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Referral to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.11 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That the Committee of the Legislative Assembly inquire into and report to the Legislative Assembly by 25 February 2016 on issues raised in recommendation 9 regarding entrenchment and recommendation 10 regarding a review of the parliamentary committee system, of the Finance and Administration Committee report “Inquiry into the introduction of four year terms for the Queensland Parliament, including consideration of Constitution (Fixed Term Parliament) Amendment Bill 2015 and Constitution (Fixed Term Parliament) Referendum Bill 2015 (the report)”.
2. That, in undertaking this inquiry, the committee consider how the current parliamentary committee system could be strengthened to increase accountability by:
 - examining the role of parliamentary committees in other jurisdictions with unicameral parliaments, including the functions and powers of those committees and how they are exercised, to see if the functions and powers of Queensland parliamentary committees can be further strengthened; and
 - reviewing the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 and Standing and Sessional Orders of the Legislative Assembly pertaining to parliamentary committee functions, powers and procedures to ensure these functions, powers and procedures are operating as effectively as possible as an accountability mechanism.
3. Further, as part of this review, that the committee consider the implications and method of entrenching matters as outlined in recommendation 9 of the report and consider alternative accountability mechanisms in lieu of entrenchment.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Reports



Mr RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (10.13 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 158 of the Ethics Committee titled *Report on a right of reply No. 28*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 158—Report on a right of reply No. 28 [\[1820\]](#).

I also lay upon the table of the House report No. 159 of the Ethics Committee titled *Inquiry into matters relating to the evidence of the former Acting Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Dr Ken Levy, to the former Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 159—Inquiry into matters relating to the evidence of the former Acting Chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission, Dr Ken Levy, to the former Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee [\[1821\]](#).

I commend the reports and the committee’s recommendations to the House.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Report

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (10.13 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 18 of the Finance and Administration Committee.

Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 18, 55th Parliament—Portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 14 July 2015 and 15 September 2015 [[1822](#)].

This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 14 July 2015 and 15 September 2015 considered by the committee. The committee did not identify any issues regarding consistency with fundamental legislative principles or the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the House.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Report

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (10.14 am): I lay upon the table of the House the Ethics Committee report No. 160 titled *Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged failure by a member to follow an order of the previous PCCC and alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 160—Inquiry into matter of privilege referred by the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on 17 August 2015 relating to alleged failure by a member to follow an order of the previous PCCC and alleged unauthorised disclosure of committee proceedings [[1823](#)].

For the information of the House, this is the first report in relation to the matters referred by the PCCC on 17 August 2015. The remaining allegations will be incorporated in a separate and subsequent report. I commend the report and the committee's recommendations to the House.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Alleged Unauthorised Release of Committee Information

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (10.15 am), by leave: Yesterday, in a question to the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition implied that I had emailed confidential information to the Premier or to her office regarding the deliberations of the Ethics Committee. There is no truth to these inferences. I did not send any such emails. In asking his question, the Leader of the Opposition has impugned my integrity and I hope he will apologise for doing so.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Alleged Unauthorised Release of Committee Information

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (10.15 am), by leave: Yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition asked me a series of questions during question time about whether anyone from my office had received any emails from the member for Bulimba's electorate office or the member for Bulimba herself in November this year in relation to the progress of any Ethics Committee matters still under consideration. I told the Leader of the Opposition that I was happy to look into that—that I did not have that information and was happy to check my office. I asked that my staff conduct a search of their systems, and I am advised that no-one from my office received any emails from the member for Bulimba's electorate office or the member for Bulimba herself in November this year in relation to the progress of any Ethics Committee matters still under consideration. The question by the Leader of the Opposition is a disgraceful reflection on the integrity of the member for Bulimba. I call on the Leader of the Opposition at the earliest opportunity to apologise to the member for Bulimba for his baseless and highly offensive allegations.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (10.16 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Further to this matter just raised, when the Leader of the Opposition asked me that series of questions yesterday, I immediately raised the issue of whether the questioning

related to a matter before the Ethics Committee and asked for your guidance on that matter, Mr Speaker. You then directly asked the question of the Leader of the Opposition whether his question related to the matter that is currently before the Ethics Committee. His response was, 'No, it does not.' The Leader of the Opposition was also asked whether his first question related to a matter before the Ethics Committee, and again he denied it. The question asked by the Leader of the Opposition was specifically about emails received in relation to the progress of any Ethics Committee matter still under consideration.

Standing order 271 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly provides very clearly that a matter referred to the Ethics Committee must not be debated in the House until such time as the Ethics Committee has reported on the matter. It is therefore my submission that the Leader of the Opposition should be referred to the Ethics Committee under standing order 268 for giving an assurance to the chair, to the Speaker, that the questions did not offend standing order 271 when in fact they clearly did. I will be writing to you about this matter, Mr Speaker.

UTILITIES, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION COMMITTEE

Reports

 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (10.18 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 9 of the Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee titled *Inquiry into Auditor-General report No. 14: 2012-13 maintenance of water infrastructure assets*.

Tabled paper: Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee: Report No. 9, 55th Parliament—Inquiry into Auditor-General Report to Parliament 14: 2012-13—Maintenance of water infrastructure assets [1824].

I commend the committee's report to the House.

I also lay upon the table of the House report No. 10 of the Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 July 2015 and 13 October 2015*.

Tabled paper: Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee: Report No. 10, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 July 2015 and 13 October 2015 [1825].

This report covers the portfolio subordinate legislation tabled on 15 September 2015 with a disallowance date of 3 December 2015, and 13 October 2015 with a disallowance date of 17 February 2016. The committee did not identify any significant issues in relation to policy or regarding the lawfulness of the subordinate legislation. I commend the report to the House.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Department of Education and Training, Security Breach

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (10.19 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

1. notes with concern that in relation to the Department of Education and Training, more than 600 records were illegally accessed—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members of the government, I would urge you to maintain your silence.

Mr MANDER: I repeat—

1. notes with concern that in relation to the Department of Education and Training, more than 600 records were illegally accessed as part of a security breach on the TAFE and education department website; and—

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A.

Mr MANDER: And—

2. refers this security breach to the state parliament's Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee for immediate investigation, and report back to the House by 18 February, 2016.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

CFMEU Rally, Security Breach

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (10.20 am): I rise to raise a very serious issue in the House with respect to an article contained in the *Courier-Mail* today headed 'Right out of order'. This article is about a union rally that occurred yesterday in the city of Brisbane. What is concerning about that union rally

is the millions and millions of dollars that have been lost to the construction industry in Queensland because the workers left the construction sites to rally behind a man charged with assaulting a woman. So we have a man facing charges of allegedly assaulting a woman, a developer, pushing her and hitting her arm—it is currently before the court—and we do not have condemnation from anyone. We have workers walking off the site to protect the alleged offender—not protecting the woman, not marching in the streets to protect the victim—and we have the union thugs rallying behind the alleged offender. Interestingly, at the rally yesterday the union official said—

... we have a Labor Government who we elected ... they must now come to the fore and tell the police and their leadership to pull their head in.

That is what he said at the union rally. Then he said, 'We have written to the Police Commissioner demanding him to stop interfering.' So we have the union bullies writing to the Police Commissioner saying, 'Leave us alone. Stop interfering in our matters,' and we have the rallying occurring. The article in the paper this morning states that when the Treasurer was asked about it, instead of standing up for the victim he said—

I've said that workplace safety is a very serious issue and it should never be used as an industrial weapon ...

There was no comment about the victim; he is talking about the rally workers. He is protecting the workers who went out to rally because we know that this government is controlled by the CFMEU and union thugs and officials.

The article states that after the rally they went to the pub. After the pub they came to parliament. They came here on the invitation of the member for Mirani, Jim Pearce, the sponsoring MP. CFMEU union officials were walking around here unassisted and unguided by a member of parliament. I am advised that in this photo from today's *Courier-Mail*, which I table for honourable members, there are union members who were present in the parliament last night.

Tabled paper: Photograph, undated, of a union march [\[1831\]](#).

I am advised that some were so intoxicated they fell out of level 3, they were kicked out of the Stranger's Dining Room after trying to force their way in and they were on the level 12 balcony without any member of parliament with them. I raise it as a serious matter. As you, Mr Speaker, are respectfully responsible for security in this place, I am going to write to you about this, particularly because the member for Mirani left the CFMEU officials, after rallying in the street, unassisted and unaided in the parliamentary precinct last night.

Liberal National Party

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (10.23 am): Whilst the sugar industry bill originated from the crossbenches it was, in fact, the Liberal National Party that provided the votes needed to make it law—a party that purports to stand for less regulation and more free trade, a party that professes to be the alternative government of Queensland and a party that claims to be sound economic managers.

Last night proved three things: one, that they believe in none of these economic principles; two, they are actually not fit for government; and, three, last night proved beyond all doubt that the Liberal National Party of Queensland is really the Queensland National Party of old. That is all they are. Those of us who have been in the House over the past three years know that was the case, when there was a whole score of Liberal members who no longer sit in this place because the former Newman government pursued a radical National Party agenda in this state. They continue in that tradition.

Last night was also about leadership. It was a true test of leadership, about who can provide the leadership for Queensland's future, for jobs and prosperity, for growth and opportunity. That is why the Palaszczuk government rejected this backward step and rejected the sugar industry bill, because it is bad for Queensland and it is bad for our economy. Sadly, the opposition thought it was all about a different test of leadership. For those opposite, it was a test of leaders, about whether the member for Southern Downs can shore up his numbers or whether the member for Nanango can gather the votes. That is what last night was all about. That is why the senior Liberals opposite stood silent whilst the travesty occurred, whilst they trashed their economic credentials. The member for Clayfield, the member for Everton and the member for Kawana all sat there silently and did not contribute to the debate. In ordinary circumstances, this might be a cause for political mirth—and they seem to be filled to the brim with it today—but the tragic consequences of the LNP's leadership race is to shred Queensland's economic credibility. That is the true travesty. Last night when they voted for a

re-regulation of the sugar industry, they voted for economic lunacy and they know it. They did it to shore up the numbers for Lawrence Springborg, the member for Southern Downs, and for no other reason. They sold out the Queensland economy for political expediency and that is why they are not fit to govern.

Queen's Wharf Development

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (10.26 am): I want to talk about Brisbane's mysterious disappearing theatre. When the former government started negotiations in respect of a proposal for a casino in Brisbane, the Queen's Wharf development, it encouraged those who put in submissions to provide some social dividend to the proposal that was to be put—and many came through as a result of the proposal eventually passed. One of the things that the then deputy premier, the member for Callide, and the then treasurer, the member for Clayfield, suggested may be a sensible thing was for a bridge to be built across to South Bank to make South Bank the enjoyable backyard of the development and to provide a theatre on South Bank. In fact, those suggestions were obviously taken up by the bidder, by Echo, because in their message to shareholders they pointed out that their plans, if successful, for the Queen's Wharf development would include a new Lyric Theatre for QPAC. I table the statement to shareholders from Echo.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Echo Entertainment Group—A Message to Our Shareholders' [1828].

I also table the statement from Cottee Parker, the architects, who also said the integrated resort would feature a new Lyric Theatre at QPAC. I table that submission.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Queens Wharf Brisbane: Project Description' [1829].

It was to our great surprise that, when the bid was finally approved and announced, despite some early press comment about there being a new Lyric Theatre at South Bank—and that was a theatre paid for by the developer for the people of Queensland, a 1,500-seat theatre, one which all the studies that have been done by governments before already indicated that Queensland needed. That theatre was there in the plan. Early press reports on the day of the announcement indicated that the theatre was there, but the theatre disappeared when the government's media release came out. Everything that had been listed in Echo's bid was there, but there was no Lyric Theatre. I table the media statement titled 'Echo consortium wins Queen's Wharf Brisbane prize.'

Tabled paper: Media release, undated, joint statement by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham, titled 'Echo consortium wins Queen's Wharf Brisbane prize' [1827].

So the question is: where has the disappearing theatre gone? It was there; it was in the deal and all we now have is another media statement which has been released which says that instead of a theatre we are going to get an inquiry. The government is going to commission a \$1.3 million business case for a 1,500-seat theatre to report back in 12 months. So instead of a paid theatre for the arts community in this state, we have, once again, an inquiry to join the 80 or so inquiries we already have.

Tabled paper: Media release, undated, by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham, titled 'Queens Wharf Delivers—jobs, public spaces, dollars' [1830].

I want to ask why it is that the Premier has duded the arts community in Brisbane and in Queensland. Why has the theatre disappeared? All excuses are used including heritage listing. However, there is nothing in the heritage listing of South Bank that would preclude an appropriate theatre being built. I ask on behalf of the arts community: where has it gone?

Liberal National Party

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (10.19 am): Mr Speaker, yesterday was a very eventful time in the Queensland parliament. First of all we acknowledged and recognised the anniversary of the member for Southern Downs, who celebrates 26 years in this parliament, and what we saw on that 26-year anniversary was the National Party stepping all over the Liberal Party in Queensland. In the words of the editor of the *Courier-Mail*—

It just beggars belief that the Parliament would even consider such a move in a modern 21st century economy, and in a country that urgently needs to lift productivity and efficiency—and has also signed off on three landmark ...

What we saw last night was the death of the Liberal Party here in Queensland. Where were all my leafy western suburbs friends last night? Where was the member for Indooroopilly? Where was the member for Moggill? Where was the member for Clayfield? They were bowing their heads in shame

because they could not stand up in this House and put their name and their words to the debate last night, but they were very happy to front up and vote. They voted for what they know is market lunacy. They know that it is setting us back 10 years. They come into this parliament and crow about how great their new Prime Minister is and his national reforms, but what we have here in Queensland is the National Party winding it back. It would be farcical if it were not so important. It is sending terrible messages to the international economy and the Australian economy about how backward the LNP and the National Party are and what they would do to Queensland. We know that under the National Party's watch they will always take Queensland backwards. That is exactly what they do, and they sit here trying to defend it. I note that all of my colleagues from out in the leafy of suburbs of Brisbane are still sitting there dead silent because they should be ashamed of what they did last night. In the words of the editor of the *Courier-Mail*—

What is also hard to believe is that the LNP—a party which allegedly stands for private enterprise, smaller government and free markets—has allowed itself to be captured by this nonsense.

There is one party in this parliament that will stand up for growing Queensland's economy, that will move us forward, that will stand up and fight for jobs, that will modernise Queensland—like we always do—and that is the great Australian Labor Party. What we fight for is a modern dynamic economy for Queensland that will always put jobs first, and we will always fight for progress.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.32 am): Despite all the pious posturing this morning from those members opposite, last night in this parliament we saw the death of ministerial accountability. We saw a government which was not prepared to stand up and say, in relation to the member for Bundamba, that her behaviour is not good enough and enough is enough. We even saw the failure of senior ministers to back the member for Bundamba, because they know they would like to get rid of her. But she is here to stay.

It is also very interesting when we look at the fact that in 2005 this parliament was reconvened by Peter Beattie to exonerate, by motion of this parliament—in one of the most disgraceful actions that I have seen in my 26 years in this place—a minister under suspicion of criminality. Imagine how that would have been viewed back in Joh's day! During that time we saw minister after minister after minister stand up here, including Peter Beattie himself, to justify and back Gordon Nuttall. Anna Bligh, the Deputy Premier; Robert Schwarten, the minister for public works; Judy Spence, the minister for police; Warren Pitt, the communities minister and the current Treasurer's own father; and a coterie of other ministers all stood up and defended the most disgraceful behaviour of the minister. What we saw last night was one minister who was prepared to stand up in this parliament and back the member for Bundamba, so on their undertaking we see an enormous contrast. We even had more ministers who were prepared to stand up and back Gordon Nuttall.

Let us look at what the Ethics Committee found today. It found exactly what we have been saying all the way along: this police minister is a reckless person. This police minister is someone who conducts herself with recklessness. It states—

However, the committee notes that despite their finding that the technical elements of contempt were not made out in respect to each allegation the evidence before the committee across the two allegations demonstrates a pattern of reckless conduct on behalf of the member for Bundamba.

My proposition to the Premier today is: when is enough enough? When the Premier came to power in Queensland she said that she has the highest expectations of ministerial standards. We have seen failure after failure from the member for Bundamba, the police minister, and we have seen excuse after excuse from the Premier. Today the Premier is no longer able to hide behind those excuses. It is now time for the Premier to act.

(Time expired)

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 11.35.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.35 am): My question without notice is to the Premier. In June this year when the Minister for Police made what the Premier called 'an error of judgement' the Premier gave an undertaking to Queensland. She said—
It will not happen again. Let me be very clear, it will not happen again.

Now that a bipartisan committee has found a pattern of reckless conduct from the police minister, does the Premier still have confidence in her police minister?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition very much for that question. The Ethics Committee's report has just been handed down. It is my intention to study that report in detail, and I will be meeting with the minister concerned about the findings of that report. Let me make it very clear, Mr Speaker: there has been a thorough investigation by the committee. From my initial observation of this report there have been no findings of contempt. On a preliminary reading of this report there is an onus and an obligation now on the minister to make a statement to the House. I will listen very closely to the statement that the minister will have to make, but this is very serious and I will be speaking to the minister about it.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Mr SPRINGBORG: My second question is also to the Premier. Now that a bipartisan committee has found that the police minister conducts herself with a pattern of reckless conduct, will the Premier listen to the people of police and sack her police minister?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. I have said very clearly that I will be studying the report in detail, and I have every intention of speaking to the minister. I will also say to the Leader of the Opposition that I expect him to be speaking to the member for Callide about the very serious Auditor-General's report that was handed down about how taxpayers' money—

Mr STEVENS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Under standing order 118, as you well know, there was no mention of the former deputy premier at all in the question. Please keep the Premier relevant to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition talked about Queenslanders, and Queenslanders want to know the reason the former deputy premier trashed the principles of transparency—

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, it was a specific question. I would urge you to make your answer relevant.

Taxation Reform

Miss BOYD: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the Queensland government's position on revenue options being considered ahead of next week's COAG meeting?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for her interest in COAG, which will be meeting next week. This will be perhaps one of the most important COAG meetings I attend this year as Premier of this state. We know that there is a proposal on the table about raising the rate of the GST. As I have said in this House before, the goalposts keep changing in relation to the tax debate in this nation. What we heard at the very beginning under Tony Abbott was that there would be a cut of over \$80 billion to health and education across Australia. In Queensland there would be a cut of \$18 billion in health and education. The last time I went to a COAG meeting I went in good faith to talk very seriously to the Commonwealth about how we fix this funding gap.

We no longer hear anything from the federal government about health and education. We know that at its heart it wants to increase the rate of the GST. What does that mean for people in Strathpine, Logan, Ipswich and right across the state? It means paying more, because the GST is a consumption tax that hurts people.

Mr Pitt: It is a regressive tax.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the interjection of the Treasurer. It is a regressive tax.

The other day I was very surprised to hear someone called Peter Reith talk about how Malcolm Turnbull should take the GST off the agenda before Christmas. It is not popular. No-one wants it. There is talk in the LNP that they do not want to go down this path.

I am advised that next week the goalposts will move again. Perhaps the federal government is listening to the state Labor premiers—Daniel Andrews and me—that a GST increase is not the way to go. What we are now hearing very clearly out of the bureaucracy in Canberra is that the GST may be coming off the agenda. That is a win for Queensland. That is a win for all Queenslanders and for Queensland families.

I look forward to seeing the Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, next week at COAG. I will be speaking to him at length about COAG, about tax and about sugar. I want the Leader of the Opposition in this state to also meet with Malcolm Turnbull and tell him very clearly why he has put at stake a multibillion dollar industry in this great state of ours.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Premier. Page 15 of Ethics Committee report No. 160 states that it finds the conduct of the member for Bundamba was 'not of the standard expected of a Member of Parliament and of a Minister for the Crown', and I ask: what action will the Premier take to restore confidence in ministerial standards?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have addressed this question. I am seriously looking at the report. I will be speaking to the minister about this report. I, along with every other member of this House, will be listening to what the minister has to say about this report. This is an all-party committee report. It has just been tabled in the House and I intend to take my time to read it. I am not going to pick and choose paragraphs out of the report when I need to study it and I need to speak to the minister about it.

Gladstone Electorate

Mr BUTCHER: My question is of the Premier. Premier, will you advise the House of any future major events that will be happening in my electorate of Gladstone?

Mr SPEAKER: It has been drawn to my attention that the member has used the word 'you'. Could you please reword the question by replacing the word 'you' with 'minister' or 'Premier'.

Mr BUTCHER: Will the Premier advise the House of any future events occurring in my electorate of Gladstone?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Gladstone very much for that question. We know how important Gladstone is to the Queensland economy. Unfortunately, the former deputy premier obviously did not realise how important the Gladstone economy is because, from my recollection of that report, very few projects were approved for Gladstone, even though they put submissions in. How do I know that is true? When I visited the mayor she told me at length that they were putting submissions in to Royalties for the Regions but they were not getting any money back.

This government values the Gladstone community. We value the hard work the local member is doing there. The Minister for State Development and I recently had the pleasure of going to Gladstone with the member for Gladstone to look at the latest shipment of LNG. We know that Gladstone is an economic powerhouse for our state.

In recognition of that, it is my intention that the first community cabinet for next year will be held in the electorate of Gladstone. My cabinet will be travelling there on 31 January and 1 February. We are getting to work early next year. We will be out there. We will be more than happy to sit down and talk to the people of Gladstone. We know how important it is to the Queensland economy. We also know from Rio Tinto's recent announcement that there will be certainty for those 2,000 people working in the refinery there. That is great news. I am quite sure that the people of Gladstone would also welcome that news.

While I am speaking about community cabinets, let me update the House. In Townsville in March this year we had over 150 deputations, in Rockhampton in May we had over 120 deputations, in the southern suburbs of Brisbane in August we had 83 deputations and in Bundaberg in October we had over 150 meetings. All up, there were more than 500 meetings with locals across Queensland as a result of our community cabinets. I assure the House that next year my ministers will be travelling across the state, as they have this year. We will continue our program of consultation. We will be working incredibly hard, delivering on our firm economic agenda for the people of Queensland.

We intend to grow this state. We intend to ensure that we have the skills needed for the future. We intend to promote innovation in this state and promote our trading relationships. Even though those opposite want to put our trading relationships in doubt and at risk, my government will not do that. We will reassure investors that Queensland is a great place to invest in. We will reassure investors that we will commit to growing jobs in this state, even though there is reckless behaviour by those opposite.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Mr NICHOLLS: My question is also to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's statement to the estimates committee of 18 August 2015 when she said—

... all of my ministers are working extremely hard. They have portfolio responsibilities and I expect high standards.

Given today's Ethics Committee report, is the police minister meeting those high standards?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have answered this question repeatedly.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, those interjections are not necessary.

Commonwealth-State Financial Relations

Mr de BRENNI: My question is of the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer please update the House about the status of Commonwealth-state financial relations?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. Next week I will be joining my interstate counterparts at the Council on Federal Financial Relations in Sydney. As the Premier stated earlier, we on this side of the House do not support the Turnbull government's plan for a GST increase because it is regressive and unfair. It would be exactly that for Queensland. Even Peter Reith says that it is not a good idea. I do not think he was much chop in terms of industrial relations, but I think he might well be on the mark on this one.

A change to the GST cannot happen without the unanimous support of every state and territory. Queensland does not support raising the rate of GST or broadening its base. We are already one of the lowest taxing states in Australia. We have the lowest rate of payroll tax and the second highest threshold on mainland Australia. We have very competitive stamp duties. I will continue to push for a constructive dialogue about tax reform, but, unlike those opposite, we will always stand up for the economic interests of Queenslanders.

We have not seen of course a commitment from Canberra to restore the \$18 billion of cuts to health and education that happened in the 2014-15 budget. Sadly, the 'under new management' sign is fading fast in Canberra. When it comes to meeting the needs of Queensland schools and hospitals, we have not seen anything that has changed from the Hockey horror show. What we have seen of course has been the Turnbull train wreck and the Morrison mashup. I keep hearing the member for Chatsworth asking us what our plan is. Our plan has been very clear. Our plan is one that Mr Turnbull and Mr Morrison should seriously consider, and that is a proposal put forward by Queensland and Victoria for changes to the Medicare levy to meet future health needs. It is time for Canberra to stop the thought bubbles. It is time to stop those in Canberra having these ideas being peddled through the media. It is about time they stopped talking about the future of taxes as though they are their playthings. We are a state. We will make our own decisions and we are part of a federation. Instead, they need to engage with the states about genuine reforms to areas such as superannuation, negative gearing and cracking down on multinationals and tax avoidance.

We have put these options on the table. They will go a long way to help address the \$80 billion of cuts to health and education across the nation. We know what happened the last time these things were announced in 2014-15. The member for Southern Downs when health minister essentially let Canberra say, 'Roll over and tickle your tummy.' We know what the member for Clayfield did. He said, 'I'll have a cup of tea, a Bex and a good lie down.' Sadly, those are the things that we have seen from those opposite. It is very interesting to note that we saw almost no identifiable Liberals speak on the bill last night. Breaking news: it seems the Nationals are on the rise, because Ian Macfarlane has defected from the Liberal Party to the National Party. It is very interesting games. Clearly the Nationals are on the rise in Canberra. Let us see if it is the same here in Queensland.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Ms DAVIS: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Agriculture, and I ask: as the only minister who chose to express confidence in the police minister yesterday evening, does the minister retain such confidence following the handing down of this Ethics Committee report?

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Aspley, I find there is no nexus with the minister and your question. I call the member for Bulimba to ask the next question.

Sugar Industry, Marketing

Ms FARMER: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries. Will the minister please advise the House of any impacts caused by legislative changes to sugar marketing and the views of the business community to these changes?

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for the question. In defeat, virtue. The Palaszczuk government proved this last night. No matter the cost, no matter the politics, this government always stands up for jobs and always stands up for Queensland. The Palaszczuk government has always and will always

act in the best interests of the people of Queensland. What happened last night in this chamber was the death of the Liberal Party. Whatever is left of the Liberal Party in this state no longer exists. It was sacrificed last night on the altar of political convenience to benefit one person and one person only. The only beneficiary from last night's debacle and economic vandalism was the Leader of the Opposition, who now leads a party that has shunned any interests in ever being a credible alternative government in this state. As Minister for Agriculture, I am deeply worried about the consequences of last night's move. The flow-on effects for business confidence, investor certainty and the prospects for future capital investment in Queensland are dire. It has already begun. This morning I was advised that MSF decided last night to cancel all non-essential capital investment while the uncertainty of the consequences of this bill lasts.

Let me be absolutely clear: every dollar lost, every legal challenge, every FTA breach, every investor that walks away, every bit of loss of confidence in this state rests solely at the feet of the Leader of the Opposition and the now Queensland National Party. The economic ineptitude of the LNP has been totally exposed. This government will fight tooth and nail to do everything it can to maintain Queensland's economic credibility both in primary industries and across-the-board. The Premier has already written to the Prime Minister last night advising him that the government has referred the matter to the ACCC for immediate review under the Competition and Consumer Act. We will be urging the federal government to take swift action to do what it can to ensure Australia's economic credibility is upheld. Today's *Courier-Mail* was a celebration—I am going to get it framed because it is the first time I have totally agreed with an editorial—and I have to quote from it—

Such intervention may have some vestigial appeal in the rural rump that comprises part of the LNP, but to see otherwise sensible and seasoned politicians such as John-Paul Langbroek—

the member for Surfers Paradise—

and former treasurer—

the member for Clayfield—

fall into line behind the protectionist recidivism of the Katters is astonishing.

I am going to blow it up, frame it and put it on my wall because it is exactly the centre of gravity of this issue and the fact that those opposite do not understand this remains a revelation to the entire business community.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Ms SIMPSON: My question without notice is directed to the police minister. Does the police minister support the view that she conducts herself with a pattern of reckless conduct?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I think the question is seeking an opinion and I ask you to rule on whether the question is in order.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment.

Ms SIMPSON: It is a yes or no answer.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Whether something is a yes or no answer does not determine whether the question is seeking an opinion. Your opinion can be yes; your opinion can be no. That is an extraordinarily silly comment to make.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, members! Thank you.

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I know this has been a topic of questions this morning. Member, with respect I believe it is an opinion in that you are asking the minister to make a comment on her own conduct which is referred to in the report, so I am going to rule it out of order.

Ms SIMPSON: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, what is your point of order, member for Maroochydore?

Ms SIMPSON: My point of order is that I am happy to rephrase it: does she—

Government members interjected.

Ms SIMPSON: There is an Ethics Committee report and does the minister support the—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, members. Leader of the House, what is your point of order?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, you made a ruling in relation to the member for Maroochydhore's question. You did not invite her to rephrase the question. She has ignored your ruling and sought to start to ask the question again in the guise of a point of order. I suggest that you rule her out of order and sit her down.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I have been reasonably tolerant. The member has many years of experience. I am going to rule the question out of order. I call the member for Bundaberg.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I do not need your assistance, Minister for Education.

Public Hospitals, Waiting Times

Ms DONALDSON: My question without notice is directed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on investments this government has made in waiting lists and wait-time policy and whether there are any alternative policies?

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order. I rise in relation to standing order 115 and I ask about the latter part of that question seeking whether there are alternate policies and whether that fits standing order 115 in relation to questions.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: It might have been done all the time, but it may not have been according to the standing orders.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. We all know what everyone's themes are for today. In response to the point of order and question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have made my ruling. If you want to write to me about this matter, I invite you to write to me. I will review *Hansard* and if I need to reconsider my position I will report back to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. Sorry, but I am asking about whether asking whether there are alternative policy positions fits what is allowed to be in a question, because surely that is asking for speculation.

Mr SPEAKER: The answer is yes. Resume your seat. I call the minister for a response.

Mr DICK: I say to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that the first rule of holes is to stop digging. No wonder they do not want to hear it, because they are embarrassed—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Pause the clock. Member for Toowoomba North, you are now warned under standing order 253A. If you persist with those interjections, you will be asked to leave the chamber.

Mr DICK: I can report to the House that the government has made a very clear commitment to address waiting times. I thank the Premier, the Treasurer and my other colleagues in the cabinet and the government for the commitment of \$361 million in the budget over four years to address the waitlist for the waitlist—the 100,000 people who those members opposite left behind, waiting in the waiting room without getting a specialist appointment or outpatient test in a public hospital in Queensland. Since we have had that investment, we have reduced that waitlist by 18,000—from 100,000 to 82,000—thanks to the hard work of our hardworking staff and clinicians in public hospitals in Queensland.

It is now 184 days since I asked the Leader of the Opposition to come into this House and prove the statement that he made in this place that there was a \$500 million program for his wait time gimmick—that it was a \$500 million program and that it was properly costed; the money was there. This man has served 26 years and one day in the Legislative Assembly of Queensland. No member has more experience in this parliament, knows the rules better, knows the practice of this place better and knows the standards required of members of parliament better than the Leader of the Opposition. Yet he comes in here and makes reckless, baseless and, I say, false statements about a program that he was responsible for as the Minister for Health—184 days. He will not come in here and tell the truth that the program was a \$500 million program—a half a billion dollars for the wait time guarantee—that was properly costed; the money was there. It is very easy for the Leader of the Opposition to criticise others, but he will not apply the same standard to himself.

No wonder the members opposite had no money for health. It was all going to the electorate of Callide to build airstrips for 'Air Marshal' Seeneey—for his air wing, for his landing strips. There he was with the braid and the hat on, saluting when he got on the plane so that he could spend \$600,000 of public money flying backwards and forwards to his electorate. No wonder there was no money for the wait time gimmick, because that is exactly what it was.

That is the LNP members' alternative policy and they have promoted it during this parliamentary term. They cannot run away from it. Not only did they promote it when they were in government; they have promoted it when they have been in opposition in this parliamentary term. It is directly relevant to the choice available to Queenslanders. It is a fraud and the Leader of the Opposition needs to demonstrate the facts of his claim.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Dr McVEIGH: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that the police minister will retain her cabinet position?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have answered this question before. I have nothing further to add.

State Schools, Capital Works

Mr WHITING: My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the House on capital works projects underway in Queensland state schools?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. As he would know, this year we have a record budget for Education in Queensland—more than \$9 billion to ensure that we are delivering world-class education right across this state. As part of that budget, there is more than \$454 million for capital works to improve and upgrade our schools. That is \$64 million more this year, in the first term of the Palaszczuk Labor government, than what was delivered in last year's budget. In the member's electorate we are investing \$3.8 million for new classrooms at Bounty Boulevard State School.

Mr Whiting interjected.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection from the honourable member, because I know that he was lobbying for these classrooms very early on when he became the member. We are also investing \$600,000 for an additional classroom at Caboolture Special School in Morayfield. I also thank the honourable member for his advocacy. I had the time to go there. This week, at Emu Park State School in Keppel a \$3 million contract was awarded for additional classrooms and work will be completed in June next year. In the seat of my very good friend the member for Chatsworth, we are delivering a \$6.8 million expansion of Gumdale State School. That is \$6.8 million for my good mate over there. I know that it was promised by the LNP government, but it never delivered. But I will deliver for the member for Chatsworth. I am here to make sure that every child, no matter where they live, gets access to good-quality education. So I say to the member for Chatsworth that he could not get the LNP government to do it for him, but I will do it for him. The LNP never delivered on that important project.

In the seat of Rockhampton, there is \$600,000 for more classrooms for Rockhampton Special School. New amenities are under construction at Geebung State School. The work will be completed over the holidays. This quarter, 53 contracts have been awarded for capital works projects in our schools and 37 projects will be completed this quarter, worth almost \$60 million. That is what happens when you elect a Labor government to deliver education in this state.

While I am on my feet, I am also very pleased to inform the House that I have now received approval from the Minister for State Development for the transfer of land and building assets at 280 Newspaper Hill Road to the Noosa District State High School. I know that this property will deliver a great boost for education at the Noosa District State High School. I know that it is something that the honourable Speaker, as the local member, has advocated for.

We are getting so excited about delivering capital works not only in our state schools but also with the partnership that we have with our independent and state schools. Even the honourable member for Mudgeeraba is writing out little cheques delivering the money that we are allocating in our budget. So I thank her for her endorsement of our strong commitment to funding schools.

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Cook for his question, can I inform the member for Albert that he has had a pretty good go with his interjections all morning. He will now join the member for Toowoomba North with a warning under standing order 253A. Please desist from further unprovoked interjections.

Mareeba Bypass

Mr GORDON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply. Can the minister please advise whether his department has plans for the urgent construction of the northern section of the proposed Mareeba bypass, which is required as a heavy vehicle transport link between the Burke Developmental Road and the Mulligan Highway and as a heavy vehicle access to the developing Mareeba Industrial Park?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not familiar with the economic costings of the proposed project that the honourable member has raised, but I am certainly happy to have a look at it in detail and refer information to him when I have that at hand.

National Disability Insurance Scheme

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland. Will the minister advise the House how the Palaszczuk government is ensuring that the disability sector is prepared for the job creation that the NDIS rollout will bring?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for the question. I know that he is working very hard to make sure that people in his electorate are well and truly ready for the rollout of the NDIS. The benefits that the NDIS will have for Queenslanders with a disability are well known. The NDIS will enable people to have choice and control over their lives.

But another exciting aspect of the NDIS is job creation. It is expected that the NDIS will generate approximately 13,000 jobs across the state, creating opportunities in the disability sector and entrepreneurial opportunities in the broader community. It is essential that everyone is prepared for the landmark reform that will come with the NDIS rollout, and I am pleased to advise the members that the Palaszczuk government is spending more than \$1 million to expand and skill up the Queensland workforce ahead of the introduction of the NDIS.

This funding will support the Queensland NDIS workforce strategy, which is led by the disability sector. The workforce strategy is a good example of what can be achieved with successful partnerships between the disability sector and the state government. The strategy was developed through a consortium of peak bodies, including the Health and Community Services Workforce Council, the Community Services Industry Alliance, the Queensland Council of Social Service and National Disability Services. These organisations know what needs to happen on the ground to get the workforce ready for these opportunities and challenges.

The workforce strategy will focus on strengthening the current workforce and growing it to meet future demands. Through the strategy, Queenslanders will have the opportunity to access training and support that will help build their skills and knowledge around the NDIS and the disability sector. We will be looking for support workers, allied health professionals, administration personnel, marketing personnel and business experts. The opportunities are absolutely endless. In line with our election commitment, we will retain all accommodation support and respite services providing specialist support to people with high and complex needs. Importantly, Public Service employees can be reassured that, unlike under the LNP, they do have job certainty and everyone will have a job. We are proud to invest in the workforce that will provide dynamic solutions to meet the needs of people with disability.

Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services

Mrs SMITH: My question is to the police minister. Given the finding of the Ethics Committee report, will the minister resign?

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much for the question. The persistent questioning from the opposition shows that they have no interest whatsoever in the portfolio matters that I am responsible for. They have no interest in asking questions about domestic violence. They have no interest in asking questions about the scourge of the drug ice and other drugs in our community. They have no interest whatsoever in the safety and the health of our police officers.

Mrs SMITH: I rise to a point of order on relevance. I asked a specific question and I would like the minister to answer that.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Mrs MILLER: They have no interest whatsoever in the fact that it is our government that has rolled out body worn video cameras and they have no interest in public safety generally in relation to police, fire and emergency services and corrective services.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order and cite standing order 118. The question is very simple, very specific. Please get the minister to answer the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Mermaid Beach. I will allow the minister a reasonable degree of latitude. I would urge the members of the opposition to allow her to answer the question and if there are further points of order in relation to relevance I will listen to them if they are raised. I call the minister.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment. Member for Kawana, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist you will be asked to leave the chamber if I have to warn you a second time. I call the minister.

Mrs MILLER: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I know that the opposition obviously wants to put a certain moniker on me in relation to my portfolio.

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs MILLER: But can I say that I am getting on with the job of being the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and the Minister for Corrective Services in this state. That is what I am doing. That is what I will continue to do because the people of Queensland expect me to get on with the job of doing what I do in keeping the community safe right across Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the member for Mackay, I now also warn the member for Burleigh. You will join the member for Albert and the member for Toowoomba North under your first warning under standing order 253A. If you persist you will also be asked to leave the chamber.

Economic Development

Mrs GILBERT: My question is of the Minister for State Development. Will the minister outline how the Palaszczuk government is committed to economic development in the Mackay-Isaac-Whitsunday region?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Mackay for her question. This year Mackay is celebrating 100 years of Labor heritage. There are 100 proud years of Labor heritage in that town. It is such a disappointment to see the proud community of Mackay missing out so badly under the Royalties for the Regions program which we know was an absolutely despicable way to hand money out.

Recently my department co-hosted the Whitsundays major projects summit to promote the Queensland government's commitment to economic development of the regions. Mackay-Isaac-Whitsunday is the largest regional economy in Queensland outside the south-east corner and is ripe with potential for economic growth. The summit held just last month highlighted key economic opportunities for the Mackay-Isaac-Whitsunday region, including the Abbot Point Growth Gateway Project and the development of the Galilee Basin. If approved, the Abbot Point project will create up to 164 jobs and lead the way for thousands more through development of the Galilee Basin. The Queensland government supports the development of this basin because it creates jobs.

The Queensland government is committed to delivering these great economic opportunities for this state. This government is committed to investing in regional Queensland because the latest figures show that the regions contribute about 95 per cent of the state's total agricultural and mining exports. The Whitsunday summit is part of a series of regional events run by my department and our regional economic partners to provide businesses with up-to-date information about major projects in the pipeline in their local area. These events are also a great opportunity for local business and industry professionals to meet major project proponents. I attended the South-East Queensland regional major projects forum at Coomera in September. Unfortunately, I could not attend the forum at Bowen as I had other commitments in Brisbane including a very important community resources roundtable on that and also Executive Council. In October my cabinet colleague Treasurer Curtis Pitt travelled to Cairns to speak at Far North Queensland's regional major projects summit. At that event the Treasurer outlined the encouraging economic outlook for the region's construction and development industries. The far north is another area of regional Queensland that is showing great promise. Meanwhile, Mount Isa hosted its first industry breakfast only last week.

I am pleased to advise that we already have benefitted from these regional major projects summits and this includes Central Queensland's major industry forum on 11 February in Rockhampton, Townsville on 15 March, 7 June and 6 December and Mount Isa again in the first quarter of 2016. I am looking to attending as many of these as I possibly can in the New Year.

Public Hospitals, Auditor-General's Report

Mr McARDLE: My question is to the Minister for Health. Talking about reports of the Auditor-General, report No. 2 of 2014-15 found a cost blowout of over \$2 billion to taxpayers for hospitals which had no business plans. As the minister responsible for health and a minister under the former Labor government, can he give an official response to these independent and disturbing findings?

Mr DICK: Can I ask the member to clarify the date that that report was tabled?

Mr SPEAKER: Could you repeat the question?

Mr McARDLE: It is report No. 2 of 2014-15. I understand it was tabled in about April of this year.

Mr DICK: Those matters have been examined by the Auditor-General and, of course, those members opposite were responsible for the administration and the application and the finalisation of those projects.

Mr Springborg: That's not what the Auditor-General said.

Mr DICK: Well, no, they relate to hospitals, including the Gold Coast University Hospital, if I am not mistaken, Leader of the Opposition, that we constructed, that we designed and that we implemented as a government, that you built and opened. Similarly, it relates to the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital.

Mr Springborg: You did the business case.

Mr DICK: Which you were responsible for administering. I say through you, Mr Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition, of course we take this seriously. That is why we commissioned a review into the opening of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital to learn the lessons of how we should deal with and develop business cases, how we should commission and how we should open.

Mr Springborg: There was a duty when you were in cabinet.

Mr DICK: It is an extraordinary comment by the Leader of the Opposition that this somehow happened when I was in the cabinet of the 53rd Parliament. I am happy to answer questions as the Minister for Health in the 55th Parliament, but I am not answering questions to the Leader of the Opposition or any of the members opposite for things that happened in the 53rd Parliament. But it is not surprising they want to go back and airbrush out the last three years. The Leader of the Opposition of all people wants to airbrush it out. He could not even get out of his office in Charlotte Street and walk for 25 minutes across the Goodwill Bridge to get to the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital.

The Leader of the Opposition did not discharge his responsibility as a minister to properly oversight the completion of a large tertiary children's hospital, the largest in the nation and one of the newest tertiary hospitals for children in the world. He is condemned by his lack of action. He was negligent in what he did. We have learnt those lessons on two points. We are applying the lessons from the commissioning and opening of that hospital to the opening of the Sunshine Coast University Hospital and I know other organisations are also doing so. The executive team and the management committee of Hummingbird House have spoken to me and said, 'We have used that report to help us commission Hummingbird House hospice for children.' It is a lesson that will be learnt by all of us. Because of the failure of those members opposite, that commissioning report will be used by us, as we will use the lessons from the Auditor-General's report in relation to future infrastructure projects.

TAFE Queensland

Mr KING: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills. Will the minister please update the House on the government's progress in delivering the Rescuing TAFE policy, as TAFE is vital for the future training of apprentices and trainees in this state?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Kallangur for his question. I know he is absolutely passionate about training and our TAFEs across the state. As we know, the Queensland government committed to our Rescuing TAFE policy, which has a number of initiatives including establishing Jobs Queensland, and we have now passed those laws and are in the process of establishing that new body; the reintroduction of Skilling Queenslanders for Work, which we have done—round 2 has recently closed and I look forward to announcing the successful recipients of the round 2 funding early in the new year; of course, establishing an interim Training Ombudsman; and our commitment to getting rid of the Queensland Training Assets Management Authority.

The LNP government was absolutely determined to destroy TAFE in this state. They had no interest in a strong public provider in Queensland and they did everything to pull down its market share to make things very difficult. There was no level playing field in relation to TAFE being able to compete

and being able to use its own facilities. QTAMA had responsibility for taking ownership of not only the physical buildings themselves but also the equipment inside. TAFEs were told, 'We know this is your equipment, which has been bought over many years,' but in fact some of it was donated by small and large businesses across the state that wanted to invest back into their own communities for training. I am not talking about small equipment; I am talking about things such as a \$1 million gas plant that was donated to support TAFE Queensland's resource sector related training, as well as numerous motor vehicles and high-value household, commercial and electrical equipment necessary to deliver industry standard training. The TAFEs were told, 'When it comes to any new equipment that is bought or donated, QTAMA has ownership of it.'

In my travels around the state I have seen equipment sitting in rooms and not being used because QTAMA said, 'You can't touch that.' I thank the member for Greenslopes for inviting me to Mount Gravatt TAFE last week, where I saw a perfectly good building that cannot be used while teachers use demountables because QTAMA refused to fix the air conditioning. I can announce that on 1 December all of the equipment within our TAFEs was handed back to TAFE Queensland. That equipment is for them to use to deliver training so that we can provide the best quality training and students for this state.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Auditor-General's Report

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.23 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. I am advised that the Queensland Audit Office website shows that report No. 2 of 2014-15 titled *Hospital infrastructure projects* was tabled in this parliament on 21 October 2014. I do not believe and I do not contend at this point that the member for Caloundra deliberately and intentionally sought to mislead the parliament or to put questions to me that were misleading. However, I suggest that the member for Caloundra check the record and, if he has questions about that report, he should put them to the then minister and speak in his party room to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! This is not an opportunity for a debate.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Resumed.

Queensland Government Crest

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General please advise whether the Attorney has received advice in relation to the prohibited misuse of the Queensland government crest on non-government documents and paperwork and any penalties that apply to that misuse?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, can I have the question repeated, please?

Mr SPEAKER: Silence please, members. There is too much noise. Question time does go until 11.35 this morning. I call the member for Beaudesert to repeat the question.

Mr KRAUSE: Can the Attorney-General please advise whether the Attorney has received any advice in relation to the prohibited misuse of the Queensland government crest on non-government documents and paperwork and any penalties that apply to that misuse?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I understand the member is not asking you for legal advice; he is asking whether you have received advice.

Mrs D'ATH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for his question. I am not aware of receiving any advice, but I am happy to check with my office. I will confirm that and get back to the relevant member.

Cycling Infrastructure

Mr RUSSO: My question is to the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports. Will the minister advise the House how his department is working with local governments to deliver infrastructure?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for Sunnybank for his question and for his strong advocacy for cycling on the south side of Brisbane. I suspect that he, like me, is more of a lifestyle cyclist than a lycra cyclist, but I endorse his commitment to cycling.

In the past 10 years, in Brisbane and across the state, we have seen an enormous surge in interest in cycling such as we have not seen before. Cycling infrastructure is a very important economic piece of infrastructure in our city and not just from a practical point of view, whether that is commuting or good health; it is also important to attract those new economy workers who are more likely to use them. Therefore, I am very pleased to announce that the Palaszczuk government has awarded new grants totalling \$2.7 million to seven local governments in regional Queensland for the delivery of important cycling infrastructure. Local governments will match the funding to complete missing links in principal cycle networks that have been done collaboratively between local and state governments. The \$2.7 million builds on the \$6.5 million in cycling infrastructure grants to local governments included in QTRIP released in July this year. The new funds are part of a \$17 million injection between now and 2018-19 that the Palaszczuk government has made to expand the cycling infrastructure programs statewide.

The 12 new projects that I am announcing today are an important milestone in the expansion of the principal cycling network outside South-East Queensland. They are further evidence of our commitment to regional Queensland that we are a government that delivers right across this state. I also share our commitment to working with local governments. The following local governments have received funding through this allocation: Bundaberg, Cairns, Gladstone, Livingstone, Mackay, Rockhampton and Whitsunday regional councils. The projects will enable more people to use cycling in a safe, high-quality way.

I am pleased to announce even more communities will benefit from the statewide cycling grants program in 2016-17. On 2 November this year, local governments were invited to apply for a share in \$15 million in matched grants. Local governments with an endorsed principal cycling network plan will be eligible to apply for funding through the program. Applications close on 29 January 2016. I encourage all local governments to take advantage of this opportunity to access that funding.

This commitment is in strong contrast to the Newman government's slashing of \$98 million, which it took away from our cycling programs during its three years in government. They slashed in Springfield, slashed in Springfield and the former minister called it gold plating. I can tell the House that cycling is an essential part of our transport network.

Independent Public Schools

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Minister for Education. Would the minister advise how many schools that applied for independent public school status in the latest round were rejected due to unions vetoing the proposal?

Ms JONES: I am not aware of any, but I am happy to have a look at that. Can I be very clear that what we always do is ensure that the whole school community supports a change in the way the school is run. As the minister, I actually think that having teachers endorse what happens at the school they work in is a good thing. I am not going to lock anybody out. Every single piece of research shows that what makes the biggest difference in the classroom is the quality of the teacher standing up the front. What goes to the heart of good quality teaching is the workforce.

Mr Mander: What about the parents?

Ms JONES: The parents are involved too.

Mr Mander: One hundred per cent parents.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you have asked your question. It is not appropriate to make further interjections of that style.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection that it is all about the parents and not about the teachers. What I like is a balanced approach—that is, where we actually have teachers, parents, principals, the whole school community, working together. I will never make decisions which attempt to divide school communities and lock out key parts of the school community. As we have just discussed, the most important part is the teachers.

What we have seen this year is a real change in the way the education department operates. That is because we are taking a very collaborative approach. The way I have approached this portfolio is ensuring that all stakeholders—every single key stakeholder—sits around the table. They have the best interests of delivering quality education at heart.

It does not matter if the honourable shadow minister speaks to the principals associations, the parents associations, the independent schools associations, the Catholic schools associations or the Queensland Teachers' Union, he will hear the same thing. The feedback I am consistently receiving from stakeholders is that they have never felt so consulted. I have taken the approach that when we are making big decisions everyone should be sitting around the table.

As I have already said here today, the Premier made it very clear when she became the Premier of Queensland that education would be front and centre of this government's agenda. I am privileged that we have been able to deliver—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms JONES: Thank you, member for Nanango. I am privileged that under this government and the Premier's leadership we have not only secured record funding for education but also delivered significant reforms through our Advancing Education policy.

We have done this, once again—surprise, surprise—in collaboration with all stakeholders. Guess who we included? Teachers. We thought it might be a good idea to talk to teachers about how we should deliver education in Queensland. I know; call us crazy, but we actually like to talk to teachers about how we deliver education. There is no greater privilege than changing the lives of children through good quality education. Labor will fight for this every single day.

Chinese Academy of Sciences, Partnership

Mr PEGG: My question is to the Minister for Science and Innovation. Will the minister please advise the House on the relationship between Queensland and the Chinese Academy of Sciences?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. I know many of his constituents in the seat of Stretton are Chinese or from an Asian background. I thank him for his ongoing commitment to the partnership that we have with the Chinese government.

I am pleased to advise that on 18 November I extended the statement of intent between Queensland and the Chinese Academy of Sciences, CAS, for a further three years. Queensland is the only place in the world to have a joint agreement with CAS, one of the world's most prestigious scientific organisations.

Agreement was also reached to extend the jointly funded Queensland-Chinese Academy of Sciences Collaborative Science Fund, Q-CAS, to support further scientific collaboration between Queensland and Chinese researchers. This \$1.75 million agreement, with \$875,000 from Queensland matched dollar for dollar by CAS, will support three Q-CAS funding rounds.

The Q-CAS fund aims to foster high-level research collaboration and industry networks between China and Queensland. Specific areas of focus are agricultural biotechnology and food research; human health, including immunology and neuroscience; and energy. Since 2010 the fund has supported nine research projects and five research fellows. To date, collaborative research projects have included treatment for oral cancers, improving solar energy generation, forest biodiversity and better understanding climate change.

A great example is QUT's collaboration with the Institute of Plasma Physics on a clean, low-cost solar electricity project. The project is looking to develop new materials and technologies to make durable, non-toxic, high-efficiency solar cells. If successful, the new materials have the potential to revolutionise the solar electricity industry.

Another example is the collaboration between Griffith University's Eskitis Institute and the Shanghai Institute of Materia Medica to understand the science behind traditional Chinese medicines. Collaboration is at the heart of the Palaszczuk government's \$180 million Advance Queensland initiative.

(Time expired)

PRIVILEGE

CFMEU Rally, Security Breach

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.35 am): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Earlier I had indicated that the Labor affiliated CFMEU union thugs, after rallying in support of an alleged woman abuser, were on the level 12 balcony. I have been advised that these union thugs were, in fact, more concerningly, in a more public place—the level 5 balcony. I correct the record accordingly.

MOTION

Order of Business

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.36 am): I move—

That general business notices of motion, House to take note of committee reports, be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Citizen's Right of Reply

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.36 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House notes report No. 158 of the Ethics Committee and the recommendation of the committee that a right of reply be incorporated into the *Record of Proceedings*; and
2. That the House adopt the committee's recommendation and incorporate the right of reply into the *Record of Proceedings*.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

RESPONSE BY MACKAY REGIONAL COUNCIL, TO EVIDENCE GIVEN AT A PUBLIC HEARING HELD BY THE FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE ON 25 MAY 2015 AND STATEMENTS MADE BY THE MEMBERS FOR FERNY GROVE AND MURRUMBA ON 4 JUNE 2015

On 25 May 2015, Ms Kate MacDonald made the following statement to the Finance and Administration Committee:

The Industrial Relations (Fair Work Act Harmonisation No. 2) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013 saw myself and my colleagues lose many valuable conditions from the industrial award I work under—specifically, the loss of locality allowance, fifth week annual leave provisions, job security and major change notification. As mentioned in my written submission, I am a single mother. I struggle each day to assure my children that everything will be okay when I am unsure myself. Losing \$18.65 in locality allowance to drop almost \$1,000 a year has a significant impact on our family when for years it has been a guaranteed feature of my income.¹

On 4 June 2015, the Member for Ferny Grove made the following statement:

Further real-life experiences of the effect of those insidious LNP laws were provided through evidence from Ms MacDonald, a local government worker at the Mackay Regional Council. Ms MacDonald explained how she and her work colleagues lost many valuable conditions from the industrial award they work under—specifically, the locality allowance, fifth week annual leave provisions, job security and major change notification. She explained that as a single mother she struggles each day to assure her children that everything will be okay when she is unsure herself. Losing \$18.65 in the locality allowance, meaning a drop of almost \$1,000 a year, has had a significant impact on her family.

We heard tonight members opposite in this chamber talking about freedom of choice. What freedom of choice did Ms MacDonald have in respect of losing her locality allowance?

Also on 4 June 2015, the Member for Murrumba made the following statement:

Let me give the House an example of what local government workers at Mackay Regional Council were facing if their agreement proceeded under the Campbell Newman laws. In recent enterprise bargaining negotiations, the Mackay Regional Council set up a corporation called Northern Australia Services. There is some secrecy surrounding Northern Australia Services, but this is what I have been informed. Northern Australia Services is 50 per cent owned by Mackay Enterprises, a council company owned 100 per cent by council. Reportedly, the other 50 per cent is owned by Partnership Australia which is 50 per cent owned by the LGAQ. Yes, the LGAQ would form a company that would benefit from the Campbell Newman laws.

The crucial thing for workers is what the council wants to do with Northern Australia Services. Northern Australia Services will perform council services and ostensibly look for contracts across Northern Australia. Services at Mackay Regional Council that would go across to NAS would include IT, client services, rates, accounts, procurement, debt collection, administration support, payroll, HR and software systems. Reportedly, 650 workers from council would go across to this

new company out of a workforce of 1,400 people. Now this company—part owned by the LGAQ—is a game changer for local government workers across northern and western Queensland. It is a potential threat to the workforce of all the local councils in those areas. It wants their outsourced business. No wonder the LGAQ opposes these new laws that prevent this contracting out. We could say goodbye to our white-collar workforce in council if this kind of set-up was introduced by councils.

The member for Maroochydore said earlier that the local council complained that the entry level for council workers is 20 to 30 per cent above the private sector. She also said that the council complained that they cannot contract out to the private sector. The real complaint is that wage levels are too high for local government workers. That is the real complaint. The crux of it is that they do not want to pay more for local government workers than what they are paying them now; they want to pay them less.

The council workers in Mackay—the ones not in Northern Australia Services—are facing this if the restoring fairness bill does not get up. Under the proposed agreement, they would lose an extra week of leave and their locality allowance. No-one would be disadvantaged with regard to their base pay, but they would lose their allowance in favour of a new reduced allowance. Under this proposed agreement under the LNP laws, existing conditions would be preserved in a separate document. These are the non-allowable matters that we have heard about tonight. These are the crucial working conditions that would not be in their new award. What is more, a worker can only enforce the conditions in this document through a civil action, not through the commission. They have to say to their employer, 'I'm going to take you to court because you're not giving me these conditions.'

The Mackay Regional Council (the Council) refutes the assertion that Council employees have suffered a loss of, or change to, their conditions. The Council contends that at no time did any employee of the Council have any change in conditions as a result of the changes to legislation or the Award. Council has its Certified Agreement, and at all times continued to employ staff under the terms of this agreement.

The Mackay Regional Council also refutes the claims on secrecy surrounding Northern Services Australia. Council has briefed all staff on a number of occasions and questions may be asked by staff on the Council's intranet. The pending arrangement was also announced at the 2014 LGAQ State Conference.

The Mackay Regional Council also refutes the number of staff employed by the Council and the number of staff moved to Northern Australian Services. The Council workforce is circa 1,100 and the number of staff in the Northern Australia Services program is 141.

The Mackay Regional Council refutes the assertion that Northern Services Australia will be a threat to all local councils. The Council contends that Northern Australia services will ensure the Council's operations remain cost effective and efficient, which will in turn relieve ratepayers of 10-12 per cent rate increases of the past.

The Mackay Regional Council asserts that it has not contracted out its services, rather its employees have a new reporting arrangement. The Council also asserts that the application of conditions to employees of Council are based on the Award and also the terms of any Certified Agreement. Whilst the Award conditions may change, it is inaccurate to assume that the same would translate to the ultimate agreed terms of the Certified Agreement.

Queensland Legislative Assembly, Record of Proceedings (Hansard), 25 November 2014, p. 3920.

RELATIONSHIPS (CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS) AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 17 September (see p. 2010).

Second Reading

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (11.37 am): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

On 17 September 2015, the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 was introduced into the Queensland parliament. I am proud to rise today to reinstate civil partnerships, restoring equality and fairness for all Queenslanders. Let us hope that this time it is here to stay.

The bill delivers on the government's commitment to reinstate civil partnership ceremonies by enabling couples, regardless of their gender, to hold a civil partnership ceremony prior to registering their relationships as a civil partnership. The bill also makes amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 2003 to provide recognition of electronic records and support the move to a digitised births, deaths and marriages registration service.

The bill was referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for consideration. The committee tabled its report on 17 November 2015.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Grace): Order! There is too much audible conversation. There are members on my right and some on my left who are not in their seats in accordance with standing order 244. I ask members to take their seats. The minister has the call. We are debating a bill before the House. I ask for silence for the minister to be heard.

Mrs D'ATH: Whilst I thank the committee for its consideration of the bill, I must place on record my surprise and disappointment that the committee's report did not recommend the bill's passage. The committee's decision is baffling given so many submissions to the committee were compelling in their arguments about the need for this legislation, including the personal impacts when the previous government removed the ability for couples to elect to hold civil partnership ceremonies.

The committee's decision is also baffling because of the simplicity of what the bill seeks to do. The bill simply reinstates previous provisions providing a personal choice for couples of any gender to hold an official civil partnership ceremony to declare and celebrate their love prior to registering their relationship. The bill also makes important terminology changes to reflect a couple's commitment to each other—for example, by renaming registered relationships as civil partnerships. Some might argue that changes in terminology or technical changes are not important. What look like simple changes in legislation can actually bring about significant outcomes for those involved. When it comes to what is the most important relationship in our lives, language and rituals are important. The changes in terminology in this bill restore the dignity and the respect that all of our loving relationships deserve, regardless of gender and sexuality.

As at 4 November this year, 6,856 heterosexual couples and 1,227 same-sex couples had registered their relationships in Queensland. This bill does not mimic marriage. Even taking into account the possibility that a federal plebiscite on marriage equality may be successful at some unknown point in the future, this bill provides choice for heterosexual couples who would prefer a civil partnership rather than enter into a marriage and provides same-sex couples with the ability to have their loving relationship recognised today.

I have heard the arguments that this bill does not need to occur because of actions that may be taken by a federal government into the future and that, if such actions were taken, that would make these changes redundant. However, as I have just stated, even with the Marriage Act in existence right now for heterosexual couples, 6,856 couples since 2011 have chosen to register their relationship as a civil partnership under our state laws.

The government understands that there are sectors of the community that oppose both the current legal recognition of relationships in the Relationships Act 2011 and the reinstatement of civil partnership ceremonies. It is, of course, the right of citizens to have different views, and this helps build a robust democracy. However, it is the job of governments to ensure that laws are fair and that they do not deny rights and choices to people on the basis of attributes such as sexuality. It is the job of governments to ensure that laws recognise that, despite our differences, we are all the same in fundamental respects and deserve recognition of this. This government is committed to ensuring laws support the equality, dignity and choice of all Queenslanders, and this bill does this in one of the most important areas of our lives—our committed intimate relationships.

It is worth reflecting on the human impact of the repeal of civil partnership ceremonies. I would like to thank those members of the public who shared their experience with the committee about the impact of the previous government's decision to remove a couple's choice to participate in a civil partnership ceremony prior to registering their relationship. The committee heard how couples felt real hurt—how couples felt that the then government did not want them living in Queensland and they were thinking of leaving the state. I would like to make it clear today to all Queensland couples, irrespective of gender, that this is your home and your state, and your relationships are valid and worthy of recognition and respect.

Although the committee did not make any recommendations in relation to the bill, I will address matters highlighted in its report. Firstly, the committee queried whether the imposition of a maximum penalty of six-months imprisonment for offences relating to the performance of civil partnership ceremonies is excessive. These offences and penalties were in the Civil Partnerships Act 2011 when it was originally enacted and reflect the offences and penalties in the similar schemes in the Australian Capital Territory's current Civil Unions Act 2012. The Commonwealth Marriage Act 1961 also includes a maximum penalty of six months for similar offences in relation to the solemnisation of marriages. As the bill's explanatory notes indicate, these offences provide incentives for civil partnership notaries—who will officiate at these ceremonies—to meet the legislation's formal requirements and discourage people misrepresenting a ceremony as being under the legislation. This, in turn, assists in upholding the integrity and community regard of these ceremonies.

The committee report noted a submission from a civil celebrant that the bill should require regulation and scrutiny of the behaviour of civil partnership notaries. In this context the committee also noted—

The regulatory mechanism used to monitor the performance of civil partnership notaries is unclear: it is assumed that an issue would have to be brought to the attention of the registrar by some means.

The government considers that the bill appropriately regulates civil partnership notaries through eligibility requirements, annual return processes and cancellation provisions. These features will ensure that only suitable persons are registered as civil partnership notaries. The eligibility criteria for registration requires the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages to be satisfied an applicant is an adult who is appropriately qualified to exercise the functions of a civil partnership notary and is a suitable person to be registered as a civil partnership notary.

In addition, the bill also includes an annual return process where a notary is required to annually update information given in the registration application. This enables the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages to assess whether the person continues to be suitable to be a notary. Where there is concern about the performance of a notary, the registrar also has a power to cancel a notary's registration if the registrar considers the notary is no longer a suitable person to be registered as a notary following a show-cause process. This level of regulation is appropriate to the functions and responsibilities of notaries.

The government members' statement of reservation noted that some submissions wanted the bill to automatically recognise same-sex marriages and civil unions entered overseas or interstate as civil partnerships in Queensland. The Relationships Act 2011 has an existing framework for recognising particular relationships in other jurisdictions as registered relationships under the act. This framework requires particular laws and relationships in other jurisdictions to be prescribed by regulation. Currently only relationships registered under relationships schemes in other Australian jurisdictions have been prescribed by regulation and taken to be registered relationships under the act. The government is giving further consideration to the issue of recognising overseas same-sex marriages and overseas civil unions as civil partnerships under the Queensland legislation.

The government members' statement of reservation in the committee report also notes one of the issues raised in the public hearing on the bill was that relationships should be terminated by a court rather than the current process where the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages registers the termination of the relationship. Under the Civil Partnerships Act 2011 as enacted, terminations of civil partnerships were made by District Court order. However, the government considers that the alternative termination scheme introduced by the former government in 2012 is appropriate for the administrative based relationships registration scheme under the act. Other jurisdictions also provide a similar termination mechanism, with some also providing the option of a court based termination. Given to date no concerns have been raised about the operation of the current termination provisions, it is not proposed at this point in time to alter current arrangements.

The statement of reservation in the committee's report also noted that the Society of Notaries of Queensland Inc. recommended that the references to 'civil partnerships notaries' be replaced with the term 'civil partnership celebrants' to avoid confusion with the role of notaries public. The government considers the term 'civil partnership notary' is appropriate. The bill restores the term as it was used in the Civil Partnerships Act when it was originally enacted in 2011, and the term itself indicates that these notaries have a role that is specific to civil partnerships.

In closing, I would like to reflect on the words of the Very Reverend Dr Catt, representing the Anglican Church of Southern Queensland Social Responsibilities Committee, in the public hearing of the bill. Dr Catt stated—

The importance of ritual cannot be underestimated. This bill, through the reintroduction of ceremonies, offers the opportunity for social recognition for those to whom such a ritual will reflect the depth of their commitment.

This social recognition and acceptance of committed relationships of couples irrespective of their gender is an important issue. This bill forms part of a bigger responsibility of government—to ensure that our laws and systems are fair and for everyone. This is a responsibility this government takes very seriously. I am very proud to commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (11.50 am): As the House knows, the LNP has decided to have a free vote on this issue. Although leading the debate as shadow Attorney-General, my speech, therefore, is that of my own opinions and not those of the party. Others will speak in the debate and express their views as well. I am proud that on this issue our party has taken the free vote attitude. The

Attorney-General made the point in her speech that this is a matter in which members of the community have differing and very strong views. I think the free vote that the LNP has allowed its members allows them to represent their views and their electorates in this place and to vote accordingly. I am proud of the decision that has been taken.

I also think it is important from the point of view of my party to make it clear that we have taken significant steps this year to ensure that we speak to the LGBTI community within Queensland. I was pleased to go with the Leader of the Opposition to a business breakfast organised by that community quite some months ago and to make it clear that in respect of a number of matters of concern to that community the opposition was very keen to see the government move in a number of particular areas. They were areas such as the elimination of the gay panic defence and the elimination of historical convictions for homosexual activity that goes back to the days when that activity was illegal. My party has been keen to ensure that we keep discussions open with that community, while not always agreeing with that community or any other community with which we need to speak to make sure that we understand their concerns and respond appropriately to them.

I want to go through the history of this measure to explain why I come to the position that I reach on this bill today. The process started quite some time ago, going back to the law as it related to what were then called de facto couples—in those days, heterosexual couples—trying to find a legal structure to deal with the legal rights and needs of people who were not married—who did not want to or who had not got around to going through the ceremonial part of a formal marriage but who needed legal protection by way of property rights and similar things. I suppose it started in that way of thinking and then moved more formally to the bill that the then treasurer in 2011, Andrew Fraser, introduced as a private member's bill in the House. It was a fairly rushed, last-minute measure that came in in the dying days of that government. It was not sponsored by the government of the day but was a private member's bill which passed through the House.

In 2012 when the Newman government came to power, our side of the House relooked at that bill and there were some issues of concern to us at that time. The bill was amended to preserve the important legal protections for people who entered into a relationship, be it a same-sex relationship or a non-same-sex relationship, but it did remove, as the Attorney pointed out, the reference to the name of civil partnerships and the ceremony.

The reason that was done was that we were concerned at that time that the ceremony and the name could lead to a mimicking of the marriage relationship. It is a bit difficult to put yourself back in those times, but at that stage the law was unclear as to whether marriage of same-sex couples was a state responsibility or a federal responsibility. The definition of marriage in the Constitution was open to interpretation. It could be defined as only male-female relationships, and therefore same-sex marriage was a matter for the state, or it could be defined to include same-sex relationships. We felt at that time that, because of that lack of clarity and the prospect of confusing the civil partnership ceremony for a marriage ceremony, it was wise to remove those provisions. I voted for the removal of those provisions and I believe that was the correct thing to do at that time.

The situation changed on 12 December 2013 when the High Court considered the matter and unanimously held that marriage including same-sex marriage was a matter for the Commonwealth parliament and not the states. I believe that reinforced the Newman government's caution in the area, because it was not clear until that point where the constitutional ability to deal with same-sex marriage arose. The decision means that the states cannot legislate or purport to legislate for same-sex relationships that are exclusive relationships for life—in other words, marriage—because they are the responsibility of the Commonwealth. Any relationship that we regulate in this parliament can only be one that does not fall within that category of a lifelong commitment—that is, marriage. This act, therefore, deals with other relationships that do not fall within that category. If the state authorises a ceremony for these relationships, it cannot be an exclusive commitment for life. That, again, is marriage and will be dealt with at the Commonwealth level. It is confusing. It is, however, legally the case.

Where are we now? The High Court's position makes absolute sense. Marriage should be a federal responsibility. People who commit themselves to each other for life should not have that relationship recognised in one state but not in another. It is a sensible thing that the federal government cover the field in this area. In relation to marriage, the Commonwealth government will deal with that matter in the very near future. We know that the current federal government, should it win the next election, has committed to a plebiscite in respect of marriage of same-sex couples. We know that the opposition has committed to legislate in that area should it win the election. Within a reasonable period of time the issue in relation to same-sex marriage will be resolved for Australia.

I disagree with the Attorney-General when she says that a sensible legislature would not wait to see what happens in that regard. I believe marriage is a very different issue from the one we are debating today. Where the relationships that we are speaking about fit within the range of relationships available to people is very much guided by whether or not same-sex marriage is accepted in the federal parliament. Let us say that same-sex marriage is accepted and ceremonies for marriage become the norm for same-sex couples. One would think that would have some impact on the attitude you would take to ceremonies at the state level. On the other hand, if same-sex marriage is rejected at the federal level, you may take a very different view as to whether a ceremony was desirable or what sort of ceremony it would be at the state level. My own view is that it would be sensible for this legislature to wait to see what happens with the federal government's decision on marriage and then to legislate here. That would be what a sensible legislature would do, but that is not open to us because the government has brought this measure before us today. That means that we do have to make a decision.

That leads me to the decision that I have made. I do believe that the way in which this has been brought to the parliament is premature and is designed to create some political conflict over this matter. I believe that, if the legislature were to wait to see what the federal government did, there may be a way of moving forward in a more bipartisan way on this issue. Unfortunately, that is not to be the case.

One thing that is clear from particularly the last year or so is that it has become an unfortunate part of our political system that citizens are caught in the crossfire of one party moving in and undoing what another party has done. I am not saying that applies to one side of politics only; it has been the unfortunate nature of our political system. As the Attorney pointed out, some 8,000 couples have registered their relationship under this legislation since it was introduced in 2011. I am concerned that their wellbeing will be compromised by the political toing and froing over this issue.

I found it difficult to come to a decision in relation to this bill for the reasons that I have set out. I do believe it would be much more sensible to wait and see what the marriage arrangements are and then fit this bill in accordance with what the nation decides, hopefully by plebiscite, but as I said that does not look like it is going to be open to us. So I have decided to support the legislation and I am doing so for three reasons.

The first reason is that I think it is very clear that what we are talking about now—and I distinguish it from the situation in 2012—is not a circumstance where we are unclear as to whether this is about marriage or not. Clearly it is not about marriage. The High Court has decided that the marriage issue will be decided at a federal level. This is about relationships which are not marriage relationships, and that makes the decision easier for me.

The second reason is that, as the Attorney pointed out, this is largely about ceremonial and symbolic matters. I am not saying that they are not important, but I am of the view that there is no substantive change in the law in relation to how people's relationships are affected, and I would find it difficult therefore to stand in the way of it for that reason.

The third reason, and perhaps the most important, is that if one had a heart and looked at this matter it would be unfair to keep those who are caught up in the political to and fro of our system in that continuing position. In order to resolve the matter in a way which does not in my opinion offend any principles that I hold with respect to the substance of what we are doing, my intention is to support the bill.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (12.01 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. I support this bill. This bill restores dignity to adult couples of any gender who wish to show their commitment and love for one another in a publicly recorded ceremony. This bill also restores respectful language when referring to the couple's commitment. The term 'partnership' will be reinstated instead of the term 'relationship'. The term 'partnership' is reserved for relationships that are close and special. It is important for couples to have a legal ceremony that is recognised and not to have to continually prove that they are in a de facto relationship for state and Commonwealth purposes.

When the former LNP government abolished civil partnership ceremonies, there were couples who had already taken part in a civil partnership. They had experienced the joy of declaring their commitment for one another in front of family and friends. They went through the process of preparing for their ceremony, choosing flowers and outfits, sending out invitations—just like any other couple preparing to publicly declare their commitment and love. They were devastated to have their status as a couple diluted to a mere registration.

I have seen firsthand the hurt caused to couples and their families. A former work colleague of mine, Shannon, and her partner, with their joint families, were devastated and bewildered that the joy they had shared at their ceremony was snatched away from them. Their parents, brothers and sisters,

and friends stood proudly with them and celebrated their happiness on the day of their ceremony. The message that this couple's parents got from the former LNP government's removal of the civil partnership ceremony provisions was that their daughter's partnership with her chosen lifelong partner was of no importance—in fact, it was an illegitimate partnership in the eyes of the government.

The amendments of this bill will reinstate the status of partnership ceremonies for couples like Shannon and her partner who want a dignified ceremony with their community. This bill gives couples seeking a civil partnership stability. Stable relationships make stable communities. I commend the bill.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (12.04 pm): I rise to support the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. It is a bill that delivers on the Palaszczuk government's election commitment to give couples of any gender the right to celebrate an official ceremony while having their relationship formally recognised. I think it is a very important principle that people should have an equal role in our society no matter what their orientation or background. One of the great things I have seen in my time as an adult over the last 20 years is the social progress that acknowledges that people from an LGBTI background are equal members of our community and they should have equal rights—just as over the last 40 or 50 years people from different racial backgrounds have been accepted by the mainstream community—that everyone should have an equal go and a fair go in our community. In the same vein, women have been recognised as equal members of our community. We have seen tremendous social progress in the last 50 years and I see this reform in that light.

I see today a range of things that I think are worth noting. I acknowledge the previous reforms brought in by former premier Bligh and former treasurer Andrew Fraser in 2011. They recognised that the time was here for those rights to be recognised to the extent that the Queensland parliament could do so. I accept that this is not necessarily related to marriage; this will allow people from all backgrounds to register their relationships. Not everyone wants to be married, not everyone is religious, but people should have the right to make those decisions without discrimination.

One of the reasons we are here though is because of the failure of the federal parliament. While we have seen marriage equality reforms happen in other countries—and New Zealand's reforms were particularly remarkable and very moving, I might add—what we have seen in Australia is a continuing failure of the federal government to keep pace with the views of the Australian community on this. That is absolutely shameful. It is time the federal parliament got with the program and acknowledged that the Australian community and the Queensland community believes and strongly supports that LGBTI people should have the same rights as everyone else in this community. So I see this bill very much in that broader light and I think it is unfortunate that some people still see it from a myopic point of view—that somehow this is all about tactics. I think it shows a really base point of view from some members.

This is a sign of social progress, and I acknowledge the role of the opposition leader in allowing a free vote. I think that is a positive move and I acknowledge that that is a good move. It is a leadership move from him and I acknowledge that that is a sign of progress. In that light, I welcome the views of a range of members opposite who will be supporting this bill, and I note the member for Clayfield, the member for Mansfield and the member for Noosa, who very courageously put his position out there a few months ago. I acknowledge his role in terms of providing leadership on the other side of the House. As a sign of social progress, the member for Kawana finally came around—after it was some of his work that took away those rights of people in Queensland in 2012, and that was a very sad and sorry situation.

It is not the role of this parliament to interfere in the rights of people in their relationships. It really is not. This parliament should be supporting people, especially in a situation of a relationship where it is a matter of commitment and love between people. People should be supported in those measures. People should be free of judgement. That is what a modern and contemporary community is all about. It is very important for the parliament to send out those signals to the community about what is reasonable, to support those people and to help them be equal members of our community. That is what this bill does.

I am very proud to be part of a government that is persistent about implementing our values in this regard. My side of politics introduced this in 2011. We are very proud of that. It was not for tactical reasons. It was because we deeply believe in equal rights—we still do—and that is what today is about. We cannot sit around waiting for the federal government. The federal government should get on with it. If the Prime Minister wants to differentiate himself from the previous prime minister, he should allow a conscience vote right now on the issue of marriage equality. Let us get on with this in this country in

terms of making it very clear that every member of our community should have the same equal rights as other members of the community. It is not the role of the state to judge people and discriminate against people based on their sexual orientation, gender or race.

This is the 21st century. We should value the contribution of everybody. We should be very clear about the signals we put out as a government that that is what our values are. We see those values, I might add, under challenge in a violent way in many other parts of the country. So let's be clear about supporting those values here. Not only does that send a signal to our community and Queenslanders, but more broadly it sends a signal about what social progress is, what social inclusion should be about. I am very proud to support this bill. I look forward to its passage not only with the support of this government but also with the support of some of the members opposite.

 **Ms GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (12.11 pm): I rise proudly to support this bill. The main purpose of the bill is to fulfil our government's election commitment to provide couples of any gender with the equal choice of having an official civil partnership ceremony prior to having their relationship registered. I remember when this issue was debated back on 30 November 2011 and the glee that the LGBTIQ community had when it was finally passed in this House. It was a proud moment for me. The Queensland government at the time did all it could to pass laws registering civil partnerships. However, unfortunately a bill was debated on 20 June 2012 and was passed the very next day—at about 12.30 am, from reading *Hansard*—that stripped away the rights to a state-sanctioned ceremony, changing the title of the act from 'civil partnerships' to 'registered partnerships' in an effort to remove any entitlements seen to be, in the words of the member for Mansfield, mimicking marriage. These actions, which caused significant hurt to the LGBTIQ community, are best described by a witness to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, Alistair Lawrie. He stated—

The decision to abolish civil partnership ceremonies, and the haste with which it was achieved, was an unjustified, divisive and mean-spirited act—and I commend the current Queensland Government for taking steps to undo the damage that was done three years ago.

I add that I may never have been able to quote this witness due to the unorthodox and exclusionary position of the non-government members opposite who would not support such evidence being part of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee final report on the bill. I commend the government members for the statement of reservation and for providing the evidence they received from the community, which included personal narratives, and recognised the time and energy these witnesses put into their valuable submissions and evidence.

Ceremony and the right to hold one is important. Rituals are also important and so is the right to participate if one chooses. This is best summed up by the Very Reverend Dr Peter Catt from the Anglican Church when he said to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee—

A ritual is the event that gives the feel of reality to an event. For example, at St John's Cathedral we have a burial register in which we record a person's death, but it is the funeral—the ritual—which helps people to grieve and move through the grief process. ... This bill, through the reintroduction of ceremonies, offers the opportunity for social recognition for those to whom such a ritual will reflect the depth of their commitment.

I do not think I could have said it better. I also quote Mr Stephen Page on behalf of the Australian Lawyers Alliance. He stated—

The ability to merely fill out a form without any public celebration of their love is short changing these couples in having that love celebrated with their friends and family, and, if they are religious, with God.

...

The key to the 2012 amendments was to deny that public celebration of love.

I believe no government has a right to take that away from citizens in this state.

Language, ceremony and recognition are important. If you do not agree, tell those from the LGBTIQ community who are in the gallery today and who were affected by the previous government's laws. I go on again to quote the Very Reverend Peter Catt where he puts it so eloquently. He stated—

Language is humanity's most powerful tool and weapon, hence the saying "the pen is mightier than the sword". The change in language that was introduced by the 2012 bill, altering partnership to relationship, caused a lot of hurt.

I agree with him entirely.

I recognise the members from the LGBTIQ community who are in the gallery this afternoon and I welcome them. Unlike the actions of those opposite when their bill was debated in June 2012, the gallery will not be cleared. They will be able to stay there and they will be welcomed by this side of the House. There are some hardworking members of the LGBTIQ community in the gallery, and I acknowledge some of them. Some are not here but I acknowledge Phil Browne of the LGBTIQ Action

Group, a tireless advocate for that community; Michael Scott from the Queensland AIDS Council; Stephen Page and Mitchell Shrimpton; Mr Emile McPhee of the LGBTI Legal Service; and, of course, Shelly Argent of PFLAG—and I acknowledge Shelly in the gallery today as well as Phil Browne and Peter Black, who also form part of that team. There are many more in there—I see Richard and others who are in the galley and I acknowledge them all and say, ‘Welcome to the gallery. You won’t be cleared today. You will be able to stay until this is voted on and we get this up in the House today.’

I take the opportunity to also acknowledge the work of the Transgender Support Association of Queensland. The president, Gina Mather, and the secretary, Kristine Johnson, of that association have worked tirelessly since its inception in 1990. On the weekend the ATSAQ had their Christmas celebrations at the Sporties in Spring Hill. I went along with my daughter. We enjoyed the show and the festivities greatly. I know the member for Chatsworth has these two members of that community in his electorate. They do exceptionally hard work in not only supporting members of the transgender community but in raising policy issues and issues such as equality for civil partnerships and in other areas of the law in this state. I thank Gina and Christine very much for all their hard work.

I take this opportunity to sum up by saying that this bill is about rectifying a wrong that was done in 2012. This bill is about reversing a mean-spirited attitude towards the LGBTIQ community that existed back then. Although I welcome those opposite who will cross the floor and join us today to vote in favour of this bill, I say that this government’s bill is about addressing an inequality brought about by those opposite. This bill is about equality. This bill is about recognition. This bill is about respect and valuing members of the LGBTIQ community. I stand here once again proudly commending this bill to the House. I look forward to voting in favour of it.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Sunnybank—ALP) (12.18 pm): I rise today on behalf of the people of the electorate of Sunnybank to speak in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. The purpose of this bill is to restore the rights of couples of any gender to hold a state-sanctioned ceremony and have their relationship recognised as a civil union.

It will reverse the 2012 amendments which were brought in by the Newman government and return the law to how it was under the Bligh government in 2011. This bill will return the title ‘civil union’ to the legal relationship available to same-sex couples. It will restore a ceremonial and ritualistic aspect to the union process, allowing for the making of declarations before the documents are signed. These amendments would not be necessary had it not been for the previous government’s blatant attempts to undermine the legitimacy of the relationship between same-sex couples.

After only six months in office, the previous attorney-general introduced legislation that he himself defined as purely symbolic. It did not affect the legal application of a civil union, but merely changed the name of it and reduced the process to one similar to registering a pet or a new car. The justification given to this blatant act of discrimination was that civil unions too closely mimicked marriage. On top of this, the LNP attorney-general claimed that such changes were urgent and deemed it necessary to fast-track the registered relationship amendments. The government bypassed the community consultation process and the laws were passed in a matter of days. The previous government did not bother to ask the community what they wanted and did not make the time to listen to the effect this would have on Queensland’s LGBTIQ population. It also resulted in awful situations where couples who had celebrated a civil union woke up one morning to find that the legal standing of their relationship had been changed.

The LNP’s 2012 amendments were trivial and hurtful, and it is right that our government is taking steps to remedy this damage. I have long been an advocate of equality not just within society, but unequivocally under the law. I believe that a person’s sexuality is their private business, as is their choice as to who they spent their lives with. Neither of these personal choices should be judged by the general public, least of all by parliamentary representatives. The law should not discriminate. All consensual, loving, committed relationships are worthy of acknowledgment. I commend the legislation to the House.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (12.21 pm): I rise to make a contribution in support of this bill. I am proud to support this bill as a step towards equality for all Queenslanders. Equality is a core democratic principle that underpins our society. Unfortunately, there are still areas of our current laws which ignore this principle. For me this is all about the fact that there are people in my community—people that I am tasked with representing—who love their partners in exactly the same way as I love my wife Kim but who are unable to celebrate that relationship with their family and friends in the same way that we did and who are unable to have their relationship recognised in law in the same way that ours is.

At a state level we may not have the power to introduce marriage equality, but re-introducing civil partnerships sends the clear message that we recognise those relationships, and we will keep pushing the Australian government to recognise those relationships too. One of the first of many spiteful acts by the Newman government was to downgrade civil unions—which was introduced by my predecessor and good friend Andrew Fraser—to registered relationships. How romantic. Can you imagine turning to your partner and saying, ‘Darling will you register me?’ After decrying Labor for pursuing what they called a ‘non-priority issue’, the LNP could not wait. Within weeks of being elected to government in 2012 the member for Kawana had civil unions on the scrap heap. This prohibited the state from offering ceremonies for those who wished to register their relationship in this manner. And for what? A waste of time and taxpayers’ money to strip back the rights of people who already have fewer rights to begin with.

This bill reflects, as far as is legally possible for a state government, the desires of the majority of Australians to provide dignity where it is denied in the federal Marriage Act. I hope it will increase pressure on the federal government to provide that dignity through marriage equality. Marriage equality in this country will happen; I believe it is inevitable. For my friends who are in same-sex relationships, I know that one day I will share your wedding day with you. In the meantime, I want you to know that the state government respects your relationship in the same way that we do heterosexual relationships.

There has been an incredible movement across the globe to stand up for marriage equality and for LGBTIQ inclusivity, and I am so pleased it is gaining traction here in Australia. The re-introduction of civil partnerships and state sanctioned ceremonies available to all Queenslanders regardless of gender or sexual orientation is something this government committed to and something we are proud to deliver. Societies are better when they include all of their citizens. We know this is the right thing to do. The evidence of that is so strong that even the member for Kawana has had a change of heart, and I have commended him for that. With this bill we are righting a cruel wrong perpetrated on same-sex-attracted Queenslanders by the former LNP government. They may have been motivated by hate, but this bill is motivated by love. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (12.25 pm): I am proud to rise in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. I support the restoration of civil partnerships and I encourage others to do so as well. The responsibility of marriage or marriage-like partnerships is a very personal experience between consenting adults. It can be hard work at times, but when it is fulfilled by caring adults with mutual respect, love and devotion to each other it can be one of the most rewarding choices we make in life. I do not believe same-sex couples should be denied the opportunity to express that love and commitment before their friends and family.

As leaders of our community, we must not get out of step with the attitudes and expectations of the people that we represent here in this place, and there is overwhelming community support for this. Communities around the world are changing to provide marriage equality. Marriage equality laws have been passed in many countries including Canada, the United Kingdom, France, New Zealand and the United States, and I hope that Australia joins these countries soon with our own marriage equality laws. Australia’s Marriage Act 1961 is the responsibility of the federal government, and while I am not able to directly vote to change this law, as a state member of parliament I am proud to support the re-instatement of state sanctioned civil ceremonies as part of Queensland’s current civil union laws.

During the recent state election the Premier made the commitment that a Labor government would restore the system of recognition of civil ceremonies for same-sex couples put in place by the Bligh Labor government that were removed by the Newman LNP government, and today we are delivering on that promise. We do know that we are removing anachronistic discrimination that has no place in modern legislation. The Anti-Discrimination Commissioner’s submission is one that I think clearly sums it up. In supporting this bill, the very intelligent and deeply committed Kevin Cocks said—

Providing the option for same-sex couples to have their relationship recognised, with or without a civil ceremony, is consistent with the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of a person’s sexuality. The Bill reflects leadership in supporting equality and nondiscrimination.

I am proud to stand up and support the restoration of this important right for loving, committed same-sex couples entering into a binding union.

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (12.27 pm): I also rise this afternoon to speak in favour of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, and in doing so it gives me pleasure to support another Palaszczuk Labor government pre-election commitment. I do acknowledge

all of the committee members on the committee that I chaired, the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, and also the secretariat and Hansard staff for their commitment to avail themselves on Melbourne Cup afternoon, when the hearing was held for this bill. I think it speaks volumes about the commitment of that committee and those staff who availed themselves on that day.

However, the committee met some challenges in reporting to this House. The committee report speaks for itself, showing government members provided a statement of reservation detailing the substance of evidence in summary of those submitters and witnesses before the committee. As chair of the committee I found this extraordinary, to have to go to this length to provide to the House clear and concise evidence to all Queenslanders.

This bill will reinstate the provisions in the Relationships Act 2011, formerly known as the Civil Partnerships Act 2011, for adult couples of any gender to hold a civil partnership ceremony prior to registering their relationship. The committee received 29 submissions, sought and received written evidence from the department in relation to responses to matters raised in submissions and held a public hearing, as I indicated, on 3 November 2015.

Evidence from the department was interesting. It actually provided data making it clear that marriage equality and civil partnerships are separate issues, as the following facts indicate. There have been 6,856 heterosexual and 1,227 same-sex civil relationships registered with the Queensland Registry of Births, Deaths and Marriages. Expressed as a percentage, this means that 72 per cent of those civil partnerships registered in an average month are heterosexual and 28 per cent are same-sex. Despite opinions provided by FamilyVoice Australia that civil unions mimic marriage, the committee was advised otherwise by parents of gay people and partners themselves. One example came from one of the witnesses, Mr Tinkler, who conversely expressed this view to the committee. He said—

Civil Partnerships are not the same as marriages and although we support marriage equality as a completely different issue, we see Civil Partnerships allowing a modern and secular way in which committed couples like ourselves can celebrate our love for each other.

That is what it is all about. It is all about love for each other as couples. The Very Reverend Dr Catt in his evidence made the relevant point to the committee—

No matter what happens in the federal sphere about marriage, there will be people who will be looking for civil partnerships for all sorts of reasons. They are actually quite separate issues, in my view.

The bill does provide all couples who are not married an opportunity to hold an official ceremony to acknowledge and celebrate their commitment, regardless of the sexuality of the couple. This bill poses no discrimination to anyone. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (12.31 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. I would like to begin by thanking my fellow committee members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee as well as the secretariat staff and the technical scrutiny secretariat.

The key object of the bill is to restore the provisions of the Relationships Act 2011, formerly known as the Civil Partnerships Act, for adult couples of any gender to hold a civil partnership ceremony prior to registering their relationship. This bill will ensure that adult couples, regardless of their gender, can have an official ceremony to acknowledge their union and provides an option for couples to make a declaration of their intention to enter a civil partnership before a registered notary.

The Palaszczuk government is delivering on its election commitment on civil partnerships by introducing to parliament legislation to give couples of any gender the right to celebrate an official ceremony while having their relationship formally recognised. The bill also provides for the recognition of interstate civil partnerships, or civil unions, as civil partnerships for the purposes of Queensland state legislation.

The Civil Partnerships Act 2011 was passed by this House on 30 November 2011 and commenced operations on 6 December 2011. On 20 June 2012, the newly elected Newman government introduced the Civil Partnerships and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which sought to remove the right to a state sanctioned ceremony and the dissolution process, and changed the title of the act and terminology used from 'civil partnerships' to 'registered relationships'. The bill currently before the House overturns the LNP's attack on equality that tried to belittle and hide public recognition of same-sex-couple relationships.

The committee received 29 written submissions to its inquiry. Submissions came from parents of gay and lesbian people, individuals directly affected by the bill, civil celebrants, advocacy organisations and legal services. An overwhelming majority of the written submissions were supportive of the bill—27 in favour to two against. A number of submissions noted that the bill reinstates rights that were removed by the 2012 amending act, causing significant hurt. As Alastair Lawrie submitted—

The decision to abolish civil partnership ceremonies, and the haste with which it was achieved, was an unjustified, divisive and mean-spirited act—and I commend the ... Queensland Government for taking steps to undo the damage that was done three years ago.

The Department of Justice and Attorney-General confirmed that the civil partnerships framework is separate from and different to marriage. The two frameworks exist in parallel. The civil partnerships framework will continue to operate following any changes to the framework for marriage.

The government is aware that there are strongly held and differing views on the proposed changes, but in making the changes the government has undertaken genuine consultation through the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, with religious and family groups, church groups, the legal community, celebrant associations and lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual and intersex organisations participating. The Palaszczuk government is proud to be leading the way on such an issue of basic human rights. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.35 pm): I rise to participate in the debate of the bill before the House. I think this is the third occasion on which I have been present in this chamber as we have sought to legislate this matter, to change the construct around civil unions in Queensland. This bill basically seeks to reinstate the provisions in place prior to about three years ago.

My views on this have remained consistent. Again today they will not change. Having said that, I think there is a recognition that this government came to power with a commitment to reinstate civil ceremonies in Queensland, just as there was a commitment in 2012 by the LNP to make changes at that particular stage. Today the LNP makes a commitment that our members will have a free vote on this issue. I think there was a free vote for members of the Labor Party when this matter originally came before the parliament.

We understand that this is a deeply personal issue for many people and that people hold deeply personal views. Those views may change from time to time. That is only right and proper as people undergo different experiences and have a chance to reflect upon their own personal view of the world and the way they may have seen things. I think we need to understand and respect that.

The LNP has a party policy that supports civil partnerships in Queensland but does not support the associated civil ceremony. The reason is that it was felt very much that that sought to mimic marriage and that marriage should be a particular covenant between a man and a woman and, indeed, that that is something best handled by the Commonwealth government apropos the Marriage Act. I certainly understand, respect and support the policy of the LNP in Queensland.

A moment ago I mentioned that there are different views amongst my colleagues—and probably there are different views that people hold deep down on the other side of the House as well. Certainly, a significant number of LNP party room members question the motivation of the government in doing this, but it is what it has done. There are members of the LNP party room who oppose the reintroduction of civil ceremonies, there are members of the party room who support it, there are members of the party room who are ambivalent and there are members of the party room who would prefer for this matter to be left until such time as we have the promised Commonwealth plebiscite on the issue of same-sex marriage.

So there is a diversity of views and therefore I absolutely respect that and I think it is highly appropriate that we allow our members a free vote. Whatever the case may be, I suspect that without too much doubt this proposal by the government will pass during the course of the afternoon. However, it is also important to address a common misconception in the community, and that is that there is no protection for those people who may be in a civil relationship when it comes to matters of succession and when it comes to matters of making decisions around the necessary medical intervention for a loved one if they do not have the capacity regardless of whether they be same sex—two men living in a relationship or two women—or indeed a man and a woman living in a relationship. It is important to note for the record that the current legislation in Queensland—the current law in Queensland—recognises absolutely the legal standing of those civil partnerships regardless of the sexuality of those people who have entered into those relationships. Therefore, there is the legal protection that should be accorded to people who are in those relationships and have made a commitment to each other by way of a civil partnership agreement, and that should be protected absolutely and that should be supported absolutely and that is something that people need to be aware of.

Today this bill by and large proposes to rename those registered relationships which are in effect civil partnerships as such and to also provide an opportunity for a state sanctioned ceremony, which was the concern of the previous government when that was removed about three years ago as a consequence of it generally mimicking marriage. There was a significant amount of support within the community for that at the time and I think that is the hallmark of this issue—that is, with the effluxion of time people do change their minds and there has been a realignment of community views, and there are probably more people in the community now who believe that those state sponsored civil ceremonies are matters that should be an instrument that is recorded as an opportunity of devotion and love to be publicly displayed by those people entering into a civil partnership.

I respect the view that is in this parliament regardless of how the vote occurs later and I would implore those who ask for respect on one side with regard to the diversity of views to have the same respect all the way around. For my part, I will be voting for the status quo. My opinion has been this and continues to be this and I do not believe it will change, but who knows. For all the reasons that I mentioned before it may change, but I have a very strong and firm personal view around that. I have a similar view when it comes to the issue of same-sex marriage, but that will be a matter for the Australian people. If the Australian people vote accordingly, then I will respect that absolutely and it should be legislated to reflect the will of the Australian people. Indeed, in my own personal situation I would probably be prepared to consider the issue of a civil ceremony after that particular vote, and indeed if that particular vote went in the negative and maintained the covenant that marriage is between a man and a woman there might then be a way of being able to reflect it in not the same way as marriage but by way of civil ceremony for same-sex or other couples who did not wish to enter into what has been an historical contract between a man and a woman. I, like Mike Baird, have a very traditional view on this. It is something that I have for no other reason than the way that I feel deeply and personally, and it is the same in that I respect other people who have a deep and personal view either in favour of this or in a different way. Therefore, I applaud my colleagues who have considered this in a very mature way that this is an issue that people have deep personal views on and therefore they should be offered a free vote. That is something that I look forward to seeing play out in this parliament later this afternoon. As I indicated before, I will be supporting the status quo.

 **Mr RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (12.44 pm): I rise in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. Madam Deputy Speaker Grace, like you, on 30 November 2011 I was very proud to rise in this chamber and communicate my support for the then bill. It is with a similar pride that I rise today to also provide my support for this bill, but it is also with a little bit of sadness because we are back at this point having to fight for equality for all Queenslanders. I would have thought that when we fought for equality four years ago and won that fight that would have been a fight that we would not have to have again, so it is with a bit of sadness but also pride that I rise in support of this bill. On 30 November 2011 I said—

My vision for Queensland is that together we can continue to build open, tolerant, supportive, understanding and compassionate communities where we together promote an agenda to ensure that all Queenslanders—all people—are treated equally irrespective of their marital status, sexuality, race or religion.

Today we have the opportunity to fulfil that vision once again and restore equality for Queenslanders, irrespective of their sexual orientation, with this bill. I was on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee which considered this bill and I was very pleased to see government members ensure that the views of all submitters to the committee's inquiry were recorded. It was disappointing to see that those views had to be recorded in a statement of reservation to the report because, unfortunately, we could not get support from those opposite to include that in the body of the report, but nonetheless it is important that those views be recorded and noted.

As I said, I am very proud to rise in support of this bill today. I ask all members to consider supporting this bill. I also ask those people who might not necessarily agree with the terms of this bill to talk to each other, to talk to their children and to talk to their neighbours and their friends and their family, to have an open mind and to think about the type of Queensland that they want to live in. This is a bill which continues that great reform of providing greater equality and tolerance in Queensland. I would be hopeful that following all those conversations that members and people will have with each other they will also see that this is great legislation which goes to making Queensland a fairer place.

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (12.47 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. This is a bill that restores the provisions of the Relationships Act 2011 and is something that I feel passionately about. It is about

ensuring adult couples can have an official ceremony to acknowledge and celebrate their relationship regardless of their genders. We went to the last election with a clear commitment on civil partnerships and today we are one step closer to seeing this become a reality for Queensland's same-sex couples. This is about equality for all Queenslanders and, as a proud member of the Labor Party, something I am pleased our party stands for. This comes after the shocking attack on equality we saw from the LNP when in government. Those opposite tried to take Queensland back to the Dark Ages, belittling and taking away public recognition of same-sex couples. Even though Labor introduced the relationship registration and official ceremonies process in 2011, the very next year the clock was wound back, scrapping the rights of same-sex ceremonies and recognition of civil partnerships. By contrast, I am proud to stand here today in support of restoring these rights to people in same-sex relationships.

My husband and I recently celebrated our 20th wedding anniversary. I still remember how special our wedding day was and what an important occasion it was to be able to share it with our loved ones. I want all Queenslanders to be able to enjoy and share a special ceremony as a symbol of their relationship and commitment to each other.

I understand that this issue has drawn both support and opposition from members of the public. However, I believe that the majority of people in my electorate are supportive of equal rights for Queenslanders. We are a government that listens and the proposed amendments to this bill have been widely consulted with key marriage celebrant associations, lesbian, gay, bisexual, trans and intersex organisations and legal groups as well as religious and family groups. The bill's explanatory notes acknowledge that generally stakeholders were supportive of the proposed amendments or did not provide comment.

The bill has also been considered in detail by the parliamentary Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I note the comments made by the committee chair and the member for Ferny Grove in the report that the committee was unable to reach agreement on the bill. I join with government members of the committee to express my disappointment. This is the same kind of denial that we saw from the previous government.

This bill is about restoring a basic right that was stripped away. I want to live in a state where everyone is valued equally and adults in committed relationships can celebrate their love and dedication to each other no matter their gender. That is why I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (12.50 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the bill before the House. Again, we have before the House a bill that represents Labor keeping an election promise. We know from media reports of last week that many from both sides of the chamber support this legislation. It is refreshing that the debate and community discourse on this topic has moved on to the point at which we can have a rational discussion on this topic.

In the past, marriage equality has been hijacked by extreme views that pollute a debate about equal rights. Under the Newman LNP government, civil partnerships were denuded of the partnership ceremonies that are a key part of giving value to these relationships. This bill will restore respect to all couples in Queensland seeking to make the commitment to each other. It means that official ceremonies prior to registering a relationship will occur instead of just the registering of the relationship in the same way one might register a car or a pet.

Symbols matter. They give meaning to our lives by representing the way in which we think and see the world. This ceremony is a symbol of love and commitment and I think that we should recognise and celebrate that in our state laws. I note that this law will apply equally to civil partnerships between two people no matter their gender or sexual orientation.

I am Labor because Labor is about fairness and this bill strikes me as fair and reasonable. This bill represents what our state can do on this matter. Currently, I am engaged to my partner, Melissa, and we will soon be married. Melissa and I have the right to marry each other because we are in a heterosexual relationship. It strikes me as profoundly unfair that, although we have the right, other adults in our country do not. It is almost as if the state places a higher value on my love than that of other people.

I know that there will be some in our community who see opposing marriage equality as upholding a certain value set. That might be the case, but it offends my values. That is why I am glad to vote for this Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. For the community at large I say that if I could do more, I would. But I stand with the campaign to see full marriage equality in our country. In the meantime, for those who seek something other than full marriage and wish their commitment to each other to be recognised in another way, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (12.53 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. I am very happy to speak in support of this important bill as it is a matter of great personal significance to me. This bill will restore provision for adult couples of any gender to hold a civil partnership ceremony and to register their relationship.

Nearly 30 years ago, I was able to declare my love and commitment to my partner in the beautiful gardens of the historical Shire Clerk's Cottage at the Waterloo Bay Leisure Centre and to celebrate and share this formal commitment to each other in front of friends and family. It is fair, it is right and it is just that couples, irrespective of their gender, have an opportunity to hold officially recognised civil partnership ceremonies. Although this bill does not mimic marriage, it provides choice for heterosexual couples and same-sex couples who would prefer a civil partnership rather than a marriage, with the ability to have their loving relationship recognised and, upon registration, the relationship having legal status.

Being able to publicly declare your commitment and love to another person in front of your loved ones is a milestone moment in life and it should be possible for each and every member of our community, regardless of gender, to experience this commitment if they choose. As a parent, this is an event that I am looking forward to for both of my children. This bill will ensure that my son and daughter can, if they choose, declare their love and commitment to their partners with a public ceremony and, hopefully, some grandchildren sometime down the track—but no pressure, Callum and Audrey. I know that some may not share my views. I am deeply respectful and understanding of their point of view. However, I feel that each of us has the right to show the one we love our commitment, faithfulness and loyalty and to have the opportunity to hold an official ceremony to acknowledge and celebrate our relationships with family and friends. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (12.55 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. This bill will restore the rights of adult couples regardless of their gender to have an official ceremony that acknowledges and celebrates their relationship. Love knows no gender. Discrimination against same-sex couples has to end and we must take more steps forward to ensure equality for all.

I appreciate that there are differing views on this issue within my electorate of Gladstone, but I consider that these changes are about fairness, equality and respect for the dignity of all members of our community. I support this bill wholeheartedly and, in doing so, I would like to share a story told directly from Jill, who works in my office: a mother, a wife and a good friend of mine. This is her story. She states—

At age 24 our daughter told us that she was dating a woman. Raised on a farm with her three siblings, educated at boarding school and with a big circle of rural friends.

You know what it's like when something comes out of left field right? We were shocked

Upon digesting her words, an early question to our daughter was 'What will your brother and sisters think'? She exclaimed 'They already know'. This was a way forward for me. They hadn't suddenly moved overseas, or gone to ground.

There were emotions of course. However, we are family, we love and support each other and nothing else really matters.

More conversations were ahead with extended family, friends and neighbours.

Of course being in a small farming community word spread quickly through the grape vine. The look on many locals faces.

Flabbergasted is the only word that comes to mind. With their stumbled words they tried to offer empathy and look for possible explanations.

Well it couldn't be anything in the water out there, this is our Kara, our first born.

Popular, loyal, fun loving, sporting, honest and hard-working like all other kids in our patch. Being gay was the unique difference.

When that right person comes into your child's life you just sense their happiness and their excitement—love changes everything. The words 'I'm engaged' were spoken in 2012.

A genuine commitment to another person for the rest of her life, I giggled nervously to myself, engaged, what does this mean in Australia? Every mother wants her little girl to have the fairy-tale wedding, a benchmark in her life to look back on.

You may think that witnessing the marriage of your daughter to her partner via skype from New York, USA on Jan 2nd 2013 would be enough.

What about inviting 183 guests to your front lawn, decked out exquisitely in a truly premier celebration on June 8 2013?

What about the fake certificate, stored in the album of your daughter and her partner, isn't that enough?

You may find this a little bit out of your comfort zone, but I proudly call the special person in my daughter's life, my daughter-in-law, because in my eyes that's what Kelly Anne is!

But right now she is just a clayton's version, according to the law.

This beautiful human loves, respects and honours my girl. Isn't this what every mother wants for their child? So, isn't that enough?

I say no. No, it's not enough. I want to be able to say this lawfully, my daughter is legally united with her partner, the woman that she loves.

Our family deserves that dignity. That would be fair, right and just.

The best thing about history is the change it has invoked. Centuries ago these two people would have been killed, perhaps stoned to death.

Earlier last century they would have remained hidden with their secret and, if found out, persecuted, shunned and perhaps harmed.

But isn't evolution wonderful. This happy couple have their own home, a beautiful garden, a dog, a cat and neighbours who wave and look out for them.

They go out in public in our regional town without fear and soon they can celebrate their legal partnership.

In another century someone may be looking through our family tree. Prior to now they were going to find a spinster and exclaim, I wonder why she never married.

With a civil partnership certificate registered in the files of history, someone in the future is going to be saying—Oh my gosh! Look at that, she was united with a woman.

So this is the story of the travel consultant and the fashion designer, they found happiness and love, and now the promise of a legally recognised partnership, the fairy-tale ending every mother wants.

That's the story I want written into history.

As the member for Gladstone, that is the story I want written not only for Jill, her daughter and her partner, but also for the electorate of Gladstone and the whole of Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Butcher, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Fernvale, Severe Weather Event

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.30 pm): I wish to inform the House how the Fernvale community is recovering from the storm supercell that devastated the town at about 4.15 pm on 27 October with an intensity that has been compared to a category 3 cyclone. The small vibrant town of Fernvale sits on the Brisbane Valley near Wivenhoe Dam at the southern end of the Somerset region and the northern end of my electorate of Ipswich West. I live nearby at Lowood and, as a former Somerset regional councillor and delegate to the Somerset local disaster management group, I am very grateful to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services, Jo-Ann Miller, who came to me in this chamber on the evening of the 27th to make sure I knew that a severe storm had hit Fernvale and she was doing everything possible to assist. The following day the minister allowed me to accompany her to inspect the Fernvale area where she and I spoke to a number of storm victims. In less than a week she had organised disaster assistance for the Somerset Regional Council pursuant to the Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements. In real terms this means that the council clean-up bill, in the order of half a million dollars, will have about half of that figure met by disaster assistance from state and federal governments. Multiple houses suffered major structural damage in the storm, many others lost their roofs, with vegetation and trees right across the Fernvale area wiped out. Dead birds were everywhere; something I had never seen before. But as we have seen previously, such as in the 2011 and 2013 floods, the Fernvale community proved resilient.

I have been amazed by the support provided to the town by community groups, volunteers and government agencies. I would like to thank the Department of Emergency Services and the State Emergency Service or, as we call them, the orange angels. SES crews came from all over the Somerset region, as well as from Ipswich, the Scenic Rim region, Logan City and the Gold Coast City with over 60 members undertaking a range of callouts including temporary roof repairs, clearing trees and establishing temporary communications as well as providing catering facilities. The council tells me there were over 180 SES callouts with the rural fire brigade doing its bit in support.

Thanks are also due to the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services community recovery team who doorknocked the entire area to ensure everyone received the assistance they required. Departmental staff Pierre Dunemu, Fay Maszczyk, Karen Mills, Sylvia Preston, Lynda Klerks, Bruce Turner, Beth Walter, Letitia Reeves and Sue Kirby all deserve congratulations, particularly

community recovery officer Annabelle Johnstone and regional director Brooke Winters. St Vincent de Paul provided essential supplies such as blankets, toiletries, food and water as well as food vouchers, lead admirably by Dorothy Stevenson.

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Before I call the member for Surfers Paradise, I acknowledge the former member for Kallangur, Trevor Ruthenberg, in the public gallery.

Body Corporate Legislation

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.34 pm): I recently met with residents in my electorate who live in the Xanadu complex. They wanted me, as their local representative, to tell the parliament their story and the issues that they are experiencing. Sarah is 60 years old. She moved from Sydney and bought a unit at Xanadu at Main Beach in September 2012. She planned to live there long term. She was not happy with the level of cleaning and decided to engage a contractor to clean the tiles in the foyer on her level prior to moving in. She was delighted with the outcome, which contrasted with the dirty appearances of the other tiled foyers. She became aware that the body corporate committee were not happy with the building manager's performance of his duties. She later discovered she was not alone and that the building manager had no interest in long-term residents but was focused solely on keeping happy the owners who had their units in the letting pool.

Sarah attended an extraordinary general meeting in August 2014 which voted to terminate the caretaking and letting agreement with the building manager. The building manager applied to QCAT for an injunction and for an order that the breaches were invalid and his termination was invalid. Sarah, like many owners at Xanadu, are totally perplexed as to why QCAT has still not heard this matter. Other disappointments for Sarah included being requested by the building manager to pay him over \$200 to let her into her master-keyed unit after locking herself out; hearing at committee meetings that the manager does not inspect external contractors' work before submitting invoices for payment; the building manager's refusal to attend committee meetings; having to go to the post office to get her parcels now that the building manager refuses to accept them; learning that the building manager reduced reception hours by 18 hours per week contrary to his agreement; and having her unit advertised for sale on the building manager's website when it was not listed with him. Sarah complained to the Office of Fair Trading who investigated this, along with other complaints by permanent tenants about the building manager's breach of the Residential Tenancy Act. The Office of Fair Trading subsequently imposed a civil penalty of \$10,200 as a result of the building manager's conduct. Sarah was very distressed at the inability of the committee and lot owners to ensure the building manager acts reasonably and performs his duties.

Sarah has recently become aware that there are over 400,000 units in Queensland. She firmly believes that the rights of these owners and their families, possibly a million people, are ignored by outdated laws that need to be urgently reformed. It is a significant issue in the electorates of Surfers Paradise and Southport. The former LNP government realised that body corporate law in Queensland has been used as a political football over many years. All that created was winners and losers. That is why we commissioned in August 2013 the QUT Property Law School to undertake a wholesale review of body corporate law in Queensland with a significant consultation process. The review and any subsequent reform needs to be done in a way that maintains the appropriate balance between the rights of all parties affected in body corporate legislation. I was concerned to read an article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* today about a proposal that could allow high-rise managers to take advantage of unit owners. I note that the Attorney-General has called for submissions on this issue. I urge her to continue the widespread consultation and sit down with owners and affected parties.

Townsville Hospital Foundation

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.37 pm): Today I rise in the House for a very special reason. Whilst I realise our parliament is a serious place where we all get to look after Queenslanders, today I get to go that little bit further by wearing this jacket. Yes, it takes a brave man to stand up in this place in a pink floral number, but a member has to do what a member has to do. To date it has raised over \$5,000 for the Townsville Hospital Foundation children's ward for Christmas.

To give members the origins of this little number, I wore it to the Townsville Hospital charity ball, which was South Sea Island themed. I wanted something to match my wife's dress. I walked in there and I was immediately challenged by the member for Townsville and plenty of other gentleman that if I wore that in parliament they would help me raise money for the charity ball. I said yes. But I had to have

great inspiration. I got that from Mr Steve Price, or Pricey as he is affectionately known, from 4TOFM in Townsville, who has plenty of 'Tropical Friday' shirts and jackets. I asked him where he got it from and he said he got it from Lowes. I said, 'Mate, can I lend it?' He said, 'Absolutely.' But I did go to Lowes and buy one so it is here to stay!

I have to thank a whole lot of people. I am going to start with the Premier, who has helped me raise money by encouraging the entire Labor caucus to donate. I thank all my fellow parliamentarians for donating to such a worthy cause. I want to talk about the Townsville Hospital Foundation, an organisation led by an excellent board of volunteers. They care. They care about the people who enter our hospital. They do so much. They have 150 volunteers. They are the ones who give up their time to don a bright yellow shirt and do so much for our tertiary hospital that receives patients from right around North Queensland. Their aim is to make the patients' hospital experience as pleasant as possible. They do a whole lot around the hospital. They provide the hospital with vital medical equipment and improve patient facilities. They provide additional training. They deliver the canteen trolleys, provide cancer clinic companionship, emergency department angels and children's ward programs.

I want to acknowledge a few people: Townsville Mayor Jenny Hill; Mr Dolan Hayes; Pat Brady; Jane Miller; Pat Driscoll from Driveit!; Patricia O'Callaghan from Townsville Enterprise; Kari Arbouin from CQU Townsville campus; Matt Lawrence, Gary Bullock and Deb Gillot from United Voice; Life Tec Townsville; Stephen Pether; Elissa Ferguson from Dreamtime Training; Ken Byron; Townsville Motorcycle Riders Association; Bernadette Symes and the Symes family; Cathy O'Toole; Evan Moorhead; Wendy Bourne; Don Wilson; Dr Ben Butson; Wayne Preedy from Queensland Fire and Emergency Services; Grahame Finlayson; and Mr Ken Kipping. Thank you very much, everyone. It is going to a great cause.

Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (2.40 pm): On 1 December, Mr Russo, the acting chair of the PCCC, made a statement in this House. That statement reflected on me and the committee generally. I table that statement.

Tabled paper: Extract from the *Record of Proceedings*, undated, regarding the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee [1832].

I believe the statement makes it clear that the PCCC is dysfunctional under the leadership of the acting chair. There are principally three issues: (1) that the position of the chair of the PCCC is still an acting role and urgently needs to be resolved; (2) the PCCC is so dysfunctional under the acting leadership of the member for Sunnybank that in six months we have not even been able to finalise a bipartisan and efficient way to organise when to meet; and (3) there have been substantial delays in the Attorney-General's appointment processes that have been blamed on the PCCC when, in fact, members are simply trying to ensure that the CCC has the most suitable nominations appointed.

Firstly, let me clarify the facts, although under standing orders my hands are somewhat tied. On 9 November at 6.04 pm, on a day when the committee had conducted five hours of business, the Attorney-General wrote to the committee. A more timely letter could have been dealt with on that day. Receipt of that correspondence confirmed that the Attorney-General took some seven months to write to the committee regarding those appointments. The excuse given by Mr Russo in his statement for the seven-month delay, in defence of the Attorney-General's complete inaction, was the delay in the Attorney-General's appointment of Mr MacSporran as chairman. Mr MacSporran, a fine appointment as chair, commenced on 1 September. Mr Russo, in turn, blamed that delay on the committee's decision-making process.

I would like to point out to the House that the committee is chaotically led by the acting chair and member for Sunnybank, who should not try to absolve himself of responsibility for the PCCC's dysfunction. The acting chair then unilaterally called a meeting on Wednesday, 11 November. While standing orders give him that power, it took us by surprise as the Labor members have consistently refused to meet on the Wednesday of a sitting week. Many months previously, I had confirmed that I would attend the centenary of Anzac remembrance commemorations in my electorate of Toowoomba North. The meeting on 11 November lasted 11 minutes.

The committee then met on Thursday, 12 November. I cannot discuss the details of that meeting under standing orders, other than to say further information and deliberations were sought and required prior to making such important appointments. On Monday, 16 November some of the requested information was provided to the secretariat. Further, when employing staff it has always been my personal preference to interview in person.

On 18 November the acting chair unilaterally called a meeting for 20 November. I had already given verbal advice, but on the 19th I advised in writing that the opposition members would not be prepared to consider those appointments until the 30th at the earliest. The acting chair then chose to call a further meeting without consultation with the opposition. That meeting lasted eight minutes and authorised the acting chair to make his statement to the House.

I would further like to point out to the House that in June, some six months ago, there was a draft meeting protocol drawn up. This protocol would aid the acting chair and the committee to set—

(Time expired)

Pacific Motorway

 **Mr de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (2.43 pm): I rise to update the House on the concerning behaviour not of members opposite but of the federal member for Forde and perhaps some of his Liberal National Party colleagues here in Queensland. The Pacific Motorway is one of the busiest roads in Queensland. It connects Brisbane to Logan and the Gold Coast, and also Brisbane to Sydney. When it comes to the community of Springwood, I try to focus on the positives, such as increases to local manufacturing jobs and exciting new social enterprises. However, no longer can I tolerate the continued attempts of the federal LNP member for Forde as he continues to mislead the people of Queensland and the community I represent. Further, I can no longer tolerate the insipid collaboration in this from those opposite. It will be proven that the people of Springwood and South-East Queensland will not be easily fooled by either of them.

In his most recent media release, a document that attacks Queensland public servants and a document that is littered with inaccuracy and contradiction, the member for Forde has claimed that Queensland should pay 30 per cent more for infrastructure than New South Wales. Today I stand to correct those inaccuracies. The M1 is part of the National Land Transport Network, which is clearly demonstrated by this map showing it as part of the non-urban national transport network. I table that map.

Tabled paper: Map, undated, titled 'Urban National Land Transport Network Road—Brisbane' [1833].

As Warren Truss states, this means—

Where the predominant use is heavy transport moving to the ports or moving interstate, we're of a mind to pay 80:20.

I table a map prepared by the federal Transport and Infrastructure Council that clearly shows that the M1 Pacific Motorway is a key freight route.

Tabled paper: Map, undated, titled 'South East Queensland—Key Freight Routes (Road)' [1834].

I table a graph showing 15,000 heavy vehicles passing through the M1/M3 merge each day.

Tabled paper: Graph, undated, titled 'M1 Pacific Motorway—Gateway Merge' [1835].

The member for Forde's public comments are misleading, at best.

I quote the Acting Prime Minister of Australia who, in question time on Tuesday, said the following about funding for the M1—

We have restored the 80:20 funding link.

He goes on—

... all of those travelling up the coast, will have a four-lane highway all the way from Sydney to Brisbane ...

If only the members opposite and their federal colleague for Forde started listening to the Acting Prime Minister. It could not be clearer. Even the opposition in this House will not call their federal counterpart on this deceit.

Recently, I wrote to all Gold Coast members of this House asking them to take action to help Queensland get a fair share for infrastructure funding. In just a moment I will table letters that I wrote to the members for Surfers Paradise, Southport, Mudgeeraba, Mermaid Beach, Gaven, Coomera, Albert and Broadwater—from whom I have received no responses—and a letter to the member for Currumbin, who ignored that letter and instead sought funding for commuters from New South Wales. I also table a letter to the member for Burleigh. His response indicated that he was not concerned about congestion on the M1, which thousands of Gold Coast residents face when travelling to Brisbane each day. The members of the opposition are failing Queenslanders. They are ignoring reality, fairness and, unfortunately, their own communities.

Tabled paper: Letters, dated 7 October 2015, from the member for Springwood, Mr Mick de Brenni MP, to the member for Currumbin, Mrs Jann Stuckey MP, the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, the member for Surfers Paradise, Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP, the member for Southport, Mr Rob Molhoek MP, the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP, the member for Mermaid Beach, Mr Ray Stevens MP, the member for Gaven, Mr Sid Cramp MP, the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, the member for Albert, Mr Mark Boothman MP, and the member for Broadwater, Miss Verity Barton MP, regarding infrastructure funding for Queensland [1836].

Royalties for the Regions

 **Mr SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (2.46 pm): It should come as no surprise that a Labor government that has ignored regional Queensland for so long would seek to discredit the success of the Royalties for the Regions program. I welcome this opportunity to completely reject Labor's absurd accusations about the R4R program and also to reject many of the conclusions of the Auditor-General's report upon which those ridiculous claims have been based. The Auditor-General's report was compiled, of course, on the advice of the Labor administration. Following a briefing that we have just had with the Auditor-General, it was compiled on incomplete information—very much incomplete information—as one would expect with a change of government, I suppose, given what we know of the Australian Labor Party. Because the Auditor-General's report was compiled using incomplete information, the report has reached some factually and fundamentally wrong conclusions that are grossly misleading and fundamentally flawed.

The R4R program provided a multi-channel conduit to invest in infrastructure in regional Queensland using a number of funding pathways, of which local government identified projects was but one. Local government submitted projects were the only projects that were required to be assessed by my department. The government took decisions to proceed with R4R projects both at cabinet and through the Cabinet Budget Review Committee process. Those projects were never subject to DSDIP assessment or any reference to the guidelines prepared for councils. Cabinet made the decision, as cabinet is entitled to do. That is the critical error in the Auditor-General's report. It is the critical information that is missing and, of course, it will produce an absurd outcome.

To achieve its objectives, R4R funding decisions for council initiated projects had to be based on more than a competitive cost-benefit analysis, especially in the comparison of projects in large regional centres, such as Rockhampton and Gladstone, and projects in small communities, such as Miles and Karumba. Adopting a competitive cost-benefit analysis assessment approach would have defeated the purpose of the R4R program and smaller communities would have continued to receive no infrastructure funding, just as they have done for generations under the Labor Party.

I disagree completely with the Auditor-General's proposal that distribution of funding across party electorates is a test of the equity and impartiality of the decision-making process. Not only did the LNP hold the majority of eligible electorates at the time, those held by non-LNP members included the large urban centres of Rockhampton, Gladstone and Mackay, all of which flooded the process with applications but had plenty of resources of their own to fund their infrastructure.

Royalties for the Regions was a long overdue investment in the future of country towns and country people that had been ignored for many generations. R4R provided water supplies, sewerage systems, road upgrades, airport improvements, childcare centres, medical centres, swimming pools and a better future for country people.

Domestic and Family Violence

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (2.49 pm): One of the most heartbreaking things I see as a local member is the scared and worn out faces of domestic violence victims who come to me to seek help for themselves and their children. These people feel powerless—trapped in a violent relationship that they do not know how to get out of, scared by what their children are being exposed to at a young age and unsure of who or where to turn to.

That is why I felt an immense feeling of pride witnessing the inaugural sitting of the pilot specialist domestic violence court in Mackay on 20 November. On that day I saw couple after couple go through what would have been a particularly stressful process in a timely and efficient manner.

The implementation of the inaugural sitting came about as a result of the *Not now, not ever* recommendations made by Dame Quentin Bryce in her landmark report into domestic and family violence. I am extremely proud of the government's efforts in implementing all 140 recommendations made by Quentin Bryce. We have already seen the positive effects these changes have made in our community.

Domestic violence does not discriminate in terms of age, sex, race, social or financial status. Nobody should be losing their life at the hands of domestic violence. Yet, tragically, there have been 29 homicides in the last two years relating to domestic violence in the state of Queensland alone. While there have been decades of action and commitment in an attempt to eradicate domestic violence, the rates and severity of the crime have continued to rise. These statistics show how important it is that we all stand up and stop the behaviours and attitudes that are in any way accepting of and excuse family and domestic violence.

The inaugural sitting of the specialist domestic violence court that I attended in Mackay is just one example of the steps our government is currently taking to help realise our vision for Queensland to be free from domestic and family violence. Prioritising victim safety is a vital goal drawn from the three key pillars of the *Not now, not ever* report. A significant shift in community attitudes and behaviour, an integrated response system that delivers the services and support victims and perpetrators need, a justice system response that will be strengthened to prioritise victim safety and hold perpetrators to account make up the three key pillars.

Once again, I commend the Queensland government on its initiatives. With these plans in place, together we can end domestic and family violence.

Shed West

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (2.52 pm): I rise to inform the House of the Shed West organisation. Men's sheds perform a valuable role in providing both an opportunity for younger men to benefit from the experience of those older than themselves as well as providing a social environment for older men who might otherwise have become somewhat isolated and lonely.

The potential to become isolated tends to increase with greater urbanisation. Social isolation can have adverse consequences for both mental and physical health. The importance to a community of organisations such as men's sheds, the University of the Third Age, the Country Women's Association and like bodies therefore tends to increase with time.

Indeed, social isolation has been shown to lead to an increase in morbidity and mortality, with the associated risk being comparable to cigarette smoking and other major biomedical and psychosocial risk factors. The implication is that any reduction in isolation is likely to reduce overall costs for health related services.

So what are men's sheds? The modern men's sheds are an updated version of the shed in the backyard that has long been a part of our Australian culture. Men's sheds are springing up all around Australia. If people looked inside one they might see a number of men restoring furniture, perhaps fixing bicycles for a local school, maybe making myna bird traps, fixing lawn mowers or making a kid's cubby house for Camp Quality to raffle. They might also see a few young men working with older men and learning new skills and maybe also something about life from the men they are working with. They would see tea bags, coffee cups and a comfortable area where men can sit and talk. They would probably also see an area where men can learn to cook for themselves or where they can learn how to use social media and enhance their information technology skills.

Many men have learned from our culture not to talk about their feelings and emotions. That means they usually do not ask for help. Becoming a member of a men's shed provides an environment where a man can find support in an atmosphere of old-fashioned mateship. Members of men's sheds come from all walks of life. The bond that unites them is that they are men with time on their hands who seek something meaningful to do with that time.

My electorate of Moggill is home to a very active men's shed—Shed West, which has two campuses. The main workshop is on Brookfield Road, Kenmore Hills, with the Bellbowrie group having set up at Priors Pocket Road, Moggill, and now building membership rapidly. I was recently invited to officially open the Bellbowrie facility. I take this opportunity to acknowledge Neil McMenimen, Graham Barnard, Doug Nissen, Phil Castle, Max Lockwood, Graham Browne, Vic Lorenz, Chris Young, Roger Harding and all the other members involved in Shed West.

In addition to the well-equipped workshops, there are a range of special interest groups and weekly meetings with guest speakers. The special interest groups include computer, photography, card playing and dinner groups. There are occasional visits to other sheds and places around Queensland. There is really no limit to what members can do. The success of Shed West in my electorate depends on its members, of which there are now over 180, with new members always welcome. May I commend to the House the good work men's sheds do in an increasingly urbanised state and propose that, as a matter of principle, we encourage and assist them in any reasonable way.

In my remaining time I also acknowledge the great collaborative work of the Kenmore Police Community Consultative Council and the various Neighbourhood Watch groups that do great work for our community.

Murrumba Electorate

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (2.55 pm): I rise to inform the House that consumer confidence, business confidence and job creation are booming in Murrumba under the Palaszczuk Labor government. North Lakes and Murrumba businesses are riding on a wave of consumer and business confidence as we approach the biggest Christmas we think for seven years.

The Treasurer saw this when he spoke prior to the opening of stage 2 of North Lakes Westfield Shopping Centre. This \$140 million project has involved 3,000 jobs during construction and creates a 113,000 square metre shopping centre with 280 retailers. It will mean 500 jobs in Murrumba.

The Treasurer also witnessed the rapid progress of the North Lakes IKEA. It will be ready in the second half of 2016. Some 150 jobs were supported during construction and it will create around 250 new jobs. The opposition may want to talk down the economy, but in Murrumba consumer confidence is building; business confidence is building. It is not just in Murrumba that we are seeing this. There are projects like the North Lakes Westfield popping up all over the state that show that business and consumer confidence is here and bringing in jobs for Queenslanders.

There is the \$2.6 billion Rio Tinto bauxite project near Weipa that will provide project work for 1,100 people, work for 1,400 workers in Weipa, work for 2,000 workers in refineries in Gladstone—jobs for 40 years. There is the QGC \$1.7 billion Surat Basin project, with 1,600 construction jobs. There is also the \$3 billion Queen's Wharf development which will deliver \$1 billion to the state, 2,000 construction jobs and 8,000 operational jobs.

The list goes on. There is the \$800 million pipeline between Mount Isa and the Northern Territory creating 560 construction jobs. That is \$8 billion in investment in total.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr WHITING: You would love to be on this side delivering that news. Put that on top of \$35 billion in investment over four years in the budget for infrastructure.

As the Treasurer said, when it comes to the economy, confidence is king. These project announcements show business and consumer confidence under the Palaszczuk government is headed in the right direction, and that is supported by a range of surveys. According to the Sensis Business Index, the confidence index for small-to-medium businesses in Queensland was plus 25 points in the August quarter. According to the NAB business survey for the September quarter, our business confidence was the equal highest in the nation. We have led the nation on business confidence for four straight months according to the NAB.

I will remind everyone again: when confidence goes up, job numbers go up. Some 43,800 jobs have been created since the election, including 9,000 full-time jobs. That is 1,000 full-time jobs created every month. Contrast that to the LNP's record of shedding 310 full-time jobs every month. All this business confidence, driven by consumer confidence, adds up to more jobs for Murrumba residents.

Zipline Australia

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.58 pm): This morning the Deputy Premier used the phrase that a clear line in this parliament has been drawn 'between those who stand for prosperity and those willing to pursue expediency; between those who believe we should be open for business and those who would slam our doors shut; between those who want to take Queensland forward and those who would take us back'. It sure has, but it started back on 31 January, not last night.

I recently met with Zipline Australia, who have been told by this government that their project at the Obi Obi Gorge will no longer proceed. The company had tried to correspond with the relevant ministers for months. After several months of unanswered phone calls and follow-ups, they finally got a meeting in June this year. All the information necessary for that meeting—briefing documentation—was provided to the department of tourism as the lead agency in advance. In that meeting the proponents were advised that canopy tours were not deemed a suitable on-park activity and that specifically steel poles and permanent infrastructure used in the canopy tour would not be approved. They were also advised in the meeting by both ministers that they were supportive of commercial nature based ecotourism in national parks as long as it was the 'right kind of activity'.

Given that Zipline Australia accepted and signed documents as the exclusive proponent in the second stage of the tender process to produce a final detailed proposal and that they had been working through all that with the department of tourism, they were incredibly disappointed to be called into a ministerial meeting where the project was being cancelled and no-one had bothered to read the documents provided. The documentation clearly stated that there was no permanent infrastructure in

the national park; that the canopy tour entered the national park in the air, traversed through the national park in the air and exited the national park in the air, and at no point would anyone set foot on the ground; and that the total contact area with the national park was less than a single square metre per tree. All infrastructure used in the national park could be stripped out and removed at any point.

In addition, Zipline Australia identified one of the key requirements in the matrix that the department sought to tackle early on which was the requirement for them to negotiate an ILUA with the Jinibara people as the identified traditional owners. Six months prior to the ministerial meeting they had negotiated that ILUA. They had agreed on the terms. These terms included a percentage of the turnover as a commercial return to the Jinibara people, 50 per cent of the gift shop space and ticketing facility to be located in Montville for Jinibara to sell their own Indigenous artefacts, funding and physical support to construct a cultural heritage tour, and first dibs on any employment opportunities that came through Zipline Australia.

As a small business one has to wonder why anyone would bother in this state when even the ministers could not take the time to read the briefing materials that they had been provided. The government wants us to believe that they are open for business. I can tell the House that Zipline Australia know that Kate Jones and Steven Miles certainly do not believe so.

RELATIONSHIPS (CIVIL PARTNERSHIPS) AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3189, on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (3.02 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. 'We live in a modern, vibrant, tolerant and accepting state.' These are the words that commenced my speech in this House on 30 November 2011 during the debate on the Civil Partnerships Bill. The 2011 bill allowed for two things: it provided for the legal recognition of relationships of couples by registration of their relationship; and allowed couples the option of holding a ceremony before a civil partnership person, where the declaration of their relationship could be celebrated by their family and friends.

This was an important and significant moment in Queensland's history. It marked a turning of the corner, where the Queensland of the seventies and eighties—the Queensland of Joh Bjelke-Petersen and Russ Hinze—came of age. We had made some enormous progress since those days, but change had not come at the same pace for all Queenslanders. Unfortunately, some Queenslanders had been left behind in some respects, and the Civil Partnerships Bill in a small way made amends for that oversight.

But 2012 saw a return to the past. Unfortunately, those words of tolerance and acceptance were not as true some seven months later when I again rose in this House to speak against the bill introduced by the member for Kawana. The bill turned back the clock to the 1970s by amending the act to remove the right of couples to participate in a recognition ceremony before their family and friends. The bill was rushed through this House. It was introduced one day, declared urgent so as to forgo committee scrutiny and debated the next. I know that not all in the parliament support this bill. I also know that some people have changed their views on this issue since they previously voted, and I welcome that change.

There were quite a number of Queenslanders who took the time to make written submissions to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee in relation to this bill, and I thank them for their diligence and the passion with which they undertook this task. I note the submission by the Anti-Discrimination Commissioner, who summed up the position with great clarity. He said—

The Commission supports the right for all couples enter into a legally recognised relationship, with the option to have an official civil ceremony. Providing the option for same-sex couples to have their relationship recognised, with or without civil ceremony, is consistent with the right to freedom from discrimination on the basis of a person's sexuality.

I note that some of the submissions oppose the bill on the basis that the recognition ceremonies mirror marriage. This is not the case. As the Very Reverend Dr Peter Catt, Dean of St John's Anglican Cathedral and Chair of the Anglican Social Responsibilities Commission said in his submission—

... the Bill addressed what philosopher John Rawls called a foundational principle of justice: That is, that Each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all ...

He went on to say—

We believe that the act and legitimacy of religious marriage is not denied or denigrated by enabling same sex couples—or opposite-sex couples who have different (or no) spiritual beliefs—to publicly commit to each other in a way that is legally and socially recognised.

Thus, the Social Responsibilities Committee supports the proposed *Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015* because it removes discrimination, affords equal rights to same sex and heterosexual couples in civil partnerships, and recognises the pluralistic nature of our society.

In his speech during the 2012 vote, the member for Kawana announced that he would be introducing legislation similar to that previously introduced by the member for Southern Downs—laws which ensured that any gay or lesbian couple who entered into a surrogacy agreement would face a prison sentence of three years. I think this is something that we all must address.

Today I am in the unique position of speaking for the third time in support of the recognition of civil partnership ceremonies in this House. For the third time I am happy to stand up in this House to say that love knows no boundary. Thousands of same-sex couples who love and are committed to one another want nothing more than to have their relationship formally recognised not only by their family and friends but by the law.

It was unacceptable that in 2011 people were still being discriminated against on the basis of their sexuality. It is certainly unacceptable that in 2012 this House removed those hard fought rights that had been unfairly denied people until only months before. I did then, and I still do, support people in same-sex relationships who believe that it is well within their rights to have their loving, committed relationship officially recognised at law, in addition to being recognised by their family and friends.

One of the major reasons that I support this legislation, and one of the major reasons that I opposed the Newman government changes, was the positive effect it will have on younger lesbian, gay and bisexual people. These are the people who can struggle to come to terms with their sexuality, who may suffer associated depression and isolation. We as a parliament and we as a community cannot stand by and let that happen. By allowing all people in committed relationships to have the option of having their relationships recognised and celebrated, we reinforce the message that these are healthy and loving relationships. We reinforce acceptance. We celebrate our diversity. We celebrate tolerance. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (3.08 pm): It gives me great pleasure and pride to rise in support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill. Of course it is quite unnecessary that we should be standing in this House debating this bill, because it should never, ever have been changed in the first place. In 2011 the former Labor government introduced laws into this state that gave same-sex couples the right to have their relationships recognised by law and celebrated in law as well.

When the Newman government, as the Premier has already articulated, took these rights away from the LGBTI community, they did so with no consultation—at least no consultation with them. The then premier Campbell Newman stood in this place and said he had consulted but with one person—one person from the Australian Christian Lobby—in relation to these law changes.

Labor is rectifying a wrong here today, and we should be very, very proud of rectifying that discriminatory, unfair wrong. Labor took this commitment to the state election earlier this year. The fundamental change that we will introduce in terms of this legislation is that we will reinstate the basic human right for same-sex couples—for all couples—to have their relationships recognised in law and celebrated in law.

Ceremonies are incredibly important to humans. From birth to death, we mark significant milestones in our lives through ceremony. As someone who comes from the Christian faith, I have been the central focus and have participated in a whole range of these ceremonies. They bring together joy and love in a way that we humans need in our lives. When the Newman government removed this capacity for same-sex couples in Queensland to have their relationships recognised and celebrated in this way, they did Queenslanders a great injustice—not just LGBTI Queenslanders but all Queenslanders. What they said is that Queensland was not ready for the 21st century. I absolutely dispute that, and everybody on this side of the House disputes that. That is why we are standing here today rectifying this wrong.

I celebrated my 10-year wedding anniversary in October this year. I remember during the speeches at my wedding that I said I looked forward to the day when I could attend the weddings—the lawful celebrations of their love—of a number of my friends who had come to attend my ceremony and

celebrate my wedding. I look forward to that day and I am still looking forward to that day, because I believe in marriage equality, which is the purview of the federal government. I look forward to the day that the federal government changes the law in this country to allow same-sex couples to have the full rights of marriage under law and celebrated under law extended to them as fellow Australians. I look forward to that day.

In the interim the Australian Labor Party and the Attorney-General, whom I commend for her work in bringing this bill forward so quickly, today in Queensland will extend as far as possible the laws of this state to allow same-sex couples the right to register their relationships and celebrate their relationships under Queensland law. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (3.12 pm): I rise to speak in support of this bill. When Labor defeated the Newman government earlier this year there was much to do in the state of Queensland. After three years under Campbell Newman there were many wrongs to right, and today I am proud to be standing in this House speaking in support of this bill that rights one of the cruellest wrongs of the Newman government. As a mother, I understand how important it is for us to recognise diversity in our children. Last month I attended a rally in Ipswich organised by the Parents and Friends of Lesbians and Gays, PFLAG.

I spoke about the importance of equality in a just and civilised society. My reiteration of the Palaszczuk government's election commitment to reinstate civil partnerships in Queensland was met with cheers of joy from the participants at the rally. They know how important this decision is for the lives of so many Queenslanders and their families, friends and supporters.

This bill reinstates civil partnership ceremonies for couples of any gender. The civil ceremony allows couples to make a formal commitment to each other in front of their loved ones and celebrate the love and value they bring to each other's lives. The intention of this bill is not to replicate or devalue marriage. It provides couples who are not married with an opportunity to hold an official ceremony to acknowledge and celebrate their commitment.

Ceremonies hold meanings for each and every one of us. We commemorate many significant moments in our lives—births, anniversaries, deaths and marriages. To remove the rights of same-sex couples to celebrate their union through a formal ceremony is simply cruel and discriminatory. These amendments are about fairness and supporting the equality and dignity of all Queenslanders. While the fight for marriage equality continues in the federal sphere, here in Queensland we can make a difference. We can make a difference by recognising the rights of same-sex couples in Queensland to commemorate their union and their love for each other. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (3.14 pm): My friend James has known ever since he can remember that he is gay. He has talked to me a lot about what it was like to grow up being seen as a second-class citizen and as an illegal person, and about how that complete rejection by society of who he was influenced his life. None of us in this House can give back to James the years he has been made to feel unequal, but today we can go some way towards making up for it. Although homosexuality is no longer a criminal offence in Queensland, we still have laws in this country that treat members of the LGBTI community as second-class citizens.

It is not okay to discriminate against anyone on the basis of whom they love. If we fail to pass this bill today, that is exactly what we would be doing. It may not seem much to some people to pass this bill which would allow same-sex couples to officially declare their commitment to their significant others in front of family and friends, but passing this law means everything. It means equality and dignity. When I rang James to tell him about the debate today, he said, 'Di, I can't even speak,' and that told me everything.

Today is an opportunity for us to right a wrong—a longstanding wrong and one which was punched home again when the LNP government took away the hope that the Bligh Labor government had created for members of the LGBTI community under its civil partnership legislation. I am not going to detail that travesty or the hurt that that caused. We all know it, but, with a sense of humour on the issue which I find amazing in someone who has suffered such discrimination, Paul, who is in the gallery today I hope with his partner, Rob, pointed out to me that it at least gave me the chance to vote twice on a civil partnerships bill—on legislation that I believe in to the very roots of my being. If we had the power in Queensland to bring in same-sex marriage, I would vote for it, but for now this bill is hugely important and I commend it to the House.

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (3.16 pm): I am proud to be part of a government that has its sights firmly fixed on the future. All of our policy commitments are about

making Queensland a smarter, more progressive place positioned to fearlessly seize every opportunity before us. The Palaszczuk government is not constrained by ideological agenda, ignorance or innuendo, and so it is incumbent on us to right the bitter wrongs of the LNP.

What we saw in June 2012, just three months after the LNP was elected, was a successive series of law reforms aimed solely at removing rights from a minority group. I clearly remember the so-called priority placed on the LNP's cost-of-living legislation that was introduced and parked so that the civil unions legislation passed by the former Labor government could be made a priority to repeal. It was unfair, vindictive and, frankly, pointless. Queensland had only just caught up with the rest of Australia's eastern seaboard by introducing civil union laws when the LNP embarked on the biggest roll-back of gay and lesbian rights anywhere in the Western world literally.

There were no winners. This was retrospective political payback against a defenceless minority. It is no wonder Queenslanders used their democratic right on 31 January to vote out the LNP in favour of a modern government to reflect a modern Queensland. Cruelly, the problem was not removed with Campbell Newman. The main perpetrators are still sitting in this chamber. The member for Southern Downs, as former health minister, axed \$2.6 million in funding to the Queensland Association for Healthy Communities to silence our state's only health organisation for LGBTI Queenslanders.

This was followed by the feverish excitement of the former attorney-general, who, on the same night the changes made to civil unions were rushed through, unexpectedly announced the next reform on the agenda was Queensland surrogacy laws. The former speaker, the member for Maroochydore, decided she did not like TV crews reporting on the completely understandable protests against her government's malicious actions, citing safety issues in the public gallery. So she banned TV cameras from filming inside the parliament for a period.

This blatant contempt for our democracy was an unfathomable form of censorship in a modern Western society. The member for Clayfield, who claimed to know better, did nothing to stop his colleagues' crusade. On 22 June 2012 civil unions simply ceased to exist in Queensland, without the LNP government even having the decency to hold a press conference. This was not a pre-election commitment. They did not have a mandate, and evidently they did not have the support of Queenslanders to do this. If this had happened in some southern state or midwest America, it would have made international news. That is exactly what we saw in Kentucky when country clerk Kim Davis tried to defy a Federal Court order instructing that she abide by the US Supreme Court's decision. Labor will not let Queensland become some kind of backwater state of Australia. Generations to come will remember the regressive, vindictive agenda of the LNP.

This bill will achieve its objective of restoring provisions for civil partnership ceremonies by renaming the Relationships Act the Civil Partnerships Act. It will also make other terminology changes, including replacing references to 'registered relationship' with 'civil partnership'. Critically, this bill will provide for couples to enter into a civil partnership by making a declaration to each other through a civil partnership ceremony. In doing so, it ends the LNP's discrimination of forcing same-sex couples to register their partner like a pet with no celebration or fanfare. At its heart, this bill is about equality. In fact, there is no alternative way of achieving this policy objective. This change comes at no cost to our state. The cost of the civil partnership notary registration scheme will be offset through an annual registration fee for civil partnership notaries.

In truth the only cost associated with this legislation has been the emotional toll inflicted on same-sex attracted Queenslanders by the LNP regime over the previous three years. For same-sex attracted teenagers growing up in this state, the past three years were a trauma they should never have had to witness. For couples who had entered civil unions, it was a petty personal attack that they should never have had to endure. Now with the dark hatred of the LNP years behind us, it is clear Queensland's collective spirit is in a much healthier place. I want the world to know that the LNP's regressive vision for Queensland will not define the future of Queensland. We are an open, accepting, intelligent state that will not be held prisoner to any extreme agenda. No kid should be made to believe that they are not entitled to the same basic hopes, dreams and rights as everyone else.

I say to every teenager contemplating their sexual identity, I say to adults who grew up vilified during the Joh era, especially those Queenslanders who had the authenticity of their relationship undermined by the LNP, that we are making Queensland better. I also want to say to the gay and lesbian staff members working for the LNP that we will make this state better for you too—even if you are not allowed to have an opinion. This is our job. That is our responsibility as a progressive party of reform. I want you to know that there are politicians in this place willing to fight for your rights, because frankly you should not have to—not in 2015.

The legislation we are voting on is a key step to putting Queensland back on the right track to a brighter future. So much has been said on this topic that it is difficult to say something new, but some of Macklemore's lyrics from his song *Same Love* sum it up perfectly—

We press play, don't press pause

Progress, march on.

...

When kids are walking 'round the hallway plagued by pain in their heart

A world so hateful some would rather die than be who they are

And a certificate on paper isn't gonna solve it all

But it's a damn good place to start

No law is gonna change us

We have to change us

Whatever God you believe in

We come from the same one

Strip away the fear

Underneath it's all the same love

About time that we raised up

...

When everyone else is more comfortable remaining voiceless

Rather than fighting for humans that have had their rights stolen

I might not be the same, but that's not important

No freedom til we're equal, damn right I support it

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): I call the Minister for Health.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the Minister for Health!

An opposition member: That's you, Cameron.



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (3.21 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I was actually taken aback by that great address by the Treasurer. I want to commend the Treasurer on his address. It was a very well thought out address to this parliament and very heartfelt as well—as the contributions to this debate have been. Before I make my contribution, I also want to commend the Attorney-General on bringing this significant piece of legislation to the parliament. She has done an outstanding job this year putting back into the legal space in our state principles of fairness, justice and equality during her tenure as the Attorney-General of this state. I want to commend her for this piece of legislation as well.

I rise this afternoon to speak in proud support of the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would know, the Australian Labor Party has a long and proud history of being the party that champions fairness and equality in Australia. Three years ago, same-sex couples in this state were stripped of their right to be officially acknowledged as partners and their union was reduced to being known simply as a registered relationship. They were stripped of their right to mark their partnership with a ceremony declaring their union before an official witness. This bill is about reinstating what should be a simple right to officially celebrate an important relationship. It is designed to remove a barrier of social exclusion.

In 2011 when I rose in this chamber to support the Civil Partnerships Bill, I reflected on the impact of several other laws introduced into this parliament by Labor governments in recent generations. Yesterday, we celebrated the 26th anniversary of the election of the Goss Labor government—the first Labor government elected in this state for at that time 32 years. It was the Goss Labor government that started down that pathway of enlightenment and implementing laws that would eliminate discrimination against same-sex attracted people in our community. That government introduced laws decriminalising

homosexuality in Queensland—laws that were entrenched by the previous National Party government and that they would never consider removing. There were other laws introduced which were focused on removing discrimination.

I was very proud as the then attorney-general to introduce legislation into this House, the then surrogacy bill, which created a new regime for surrogacy.

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms Farmer interjected.

Mr DICK: I take the interjections of the member for Brisbane Central and the member for Bulimba. They were strong supporters of that legislation and served with me in the 53rd Parliament. At each of those stages, those legislative reforms were vehemently opposed—not just strongly opposed but vehemently opposed—by the then National Party and Liberal Party and then the Liberal National Party.

I believe we had that terrible stain in that debate on the surrogacy bill when the Leader of the Opposition moved amendments to ensure that same-sex couples and people in de facto relationships of less than two years could not participate in surrogacy arrangements. Then they pledged to change the act when they came into government. That was a pledge made by the member for Kawana when he was the shadow attorney-general. He was very strong about that before the 2012 election. He is a man who puts about that he has the courage of his convictions. He said that he would change the law. The only way he could have changed the law then to stop same-sex couples or de facto couples of under two years participating in surrogacy arrangements was to criminalise it. That was the only way he could have changed the law. Of course he did not have the courage of his convictions, and when he became the attorney-general he did not pursue that—after campaigning on that for a very long period of time.

As Minister for Health, I know the devastating impact that social exclusion and discrimination can have on the mental health of Queenslanders. For the LGBTIQ community, effects of exclusion and discrimination are all too real. The mental health of LGBTIQ people is amongst the poorest in our country, I am very sad to report to the parliament. According to beyondblue, their suicide rates are the highest. In fact, beyondblue states that the rate of suicide attempts for same-sex attracted Australians is up to 14 times higher than the general population. Furthermore, lesbian, gay and bisexual Australians are twice as likely to have a high or very high level of psychological distress as their heterosexual counterparts, making them particularly vulnerable to mental health problems. The elevated risk of mental ill health and suicidality among LGBTIQ people is not due to sexuality but is often due to discrimination and exclusion. That discrimination and exclusion was imposed on them in 2012 when they were stripped of their ability to celebrate civil partnerships in this state.

I am pleased that the Liberal National Party opposition is permitting a conscience vote on this. There was a time when the Liberal Party of Australia had at its core the capacity for all parliamentary members of their party, no matter what parliament they served in, to cast a conscience vote. The history of the Liberal Party was liberalism, but I know that is a foreign concept now. Not only have they turned their back on economic liberalism; they have turned their back on social liberalism, and of course they did not permit a conscience vote in the 53rd Parliament. In fact when our parliamentary party permitted a conscience vote they decried it; they criticised it. The member for Cleveland circulated something in his electorate saying that Anna Bligh would not permit a conscience vote when the complete opposite was the case. That is their history. It is very sad, although I give them credit now that they are allowing a conscience vote. Let us hope that remains the case for the 55th Parliament and beyond so these sorts of discriminatory laws can be removed.

Our society is making real progress towards breaking down barriers to afford LGBTIQ people the same rights as others, including a cultural shift supporting formalising their relationships. I know there are many people in Queensland who question this approach, but I think it is the right thing to break down those barriers of discrimination.

I respect the views of others, but this is the right step for our parliament to take to break down those barriers of discrimination. I gave a speech last week at the Kawana branch of the Australian Labor Party and I said, 'Our work as a party, as a trade union movement and as a Labor movement must always be underpinned by eternal values and principles like fairness, opportunity, equality and freedom.' People in our community have a right to live their lives free of discrimination so they can live happy, productive and fulfilling lives. Those values of fairness, opportunity, equality and freedom are the values which underpin this bill. That is why it has my full support. I commend it to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (3.30 pm): I rise to speak to the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. Both Robbie and I have been very consistent on this matter. We believe that a relationship and a marriage is between a man and a woman. I have said that that consistency goes back to the Newman days when we actually moved the amendment to define marriage and a relationship as being between a man and a woman. We will not be supporting this bill.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (3.30 pm): I rise to make a simple contribution to state our position on this bill, which is consistent with the position we took last time this issue came up. We see civil unions as a stepping stone to marriage. Many people would see it as the next step. That is a position that was admitted by advocates of this last time this debate came up. We are not supportive of that. That is our position. We respect the right of other people to have their position, but this is ours. We will be voting against this bill.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.31 pm), in reply: I want to thank all the honourable members for their contribution to the debate on the Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. This bill delivers on the government's commitment to reinstate civil partnerships ceremonies. This is a good day for the people of Queensland. I am proud to deliver on the Palaszczuk government's commitment to do what is fair and what is right for Queenslanders.

I would like to thank those in the public gallery who are here today to show their support. I also recognise and thank the LGBTIQ community and also PFLAG for their ongoing advocacy right across this great state and country. For them this has been a long battle and I want to thank them for their tireless advocacy. I would also like to thank all my colleagues who have spoken in support of this bill today. Your words and your passion in the House demonstrate your support on this issue.

There has been a lot of work over many years to keep this issue in the minds of all Queenslanders. Let's hope this is the last time we have to have this debate in the Queensland parliament. Let's also hope these laws are here to stay. Whether this is about changes in the law or whether members are responding to shifts in public attitude, perhaps today can be the line in the sand that demonstrates Queensland has finally moved forward.

I would like to pay tribute and thank my colleagues for the respectful nature of today's debate. It is a credit to all of us. May we demonstrate today that Queensland is no longer the land that time forgot. Let's do away with this state's unfair reputation for being a backwater and demonstrate to one another and to this nation that we will stand up for what is right, for equality, for respect and for fairness. This bill reminds us that language and rituals matter when it comes to the most important relationships of our lives. Every loving couple should be able to recognise their love with a ceremony, recognised at law in front of friends and family. In a few short weeks, I will be celebrating my 22nd wedding anniversary.

The changes in terminology in this bill restore the dignity and the respect that all of our loving relationships deserve regardless of gender and sexuality. The decision by the previous government to repeal civil ceremonies caused real hurt in Queensland. Some people considered leaving, disenchanted by that decision. I want to reiterate to all Queensland couples that this is your home, this is where you belong and we want to see your relationship celebrated, recognised and respected. I am proud to bring forward this bill which rights the wrong that was done by the former government's amendments in 2012. This is a great moment for Queensland. In our hands is the potential to restore fairness, equality and respect to all the members of our community. This is a vital step and brings Queensland into a world that wholeheartedly embraces all of its citizens.

I urge all members of this House to think deeply and carefully in voting on this bill. Think about what is important and matters most in your life and the life of your family members. Think about the opportunities and choices you want for your children and grandchildren. Think about whether you would want these opportunities and choices to be available to them should they fall in love with someone of the same sex. Think about how important it is that they feel acknowledged, valued and accepted. I once again thank all honourable members for their contribution during the debate. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! Honourable members, a division has been called. I have received prior advice pursuant to standing order 104(2) for this matter to be a conscience vote. In accordance with that standing order, I will permit a personal vote to be held instead of a party vote. The procedure for the personal vote is that the ayes will pass to the right of the chair and the noes will pass to the left of the chair.

Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 64—Bailey, Barton, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, D’Ath, Davis, Dick, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Stevens, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Whiting, Williams. Tellers: de Brenni, Power.

NOES, 22—Bates, Bennett, Costigan, Cripps, Katter, Knuth, Krause, Leahy, Mander, McVeigh, Millar, Perrett, Powell, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Smith, Springborg, Watts, Weir. Tellers: Dickson, Rickuss.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Mr SPEAKER: I understand that someone is taking photos or is about to take photos. It is not permitted to take photos in the gallery.

Clauses 1 to 19, as read, agreed to.

Clause 20—

 **Hon. YM D’ATH** (3.49 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 20 (Insertion of new pt 3)

Page 16, after line 19—

insert—

- (5) However, information mentioned in subsection (3)(b) may be published on the department’s website only if the civil partnership notary consents.

Mrs D’ATH: I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

Tabled paper: Relationships (Civil Partnerships) and Other Acts Amendment Bill, explanatory notes to Hon. Yvette D’Ath’s amendment [\[1837\]](#).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 20, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 21 to 52, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. YM D’ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.50 pm): I move—

That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 64—Bailey, Barton, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, D’Ath, Davis, Dick, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Whiting, Williams. Tellers: de Brenni, Power.

NOES, 22—Bates, Bennett, Costigan, Cripps, Katter, Knuth, Krause, Leahy, Mander, McVeigh, Millar, Perrett, Powell, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Smith, Springborg, Watts, Weir. Tellers: Rickuss, Dickson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. YM D’ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.56 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

QUEEN'S WHARF BRISBANE BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (3.56 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the ratification of the agreement for the Queen's Wharf Brisbane casino and provide for other matters relating to the development of Queen's Wharf Brisbane, and to amend this act, the Brisbane Casino Agreement Act 1992, the Casino Control Act 1982, the Economic Development Act 2012, the Liquor Act 1992, the South Bank Corporation Act 1989 and the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Queens Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015 [[1838](#)].

Tabled paper: Queens Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1839](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill 2015 into the parliament today. On 20 July 2015 the Destination Brisbane Consortium was announced as the government's preferred proponent to revitalise an underutilised area of state owned land in the heart of the Brisbane CBD known as Queen's Wharf Brisbane and stimulate the tourism and construction sectors of Queensland's economy. The redevelopment is proposed to commence in 2017, with completion expected by 2022.

The redevelopment of Queen's Wharf will deliver, among other things, five new premium hotels including Brisbane's first six-star hotel; three residential towers; 50 new bars, restaurants and retail outlets; a riverfront moonlight cinema; a new pedestrian bridge to South Bank; revitalised heritage buildings and spaces; and 12 football fields of public space. It will create 2,000 construction jobs and 8,000 operational jobs, a \$272 million-plus payment to the state and a guarantee of \$880 million in casino taxes for the first 10 years of operation.

In recognition of the significant financial commitment by the Destination Brisbane Consortium—in excess of \$3 billion—to deliver a world-class tourism, leisure and entertainment precinct, a casino licence was also offered. As such, one of the main purposes of the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill is to ratify the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Casino Agreement, which is a prerequisite to the grant of a casino licence. The casino agreement outlines the terms on which the casino licence will be issued and imposes a number of reporting obligations on parties to the agreement and other relevant entities. This agreement must also be ratified by the parliament for it to have the force of law.

The bill also contains provisions to maintain the integrity of casino operations and those involved or associated with ownership, management or operations of the Queen's Wharf casino or complex. For example, the bill provides for the ways in which an entity may become a party or cease to be a party to the agreement and requirements in relation to the levels of voting power that persons may have in the licensee or entities related to the licensee. These requirements are intended to ensure that persons associated with such entities are suitable to be associated or connected with the ownership, management or operations of the casino or complex. The bill also contains provisions which amend the Liquor Act 1992 and the Casino Control Act 1982 to provide for a number of regulatory matters relating to the proposed casino.

To facilitate the redevelopment process, the bill amends the Economic Development Act 2012, the South-East Queensland Water (Distribution and Retail Restructuring) Act 2009 and the South Bank Corporation Act 1989 to enable the minister for Economic Development Queensland to act as development assessment manager for the Queen's Wharf Brisbane priority development area and the development of a pedestrian bridge to South Bank.

The bill also exempts certain provisions of the Property Law Act 1974, Land Act 1994, Land Title Act 1994 and Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 to facilitate the redevelopment of the Queen's Wharf precinct by excluding the application of certain property and planning legislative provisions. Planning and heritage approvals for the existing Treasury hotel-casino site remain captured under the Brisbane Casino Agreement Act 1992. However, I intend to bring a further bill to parliament early next year to amend the Brisbane Casino Agreement Act 1992 to provide for the redevelopment of the current hotel-casino site to also be approved under the same development approval scheme by the minister for Economic Development Queensland.

The bill also amends the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 and the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008 to achieve the commercial outcomes negotiated by the state. The Queens Wharf Brisbane redevelopment is one of the most significant and exciting infrastructure projects

to be undertaken in this state and I am very pleased to be introducing this bill for parliament's consideration today. The project will provide a well needed economic and tourism stimulus in our capital city and in the process rejuvenate the Brisbane CBD and provide an attractive world-class integrated resort facility that will put Queensland on the world map. The introduction of the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill is one of the first steps in getting this process moving and underway. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.02 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 the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee

Mr SPEAKER: In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee.

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.02 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee report to the House on the Queen's Wharf Brisbane Bill by 4 April 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE

Ethics Committee Report

 **Hon. JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (4.02 pm), by leave: I rise to make a statement to the House. Today the parliamentary Ethics Committee tabled its report into a matter of privilege in relation to an alleged failure to comply with the rules adopted by the former Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee in relation to confidentiality of its proceedings and an allegation that I deliberately misled the PCCC by signing an incorrect statement in relation to the destruction of documents tendered to the PCCC. I did not intentionally fail to adhere to the guidelines adopted by the former Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee. However, I should have ensured I was cognisant of the guidelines that were applicable, and for this I apologise unconditionally to the parliament. I accept the committee's findings. As such, I unreservedly apologise for not complying with the rules in relation to maintaining the confidentiality of documents and for incorrectly signing a statement in relation to the disposal of these documents. I have a strong belief in the integrity of the committee system of our parliament here in Queensland and an abiding commitment to ensuring the most important legacy of the Fitzgerald inquiry—the PCCC—remains as a strong and lasting body to oversee the integrity provisions of our legislation. Therefore, I unreservedly and sincerely apologise for any conduct that was not of a standard expected of a person in my position. The people of Queensland expect the highest standards to be met and maintained at all times by members of parliament and ministers of the Crown and I can assure you I will not let them down again.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Queensland Times Article

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (4.05 pm), by leave: I refer to the Leader of the Opposition having raised a point of privilege in relation to an article that appeared in the *Queensland Times* on 30 November. The article refers to a source close to the Ethics Committee. Having consulted with my

colleagues on the Ethics Committee, I wish to advise the House that comments I made to a *Queensland Times* journalist during the course of a longer conversation that traversed a number of topics appear to be the source of information in his article. At this point I advise the House that I am formally authorised by the Ethics Committee to make this personal explanation to parliament. I am a relatively new member of parliament and the Ethics Committee. On reflection, I see the comments I made to the journalist—which I thought at the time were of a general nature and innocuous—appear to have given the journalist sufficient information to write the article and I should not have spoken to him at all. I emphasise that at no point did I disclose the contents of the draft committee report referred to in the newspaper article. I apologise to my fellow committee members and to the House and I advise that I have requested the Leader of the House to discharge me from the Ethics Committee.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Membership

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (4.06 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the member for Ipswich West, Mr Madden, be discharged from the Ethics Committee and the member for Stretton, Mr Pegg, be appointed to the Ethics Committee.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

RACING INTEGRITY BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (4.06 pm): I present a bill for an act to safeguard the welfare of animals, to ensure the integrity of persons involved in the racing industry and to manage matters relating to betting and sporting contingencies, and to amend the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001, the Bail Act 1980, the Criminal Organisation Act 2009, the Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Act 1998, the Liquor Act 1992, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Public Service Act 2008, the Racing Act 2002, the Trading (Allowable Hours) Act 1990 and the Wagering Act 1998 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Agriculture and Environment Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Racing Integrity Bill 2015 [[1840](#)].

Tabled paper: Racing Integrity Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1841](#)].

I am pleased to present to the House the Racing Integrity Bill 2015. The primary purpose of the bill is to implement recommendations 1 to 3 of the Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry report to improve integrity standards and to further safeguard the welfare of licensed animals. The bill forms part of the broader racing industry reforms being delivered by this government, with the institution of greater integrity processes and accountability measures being incorporated into the racing industry framework. The bill provides for a new act, the Racing Integrity Act 2015, and amends the Racing Act 2002. Both are aimed at increasing certainty to participants and restoring public confidence in the racing industry.

In response to the findings of the commission of inquiry that the current system of self-regulation in the racing industry has failed, the bill establishes the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission—the commission. It is starkly demonstrated in the commission of inquiry report that there is potential for conflict when compliance functions relating to integrity and animal welfare and the commercial operations coincide. The establishment of this commission will give independence to these individual objectives. It will be a statutory body, separate but linked initially to the Department of National Parks, Sport and Racing before transferring to the Department of Agriculture and Fisheries on 1 July 2016.

The QRIC will have the specific functions and necessary powers to fulfil its regulatory responsibilities effectively. These responsibilities include licensing and registering animals, participants, clubs and venues as the licensing body for the racing industry; auditing and investigating licensees; scientific testing via the Racing Science Centre; providing stewarding and further integrity services at race meetings; and monitoring compliance with the proposed Racing Integrity Act and the Rules of Racing, which include the commission's ability to carry out disciplinary action against the licensee.

In the event that further applications to become an approved control body under the Racing Act are received by the minister, the commission will now be required to provide advice to the minister on the applicant's suitability to be a control body for the new proposed code of racing and advise on the commission's ability to carry out its functions to support the new code of racing.

The bill will establish a full-time Racing Integrity Commissioner to lead the commission in its performance of its functions. Two or more deputy commissioners will be appointed to assist the commissioner in this role. This empowers the commission not only to fully commit to the proactive management and identification of issues but also to provide education to the industry to develop its understanding of integrity and animal welfare. This government does not want the issues of the past to be the problems of the future.

In conjunction with the formation of the new commission, the bill amends the functions and powers of control bodies under the Racing Act to focus their activities on the commercial matters involved with the operations of the racing industry. These amendments will maintain the control body's role in allocating race dates and the management of the racing calendar, the allocation of prize money, handicapping activities prior to the race meeting being held and developing and maintaining the rules of racing. The control body will continue to manage licensed clubs with an emphasis on promoting good corporate governance and appropriate infrastructure maintenance.

The bill provides for an expansion and renaming of the Queensland All Codes Racing Industry Board to the Racing Queensland Board. Membership of the board will increase from five to seven members. This will also be the end of the three individual code boards as they are being abolished in this process. This will create a further streamlined and cost-effective model for communicating and decision-making in the industry. Four of the members of the Racing Queensland Board will be entirely independent of the racing industry, providing representation across a number of professional fields. Only these independent members will be eligible for appointment as the chairperson and deputy chairperson to the board. The remaining three members will have relevant experience in the racing industry and be drawn—one each—from the three codes of racing.

The bill also abolishes the Racing Animal Welfare Integrity Board and the Racing Disciplinary Board. The dissolution of the Racing Disciplinary Board will be replaced by a new internal review process. The bill will require the commission or the control body to, in the first instance, internally review an original decision made by it. For example, a decision made by the commission to cancel, suspend or not to grant a licence or take disciplinary action against a licensee's original decision under the bill can be reviewed. Once the internal review process is complete, a person may seek an external review of a decision by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal or the court in particular circumstances. This internal review process is particularly important as the sector looks to restore public confidence and improved decision-making. It also brings it into line with the processes in place in other compliance agencies.

The bill will create transparency in the industry by introducing the requirement for the commission and the control body to have strategic and operational plans and to report on the achievements of the goals stated in these plans on a quarterly basis. This is consistent with other Queensland government departments and statutory bodies. The bill also requires that the commission and the control body keep the minister reasonably informed of its current performance, including its current financial performance and financial position, and report immediately to the minister if any issues arise that may directly impact on the commission or the control body's strategic or operational plans.

While the bill retains the functions and powers of the previous compliance and integrity officers, the general powers of authorised officers will mirror the powers of inspectors and authorised officers under the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001. This will provide authorised officers appointed by the commission with the powers of entry to premises and seizure powers where that power relates to the protection of a licensed animal. The bill provides for an authorised officer to issue an animal welfare direction to a licensee or licensees who have breached or may be likely to breach certain provisions under the proposed Racing Integrity Act, the Racing Act, or the ACPA. Failure to comply with the animal welfare direction constitutes an offence under the proposed Racing Integrity Act. This standardisation of powers enables authorised officers to take proactive action for the prevention of an offence against an animal rather than the current reactive approach to animal welfare issues.

The bill provides for new information-sharing powers. These permit an authorised officer, an inspector or authorised officer appointed under the ACPA, or an officer of the Queensland Police Service who has obtained information in regard to an animal or animal welfare offence, to share this

information with a relevant officer to allow the matter to be further investigated or for appropriate action to be taken by the relevant agency. These amendments will support the collaboration between the agencies to improve the investigation into and the prosecution of animal welfare offences.

The bill omits chapter 4 of the Racing Act, which includes the accredited facilities provisions. That will eliminate duplication between the Racing Act and the Rules of Racing. It allows the Rules of Racing to dictate testing procedures. This is consistent with other Australian jurisdictions.

The removal of these provisions will not affect the operation of the Racing Science Centre. It will, however, eliminate the legal ambiguity that occurs when the rules around sample collection and testing conflict with the act. The Racing Science Centre, the primary testing facility for Queensland's racing industry, will form part of the commission and will continue to be the facility accredited by the National Association of Testing Authorities, Australia.

The government is committed to ensuring that the racing industry is prosperous and sustainable in the future and that public confidence is restored to the fullest extent possible. The bill delivers on these commitments through the implementation of the specific recommendations from the commission of inquiry report and through the establishment of a greater regulatory framework for the racing industry to improve integrity processes and safeguard the welfare of licensed animals.

At this point, I would like to table the government's response to the Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry.

Tabled paper: Queensland Greyhound Racing Industry Commission of Inquiry: Final Report, 1 June 2015, government response [\[1842\]](#).

I want to make it clear to the House that the bill will not increase the current requirements placed on industry participants. It does, however, create a more effective framework in which those requirements can be regulated. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (4.18 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 the Agriculture and Environment Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee.

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Sport and Racing) (4.20 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, under the provisions of standing order 136, the Agriculture and Environment Committee report to the House on the Racing Integrity Bill by 1 March 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

DEPUTY SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitor to Public Gallery

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Before I call the next minister, I inform honourable members that I am pleased to acknowledge and welcome to the gallery Dr Uncle Bob Anderson, a well-respected Ngugi elder from Mulgumpin in Quandamooka who has family connections to the Minjerribah people.

NORTH STRADBROKE ISLAND PROTECTION AND SUSTAINABILITY AND OTHER ACTS AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (4.20 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Land Court Act 2000, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, and the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Finance and Administration Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015 [[1843](#)].

Tabled paper: North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and other Acts Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes [[1844](#)].

I am pleased to present to the House the Palaszczuk government's three-part plan to begin a new chapter for North Stradbroke Island; to unlock the island for all Queenslanders to enjoy. We want all Queenslanders to experience the island's unique natural and cultural values. We will launch new opportunities for the island, its community and economy. North Stradbroke Island, Straddie to many of us, Minjerribah as it is called by the traditional owners, is the second largest sand island in the world. It is right on Brisbane's doorstep and it occupies a special place in the hearts of many Queenslanders. It is important that we take action now to secure the future of this beautiful island. Many Queenslanders know how great Straddie is and it is time to get the secret out. If members read the *Courier-Mail* yesterday they would have seen that Fodor, the biggest English language travel publisher in the world, has rated the island as one of the top 15 under-the-radar destinations on the planet.

This government recognises that the Quandamooka people are the traditional owners of North Stradbroke Island and have a right to use and enjoy their native title land on the island. We have been working closely with the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation, QYAC, the registered native title body corporate, to understand their plans and aspirations for their lands. The Quandamooka people have a deep connection to their land and sea country that goes back over 20,000 years. They want to protect their land and their cultural heritage from the damaging effects of mining. That is not only fair but their right as native title holders. There are spectacular, pristine parts of the island of unbelievable beauty and significant conservation value that are inaccessible because of sprawling mining leases. The Quandamooka people know these places. The rest of us do not. Sadly, there are generations of elders who have never had access to those special places. North Stradbroke Island has the potential to be a world-class tourism destination, just like Fraser Island. It is inconceivable that we would allow sandmining on Fraser Island now, but we once did. We used to mine Fraser just like Straddie. Sandmining came to an end on Fraser only in the 1970s. Look at Fraser Island now. It is one of our great tourism assets and it is getting stronger every year. On Fraser Island, visitor activity injects \$360 million through direct overnight expenditure into the economy every year. It is also generating nearly \$648 million through transport, accommodation, food services and retail trade. It contributes to securing 6,015 jobs for the region. Straddie could be our next Fraser Island right on Brisbane's doorstep, if we pass this bill.

Today it is my privilege to introduce the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill 2015. This bill delivers the government's commitment to return the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability Act 2011 to its original intent. The original act facilitated a staged phase-out of mining and enabled the island to transition to new economic activities and grow its protected areas, including national parks. The act provided a balanced resolution and certainty for all parties on the island, including mineworkers, residents and the Indigenous community. The previous LNP government undid all the hard work of the local community. It was already on its way to unlocking the island and launching new, exciting and sustainable opportunities when the LNP bluntly amended the act to extend the area and end date for sandmining way out to 2035. Even Sibelco, the island's mining company, was surprised. All it wanted was to mine to 2027. This bill will remove these environmentally and socially irresponsible changes and implement Labor's commitment to return the substantial phase-out of mining to 2019. It is time for the House to unite and provide certainty to the Straddie community. In terms of its features, this bill reinstates a restricted mine path for Enterprise Mine, the biggest mine on the island.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I warn the member for Cleveland that the minister is not taking your interjections so please cease.

Dr MILES: This will ensure that mine production can be completed by 2019 while preserving the unique environmental values around the site.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cleveland, please cease your interjections.

Dr MILES: The bill also includes provision for the mining company to apply to amend the restricted mine path within four months of commencement of the act. This will ensure the mine path properly reflects contemporary operational issues while avoiding impacts to Aboriginal cultural heritage and high conservation areas. The provisions limit the extent of allowable change and ensure threatened ecosystems cannot be included in the mine path and that native title rights and interests are properly taken into account. Any proposed changes to the mine path will be decided at a ministerial level. This bill removes the ability to renew mining leases on the island so as to substantially end mining leases by 2019.

In lieu of lease renewals, we have developed a tool so that land does not need to be locked up and rendered inaccessible to the community just so a former mining site can be rehabilitated. We have created a new legal framework under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 to ensure the mining lease holder will be able to meet their rehabilitation obligations under the environmental authority. This provides certainty to all stakeholders, and all Queenslanders, that rehabilitation work can and will be undertaken. Notwithstanding this, I am encouraged by recent commitments made to me by QYAC and Sibelco to work cooperatively together. I applaud this and I am prepared to give both parties time to negotiate alternative access arrangements for rehabilitation, which might forestall me taking action under existing legal powers.

As I mentioned at the beginning, this bill is the first of a three-part plan the Palaszczuk government has developed to kickstart this transition, building on previous transition work stopped by the LNP. Later today the Deputy Premier will be releasing for public consultation a comprehensive \$20 million economic transition strategy.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cleveland, I warn you under standing order 253A.

Dr MILES: On top of our \$20 million investment, we will announce an additional \$3.87 million in in-kind contributions for identified actions and implementation and an additional \$5 million package to directly help mineworkers pursue new employment opportunities. I table for the information of members the consultation draft of the economic transition strategy and the workers' assistance package.

Tabled paper: Queensland government: North Stradbroke Island Sand Mining Workers Assistance Scheme, December 2015 [1845].

Tabled paper: Queensland government: Draft North Stradbroke Island Economic Transition Strategy, December 2015 [1846].

I have been working closely with my ministerial colleagues and their departments to develop a transition strategy that takes account of the interests and needs of the affected stakeholders. I thank the Deputy Premier, the tourism minister, the Minister for State Development and the Treasurer for their efforts in putting this package together. The strategy focuses on driving sustainable tourism, expanding education and training opportunities and fostering business development and growth. North Stradbroke Island's future lies in its exceptional natural and cultural heritage. This bill, together with the economic strategy and workers' package, will provide certainty and support for the island's transition away from sandmining to a more diverse and stable economy in the longer term.

The government has consulted widely on this bill, the transition strategy and the worker assistance package. Ministers, including the Premier and the Deputy Premier, have met with key stakeholders, including the native title holders QYAC, the mining company Sibelco, the Redland City Council and the Straddie Chamber of Commerce. The changes I propose in this bill will finally draw a line in the sand regarding the duration and extent of mining on North Stradbroke Island. The changes represent a new start for the island and the beginning of the process of ending sandmining. They will transition North Stradbroke's economy away from mining and towards sustainable productive industries. This is what Straddie needs and what Queenslanders want.

First Reading

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (4.29 pm): I move—

That the bill now be 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 the Finance and Administration Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Finance and Administration Committee.

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (4.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, under the provisions of standing order 136, the Finance and Administration Committee report to the House on the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability and Other Acts Amendment Bill by 31 March 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**Reporting Date**

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (4.31 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Finance and Administration Committee—

1. resume its consideration of the North Stradbroke Island Protection and Sustainability (Renewal of Mining Leases) Amendment Bill; and
2. report to the House on this bill by 31 March 2016.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

**DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND ANOTHER ACT
AMENDMENT BILL**

Resumed from 29 October (see p. 2952).

Second Reading

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (4.31 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I introduced the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 into parliament on 29 October 2015. The bill was referred to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee and the committee tabled its report on the bill on 26 November 2015. I thank all members of the committee for their examination of the bill. I table a copy of the Queensland government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 10, 55th Parliament—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015, government response [1847].

The committee received 13 submissions on the bill, including submissions from the Queensland Domestic Violence Network, the Women's Legal Service, the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service (Queensland) Ltd, the Cairns Collective Impact on Domestic and Family Violence, the Australian Law Reform Commission, Soroptimist International Brisbane Incorporated, the Queensland Council of Unions and the Immigrant Women's Support Service. I thank everyone who made a submission on this bill for taking the time to do so.

The committee made five recommendations and I will address each of the committee's recommendations in turn. The committee's first recommendation is that the bill be passed and I thank the committee for that recommendation. The second recommendation relates to clause 4 of the bill. Clause 4 inserts a new principle into the act that, to the extent it is appropriate and practicable, the views and wishes of people who fear or experience domestic violence should be sought before a decision affecting them is made under the act. The committee recommended that the bill be amended to omit clause 4 and that my department reconsider how to best ensure that the victims of domestic and family violence are afforded the opportunity to express their views and wishes as part of its wider review of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and implementation of the task force recommendations. The government does not accept this recommendation.

The principles set out the key priorities for the administration of the act and the government believes that a principle to hear the views and wishes of victims sits well with the current principles, which include the safety of victims being paramount, victims should be treated with respect, perpetrators should be held to account, the person most in need of protection should be identified and special attention should be paid to those most vulnerable. The inclusion of this additional principle in the bill recognises the rights of victims to be heard and legislatively reflects the importance of victims having an opportunity to have their voices heard throughout all stages of the process. The new principle is intended to be a first step in addressing the concerns identified by the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence that victims often feel their voices are not heard, including during court proceedings.

Recommendation 129 of the task force report recommended the introduction of victim impact statements in domestic violence proceedings. The government accepted recommendation 129 and noted that the government is committed to ensuring victims' voices are heard in all domestic violence related legal proceedings and ways to achieve the intent of that recommendation would be considered as part of the review of the act. During the development of the bill, stakeholders raised with my department concerns about the use of victim impact statements in civil proceedings on an application for a protection order. We listened to them and that is why the bill does not include provisions for victim impact statements. During the committee process for this bill, stakeholders again raised concerns about the use of victim impact statements in proceedings on an application for a protection order and it has been raised by the opposition that the reference to recommendation 129 in the explanatory notes may at least give rise to the perception that a statement to court is the intention.

Let me be clear: this bill does not introduce victim impact statements in civil proceedings. There is further work to be done on this matter and it has been deferred for consideration as part of the broader review of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act, which is also underway.

Giving victims of domestic violence an opportunity to have their voices heard is a significant issue that should be given recognition as a principle for administering the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. The principle was developed and amended in consultation with stakeholders, including service providers from the domestic violence sector and the courts. For example, the inclusion of the words 'to the extent it is appropriate and practicable' reflects that the inclusion of the principle is not intended to result in unnecessary delays or impose unreasonable requirements on the courts to change existing processes. After receiving the committee's report, officers from my department again contacted key domestic violence sector stakeholders. The stakeholders contacted indicated that they were supportive of the principle remaining in the bill. Some concerns were raised during the committee process that the principle may be interpreted by magistrates as imposing an obligation to question the victim about their views and wishes in court. The principle does not require magistrates to question victims in open court and there will continue to be a range of opportunities for victims to be heard during proceedings. The principle is a reminder to decision-makers that victims should be given the opportunity to express their views and wishes to the extent it is appropriate and practicable.

The government will continue to consider how best to implement the intent of recommendation 129 of the task force report as part of the overarching review of the act, as well as through the implementation of the government's response to the task force recommendations. Through this review, we will continue to seek further input from stakeholders to ensure the intent of recommendation 129 is fulfilled.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I remind the member for Chatsworth that, in order to interject, he needs to be in his own seat.

Ms FENTIMAN: The third recommendation of the committee report is for the Queensland government to work with the Magistrates Court to establish procedures and guidelines to ensure that decisions about which courts should hear cross-applications are made in a timely manner and in

accordance with the principles in section 4 of the act. The government notes this recommendation. It is in everybody's interests that orders are managed in a timely manner, particularly given one of the driving reasons behind this amendment is to avoid the deliberate use of cross-applications to frustrate the court and other parties. I am advised that, as part of current practice, court staff routinely perform searches of court systems to determine whether or not there is a cross-application.

Section 10 of the application form used to apply for a domestic violence protection order contains a question to applicants to provide details of other orders or applications, including whether there is a current or past Queensland domestic violence order. To consolidate consistent practice and ensure the earliest identification of cross-applications can be made, new and updated procedures for Magistrates Court staff are being developed to mandate these searches and improve processes. Consideration is also being given to a practice direction to be issued by the Chief Magistrate, setting out a framework for the hearing of cross-applications and providing submissions about the transfer of proceedings.

The committee's fourth recommendation is that the Queensland government work with the magistrates courts to ensure that applicants for domestic violence orders are given the opportunity to provide details about why a matter should be heard in a particular court. The government notes this recommendation. Currently, a magistrate making a decision to adjourn a matter to another court location will generally hear from the parties before making such a decision. As I mentioned previously, consideration is being given to a new practice direction to be issued by the Chief Magistrate setting out a framework for the hearing of cross-applications and how submissions from the parties can be made about the transfer of proceedings.

The committee's final recommendation is that I clarify a number of matters about body worn cameras during the second reading debate. Let me address the matters that the committee has asked for clarification about. The committee asked me to outline what training police officers receive in relation to the use of body worn cameras at domestic and family violence incidents.

Body worn cameras are considered to be an evidence gathering tool that may enhance the police response to and investigation of domestic and family violence and other incidents by recording relevant information. The appropriate circumstances for the use of body worn cameras are outlined in the police *Digital electronic recording of evidence and interviews manual*.

Police receive extensive training in relation to investigating domestic and family violence as part of their initial training. Additional training is provided through online learning products. This is supported by a comprehensive Queensland Police Service policy in relation to domestic violence as contained in chapter 9 of the QPS *Operational procedures manual*. This chapter outlines the policy and procedures for managing domestic violence incidents and providing assistance to members of the community who may be affected by domestic violence.

The Queensland Police Service has an extensive network of domestic and family violence coordinators throughout the state. These are specialist police officers available in each police district to provide direction, guidance and advice to police officers on domestic and family violence issues.

The committee has also asked me to outline what measures are in place to ensure that police officers are aware of and comply with the Queensland Police Service's policy on the use of body worn cameras and the handling and storage of body worn camera recordings. The Queensland Police Service has advised me that the Queensland Police Service policy about body worn cameras was developed to support the rollout of service issued body worn cameras. That policy is located in the *Digital electronic recording of evidence and interviews manual*. Police officers were advised of this policy through a statewide email dated 16 October 2015.

Police officers are under a statutory obligation to comply with directions and orders given to them by the commissioner under section 4.9 of the Police Service Administration Act 1990. The commissioner requires all members of the Police Service to be familiar with the contents of the manual and to comply with the contents of the manual so that their duties are discharged lawfully, ethically and efficiently.

The committee's recommendation also asked me to outline what procedures are in place to deal with noncompliance with the policy. A failure by police to comply with the Queensland Police Service policy may make that officer liable to disciplinary action under section 7.4 of the Police Service Administration Act 1990. The disciplinary sanctions that a police officer may face through the police discipline process range from cautioning or reprimand to dismissal from the service. This range of disciplinary sanctions allows the severity of the disciplinary sanction to be commensurate and reflective of the seriousness of each individual matter.

I will now turn to provide a general overview of the amendments that the bill contains. This bill responds to three specific recommendations and legislative amendments in the *Not now, not ever* report of the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland. Recommendation 99 of the task force report recommended that the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 be amended to require the court to consider concurrent cross-applications at the same time and a latter application and related cross-application or order.

The bill implements this recommendation by requiring a court, if it is aware of cross-applications, to hear the cross-applications together and determine the person most in need of protection. A court will have discretion to hear cross-applications separately if the court decides it is necessary to deal with applications separately in the interests of safety, protection or wellbeing of an aggrieved person.

This amendment will help to improve the safety of victims by setting a clear expectation that in the majority of cases all relevant issues and circumstances surrounding a particular domestic or family violence case are considered by a court at the same time. Courts will also be required to identify the person most in need of protection in accordance with existing principles of the act.

The task force report also recommended legislative amendments to require a court, when making a domestic violence order, to consider whether an order excluding the perpetrator from the home should be made, having regard to the wishes of the victim. This was contained in recommendation 117 and is commonly referred to as an ouster condition.

The bill implements this recommendation by requiring the court to consider the imposition of an ouster condition in relation to each application for a temporary or final domestic violence order. Although the court is required to have regard to the wishes of the victim, whether or not an ouster condition is made will ultimately remain a decision that is made by the court. As with all decisions made under the act, the safety, protection and wellbeing of the victim and any children will continue to be the paramount consideration for the court. While it will not be mandatory for a court to consider the imposition of an ouster condition in relation to variation applications, the court will retain discretion to be able to impose a condition if it is necessary.

It is important to note that the bill does not require victims to express their views or wishes about the making of an ouster condition. The bill includes a provision stating that no adverse inference can be drawn if a victim chooses not to make their views known.

The bill includes an amendment that relates to recommendation 129 of the task force report. That recommendation sought the introduction of victim impact statements in domestic violence proceedings and mandatory consideration of these statements by courts in applications for protection orders.

As I mentioned earlier, the amendment in this bill does not introduce victim impact statements. Rather, it includes a new principle that, to the extent it is appropriate and practicable, the views and wishes of people who fear or experience domestic violence should be sought before a decision affecting them is made under the act.

Currently, when a court is deciding whether a protection order is necessary or desirable to protect the aggrieved from domestic violence, the court must consider the principles in section 4 of the act. The inclusion of the additional principle recognises the rights of victims to be treated with respect and dignity and the importance of ensuring an opportunity for victims to provide information about their views and wishes if they wish to do so.

There is no mandatory requirement for a victim to provide information to a court and it will continue to be a matter for each aggrieved person as to whether they choose to provide any information based on their personal circumstances. The inclusion of the principle is a reminder to decision-makers that, if victims wish to be heard, they should be given appropriate opportunities to do so and their difficult and traumatic experiences of domestic and family violence should be treated with care and respect.

Although a new principle is being included through the bill, the paramount principle of the act is the safety, protection and wellbeing of people who fear or experience domestic violence, including their children. This will continue to be the overriding consideration for every decision made and action taken by a person involved in the administration of the act.

The bill also responds to recommendation 131 of the task force report that the Queensland Police Service develop and implement a strategy for increasing criminal prosecution of perpetrators of domestic and family violence through enhanced investigative and evidence-gathering methodologies. The government accepted this recommendation and has funded the rollout of 300 body worn cameras for police officers at the Gold Coast. This new technology will help our front-line police to assist in gathering evidence in domestic and family violence situations as well as other priority policing functions.

The amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 in the bill provide certainty that the use of body worn cameras by police officers in the performance of their duties is lawful. Police officers using body worn cameras currently face the remote risk that they may unintentionally record private conversations. This provision will remove that concern by providing police officers with an exemption to the general prohibition on recording private conversations under the Invasion of Privacy Act 1971.

This provision will operate to ensure that the use of body worn cameras will be considered to be lawful even if their use is inadvertent, unexpected or otherwise incidental to the performance of the officer's duty. This provision only applies to body worn cameras which are defined to mean a device that is designed to record images or images and sounds and which is worn on clothing or otherwise secured on a person.

The bill also makes two minor and technical amendments. The first of these will allow victims and police to appeal a court's decision not to make a temporary protection order. The second will allow temporary protection orders to be made to protect a person who is seeking to be added to a protection order, such as a child or a new partner. These amendments were recommended by the task force report.

Again, I would like to extend my thanks to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee for its examination of the bill. I would also like to thank the research staff of the committee for their hard work and dedication in assisting the committee in their consideration of the bill.

This bill continues this government's significant reform efforts that have already seen the passage of the Criminal Law (Domestic Violence) Amendment Act 2015. This bill delivered immediate changes to our courts and criminal justice proceedings including increasing penalties for breaches of domestic violence orders, better recording of convictions and allowing for special witness protection. In addition, the Coroners (Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board) Amendment Act 2015 has also been passed and provides for the establishment of a death review and advisory board so that systems can be improved to prevent further deaths.

The Attorney-General and Minister for Justice has also introduced the Criminal Law (Domestic Violence) Amendment Bill (No. 2) 2015 this week, which proposes a new offence of strangulation and the introduction of amendments to the Penalties and Sentences Act 1992 to make domestic violence an aggravating factor on sentence. We know that non-fatal strangulation is a serious predictive risk factor for future homicide, and a specific offence of non-fatal strangulation aims to improve the identification of such conduct, increase perpetrator accountability, and improve risk assessment and management for victims.

I look forward to hearing members' contributions to the debate of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. In conjunction with the other reforms being implemented by this government, this bill will make a significant difference to the lives of those experiencing the devastating effects of domestic and family violence. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (4.51 pm): Domestic and family violence is a terrible stain on our society. The impact on victims is horrific and we should be doing all we can to eradicate it from our communities. That is why in government the LNP established the domestic and family violence task force, chaired by Dame Quentin Bryce, and it is why the LNP has offered bipartisan support to implement the recommendations of the task force. The LNP will give support to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 as it provides for a number of the task force recommendations to be put into effect.

In a civilised society it is shameful that we have allowed domestic violence to have a presence in the past but even more shameful that it still has a presence behind closed doors today. We are making some headway by talking much more openly about the issue and saying a resounding no to domestic violence. But we need to continue with great resolve to do all we can to make the process more supportive of the victim and make the perpetrator more accountable.

For many victims, making the decision to leave a domestic violence relationship can take a very long time, and the thought of having to appear in court where the perpetrator is present is overwhelmingly traumatic. We should always avoid being judgemental of victims who decide to stay in unsafe or unhealthy relationships. From the outside looking in it can seem that a decision to leave a violent or demeaning relationship is an easy one, but for the overwhelming majority of victims this is not the case. The reasons for staying are far more complex.

Often it is dangerous for a victim to leave an abusive relationship. Leaving could mean a fear of financial hardship, it could mean living in fear of being stalked or fear of losing custody of children, and it could mean experiencing harassment at work. Women particularly may not immediately leave an abusive relationship because they fear that the perpetrator will become even more violent—perhaps fatal. If there are periods of calm, nurturing and love between incidents of abuse, some think it is better to keep the family together for the sake of the children. Questioning why people do not leave these relationships lays blame with the victim. What we should be questioning is why perpetrators commit acts of domestic and family violence and terrorise their partners.

As I have said, the bill before the House gives effect to some recommendations of the domestic and family violence task force, and it does this through making amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. As we are supporting the bill, I will keep my remarks short. The minister did give a very good overview in her contribution. I will start by speaking to the amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012.

As outlined in the explanatory notes, there are three key amendments to this act which were recommended by the task force. Firstly, with respect to recommendation 99, which recommends that 'the court must consider a family law order when making a domestic violence order' and also 'that the court must consider cross-applications at the same time and a later application and related cross-application or order', there is general agreement that it is desirable that cross-applications for domestic and family violence orders be considered together with the exception of where the court deems that the safety of the aggrieved is at risk. It is important that these cross-applications are heard within a reasonable period of time not only so that the matter is not protracted unnecessarily but for the further safety of victims, because in some instances a vexatious cross-application can be made by the perpetrator as a means of revenge or used as a bullying tactic in an attempt to force the victim to withdraw their application.

The Women's Legal Service in the public hearing on 18 November broadly supported this amendment. However, in her submission on behalf of the Women's Legal Service, Ms Angela Lynch said—

In relation to applications, we agree that cross applications for domestic violence orders should be heard as much as possible and practical together, as this will assist the court to make a determination about who is the most vulnerable and in need of protection and whether a protection order is necessary or desirable. However, we do believe that the bill could be improved by introducing a legislative process to assist the court's decision-making about determining the most suitable registry when there are simultaneous court applications on foot between two magistrates courts. Which court will make this determination? What legislative guidance will they be provided with?

Ms Lynch makes a very sound point and identifies an issue that does need to be addressed as a matter of priority in order to ensure that the intent of the amendment is practically met. As I understand, there are just over 80 per cent of cross-applications filed in the same registry as the first application which means that nearly 20 per cent would in fact require a determination. I appreciate that the minister spoke to this during her contribution. But what is really important is that those things that the minister spoke about and the methods in which those are going to be applied really need to be tracked to make sure that we do get the very best outcomes for those who appear in court through cross-applications.

The second amendment makes it a requirement of the courts, when developing new or making changes to existing orders, to consider imposing an ouster condition. Whilst ouster conditions are currently available to be considered in domestic violence orders, they are not required to be considered. As the minister said in her speech, this is 'because the court is not obligated to consider imposing this condition, such conditions are not applied for or made often enough'.

But, even if an ouster condition is being considered, there are a number of external factors that would need to be deliberated on such as the availability of alternative accommodation for the person removed from their place of residence and, in the case of rural or remote communities, this is a particularly significant issue and needs to be addressed. But, importantly, in circumstances where the court is considering an ouster provision in a domestic violence order, the views of the victim should be taken into account when the determination is being made. But I am pleased very much that it is not mandatory for the aggrieved to do so, and that was confirmed in the minister's contribution.

The third element is around ensuring that the aggrieved is listened to through the entire process. There is no doubt that many victims feel they are not being heard, and that is certainly reflected in conversations that I have had with victims of domestic violence along with front-line support professionals. I thank the minister for the opportunity to be briefed yesterday on the matter, because during the public hearing, as the minister mentioned, many submitters expressed their grave concern

around the use of victim impact statements. I also thank the minister for clarifying what was ambiguous language in the explanatory notes which did give rise to the perception that clause 4 was dealing with victim impact statements. Based on the assurances from the minister, the LNP accepts that clause 4 is intended as a guiding principle which seeks to ensure that the views and wishes of people who experience domestic and family violence are sought at every stage of the process. But what we do want to see is the principle being practically implemented, not just well-meaning words within the act.

I move briefly to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. The bill amends the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to allow for police officers acting in the performance of their duties to lawfully wear body worn cameras. We note that the Queensland Police Union has been briefed as part of the consultation on the rollout of the body worn camera project. We also note that the committee has recommended that the minister clarify the policies, training and procedures that should be put in place for the use of those body worn cameras by sworn officers. The minister did take a great deal of time to talk about that in her contribution, and I thank her for that.

With those few comments, again I affirm our support for the bill, but while I am on my feet I think it is really important that I say a few words more broadly. Many honourable members in this House have shared stories about domestic and family violence, and some have been very, very personal stories. What that demonstrates, sadly, is that domestic and family violence lives everywhere in our community. I think wherever possible we should share these stories and not be scared about sharing them, because the stories give this issue context. It puts a human face to domestic and family violence—that people are not just statistics.

I am a very fortunate woman. I have lived a life with love and support from the men in my life. But, sadly, two of my friends have died at the hands of their intimate partners. The first was murdered around 25 years ago by her domicile boyfriend. I had spoken to her only a few days earlier when she had said to me that she wanted this man out of her house. I was very busy when she rang—I had very small children running around and I just did not have the time to speak to her—so I told her to go to the police and get an order to have him removed as it was her home. As I said in my earlier remarks, we should not assume that exiting an abusive relationship is an easy decision to make. I did not know then what I know now—that making the decision to leave can be very, very dangerous. I do not know if she took my advice and his violence was a reaction to that, but just days later she was dead. Her partner had strangled her and dismembered her body. I will never stop wondering whether if I had given her a different response she would still be with us here today.

My second friend was brutally bashed by her husband, but to ensure she was dead he strangled her with a dog collar. I had rung my friend and her husband had answered the phone. He told me she was at the shops. I said to him that I would ring her later but nobody was at home so I left a message on the machine. During the investigation, the police advised me that it was likely I had spoken to him very shortly after he had killed her—that he had panicked and he had answered the phone. So ridding our society of domestic and family violence is an intensely personal quest for me. No-one should suffer at the hands of the person who is supposed to love them.

In closing, I thank the committee for their examination of the bill, particularly the deputy chair and member for Caloundra, Mark McArdle; the member for Warrego, Ann Leahy; and the member for Redlands, Matt McEachan. I would also like to thank the committee chair for allowing me to participate as part of the committee for the public hearing on 18 November. I would like to thank all of those who made submissions and those who appeared at the hearings. They provided insights that are necessary to make sure that any proposed changes to legislation that we are making now and into the future actually reflect the needs of victims both in the courts and via our support services.

 **Ms DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (5.05 pm): I rise as the chair of the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee. I would like to thank my fellow committee members for their hard work. I also thank the committee secretariat, the departmental officers from the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services for all of their hard work and all of the people who provided information and came to give information to the committee. The Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 is a recommendation of the domestic violence task force. It specifically addresses recommendation 99, cross-applications; recommendation 117, ouster conditions; and recommendation 129, views and wishes. It also introduces amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 to allow for the use of body worn cameras by police.

Firstly, I would like to talk about cross-orders and the challenges they currently pose for victims and why it is important that courts give proper consideration when determining who the person most in need of protection is and why it could be in the victim's best interests for applications to be separately

heard if they needed to be. In my experience working for the department of child safety, I was involved in a professional capacity with domestic violence as an issue for a couple of decades. I had firsthand experience of the court system and the challenges for victims who go through that, and I know how cross-orders can be used to prolong or to continue to control a victim by a perpetrator. So I am very happy to support any steps we can take to get this to stop and to support victims and keep them safer.

There has been a lot of concern about determining which is the most appropriate court. I have had people come into my office about this, including a young woman with a baby in a pram who is currently going through applying for a domestic violence protection order. She lives in Bundaberg and her partner lodged the application in Hervey Bay, which means she now has to travel down to Hervey Bay, but every time she goes there he adjourns it again for another day. With a small child and no mode of transport, this is incredibly difficult for her and it is just another way that he is continuing to control her after she has made the brave step to leave that relationship. So I thank the minister and the government for the response. If the courts actually determine who is most in need of protection and which is the most appropriate court, it will go a long way to supporting victims to be able to navigate the court process. I think some people give up now because it is all too hard and too difficult.

Secondly, I would like to talk about ouster conditions and the response to recommendation 117 of the DV task force. Ouster conditions are currently only used in about 28 per cent of cases, even though they are something that magistrates can consider but now the applicant has to actually ask for them. If somebody is going through the DV court where they may be feeling quite disempowered—because they are in a room with the perpetrator—it is probably not the best environment for them to be standing up and saying that they want the perpetrator thrown out of the house. That can be an incredibly intimidating environment.

There are a lot of reasons that it makes perfect sense for victims—mostly, in my experience, with children—to stay in the home if it is safe to do so. Predominantly, women and children who are made to leave a home find somewhere in a refuge or another safe place and that can be away from their children's schools. Having to move school and move away from their neighbourhood or friends can add more trauma to a child who has probably been witnessing trauma for quite a number of years if there has been violence in their household between their parents. Pets can also be used. Children can be incredibly bonded to their pets. If they are forced to leave their pet behind with a violent parent sometimes those parents can use pets as leverage to get the children and the victim to return to the home. Anything that we can do to make children's lives better, to reduce any trauma on children, to allow them to sleep in their own beds and have familiar surroundings and their support systems around them is another important recommendation.

I would also like to applaud the minister for the expansion of the safety upgrade program. This can make a lot of difference psychologically as well. Under this program, a woman can have refuge staff or police come in and do a security assessment of their home, change locks, put security screens on or do a number of things to actually make the home safer—not only physically safer but also psychologically safer.

Thirdly, the minister talked about 'views' and 'wishes'. Originally, the discussion was about impact statements. This caused quite a lot of discussion in committee hearings and about submissions because there was a bit of confusion around views and wishes and whether that meant a victim impact statement or whether that meant somebody had to stand up in a proceeding and give their views or wishes in front of a perpetrator. I thank the minister for clarifying that. It certainly put my mind at rest as well.

Finally, I want to talk about the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and how body worn cameras for police may actually support victims to not have to stand in a courtroom and give verbal evidence. Instead, police may use that video as evidence of domestic violence. All round, this is another great step in trying to eradicate domestic violence from our community but also support victims—victims meaning adults and children—to have some semblance of normality in their lives if they choose not to leave home rather than have their whole worlds turned upside down as well as having proper process afforded to them in considering what is best and who is the person most in need of protection. In my experience I have seen a lot of children whose lives have not been made better by going through the court system and leaving their homes. I am particularly pleased about the strengthening of ouster conditions so that children can stay with pets, can stay in familiar surroundings and can stay at the same school or in the same community. This to me is a major improvement in our system.

I would like to say thank you again to all the departmental staff and to the committee. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (5.13 pm): I rise to make a contribution to debate on the bill before the House. I want to acknowledge my colleagues on the committee and, in particular, acknowledge the work done by the secretariat staff: Karl, Lucy and Carla. The bill derives from the content of the *Not now, not ever* task force report and specifically deals with recommendations 99, 117 and 129 of that report. I refer to the explanatory notes and quote as follows from page 1 of that document. It states—

The Taskforce Report recommended three specific amendments to the *Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012* ... These were that amendments be made to:

- require courts to consider family law orders when making a domestic violence order and also consider concurrent cross applications at the same time and a later application and cross application or order ...
- require courts when making a domestic violence order to consider whether an order excluding the perpetrator from the home should be made, having regard to the wishes of the victim ...
- provide for victim impact statements to be introduced and for mandatory consideration by the courts in applications for protection orders ...

It is the last point that is of relevance. There are two other minor amendments allowing an appeal from a court's decision not to make a temporary protection order and allow temporary protection orders to be made to protect a person who is seeking to be added to the protection order. The final amendment deals with the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, which I will deal with separately.

The committee's report was tabled last month and recommends the bill be passed in recommendation 1. Recommendation 2 is that clause 4 of the bill be omitted. It is this clause that caused perhaps the most concern for committee members. It can be referenced to recommendation 129 as appears on page 1 of the greens and contained in the Bryce report that deals specifically with the victim impact statements. This derives from page 316 of the report, which clearly references that victim impact statements should be included in any amendment to have the court hear the impact of domestic violence by the aggrieved once an order has been made. This in part is based on a submission to the task force by the Bar Association of Queensland. They say at page 316 of the Bryce report—

The obvious advantage of including victim impact statements in Protection Order proceedings is that the aggrieved has a direct voice to the Magistrate and can feel heard in the court process. As corollary, the aggrieved and their supporters' confidence in the legal system is enhanced. Equally, there can be something very powerful when an aggrieved is able to state how the violence and abuse personally impacted upon them, in the presence of the Respondent, when the Respondent cannot interrupt and is being watched (and judged) by the Magistrate. The violent and/or abusive bully has to sit, be quiet and listen.

It is then that the Bryce report recommends that the statement be included in court proceedings.

Victim impact statements are used in the criminal jurisdiction at the conclusion of a trial and subsequent to the defendant having been found guilty or if a defendant pleads guilty. At that point the victim, either in person or through written documentation, has a right to address the court and explain to the court what impact the crime has had upon them and their family. That is a standard understanding of that term. That is, in fact, the wording that appears on page 1 of the greens and is a clear recommendation the government said it would implement. Honourable members should then turn to page 7 of the greens, which explains clause 4. It states—

It also includes the addition of a new principle at section 4(2)(b) which recognises the importance of victims of domestic violence being able to express their views and wishes in relation to decisions made under the Act which affect them.

The unfortunate thing about page 7 is that, when we consider the terms contained to explain clause 4 against the terms of page 1, when taken literally, it is meant to refer to a victim impact statement. In fact, the words at page 7 dealing with clause 4 do not clarify the intent of recommendation 129 and they should have. Clause 4 in the context of a victim impact statement makes no sense. When we read the terms of clause 4 it refers to obtaining the views and wishes of people 'before a decision affecting them is made under this act'.

A true victim impact statement would not be given before a decision is made, hence either the greens are incorrect or some other meaning was intended to be given to clause 4. It is not only the committee members who had concerns in relation to clause 4. In its submission to the committee the Women's Legal Service made the following comment—

We do not agree with the current proposed provision and have concerns that it might actually have the opposite effect of decreasing women's safety in certain circumstances or other unintended consequences.

In her second reading speech the minister has now explained that it was not the intent to provide a victim impact statement as referred to in the *Not now, not ever* report. Rather, clause 4 was to ensure that, along the process from the first contact with the police, to making an application for an order, to the conclusion of proceedings, the wishes and views of the aggrieved should be able to be sought and

listened to. The minister has explained that this would apply to police officers, staff in the registry and the like who should then be aware that they are required to listen to applicants and heed their desires as part of the listening process so that a victim is able to put their point of view across. Critically, it highlights that in dealing with matters of this nature one must be very cautious. Courts have the right to look at explanatory notes to try to understand the intent of the bill just as much as the courts can look to the second reading speech of a minister to understand the terms of the bill. The minister's statement here today rectifies this problem, and I congratulate her for doing so.

The other point that I wish to discuss is that, when there are two applications filed in separate registries, the bill determines that they are to be heard in one registry. This arises from recommendations 3 and 4. It is quite possible to have competing applications filed some distance apart and in two separate registries. In other jurisdictions applications are accompanied by an affidavit; for example, in the Family Court an affidavit will provide details of where assets are or children reside. It makes it easier in those circumstances for a court to transfer a file from one registry to another or, of course, even interstate. The current situation with an application for a domestic violence order is that the detail that you put into such an order is quite voluminous; in fact, it is quite a complicated document.

In my opinion, there would be little scope in amending the application form to put further detail in there as to why a registry should have the carriage of a particular matter. The situation at present, as I understand it, is that where there are applications in separate registries the courts make orders in those registries, as they are reluctant to pass them on to another registry—particularly in the Magistrates Court, where the workload is very heavy—without a very good reason for doing so. I would ask the minister in her reply if she could update the House on what steps will or can be taken to assist in one registry dealing with both matters, given that the application form is somewhat scant on detail in relation to what it includes for the court to make that determination and what a court would require before it determined the matter. As I said, I understand it is complicated because the Magistrates Court is the busiest registry in any jurisdiction.

Regarding the amendment to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act in relation to body worn cameras being used by police and the evidence obtained from that being used in a court of law, the bill will allow the evidence, both audio and visual, obtained through the cameras to be used as evidence in a court; but it will not affect the impact of the Evidence Act 1977 and the admissibility of any recordings is still a question for the court to determine. This means that, even though the use of a camera to record images and audio is lawful, the legality or the weight to be given to such evidence is still subject to the terms of the Evidence Act and will come down to the individual circumstances of each case.

I have said many times in this place that the question of domestic violence covers both male and female victims. I note that in the *Australian* on the weekend of 14 and 15 November, in an article by Bettina Arndt titled 'Silent victims', she refers to Professor Murray Strauss, professor of sociology at the University of New Hampshire, and his paper 'Thirty years of denying the evidence on gender symmetry in partner violence'. She states that Strauss—

... concludes that in the US men sustain about a third of the injuries from partner violence, including a third of the deaths from attacks by a partner.

Arndt then goes on to state—

In Australia, men made up a quarter of the 1,645 partner deaths between 1989 and 2012.

Again, I repeat that it is important we understand that domestic violence is not a gender based issue; it is an issue that attaches to men and women right across this nation.

I also want to commend the shadow minister for her speech this afternoon and for taking the step to inform the House of what happened to two of her friends a number of years ago. It takes courage for people to step up in this chamber and speak about their own issues, their own concerns and their own experiences. I commend her for doing so, and I commend her for the spirit in which she did so. I also commend the bill to the House.

 **Miss BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (5.25 pm): I rise today to make a very short contribution to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Act Amendment Bill 2015. I think I might start off where the member for Caloundra left off in acknowledging the contributions that people have made not only today with this bill but also with other domestic and family violence legislation before the House. Not only have we heard from the member from Aspley today, but in the past we have heard from the member for Pumicestone, the member for Ferny Grove, the member for Redlands and a number of other honourable members in this House. Their contributions demonstrate to us how poignant it is to act in this space at this time.

When I acted as Deputy Speaker for the youth parliament here in this place a couple of months ago, I was able to experience a number of our youths make personal contributions. What struck me was that the majority of those contributions talked about violence in one form or another: sexual violence, domestic violence and assaults. This is something that we must act on now. That is why this bill is so important. Of the 140 recommendations in the *Not now, not ever* task force into domestic violence, this implements three of them: recommendations 91, 117 and 129.

There are four main objectives to this bill, and the first one deals with cross-applications and ensuring that, when there are conflicting allegations of domestic and family violence in civil applications for protection orders, the courts are identifying and protecting the person who is most in need of protection. Ouster conditions are the second component to this legislation, so that is increasing protections for victims of domestic and family violence and minimising the disruption to their lives by requiring the court to consider imposing a condition excluding the perpetrator of domestic violence from their home regardless of their gender.

Thirdly, we are looking at impact statements and recognising the importance of victims of domestic violence being able to express their views and wishes in relation to decisions under the act. This is a really important point that I want to pick up on. In saying that, I also pay my respects to the member for Brisbane Central and the member for Lytton, who subbed in for me on this committee. There were meetings and hearings that I could not attend while this bill was under consideration, so I thank those members for doing an outstanding job with the committee work.

I also want to pick up on the commentary today from many speakers, particularly the minister, around the impact statements. Clarification in that space, as opposed to the committee recommendations, I think is terribly important.

The fourth thing this bill does is clarify that the use of body worn cameras by police acting in the performance of their duties is lawful. We heard from the QPS at an earlier hearing. We got to see a body worn camera. That was pretty exciting; I definitely enjoyed that. To actually see and hear firsthand how these devices are used, the difference they have made and the fact that so many of our police men and women have actually gone out and purchased these devices themselves, rather than have them provided, showed us what an appetite there was to use them and have more of them. This bill has four very important components.

I thank all of the members and the chair of the committee. We currently have quite a number of different bills and inquiries before us. I also pay my respects to the really essential support staff we have on the committee. They do a terrific job. Carla, Lucy and Karl, I thank you. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (5.30 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Domestic and Family Violence and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. I thank my good friend and colleague Tracy Davis MP for being the driving force behind the *Not now, not ever* task force. I am pleased that the current government is adopting the recommendations of the report.

Ordinarily I would not have told the story I am about to tell, but what prompted me was when another member in this House said that they seriously doubted that there was anyone in this parliament who had been a victim of domestic violence. Well, you are wrong. Let me tell you Barb's story.

Barb was a beautiful 23-year-old schoolteacher. She came from a loving Catholic family where her father was a school principal and her mother was a true lady. She had never known violence in her sheltered life, but for the next 35 years it became the norm. She moved to a small country town and was a real catch. Not long after arriving she met a dashing, handsome champion footballer. He was smart and charming and could dance like Fred Astaire. Very quickly they fell in love and married.

Barb saw his temper every now and then when he had been drinking but put it down to disappointments in his life. He had escaped the family farm and become a pilot and was playing football in the big smoke, but he got called back to work on the farm and his dreams died. Three little girls followed in quick succession. Even when she was pregnant and he had locked her in the nursery for three days without food or water or somewhere to go to the bathroom, she did not tell anybody and she did not leave because she loved him.

It did not take long for the violence to begin. At first she thought it was her fault—that she was not good enough, that she must have done something wrong—so she would go to mass and pray that things would get better. She did not tell anyone because she had taken a vow and she was ashamed. She did not tell her sister or her parents. She thought she had made her bed and she should lie in it. She did not leave because she loved him.

Friday and Saturday nights after the pub closed were always the same. The family would wait for the car door to slam and then wait for the violence to begin. It generally began with the evening's dinner, which was being warmed on the stovetop, thrown against the wall and then the fists would start to fly. Barb would try to get the three girls in bed before he came home, but that did not always protect them. The girls had vivid memories of these nights—nights when one of them would run to the neighbours to plead with the man next door to come in and stop dad hurting mum, nights when the violence was so bloody that the police would come. They would quiet things down and then leave, and retribution always followed. So the family stopped calling the police and Barb stayed because she loved him.

One night the two older girls awoke to hear the most pitiful sound, like the sound of a wounded animal. They went into their mother's room and saw her sitting on the bed, sobbing and holding a chunk of her scalp and with a large bleeding wound on her head. She could not work out how she could go to school the next day and hide it from her fellow teachers. The girls found a chocolate box, took the green ribbon off it and helped her fashion a headband from the ribbon so that no-one would know.

The girls were sworn to secrecy. The girls were used to making up stories about their mother's bruises or their bruises. The girls were taught to be ashamed of their family's dirty little secret. Many a night the older daughter would try to stop the baby from jumping up and down in her cot and giggling, because she was too little to understand that it endangered them all. The baby thought it was a game when the older sisters hid her under the bed or in the wardrobe.

One night that still brings nightmares was waking up and hearing Barb pleading for her life. The oldest girl's job was to hide the carving knife with the red handle. No-one told her to do it; she just knew that she should. That night the girls had forgotten to hide the red knife. The middle daughter remembers standing behind her father, who was wielding the red knife. She remembers picking up the metal extension of the vacuum cleaner and saying, 'You kill Mum and you're next.' And with that she was thrown up against a wall and given a black eye—and it would not be the last time. She was seven.

The nuns at the school and the parish priests prayed for the family, and then they stopped asking why the daughters had bruises or black eyes. The local police knew, but in small country towns people mind their own business. Barb's family was one of a number of families in that small country town whose weekends were spent covered in blood. There were no family holidays. There were no friends sleepovers, because if they did they were terrified and they never came back and they stopped being friends with the girls.

When the family moved to acreage things got worse. With no neighbours, no-one could hear the screams. In the new house they all had their own rooms, with sliding doors along with passageway, and they would wait in dread as the first door slammed open and then the next and finally to the room of the middle daughter, who took many a punch meant for her mother.

Relatives knew and did nothing. Relatives even said, 'You must have done something to deserve it. You shouldn't antagonise him.' So many times the home phone was ripped out of the wall to prevent calling for help. There were many times, after being violently beaten herself, that one of the daughters would run three miles to the only payphone in the area to ring an uncle to come and stop the fists. Eventually, because they were sick of it, no-one came. And Barb stayed because she loved him.

Weekends were horrendous, but during the week no-one drank. They were a normal family. Without alcohol the father was the best father anyone could have. No-one ever talked about the violence of the previous weekend. It was never discussed, and life went back to normal and no-one ever said sorry.

For Barb it was all about the shame. She could not leave because she was Catholic. She could not leave because she would be taking the girls' father from them. She could not leave because she did not want her parents to know. She would often sob in between the blows and say, 'Why are you doing this to me? I thought you loved me.'

She tried to leave once, but he came after her and promised that it would not happen again. But it always did. No child should know what it is like to be hit with a fist like an iron bar. No child should know what it is like to be thrown up against a wall like a rag doll. No child should know what it is like to be hit in the face with an iron or have their jaw almost broken, their nose broken and earrings ripped from their ears. No child should ever know what it is like to be curled in the foetal position, covering their head whilst trying to fend off kicks to their stomach, their back and their head. The middle daughter vowed to never allow her mother to be hurt if she could stop it, but she knew that if she stayed then one night he would not stop and she would be dead. She left home at 15.

The girls eventually forgave their father. He died 11 years ago and Barb died four years later from a broken heart. I tell this story in memory of Barb. I tell this story because she was too ashamed to. I tell this story through the eyes of a child and I tell this story because I was the middle daughter.

Barb's favourite prayer was, 'God, grant me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, courage to change the things I can and wisdom to know the difference.' She could have changed it but she did not. She chose to stay. She did have courage, but it was not courageous to stay. She should have had the wisdom to know what lifelong effect her decision to stay would have on her three girls.

As politicians we are all appalled by domestic violence. The media spotlight quite rightly is now on domestic violence. The danger is that, as with everything, once the media dies down the victims are forgotten until the next shocking incident. So when we as politicians tonight or at the end of the week go home to our families, where I truly hope that none of you is a victim of domestic violence, just remember the children of domestic violence whose experiences they will take with them throughout their entire lives.

 **Mr PYNE** (Cairns—ALP) (5.39 pm): I rise to speak on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill. Again finding myself at the end of the speaking list, there is little I can add that has not been articulately laid out by the minister and particularly the member for Bundaberg and nothing that I can say of a personal nature so moving as what we have just heard. In lieu of that, I want to recognise some people in my own community such as Amanda Lee-Ross from the Cairns Regional Domestic Violence Service and other community sector workers and people from Ruth's Women's Shelter and those who have worked so hard around the scourge of domestic violence. I would just like to reflect on the White Ribbon Day event where so many of us were earlier in the week with Quentin Bryce. It was wonderful to see so many members of parliament there. I could not help reflecting during previous speeches on Quentin Bryce's remarks that she hopes this does not go off the agenda. I certainly feel there is no other issue that has captured the attention of the public, the attention of the parliament and the attention of the community as much as this. I for one feel very confident that this issue is in no danger of slipping off the agenda. Legislation is being enacted, resources are being allocated but, most importantly, the will of the parliament and the will of the people of this country and this state is for this situation to change and I am confident that it will.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. I want to thank the committee staff for their assistance with the inquiry and the professionalism in which they have undertaken the task assigned to them in the time frame. I also want to thank my fellow committee members from both sides of the House for their participation and consideration of this bill. The bill, as we have heard, seeks to implement a further suite of recommendations made from the *Not now, not ever* task force report—an initiative of the former LNP government. It seeks to ensure that domestic and family violence victims' voices are heard, the framework for how cross-applications for protection orders are dealt with and a requirement for the courts to consider ouster conditions and the use of body worn cameras by police. The task force heard that domestic violence victims often feel that their voices are not heard during court proceedings. Clause 4 seeks to amend section 4 of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to achieve this outcome.

Currently, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act provides the court may hear cross-applications together but it does not require the courts to do so. The bill implements task force recommendation No. 99 by requiring the courts to consider cross-applications together, and it defines the terms and procedures for dealing with cross-applications. The court will be allowed to determine who is most vulnerable and in need of protection and whether the protection order is necessary and desirable. I hope that rural and regional victims of domestic violence do not suffer delays in the management of cross-applications. It seems to be a good concept to hear the applications in one court. However, there are issues related to which is the most appropriate court to hear those applications and where parties reside in geographically distant locations—for instance, one in Cunnamulla and maybe one in Toowoomba—it could be problematic or courts may be reluctant to add to the workload of other courts. The committee noted that there would be considerable challenges in rural and regional locations due to the imposts of cross-hearings and I encourage the government to look closely, as addressing these issues will be of benefit to domestic violence victims, be they male or female.

The task force report raised concerns that ouster conditions are not considered often enough. The data presented indicates that approximately 28 per cent of cases from 2012 to 2015 had ouster conditions. The bill requires the court to consider whether to impose an ouster condition for each domestic violence order it makes. Concerns were raised in relation to the practical imposition of ouster conditions, and I fully understand why these concerns have been raised. They were well articulated by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, which stated that the amendments will lead to

an increase in the number of ouster conditions imposed and as a consequence may cause an increase in respondent homelessness given that there is a dire lack of available hostels, shelters and accommodation for men in Queensland. One does not have to travel very far out into rural and regional Queensland to see the shortage of appropriate accommodation for domestic violence affected men and women or those parents who have children with them who are affected by domestic violence. It is not uncommon to find that people have to leave their community to find suitable accommodation and on many occasions they find it very difficult to leave because there is little or no public transport. Although the various services such as neighbourhood centres and church and community groups do their best to accommodate male and female domestic violence victims—and I commend them for their community work—there are limited accommodation options in rural and regional communities and these services are always very stretched and do their best to look after their clients. There are also concerns that there may be an increase in the possibility of breaches of domestic violence orders if someone has nowhere else to go but back to their home, and in many communities this is the case. It was a very good suggestion from one submitter who suggested that there should be increased training and advocacy within the private real estate sector. This may be of assistance in this regard and I would encourage the government to investigate this suggestion, as it would be of assistance to all Queenslanders.

The bill also provides for amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act that currently makes limited mention of the use of video recordings as there is no provision that expressly authorises the use of body worn cameras by police officers. These amendments provide clarity and make it clear that it is lawful for a police officer to use a body worn camera to record images or sounds while an officer is acting in the performance of their duties. I have no doubt that cameras will be of assistance to police officers in many policing situations. I do wish to tell the House a story, but I do not wish to detract at all from the seriousness of the subject that we are discussing here today. I was having a conversation one day with a police inspector at Charleville who told me how he was parked at a set of crossroads in far western Queensland when an emu raced out of the mulga and smashed into his police car door and wrecked the door. He then had great difficulty in explaining to his superiors how his stationary police car was smashed by a crazed bird in the middle of nowhere. If only the police inspector at that time had had a body camera it would have saved a lot of paperwork and a lot of explanations would have been avoided, and we may even know the fate of the emu. I hope the cameras will also assist those police officers who man one-man police stations across rural, regional and remote Queensland. They, too, deal on a regular basis, unfortunately, with domestic violence matters and they have to attend many of those policing issues on their own on a daily basis. I hope the body cameras are of assistance to them. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (5.47 pm): I am grateful to have the opportunity today to speak on another bill aimed at tackling domestic violence and I am proud that this parliament has been so strong on this issue. The horrific domestic violence attacks on women and children which occurred so publicly on the Gold Coast and here in Brisbane a couple of months back were shocking and devastating and I know that these deaths, so very public, were just the tip of the iceberg in terms of the level of violence against women that is occurring. There are 200 complaints a day to Queensland police. That is why the Palaszczuk government announced earlier this year that it will implement all 140 recommendations in Dame Quentin Bryce's landmark *Not now, not ever* report into domestic and family violence. One of those recommendations was ouster conditions. An ouster condition means that perpetrators instead of victims are forced to leave their family homes in the event of abuse or violence. Victims of domestic violence often have low financial resources and need to remain close to friends and family for support, so these changes may allow them to retain some fraction of normality in an incredibly stressful and terrifying situation. Why should the victim of violence be responsible for leaving? Our response to domestic and family violence is often addressed in terms of helping a woman escape violence and worse—the question, 'Why doesn't she just leave?' What would it take to leave your home? Think of the lack of available refuges and appropriate accommodation, how hard it is to obtain short-term accommodation when we know some rental agencies will not rent to women escaping domestic violence. Think of the effect this might have on your employment, on your finances.

If there are children involved, it becomes even harder. Think of their schooling being interrupted, their routine being upended. Think of them having to move away from their friends and support networks. Ouster conditions are not new, but they have had to be applied for. Over the past three years, only about 28 per cent of cases included them. This amendment to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act for the mandatory consideration of ouster conditions along with ongoing support and counselling is a very important step towards empowering victims of domestic violence. This will not work for all victims. Sometimes an ouster condition is not appropriate. This could include situations

where the victim does not want the perpetrator to know their location, and risk assessment plays an important part in this determination. Safety and security for women must be absolutely paramount, which is why magistrates will have the discretion to decide if an ouster condition is appropriate.

This bill is just one more step towards our goal of ending domestic violence. It is our firm belief that domestic violence is a violation of the basic right that we all have to healthy, supportive and safe relationships. We certainly have a long way to go, but the Queensland government is committed to the most comprehensive reform package ever initiated in Queensland and we are determined to follow it through. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (5.50 pm): I rise to speak to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. Before I get into my written speech, I would like to acknowledge the member for Mudgeeraba for her courage in sharing with us a harrowing and deeply personal story. I think we were all very moved by that. I would also like to acknowledge the hard work of my fellow committee members—the members for Bundaberg, Caloundra, Pine Rivers, Cairns and Warrego—and also the committee secretariat.

In accordance with the recommendations contained within the *Not now, not ever* report handed down by the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland, this legislation seeks to do a number of things. Of those objectives, I wish to focus primarily on the first two. The first objective is to seek to ensure that, where there are conflicting allegations of domestic or family violence in civil applications for protection orders, the courts identify and protect the person most in need of protection. It is unfortunately all too common that, when an application is made for a protection order, the offending partner also applies for a retaliatory protection order. This legislation requires courts to consider the veracity of each protection order application and to act to protect that person most at risk of harm.

The second objective of the bill before the House is to seek increased protections for victims of domestic and family violence and minimise disruption to their lives by requiring the court to consider imposing a condition excluding a perpetrator of domestic violence from the family home, otherwise known as an ouster provision. We know that victims of domestic and family violence are most at risk while in the process of ending their relationship with the perpetrator as well as face the greater share of upheaval to their lives. Vulnerable women and children often move out of the family home, which impacts on their social support networks, school attendance and continuity of employment. In regional communities, that can be particularly disruptive.

In my own electorate of Redlands, there are five island communities upon which this legislation promises to have a significant impact. Like mainland Queensland, island communities experience domestic and family violence. However, the combination of a small population, isolation and a reliance on water based transport makes it especially difficult for victims of domestic and family violence. It is my sincere hope that this legislation provides a stronger framework for victims to break free from those relationships where they are in harm's way.

In reading the evidence given to the special task force, one contribution particularly stood out to me. The contributor said—

You may ask why did I go back and believe me I have asked myself the same question but there are so many emotions involved and other considerations. I was for the most part a stay at home mum, and had no financial support and because I kept the violence hidden from my family and friends I literally felt that I had no choice but to stay ... I always hoped things would change.

Unfortunately, we know that too many victims of domestic violence in our community have experienced this isolation. I want to acknowledge the many organisations in the Redlands electorate and Redlands City that are working to support victims of domestic and family violence in our community: the Bay Island Community Centre, the Redland Community Centre, the Cage Youth Foundation, the Redlands Centre for Women, and the WAVSS support service, to name a few.

This bill also seeks to recognise the importance of victims of domestic violence being able to express their views and wishes in relation to decisions under the act. Lastly, this bill seeks to clarify that the use of body worn cameras by police officers acting in the performance of their duties is indeed lawful. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (5.54 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill. Already this year this parliament has passed two bills as part of ongoing reforms to tackle domestic and family violence in our homes and communities. This bill before the House continues this vital work by implementing legislative changes to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act, recommended by the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence, and amends the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to remove any doubt about the lawfulness of the operational use of body worn cameras.

The provisions in clause 5 of the bill before the House give effect to recommendation 99 of the *Not now, not ever* report to require the court to consider cross-applications at the same time and to consider a later application between the same parties in the context of the order that already exists between the parties. Cross-applications, when brought vexatiously, can deepen the trauma and extend and frustrate the process of applicant spouses seeking a protection order. In most cases, there is only one party who is living in fear of the other. However, respondent spouses may make an application to use the law to retain some control over their spouse. The law is there to protect aggrieved parties, to allow aggrieved parties some relief and not to be used as a further tool of control and manipulation. The bill requires that, where a court is aware that there are cross-applications, it must hear the applications together and, importantly, determine the person most in need of protection. I am glad to see this amendment brought before the House. It has been a concern that has been raised with me within my own electorate by aggrieved parties and by support workers and represents an important step forward.

The bill also gives effect to recommendation 117 of the *Not now, not ever* report to require a court to consider including an ouster condition as part of a protection order. Last week on White Ribbon Day an Indigenous elder within my community raised this issue with me. She talked of the importance of protecting victims of violence by reducing the disruption to their and their children's lives by removing the perpetrator rather than the innocent victims from their homes, their communities, workplaces, schools or child care, all of which may provide vital security and support to otherwise traumatised individuals. The bill strengthens the duty of courts by requiring them to consider the need to impose an ouster condition in all cases, having regard to the wishes of the victim rather than the current position where an aggrieved party applies for it. Of course, imposing an ouster condition will not be appropriate in all circumstances. The court must consider the safety of the aggrieved and any children present before imposing such a condition. Additionally, the funds allocated by the government to provide safety upgrades to improve the home security of victims of domestic and family violence are imperative to making this condition work for victims.

The third key amendment contained in the bill seeks to ensure that the courts hear directly from victims about the impact of violence. The bill implements this response by adding a principle to the act to provide that, to the extent it is appropriate and practicable, the views and wishes of people who fear or experience domestic violence should be sought before a decision affecting them is made under the act.

There is no more powerful expression of the cost of domestic and violence than to hear from those who have lived experience. On a personal note, can I say how moved I was by the address by the member for Mudgeeraba earlier and by her courage in sharing such a deeply personal story. I know many others in this House have done similarly.

The bill also amends the PPRA to insert a new section regarding the use of body worn cameras by police. This section supports the use of body worn cameras by police officers by providing that the use of such cameras in the performance of their duties is lawful even if it is inadvertent, unexpected or incidental. Across Queensland, police officers will benefit from these cameras as they can capture evidence, record their interactions with victims, offenders and the general public and create a record of operational activity. The amendment does not affect the existing powers or responsibilities a police officer has about the covert recording of information under the PPRA or, indeed, any other act.

This bill, like the two before it, sends a message to perpetrators that domestic and family violence will not be tolerated. Equally, it sends a message to victims of such violence that the government is committed to leading reforms and collaborating with the community to do everything possible to ensure that sustainable change is made. I commend the bill to the House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Crandon, adjourned.

MOTION

Department of Education and Training, Security Breach



Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House:

1. notes with concern that in relation to the Department of Education and Training, more than 600 records were illegally accessed as part of a security breach on the TAFE and education department website; and
2. refers this security breach to the state parliament's Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee for immediate investigation, and report back to the House by 18 February 2016.

This year the Department of Education has had two major IT blunders; blunders that have shaken the confidence of principals, teachers, parents, students and the general public. In late July we were advised of a significant IT bungle where the child protection reporting and the OneSchool system failed miserably. There were 644 reports by school principals concerned about the welfare of children in their schools that did not make it to the Queensland Police Service. Despite claiming that she was not going to be political, the Minister for Education sheeted the blame for this failure to everyone else but herself, failing to recognise that the vast majority of these failed reports occurred under her watch. This is also despite the independent Deloitte report identifying six events between 16 February and 29 May 2015 where reports were made by staff that student protection reports failed to reach Queensland police. The Minister for Education has still not explained why these incidents did not lead to earlier detection of the error; earlier detection that would have prevented a lot of pain for children and their families.

If this bungle was not serious enough, on 10 November we were notified of an even greater breach. We were advised, not by the minister but by the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, that IT hackers had infiltrated the Education department's IT system and accessed personal information of TAFE students. When questioned about this the Minister for Training and Skills assured everybody in the House that the information that was accessed was information of a low level that anybody could find in the White Pages, for example. How wrong the minister was. Two days later further information came to light in the public domain, again not by the Minister for Education but by a concerned parent. I spoke to a mother who had been contacted by a senior Education official who advised her that the incredibly sensitive complaint that she made through the education department's website had been accessed by international computer hackers. To say that she was distraught would be an understatement. She was obviously concerned about her daughter, but she was equally concerned about the details of the person who was the subject of her complaint. She felt violated and genuinely fearful. This is an incredibly serious issue.

Under pressure from opposition questioning, the Minister for Education eventually made a statement that confirmed that the information accessed was far more serious than what could be found in the White Pages. I acknowledge and thank the Minister for Education for a briefing from her department and QPS officials on this breach and the sensitivities attached to it. Because of that I do not intend to go into the details of the information that was accessed. However, in the interests of transparency and to restore the public's confidence in the department's IT systems, it is my contention that this criminal act needs to come under the scrutiny of a parliamentary committee.

During the departmental briefing I received the distinct impression that we may never hear the minister make any further public announcement on this extremely serious issue. I believe this would be a completely inappropriate outcome. I want to remind the minister that we live in a thriving democracy where transparency and accountability is paramount. The minister has an obligation to the Queensland public to fully disclose the breadth and content of this breach. There are numerous questions to be answered. Has the privacy of innocent people, who disclosed sensitive information through the IT website, been compromised? Have individuals' identities been stolen? How did the government not recognise that its system had been hacked? Can parents have confidence in making complaints through the EQ website in the future? With the minister not addressing these issues in the parliament the only option is for a full and frank inquiry by the relevant committee. We must ensure that no similar breach occurs again.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (6.04 pm): I rise to oppose this motion. The member for Everton has just demonstrated why he has failed the leadership test. He chose today to again put personal interest above public interest. He has moved this motion today because the motion he moved on Tuesday was ruled out of order because it was deliberately misleading and included facts that he knows were untrue. That is why we are sitting here on Thursday debating a motion he originally moved on Tuesday. The reason I know this to be fact and I feel confident in saying this is, as members heard from the member for Everton, he was provided a confidential briefing by the Department of Education, by the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer—

Mr Mander: There was nothing confidential about that briefing. It was the same briefing given to others.

Ms JONES: I will take the interjection from the member for Everton, who is claiming here tonight that that briefing was not confidential. I can assure members that the police, the Department of Education and the Chief Information Officer, I would believe, would be of the opinion that it was and that it was for good reason. I will get into that as I make my contribution. The reason this happened was not that the member for Everton was so concerned about it that he sought a briefing from my department—no, that is not why it happened—it was that I offered it to the member for Everton.

Mr Mander: With 90 minutes notice.

Ms JONES: And how many days did it take the member for Everton to find time in his diary to have this briefing? Six days! That is how concerned he was.

Mr Mander: You went to China. I couldn't speak to your chief of staff. You were in China.

Ms JONES: I did not attend the confidential briefing. He knows that.

Mr Mander: That's how concerned you were.

Ms JONES: You decided the timing, honourable member for Everton. Let us go to the substantial issues though.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Member for Everton, this is not a debate. You have had a chance to make a contribution.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Everton has already spoken. The minister is now speaking. I would urge you to be more considered in your interjections.

Ms JONES: At the briefing the Chief Information Officer and the Queensland police confirmed that the release of information in the public domain could potentially undermine their ongoing investigation into this criminal matter. The reason I believe they would have said that to the honourable member for Everton was that, as I have said repeatedly in this parliament, the Police Commissioner himself advised me not to go into detail publicly about an ongoing criminal matter. I assure every single member of this House that if the Police Commissioner advises me to take a certain course of action in the public interest then I will listen to him. I honestly thought, when I offered the confidential briefing to the member for Everton, that if a police officer told him to do what the police had told me to do that he would respect that. But here we are. He has chosen to come in here today and ignore the advice of the Queensland Chief Information Officer, he has chosen to ignore the advice of senior departmental officers and he has chosen to ignore the advice of the police. That is why I know this motion has nothing to do with the public interest but has everything to do with his own personal interest.

Do members know what the key difference is between this motion and the one on Tuesday? He deliberately, even after getting a briefing, included the scaremongering of 600 schoolchildren and he knew that not to be true.

Mr Mander: So no schoolchildren?

Ms JONES: You were briefed. He is putting Queenslanders at risk with his reckless behaviour. He knows that the more he talks about cyber security the greater the risk that the Queensland government IT network will be attacked. I know that he knows this because this was the advice provided to him consistent with the advice provided to me.

Mr Mander: Let's have a committee look at it.

Ms JONES: We do not need to. This man is clutching at anything. We know that because we have spoken to independent experts. In a letter to the director-general of Education and Training, Thomas King, the general manager of the Australian Cyber Emergency Response Team, said—

... the Queensland government's response to this incident has been professionally managed and actions taken have been appropriately planned and executed.

I take this opportunity to say to every single member of this House, to every teacher, to every principal and to every parent that I will never risk the safety of our systems for personal gain, but those opposite certainly will. The member for Everton's true colours, such as denying jaywalking and what he says in this parliament, are coming home to roost.

(Time expired)

 **Dr McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (6.10 pm): As the shadow minister for science, information technology and innovation, I rise to strongly support the motion moved by the member for Everton. This House should absolutely note with concern this significant IT security breach and it is very appropriate to refer that breach to the committee for immediate investigation. In fact, it is essential that it is investigated, because what we have before us is an accidental government that is falling apart before Queenslanders' eyes. We all know that the downfall of the former Labor government was based, in part, on IT bumbles and failures, and maladministration. Of course, this evening the news is that the police minister has been sacked, but it remains absolutely imperative that the Palaszczuk government live up to its transparency rhetoric and welcomes a true investigation into its ongoing IT bumbles. Just this morning in question time I asked the Premier if she would guarantee that the police minister would

retain her cabinet position. Rather than address that more than reasonable question, she dodged it, as we all know. It took her half a day and now she has answered it with the recent sacking. The Premier could not guarantee that, so I am now wondering if she can guarantee that her government has IT functions of government under control.

When I am concerned about IT bumbles under this government, I believe it is appropriate, amongst other things, to turn one's attention to the relevant department, that is, the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation. What do we see? In May this year, the minister who oversees the IT department of this government issued a statement regarding the government's IT service, CITEC, and the scrapping of plans to embrace best practice and professional industry engagement of the management of government IT services. She said that Labor wanted to keep it all in-house, stating that 'transformations' and 'protection upgrades' had already begun. It appears that they have not got very far. Earlier this year in estimates, the minister could not outline a proper plan for the government's IT services under CITEC or how it would be future proofed, to use her words. We saw that CITEC and the Chief Information Office are expected to provide independent quality advice to ministers and consolidated data integration and aggregation to the whole of the government and to run a secure government network that allows government departments to exchange information easily and securely. I say to the Premier and to the House that we have continuing evidence that that is not working, as well. Of course, we are aware that the department does not yet have a permanent director-general.

We know that the minister responsible for the IT department was not involved in finding solutions for the government's IT failure in the OneSchool reporting system earlier this year. Instead, another minister did the talking. We are aware that the minister was nowhere to be seen in relation to the security breach that is the topic of the very motion before the House this evening. Instead, another minister is doing all of the talking. We know that the minister responsible for IT reluctantly made a comment on the overpayment of government contractors by some \$12 million in her own department and, in so doing, simply blamed it all on a conscientious public servant. Over nine months of the Labor government we have seen these bumbles and, of course, we saw them under the former Labor government, as well. I do not think I need to remind Queenslanders of the Health payroll debacle, which was a classic mistake of the former Labor government. Do I need to remind Queenslanders of the unbelievable exploits of the Tahitian prince, who ripped our state off under the former Labor government?

It is for those reasons that I very strongly support this motion. It is absolutely imperative that the House notes with significant concern this most recent IT security breach and it is absolutely imperative that that breach be referred for immediate investigation to the relevant committee, as the member for Everton has moved. It is imperative that that happens before we see more catastrophic IT failures under this Labor government.

 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (6.16 pm): This is a desperate opposition. This is an opposition that is showing reckless disregard for the safety of Queenslanders. This is a serious matter. It is a criminal matter that is currently under investigation. The opposition has tried to play politics on this, yet again. They have stood here and demanded that the minister release more information. The minister has always said that she will not act against the advice from the police and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer by providing commentary that could undermine their ongoing investigations. That would be reckless. It would put Queenslanders at further risk. But those opposite ignored the minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Townsville, one moment. There are a number of members having conversations. I urge them to take those conversations outside.

Mr STEWART: I understand that on 13 November the Minister for Education offered a confidential briefing on this matter to the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Surfers Paradise and the member for Everton and their staff, so that they could talk directly to police, the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, as well as department officials. I seek leave to table an email between the member for Everton and the chief of staff of the Minister for Education. The email states—

Dear Mr Mander,

This briefing will cover confidential information relating to an ongoing investigation into a criminal matter and, therefore, cannot be conducted via telephone.

Tabled paper: Emails, dated November 2015, between the member for Everton, Mr Tim Mander MP, and chief of staff to Hon. Kate Jones, Ms Verena McCarthy, regarding a briefing from the Department of Education and Training [1848].

I understand the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Surfers Paradise ignored this invitation and did not even bother to reply to the email. However, the member for Everton, always looking for ways to rise above his leader, said that he would attend the briefing on behalf of the opposition. I understand that six days later the member for Everton made time for the briefing—six days later. As the minister has said, in that briefing the police and the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer both outlined that the release of further information could undermine their investigations. Today, we have seen the member for Everton blatantly ignore that advice from the police and the Queensland government Chief Information Officer. This is a clear dismissal of their professional advice and a complete disregard of them and the positions they hold.

We will not stoop to their level. On this side of the House we will act with openness, accountability and integrity. That is why the minister offered the confidential briefing to the member for Everton in the first place. We will always act on the advice of the experts. We will not ignore police or the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer. This motion is nothing more than a try-on and a political stunt. Not only that, it is also potentially dangerous as it portrays a cavalier disregard for proper police and criminal investigation processes and, if supported, could well jeopardise those ongoing sensitive investigations. We will not be acting against the advice of the experts in the form of the police and the government CIO, and we will not be commenting on this criminal matter. I call upon those opposite to stop playing politics on this serious matter; to stop calling on the government to release information when they know full well that to do so would be against the advice of the experts. Not only was this stunt reckless and irresponsible, but, as the minister said, the member for Everton showed that he could not even get the simple motion right. He could not even get his facts straight the first time. He tried to move the motion on Tuesday and was forced to make an embarrassing withdrawal.

Of course, the member for Everton has a bit of form in this area. Who could forget the infamous nitwit-gate incident a few sittings ago when he made that interjection in this chamber. He initially denied making the comment but was caught out by the upstairs referee—the audio recording. He later made a gobbling withdrawal, while still swearing black and blue that he did not know that he even said it. It seems that poor old 'Mandy' does not even know what he is saying half the time.

This motion is just another example of the opposition trashing proper process and administration. It shows a disturbing pattern of behaviour—exploiting information the government has provided in good faith through correspondence or private briefings offered to opposition MPs and then throwing it back in the government's face by rejecting that advice and turning it into stunts in this House.

(Time expired)

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (6.20 pm): How extraordinary to hear the previous speaker just say that the motion before the House trashes proper process. How could anyone possibly say that a motion that draws what is undeniably an important issue to the attention of a parliamentary committee is trashing proper process? That is extraordinary, as has been the hysterical reaction of the government to this simple motion—a motion which I would have thought would be unexceptional in relation to the conduct of the state's affairs by a parliament like ours.

Before I go any further, I want to address the issues that have been raised by the minister and other speakers—that is, saying that the member for Everton has been careless in the manner in which this has been brought to the House. He has been far from that. I have listened carefully to the member. I know that the member has been very careful in the way that he has both addressed this particular issue and delivered his speech tonight to ensure that he does not talk about the details of this issue which are, no doubt, the subject of a police investigation.

What he is talking about is the structural issues that go to how something like this can happen. That can be easily investigated by a committee of this parliament without there being any breach of confidence or any compromising of the investigation that is underway. There is absolutely no issue about that. Yet there has been hysteria and arms thrown around as though a committee of this parliament cannot very clearly and logically look at something that has happened within government and advise this parliament as to how it can be avoided in future.

This needs to happen. As a former minister in this area I know that it is an area where transparency can never hurt. We have seen from the history of Labor governments in this area that a lack of transparency and a lack of review has caused numerous disasters of great significance that have not only been dangerous to the effective administration of government in this state but also cost the taxpayers of this state very dearly. We must be sure that we do not go down that track again. We have seen it numerous times with the Labor Party.

I want to particularly raise three examples. When we came into government we found that the IT systems were left in a mess by the government that preceded us. I quote from Delimiter, a well-regarded blog which covers IT matters. It said this on 6 May 2013—

Queensland has been battered over the past half-decade by a series of failures in fundamental ICT projects and service delivery that has left the state government's IT workers reeling.

That was the scenario into which we walked; the scenario that the previous government had left. They had left chaos in IT. My predecessor as minister, the member for Mudgeeraba, instituted a significant ICT audit which I in turn put into place through our ICT action plan and other measures. There were a number of very important measures to deal with the chaos we had been left.

Transparency, which this review would achieve, is one of those measures. The ICT dashboard that we instituted made sure that any blues that occurred were available for scrutiny very quickly. The ICT dashboard puts up in an easy traffic light format—red, yellow, green—on the government website exactly how all IT projects are proceeding and what their status is. I looked at it the other day. To give the government credit, they are maintaining this system. It is available for scrutiny.

There are 105 projects shown there. They are following the lead we took in government. There are 81 in the green area, 22 in the amber area and two in the red area. I make no criticism of the red area, but I would say that it alerts people to things that are going wrong. It is exactly that transparency that allows us to ensure that our IT programs work.

The second issue I will speak about is the Health payroll disaster. This \$1.25 billion issue was only brought to light when Mr Chesterman was appointed to investigate it. When he investigated it he said—

The replacement of the Queensland Health payroll system must take a place in the front row of failures in public administration in this country. It may be the worst.

That is what a review gave us. It was necessary. The third issue I will mention is the review of simple things in the IT area—printing on both sides of the paper. Bringing phone lines into simpler categories saved us some \$38 million over two years. This was achieved by reviewing what was happening in that area. So reviews are important in this area. This motion should be supported.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (6.25 pm): I rise to oppose this motion and to make it quite clear that the Queensland government takes any criminal act very seriously. That includes acts of cyber security.

I mention in response to the comments of the member for Mansfield that on 7 June 2013 he tabled the ICT audit in this parliament. He did not table the confidential annex which would have revealed the security risks. He says today that there should be full transparency. Thankfully, he was a little more responsible when he was in government.

When this incident came to the government's attention the immediate and most important actions were to block any further damage and to limit access to the stolen data. The affected systems have been remediated and the data is not publicly available on the internet. We notified federal and state police agencies as well as the Australian Cyber Security Centre. Their investigations are continuing.

The Queensland Government Chief Information Office, QGCIO, was tasked to work with the affected agency on the security breach and what can be done to safeguard its systems from future attacks. Our IT security experts are continuing their forensic analysis. That may take some time given the anonymous nature of this activity. The risk of the perpetrator publicly releasing the data still exists. Control efforts are ongoing to mitigate this risk.

We are taking this matter very seriously. That is why we have accepted the advice of the QGCIO and the police that any public release of further information could impact their ongoing investigation. Unfortunately, the LNP members in this state seem to have little respect when it comes to the responsible way to behave in the face of these types of matters.

This government extended an invitation to members opposite to attend a confidential briefing on this incident. I understand that the member for Everton said that he would attend on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Surfers Paradise. I find it deeply concerning that, despite knowing the risks involved, members opposite have flagrantly ignored all advice and continued to pursue this matter in the hope of scoring cheap political points.

Just yesterday in the federal arena we learned about a major cyber attack on the Bureau of Meteorology. ABC News coverage states that the bureau owns one of Australia's largest supercomputers and provides critical information to a host of agencies. It stated—

Its systems straddle the nation, including one link into the Department of Defence at Russell Offices in Canberra. Cyber attacks on government agencies are routine and the 'adversaries' range from thrill-seeking hackers, through to criminals and foreign states.

The ABC report references a spokesperson for Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull. What did the PM's office have to say in relation to this cyber attack on the weather bureau? In a statement, the Prime Minister's spokesperson said that 'the government would not comment on specific cases'. Perhaps the Prime Minister can come up to Queensland and give those LNP members opposite a lesson in responsible conduct in the event of a crime being committed against a government system.

IT vulnerability is, unfortunately, a reality for governments and major corporations in the modern age. This is not just a Queensland government issue; this is an issue for major corporations and for governments around the world—for anyone doing business in 2015. In recent months we have heard reports of the biggest hack in United States history, with the fingerprints of 5.6 million current and former government officials stolen. The United States largest bank JP Morgan is among the growing list of major corporations who have had information stolen, and we know that identity fraudsters now regularly target Australian tax records.

A number of high-profile examples of cybersecurity incidents have been covered in the media in recent days, such as those experienced by Aussie Farmers Direct, cloud based accounting companies, the federal government, Kmart and David Jones. This type of attack is increasing in both its sophistication and its frequency, and it is nothing short of criminal. The QGCIO is observing an elevated level of cybersecurity incident activity across the public sector and it is concerning that many of the incidents appear to be criminally based.

No-one can afford to be complacent and I want to assure Queenslanders that the government is committed to fully investigating and remedying this breach. I am committed to efforts to safeguard the government's network from further attack and can advise that the government has put in place further IT measures to protect and strengthen our security protocols and systems.

In relation to the second part of the member's motion, I would be happy to provide the Utilities, Science and Innovation Committee with an in-camera update on investigations into this matter when I brief the committee on 17 February 2016.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Nanango. You have had a pretty good run.

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 40—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 41:

ALP, 41—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

Pairs: Palaszczuk, Springborg; Lynham, Cripps.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.36 pm to 7.36 pm.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Local Government Administration

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (7.36 pm): On 14 October, the member for Cairns provided my office with a range of documents pertaining to local government in Queensland, with similar documents subsequently tabled in the House. As I advised parliament on 15 October, my office immediately referred this material to my department for consideration and assessment. My department provided an initial review of these claims and at that time advised me that they had not found any basis to substantiate the call for a judicial inquiry that accompanied the release of this material.

The Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning has now completed a full review of the material provided in October. Based on this review, my department is of the opinion that the issues raised amount to localised matters specific to each of the local governments in question and that it does not provide any cogent evidence of systemic problems with the local government system that would justify an inquiry into local government, as called for by the member for Cairns.

My department's review of the material has identified that two local matters relating to potential conflicts of interest should be referred to the CEO of the Cairns Regional Council for preliminary assessment under the Local Government Act, and I can advise that this has now occurred. In relation to the remaining claims in the October material, my department found that the matters had already been investigated by the relevant authority, or that matters could not be substantiated based on the limited details provided, or that the claims were of a general nature and did not specify any actionable material, or that the issues raised reflected an individual's disagreement with the decision of the local government.

Beyond the two potential conflict of interest matters raised above, I am advised that it is not considered necessary to take any further action in respect of any of the allegations made by the member for Cairns in October. I have today written to the member for Cairns advising him of these findings. To remove any doubt, my director-general has also today written to the Ombudsman asking he undertake an expeditious review of the department's actions in relation to this matter.

In my correspondence to the member for Cairns, I have also taken the opportunity to remind him of the most appropriate method by which affected parties should seek remedies to any issues that they think constitute a dispute with local government. For the benefit of all members, local government complaints should be dealt with as follows: if a person has a complaint about a decision of local government or the service the local government provides, they should contact their local government's customer service area, call centre or inquiry counter which may be able to address their concern. If this does not resolve the matter, it is recommended that they write to the local government and make an official complaint.

The local government is required under legislation to respond to complaints about specific actions of local government in a fair and effective manner. All local governments must have a complaints management process, including written policies and procedures for how they manage and respond to complaints. This process must be publicly available through the local government's office and website. Local governments must record all complaints, whether made verbally, in writing or anonymously, and must report on their complaints management process in their annual report. If a person is not satisfied with the local government's response, a review body may be able to help, including the Office of the Queensland Ombudsman and/or judicial review through the courts. As part of its role, the Ombudsman can consider the administrative action of the local government and determine whether the action taken was lawful and in a reasonable manner.

Specific complaints against councillors or mayors should also be referred to the relevant local government in the first instance. A complaint about the conduct of a councillor is assessed by the chief executive officer of the relevant local government, unless the complaint is made by the mayor or the council chief executive officer. In that case, the chief executive officer refers the complaint to my department for assessment. If the complaint amounts to misconduct, the complaint may be dealt with by the regional conduct review panel or the Brisbane City Council conduct review panel. Members of these panels are independent and drawn from a pool of suitably qualified persons. For serious complaints of misconduct, the matter may also be referred to the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal. If the complaint relates to corruption or official misconduct, then the matter should be referred to the CCC for investigation.

I am aware that the member for Cairns has again raised allegations about local government this week, including the tabling of more than 100 pages of further material. Whilst I have asked my department to again review this material to determine if there are any matters that warrant further investigation, I must say that the member would be advised to pursue alternative actions that better serve his cause. If the member is genuine in his pursuit of the issues he is raising, I again strongly encourage him to follow the established processes to ensure that all matters are thoroughly investigated by the relevant authorities. Whilst it is incumbent on all of us as members of this parliament to faithfully represent our communities in this place, it is also important that we do not exercise our privileges in advance of proper or due process. I encourage all members of the House to avail themselves of the statutory processes to resolve local government complaints as and when they occur.

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (7.42 pm): I rise to make a ministerial statement. In the debate earlier this evening, the member for Everton claimed that he was unaware or did not know that the briefing provided to him by the police, the Queensland Government Chief Information Officer, the deputy director-general of the Department of Education and Training as well as government officials

was confidential. During the debate, the member for Townsville tabled correspondence between my chief of staff and the member for Everton which clearly states that the briefing was going to 'cover confidential information relating to an ongoing investigation into a criminal matter'. I believe the member for Everton has misled the House. I call on him to correct the record at the earliest possible opportunity. I will be writing to the Speaker about this matter.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PROTECTION AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3226, on motion of Ms Fentiman—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr GRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (7.43 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015 and the associated report. Over the past six or so years, I have engaged with my constituents and with those working in the domestic violence sector. In fact, I have been very aware of the prevalence of domestic violence right from the beginning of my career, but I really was not aware before that.

I received an invitation early on to a CEO Challenge breakfast down on the Gold Coast. There were about 90 people in attendance. The most telling presentation at that breakfast—the one that has stuck with me the most—was where the presenter provided those in attendance with a very graphic picture and a piece of information. In a nutshell, the presenter said that every week in Australia two women escape domestic violence. The graphic that was shown was two trolleys and there were two bodies on those two trolleys. All you could see were two sets of feet protruding from under two sheets and there was a tag attached to the left big toe of each of the bodies. It was a very blunt way of telling the audience that on average two women lose their lives to domestic violence in Australia every week—and I will never forget that graphic.

Before that morning, I had absolutely no idea. That breakfast changed my perspective and convinced me that we—those of us here and society—had to do something. As a result, and thanks to the then Speaker, John Mickel, parliament hosted White Ribbon Day for the very first time. I approached him and I asked him if he would consider doing it. It was certainly outside of my budget. He looked at the material and he was more than happy to host it. Many members in that first parliament that I was here did commit themselves to the white ribbon pledge. I am happy to say that from then on this parliament has had a close association with White Ribbon Day and the swearing of the oath. Since then, I have sworn the oath each and every year. I had already sworn the oath on a previous occasion this year, but I know that many members attended a function earlier this week where they swore the oath. In fact, they swore the new oath and it is a very simple and straightforward one—stand up, speak out.

Here we are tonight passing another bill. It is a bill that strengthens our society's commitment to changing the way we deal with domestic violence. This stems from the *Not now, not ever* report. This bill is intended to protect the person most in need of protection. It is intended to require the court to consider imposing a condition to exclude a perpetrator of domestic violence from the family home. It is intended to provide the ability for a victim of domestic violence to be able to express their views and wishes when applying for domestic violence orders. Submissions to the report indicated concerns in regard to this last area. I note that as such the report recommended that the department reconsider this area as part of a wider review.

The final aspect of this bill relates to clarifying that the use of body worn cameras by police acting in the performance of their duty is lawful. That means certainty about the evidence as well. Situations occur. We see video footage—taken on smart phones sometimes—but often what we do not see is the precursor to the reactions by the police. The use of body worn cameras is going to provide that information. This bill is intended to ensure that the use of body worn cameras is in fact lawful. That will then provide more certainty about everything that has occurred in that particular instance.

I simply want to finish by congratulating both sides of this House. I also congratulate the committee for its work in putting its recommendations together. The task force commenced under the previous government, under the member for Aspley's watch, and I congratulate her for her determination to ensure that that commenced. It continues now under this government's watch. We have the *Not now, not ever* report to use as a blueprint going forward from here with something like 140

recommendations. From memory, 129 of those, when looking through the report, relate to these specific areas. Over time we will implement the report's recommendations and in a sensible manner, not rushed but properly thought through, properly considered and properly discussed with the community at large.

This bill is our next step. I commend the bill to the House and know our work is going to improve the lot of victims of domestic violence and change the thinking of the community and perpetrators.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (7.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015, which seeks to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 to ensure that where there are conflicting allegations of domestic or family violence in civil applications for protection orders, courts identify and protect the person most in need of protection and that they recognise the importance of victims of domestic violence being able to express their views and wishes in relation to decisions under the act. I understand that was an issue that was raised quite consistently in the *Not now, not ever* task force consultations, that victims were feeling that their voices were not being heard. The bill also seeks to increase protections for victims of domestic and family violence and to minimise disruption to their lives by requiring the court to consider imposing a condition excluding a perpetrator of domestic violence from the family home.

I was particularly interested in that last amendment because it is something that has been raised with me quite a lot in my own area where there has been quite a degree of awareness about what is happening around domestic violence. In fact, I congratulate East Brisbane Zonta on an excellent event that they hosted last week which Dame Quentin Bryce attended. We talked about the legislation that the government is putting in place and about the ouster provisions in particular. A number of people raised with me their concerns about it being all very well to actually have people supported to remain in their homes, but what happens around security and what happens about making sure that those families are safe from the perpetrators? It was very good to delve further into this report and read the recommendations about including police operational procedures, supporting women and children staying in the home when it is safe to do so and the expansion of safety upgrades which will enable the physical security of the home to be improved. It is also very good to see the budget that has been allocated towards this with the department allocating almost \$1.4 million for 11 services across Queensland to undertake safety upgrades and also for part of the funding to be used for brokerage to provide crisis accommodation services for respondents who are actually subject to the ouster condition. This raised for me the issue of accommodation and support for people who are involved in domestic violence situations.

I want to raise in particular some of the things that are happening in my local area of Bulimba. I think I have mentioned in this House before that a lot of people say to me that they did not think there would be much domestic violence in the electorate of Bulimba, which is somehow related to the reasonable affluence of the area and the reasonable statistics of people who are tertiary educated or in professions. However, I can assure this House that nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, domestic violence, which knows no boundaries, is certainly a huge and significant problem in my local area. I was gratified to see the number of community organisations in my area that really want to help people who are involved in domestic violence situations in the most practical ways. When we first started talking about this in my local area when the awareness of domestic violence literally exploded onto our TV screens with the most terrible public deaths earlier this year, local groups and local individuals came to me saying that they were taking victims of domestic violence and their families into their own homes and looking after them for months on end because they realised there was nowhere else to go. That is why it was such good news to know that the crisis shelters for women and children fleeing domestic violence have been funded and are going to be open and accessible in Brisbane and Townsville by the end of this year. Meanwhile, here are people in my own local community who are actually taking people into their family lives. I do want to acknowledge those people who are doing that. I would particularly like to acknowledge Sybil Burgess and the women from the Cannon Hill Baptist Church who are doing an enormous amount to help make people safe and secure.

I held a domestic violence forum a couple of weeks ago. I thank the minister for coming out and speaking at that forum. I also thank the other people who participated including Kara Cook, who was the principal solicitor of the Women's Legal Service; Sergeant Lisa Wathen, who is the Domestic and Family Violence SupportLink coordinator for Upper Mount Gravatt and riverside patrol groups in the South Brisbane district; Terri Butler MP who was the shadow parliamentary secretary to the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow parliamentary secretary for child safety and prevention of family violence and is my very close friend and colleague the member for Griffith; Karyn Walsh, who is the coordinator of the Brisbane Domestic Violence Centre and Micah Projects; and Leza Sullivan, who is the co-founder, director and psychologist of Child Aware, which is a counselling and psychology service

that is working in my local area and, unfortunately, is seeing all too many children from domestic violence situations. What was wonderful about this forum was that over 80 local community organisations came along because they are being confronted every day, every week with people who are in those situations. They are not people who are working in domestic violence per se; they are the football groups, the Neighbourhood Watches and the seniors groups. We had 10 people from the Norman Park National Servicemen's League. I think the average age of those people is 85. They wanted to come along and ask, 'What can we do in our local area to look after people who are in this situation?' I want to acknowledge that in my local area we are working together to do the best that we can to provide support for people in this situation as a way of supporting this excellent work that the government is doing around legislation, programs and funding to implement the recommendations of the *Not now, not ever* task force. The recommendations of that task force were truly about all of us actually taking responsibility for it.

I know that those people in those 80 community organisations and all of the other people in my local community are going to be so pleased to hear that there is another prong to the legislative framework that is going to help make our jobs easier and help us work better to address this situation. I would like to really commend this committee, which must surely feel very overwhelmed by some of the situations that they are confronted with and are seeing at very close quarters. I congratulate that committee and I congratulate the minister on her passion and the hard work that she is putting into this. I think we all have great admiration for the work she is doing to make sure we are on the right track. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (7.58 pm): I rise in the chamber to contribute to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. I would like to begin by saying that domestic violence is a blight and a scourge on society. It is a very serious and complex issue which faces all of our respective communities. It is indeed an issue which is well overdue in being addressed and discussed openly. It continues to be a topic which even today some people in society do not like to publicly discuss. This needs to end now.

For far too long we saw domestic violence kept behind closed doors. I know as a child growing up in the sixties and seventies you would rarely have considered checking to see if your neighbours were okay if you heard a fight taking place. It was something that happened far too often but, as a society, we often chose to ignore it.

We in this august chamber have been elected as spokespersons and the voice of our local communities within the Queensland parliament. Accordingly, we have been entrusted to represent the beliefs of our constituents and ensure that we enact legislation which will deliver positive and progressive changes to society. I am proud to wholeheartedly support the bipartisan approach of this Queensland parliament to address the abhorrent nature of domestic violence. As my colleagues in the House would be aware, last week, Wednesday, 25 November, was White Ribbon Day. This day is an annual reminder for men and women alike that domestic violence is never, ever okay. I passionately support this organisation, as not only does it provide support to victims, but it offers education and guidance to perpetrators.

As a strong advocate against domestic violence I took the opportunity to address the Carindale and Eastern Suburbs Community Forum which was, coincidentally, also held on Wednesday of last week. I asked the men in the room what the leading cause of death and injury was in women under 45. Many responded with what you would think are typical responses such as cancer or suicide as a result of depression. When I mentioned it was domestic violence, there was complete and utter silence in the room. I encouraged each of them to take the pledge to not commit domestic violence and, importantly, to start the conversation if they believe their friends are mistreating their partners, whether male or female. I took the pledge myself here in Parliament House on Tuesday with several members from both sides of the chamber.

In addition, last week I also had the opportunity to meet with the director of the Queensland Association of Independent Legal Services, Mr James Farrell, and president of the Bayside Community Legal Service, Mr Michael Stubbins, where it was brought to my attention that almost one third of all cases seen by the bayside centre were family law related including, sadly, a high number of domestic violence matters. I asked whether they thought there was an increase in domestic violence, to which I was told that more people are becoming aware of the options available to them and therefore more people are reporting these incidents.

This gave me pause to think and look back at the statistics available for my own electorate of Chatsworth. My wonderful seat in the eastern suburbs of Brisbane falls within two police divisions: Carina and Capalaba. In 2015, the current year, up to the end of September there were 50 breaches

of domestic violence protection orders in Carina and 94 in Capalaba. For the same period last year in 2014 there were 29 in Carina and 24 in Capalaba. Tragically, that is an increase in breaches of domestic violence protection orders of 72 per cent and roughly 11 per cent respectively. These figures alarm me and reinforce my belief that more needs to be done to protect our most vulnerable. The Bayside Community Legal Centre and its staff, which services my electorate almost in its entirety, are volunteer barristers and solicitors. This year they have already received approximately 50 phone calls from victims of domestic and family violence and have 10 open cases of the same nature.

The LNP, like the Labor Party, are serious about cracking down on domestic violence, which is why in 2014 we initiated a special task force led by Dame Quentin Bryce. This task force, as all members know, resulted in the *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland* report which was handed down this year. We set out to make a positive and directional change in this area, with a vision to stop once and for all domestic violence in this state. This report is now the responsibility of the current state government, and I commend them for accepting all of the 121 recommendations.

Further to this, I welcome and commend the suite of reforms they are introducing to tackle this problem. It is rare, admittedly, that you will hear me commend the current government, but some issues transcend partisan politics and this is an issue of basic human rights; the right to be free from domestic violence and to pursue your dreams and aspirations without the need to keep looking over your shoulder. In October of this year the LNP provided bipartisan support to increase the severity of breaching a protection order—something which is most evidently needed. The bill before the House today is an example of members from both sides of the chamber coming together in a bipartisan way in order to improve Queensland society. Sadly, due to the adversarial and robust nature of debate in this place, most of our constituents only see the chamber in full flight on the nightly news. I sincerely wish that all of our constituents could see what is taking place here right now in the spirit of genuine bipartisan support for this important legislation. We may come from a different ideological and philosophical perspective in our quest to improve Queensland, but no political party has a mortgage on the human spirit and condition.

I note that the bill aims to implement three specific changes to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 and an amendment to part 6 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. These include requiring a court to hear proceedings on cross-applications together. Where two people seek protection orders against each other, it is then up to the courts to determine which person is in most need of protection. The bill will also see increased protections for victims of domestic and family violence by requiring the court to consider imposing a condition excluding a perpetrator of domestic violence from the family home, which is known as an ouster condition. Whilst this condition is currently available for the Courts to apply, it is not mandatory for them to consider it—often resulting in under-utilisation. A third amendment will see victim impact statements introduced into the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act for mandatory consideration in civil applications for protection orders. This will result in the courts hearing directly from victims about the impact of violence. Finally, the use of body worn cameras by police officers will be included in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act so to remove any doubt about their legality.

I will never know how difficult it must have been for people to come forward and share their stories with the task force. I was blessed to have a father who detested violence against women, and he and my mother provided me and my two siblings with an harmonious childhood upbringing. It would, however, be a grave insult to the bravery of those people who overcame their inner demons to come forward and speak out, and we owe it to them and the numerous people before them to mean it when we say, 'Not now, not ever.'

In concluding my contribution supporting this bill, it would be remiss of me not to place on the public record my sincere admiration and thanks to the domestic violence task force, and I pay tribute to the former member for Greenslopes, Ian Kaye; the former member for Woodridge, Desley Scott; the former member for Gladstone, Liz Cunningham; and the former member for Sandgate, Kerry Millard, who is present in this chamber tonight. Each of these past members, along with the current task force members and the minister, have my deepest respect and gratitude with regard to this bill. I am proud to support this landmark legislation. For all of the tumult that has occurred in this chamber this year, I believe this is when we have come together in one of our finest moments.

 **Hon. CJO'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (8.06 pm): I rise in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. Unfortunately, domestic and family violence is a complex and entrenched problem in our society. It affects communities across

Queensland, and I am well aware of the devastating impacts that this insidious form of violence has on families. The Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland found that the rate of violence in these areas was alarmingly high. The task force reported that in 2013-14 the Mount Isa region had the highest rate of applications for domestic violence orders in the state: 1,687 per 100,000. Numbers are also high in the far north: 947 per 100,000; and in my hometown, Townsville, that rate was 736 per 100,000. This was in comparison to rates less than 300 per 100,000 in Brisbane.

Domestic and family violence in any form is absolutely not acceptable and there is no place for it in our community. This bill implements three specific changes to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 that were recommended by the special task force. These changes will improve how the courts deal with cross-applications for domestic violence orders; increase the court's consideration and use of ouster conditions to exclude perpetrators of violence from the family home; and it will encourage the views and wishes of victims to be sought before decisions affecting them are made. I welcome these changes.

But sadly, domestic and family violence can reach all corners of our community, and people with disability are some of our most vulnerable Queenslanders. The mandatory consideration of the imposition of an ouster condition is a positive step for these victims with a disability. It will mean that wherever possible victims with disability will have the opportunity to remain in their home, which is particularly important if modifications have been made to make their house more accessible.

The special task force also noted that in many cases victims in rural and remote communities have to flee long distances to escape violence. This problem is particularly pronounced in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. For example, victims of family violence in the Torres Strait have to travel to shelters on Thursday Island or even Cairns to seek refuge. While ouster conditions are not necessarily the safest option for all victims, where they are safe they can help victims continue with their jobs, maintain support from their family and friends, keep their children settled at school and minimise disruption to their lives in other ways. Under this bill, perpetrators will be required to leave the household, not the victim.

The use of ouster conditions by courts has to be supported by the availability of necessary services. These include safety upgrade services that enable victims to change the locks in their homes and make other improvements to secure their property. Currently, safety upgrade services are available in Townsville through the North Queensland Domestic Violence Resource Service and in Mount Isa through the North Queensland Domestic Violence Resource Service Mount Isa.

I am so pleased to say that the two new 72-hour crisis shelters for women and children fleeing domestic violence will be open this month, in both Townsville and Brisbane. These new shelters will give women and children a secure haven, where they can feel safe and get the professional support they need to start afresh.

Our government is also committed to implementing other task force recommendations that will support the increased use of ouster conditions. These include recommendation 86, which deals with expanding safety upgrade services and brokerage funding for alternative perpetrator accommodation, and recommendations 9 and 74, which involve trialling integrated service responses including in discrete Indigenous communities. Together, the bill and these service expansions will improve the legal response to domestic and family violence by increasing protections for victims and ensuring people who use violence are held accountable for their actions.

I do not want to see another life lost at the hands of a loved one, and it is for the reasons I have detailed that I support this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (8.11 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise this evening to make a brief contribution to the debate of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill. I do not intend to canvass the objectives of the bill, because I think the minister in her second reading speech did a very good job of detailing what we are hoping to achieve tonight. I want to join colleagues on both sides of the House in this bipartisan push to make sure we address domestic violence in this state.

As members of this House would be well aware, the Gold Coast has the busiest domestic violence court in Queensland. We have seen far too often on the news horrific stories coming from the Gold Coast that detail the plight of those who are victims of domestic and family violence.

When I was listening to the contribution of the shadow minister and member for Aspley this evening I was struck by some of the things she said, in particular that not only do we need to make sure perpetrators are held to account but also we need to make sure we stop the victim blaming. I think far

too often, for those of us who have never experienced domestic and family violence, it is not very easy to understand why it is difficult for people to walk away. It is my hope that, together as a parliament, when we work together to rid our community of the scourge that is domestic and family violence, we can not only make sure that we stop the victim blaming, whether it is a man or a woman, but also make sure that the services people need are available. We can encourage them to be more open and we can encourage them to talk. I think all members of this House would agree that perhaps some of the biggest challenges we have seen over the past few years are in the area of making sure people feel comfortable enough to speak about what it is they are suffering at home or in their workplace.

In the last parliament I served on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. We were tasked with a wideranging inquiry into strategies to prevent crime. It became very clear when we were travelling the length and breadth of Queensland that domestic and family violence was a significant issue that people wanted addressed. It was a very proud moment for me when the LNP, under then premier Campbell Newman, invited Her Excellency Dame Quentin Bryce to launch an inquiry into domestic and family violence. I would like to acknowledge the work that Dame Quentin Bryce and other members of that task force did in a truly bipartisan fashion. I also acknowledge that the Premier and the Minister for Communities and Women have worked hard to make sure they implement the recommendations of that report. I think it is very telling that, in a parliament that hangs on a knife edge, we can work as one on things that will genuinely better the community. When we consider what it is we are all here to do, that is a very honourable thing. I am sure we can all be very proud of the bipartisan nature in which we are working together on this.

I spoke about how unfortunate it is that the Gold Coast has the busiest domestic violence court in Queensland. I place on record tonight my appreciation for the Gold Coast Domestic Violence Prevention Centre and in particular the many wonderful volunteers who give of their time to serve on the management committee of that organisation and the director, Amy Compton-Keen. I have had the pleasure over the past few years of attending their AGM so that I can show, alongside many of my Gold Coast colleagues, my support for the great work they do. They do a fantastic job, whether it is supporting women in a crisis stage or providing counselling for families, perpetrators or victims. They do an amazing job. Tonight I place on the record my deep admiration for the work they do. I honestly do not know how they can get up each and every day and listen to the horrific stories they hear. It is the mark of very compassionate and amazing people that each and every day they continue to work to make the lives of the people of the Gold Coast better.

Over the past few months we have heard the very personal stories of a number of members of this House. I am very blessed that neither I nor members of my family have ever been the victims of domestic or family violence, and neither have any of my friends. I genuinely hope that it is because they have never been victims as opposed to not feeling comfortable talking about it.

When I was a child, every fortnight I used to go and spend the night at my grandparents' place. When I was young I did not understand why. As I got older I understood that it was because my mother was giving of her time two Saturdays a month—from 8 am on Saturday to 8 am on Sunday—to volunteer at a St Vincent de Paul safe house for women who were escaping violent partners. My mother does not talk about the experiences she had, but I heard of one from one of my grandfather's friends, Jim Donaldson. In the 1980s Jim was on the first date with his now wife when my mother received a phone call from the police saying that the abusive partner of a woman who was at the safe house knew where the safe house was. The police did not know where he was, but they suspected that that was where he was going. They told her that she needed to be vigilant and very cautious and aware of the fact that he might be about to arrive. My mother rang Jim that night. She found him at the restaurant. She said to him, 'I need your help.' As a young mother with a young child at home, she could have very easily walked away that night, but she stayed. She stayed awake all night making sure that man did not come anywhere near the women she was seeking to protect. Jim to this day talks about the courage that night of the women who had no idea what was about to befall them, knowing that somewhere there was a man trying to find his partner so that he could kill her.

As we talk about domestic and family violence, I am struck by the fact that there are so many women who have never felt that there is anywhere to turn and men who have never felt that there is anywhere to turn. I say to the people of my electorate and the people of the Gold Coast: if you ever need anyone to talk to, regardless of who you are, where you come from or what you believe, my door is always open, as is the door of any member of this House. Together we are committed to working to address the scourge that is domestic and family violence in our community.

I want to pay tribute to the work that the minister and the shadow minister have done together in a true effort of bipartisanship. It is so heartening to see the Premier and the opposition leader and the minister and the shadow minister come together to work to address such a pressing issue in our community. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (8.19 pm): I am proud to have the opportunity to speak to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill and I commend the honourable member for Broadwater for her contribution because it was a very good speech. The reason why it is so important that all of us stand united in standing up against domestic violence through legislative reform is that we know that this bill will help to increase safety and protection of victims of domestic and family violence. As the honourable member and many others have already canvassed the specifics of the bill tonight, the one issue that I want to talk about is ouster conditions—that is, where domestic violence victims are given the opportunity to remain in the home and perpetrators are forced to leave. Ouster conditions mean that perpetrators are excluded from their home or from going anywhere near it so victims can remain. As the Minister for Education it is very important that we reflect on this, because the reason ouster conditions are so important is that they provide stability—stability for the woman and the mother and stability for children who are often trying to complete school programs and continue their studies in what are very difficult circumstances during family break-up and domestic violence situations. Ensuring that we provide as much stability through keeping them in their family home close to their support networks and close to their school and their school friends is a way that we can provide additional protection and support for families who are experiencing domestic violence.

In far too many cases the responsibility falls on the victims of domestic violence—most commonly the woman or the mother—to flee, and that causes huge disruption for them and their family. These amendments tonight are important because even though ouster conditions have been available they have only been applied in around 28 per cent of cases in the last three years. To me it just seems logical that if it is suitable and safe they ought to be considered and applied more often. The driving principle surrounding all of this must be protecting the personal safety of the victim and their children. We know that this will not be suitable for every situation, but this bill provides the opportunity for these conditions to be applied more and considered as part of the decisions. This is about giving greater choice to the victim and ensuring that courts are obliged to consider ouster orders and determine if they suit the situation. Quite rightly, magistrates will have the discretion to decide if it is appropriate. Safety will always need to be paramount, and these orders must be part of integrated responses with support from police, counselling and legal services along with risk assessment and appropriate security upgrades. As members have heard, we are investing \$1.38 million—the Minister for Women talks about it all of the time—with regard to additional services across Queensland to undertake security upgrades for the homes of victims of domestic violence.

I want to join the chorus here tonight in acknowledging the work of the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, who has done a fantastic job. As someone who is a good friend of hers, I know how important she takes the responsibility of seeing a reduction of domestic violence and family violence in this state. If you go back and look at the *Hansard* records over many years we have seen a significant shift in terms of domestic and family violence in this state, the attitudes towards women and the attitudes towards domestic violence perpetrators. We have been on a long and significant journey in the last 20 years. In a meeting with the minister in my community, together with Steven Miles, more than 100 people came together in that room standing up against domestic violence. I reflect on that because I remember at the time being quite humbled because I have known women who have worked in the domestic violence sector for the best part of 30 years and the shift that we have seen in the last five years is significant. Often these people—mainly women—were working in conditions that were severely underfunded, severely undersupported and not getting the voice that they needed of politicians in this parliament. To be standing here today in a bipartisan way in 2015 and talking about domestic violence in this way just shows that there is hope that we can end the death, end the damage and end the hurt that is domestic violence.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (8.24 pm): I rise to address the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. On 28 February 2015 the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence in Queensland released its report, *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*. The task force report recommended three specific amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012. These were that the amendments be made to require courts to consider family law orders when making a domestic violence

order and also consider concurrent cross-applications at the same time and a later application and cross-application or order; to require courts when making a domestic violence order to consider whether an order excluding the perpetrator from the home should be made, having regard to the wishes of the victim; and to provide for victim impact statements to be introduced and for mandatory consideration by the courts in applications for protection orders.

In addition, the task force report recommended an overarching review of the act to ensure it provides a cohesive legislative framework that incorporates the reforms recommended by the task force. In making this recommendation, the task force identified issues for consideration in the review. These included two minor amendments—allowing victims and police to appeal a court's decision not to make a temporary protection order and allowing temporary protection orders to be made to protect a person who is seeking to be added to a protection order. The Queensland government response accepted these recommendations. In particular, the government committed to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act so that courts must consider dealing with cross-applications at the same time; to amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to require a court when making a domestic violence order to consider whether an order excluding the perpetrator from the home should be made, having regard to the wishes of the victim; and to ensure victims' voices are heard in all domestic violence related legal processes.

I will focus my short contribution and attention on the aspects relating to victim or survivor support, court support services and some local applications to my electorate of Cleveland. It would be remiss of any of us sitting in this House tonight to turn a blind eye to the fact that domestic violence occurs with alarming frequency in our society. Unfortunately, many instances go unreported. Keeping the situation hidden away only exacerbates the agony for the victims or survivors. Often helpless women and children live in fear of the next occurrence—violence that can be triggered by a number of factors including alcohol, anger, frustration, financial hardship, mistrust and jealousy, none of which of course is acceptable. Vulnerable women and children require support and understanding to enable them to be proactive about their situations. They need support to get their lives back on track and, most importantly, they need support to regain the confidence to establish a safe, strong and caring home environment—an environment where they no longer have to see and feel the tension, terror and aggression of domestic and family violence. When in government we began this focus on domestic violence—though it had been going, as other speakers have noted, for many years and decades—and we continue it now in opposition, and it is good to see the new government continuing that work and some of the recent reforms that the LNP in government made. In terms of White Ribbon Day, if I may say on a personal level briefly, it has been an honour to join millions of men for a good number of years now on White Ribbon Day to make the pledge and as a male member of parliament to use this position to try to influence other men to follow suit and to be respectful of women. I have again joined with many men to sign an oath never to commit violence against women, never to excuse violence against women and never to remain silent about violence against women. This is my oath and I continue to ask that every Queensland man and Australian man make that commitment.

While domestic violence exists in Queensland and is rife in our society, I will continue to use whatever influence I have to challenge men to do the right thing and say no to domestic and family violence. Vulnerable women and children need support to survive the hell of domestic and family violence and to create a caring and fear-free home environment. The oath includes a statement to never be silent about violence against women. To this aim, previously in this House—and going back to the years 2009 and 2010—I have mentioned the good work of local Cleveland and Redlands city groups, such as the Bayside Domestic Violence Initiative, or BDVI; in more recent times WAVSS, the Working Against Violence Support Service, which has been fantastic in the Redlands; and Maybanke. These groups provide critical services in the prevention of domestic and family violence and support for survivors of domestic and family violence.

I mentioned the BDVI group, because it provided court support and assistance for victims of domestic violence at the Cleveland and Wynnum magistrates courts, among other services. Under the direction of the former president, Pauline Eglington, BDVI covered at least four electorates in south-east Brisbane: Lytton, Capalaba, Cleveland and Redlands. FIFI—Females in Finance Inc.—mainly through fundraising dinners in Cleveland raised a stack of money for BDVI. Over the years, they have been a fantastic group of women, particularly in that earlier period. In an 18-month period, the funding provided by FIFI's efforts assisted 238 applicants and respondents. It was a real honour to get the BDVI funding—firstly, emergency funding and then other forms of funding—from the government to supplement FIFI's efforts, but I would have to say that it was a sad time when this organisation folded as a result of a lack of funding from the previous Bligh Labor government. Unfortunately, at the time

Minister Struthers needed a lot of convincing to continue the funding and we had to fight for it. It really is a lesson about us keeping our eye on the situation and ensuring continuity of support, whether it is Labor or the LNP that is in government. It was a very disappointing period to have to fight for that funding. I want to go on record and thank the member for Aspley, Tracy Davis, for her time when she was the responsible minister for renewing the funding. I never at any moment had to go and beg or raise the matter in the parliament. I only had to talk with her. The member was very supportive of the Cleveland court support and ensured that it was always there for those victims and those who had suffered domestic violence.

The Working Against Violence Support Service is the regional domestic and family violence service for Logan and the Redlands. It is a not-for-profit, non-government organisation that is funded by the Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services and governed by a board of management. The service was established in 1994 in the Logan region and it has been providing services for the past 21 years in Logan, Beenleigh and Beaudesert. In September 2015, WAVSS launched its newly funded service in the Redlands community. That service has been a great addition to the other services that we have in the area. In that regard, in a bipartisan spirit I commend the government for its work.

Maybanke is a fantastic domestic and family violence organisation that also operates in the Redlands. It provides shelter for survivors of family violence. From time to time I have had the opportunity to get some funding for Maybanke. I also want to thank the Gateway Church at Carindale for its recent gift of hundreds of dollars worth of nappies to Maybanke to support some of the women in the shelter who had little babies. I commend the people of Gateway Church and also the staff and volunteers of Maybanke.

Governments must not only provide the necessary resources to domestic violence programs but also ensure that its decisions do not lead to increased family stress. Without going into the bill, I just sound a note of caution in terms of the government's decision on North Stradbroke Island. Certainly, mass job losses will cause stress. It is my hope that we can be very careful not to provide additional family stresses and strains that will come with unemployment. I appeal to the government to think very carefully about its related decisions.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (8.34 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. I support the objectives of the bill. In previous debates on other bills relating to domestic and family violence—and again tonight—we have heard harrowing accounts from members of this House about how domestic and family violence has impacted upon them and their families. I would like to thank those members who chose to share their personal experiences, particularly my parliamentary and professional colleague the member for Mudgeeraba. These deeply personal experiences that have been shared demonstrate that domestic and family violence affects all parts of our community.

Just as it is a problem that affects all parts of our community, it is a problem that we can and will solve by continuing to work together as a community. Recently, I held a domestic violence round table in my electorate for community leaders. School principals, guidance officers, community workers, women's services organisations staff, police, journalists, academics and representatives from local P&Cs gathered to discuss what we can do to lead people in our community to stand up to say, 'Not now, not ever to domestic violence.' There was a recognition that the whole community needs to play a role in stopping domestic and family violence. The group identified some key things that needed to be done: we need to stop domestic violence from occurring in the first place, we need to hold offenders accountable for their actions and offer them rehabilitation, but mostly we need to support those affected by domestic violence and afford them the opportunity for justice. I support this bill, because it supports victims and will play a key role in affording them justice. The bill reflects the Palaszczuk government's commitment to implementing the *Not now, not ever* report in full. This bill gives life to recommendations 129, 99, 117 and 131 of the report.

The community leaders who gathered in my electorate acknowledged that security of accommodation is an essential element of supporting victims of domestic violence. This bill gives the court the option of ensuring that victims are not further traumatised by being forced from their homes as a result of domestic violence. Streamlining court processes and allowing for the use of evidence gathered by police using body worn cameras will assist greatly in obtaining justice for victims of domestic violence.

Perpetrators of domestic violence are seeking to dominate and disempower their victims. This bill will ensure that victims do not feel further disempowered by a court system that does not hear their voice. This bill requires that the views and the wishes of the victims of domestic violence are sought before decisions are made to the extent that it is appropriate and practicable. I note that there were some concerns raised around this provision by some stakeholders, and I thank the minister and the department for working through those issues with the stakeholders to maintain this provision of the bill.

I would like to make a few observations about some things that have been achieved since this House and our entire community started to work together to tackle this issue. Firstly, I hear many more people talking about domestic violence and what they can do about it. There is a growing understanding of this issue and a willingness to discuss it, identify it and act on it. Secondly, in my practice as a nurse during this year I have encountered patients who have sought help and advice about domestic violence. The education and experience that I have received on this issue since being elected has helped me to provide better support and the nurses whom I have worked with have known how to support these patients in these very difficult situations.

Finally, I have highlighted this issue in communications to the electorate through newsletters and electronic newsletters, and a number of people have contacted my office seeking advice. These things may seem small but, hopefully, they have resulted in some people getting help. I would like to thank the participants of the community leaders round table: the Zig Zag Young Women's Resource Centre, the Women's Legal Service, the Mount Gravatt Community Centre, the Holland Park police, Coorparoo Secondary College, Cavendish Road State High School, Holland Park State School, Greenslopes State School, the P&C of the Brisbane School of Distance Education and the *South-East Advertiser*. I would also like to thank Carers Queensland for the use of their venue and participation. I also thank Matthew Campbell for convening the workshop. At the round table we discussed the fact that sexual harassment in the workplace was once common. It is now rare and unacceptable both socially and legally. We all agree that, in the past, we have changed cultural behaviours and that we must join together to do it again. This bill is an important part of that process and I commend it to the House.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (8.40 pm): I rise to speak on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. From the outset I would like to acknowledge that the LNP supports the government in this bipartisan approach to addressing the abhorrent societal shortcoming that is domestic violence. The LNP determined during the last parliament that the prevalence of domestic violence was escalating and not enough was being done to protect women in particular. In recognition of this, in 2014 we established the special task force headed up by Dame Quentin Bryce. Earlier this year the task force report, *Not now, not ever: putting an end to domestic and family violence in Queensland*, handed down 140 recommendations to address the horrendous issue of domestic and family violence.

I note the policy objectives of this bill are to protect the person most in need where there are conflicting allegations of domestic and family violence. To assist this process, the court is required to consider excluding the perpetrator from the home and to recognise the importance of victims being able to express their views through victim statements which would attract mandatory consideration. Police officers will have the use of body worn cameras in these circumstances made lawful. I was speaking with a number of police officers on Saturday at a White Ribbon awareness day hosted by the dedicated team at Palm Beach Neighbourhood Centre. They are pleased with the new laws regarding body worn cameras and say they will provide invaluable evidence. All too often victims go cold about going to court out of fear and the evidence captured on camera gives them courage. I asked about increased reporting and they informed me that in some Gold Coast suburbs the rate is up by 30 per cent, especially in light of recent shocking tragedies resulting in the violent deaths of two women—whom, I might add, were murdered away from their homes. I would like to place on record the special efforts of Samantha Way, Jill Wynd and their colleagues for organising this free family event in one of our local parks. I would also like to thank our police and fireys for their big efforts in the tug-of-war competition, as well as our sporting teams, the Titans and the Suns, who gave more depth to the *Not now, not ever* campaign by standing side by side and reciting the oath against domestic violence. I have often said how proud I am of Currumbin being a connected and caring community and Saturday, 28 November was another example of this.

Implementation of these amendments to the act will require courts aware of cross-applications to hear all cross-applications together and determine the person most in need of protection, unless the interests of safety, protection and wellbeing of an aggrieved require that applications be dealt with separately; call for the court to consider imposing an ouster condition to remove a perpetrator from the family home, whilst taking into account the wishes of the aggrieved; and introduce the principle that the

views and wishes of individuals who currently fear or experience domestic violence should be sought before a decision is made where it is practicable and appropriate to do so. Unsurprisingly, the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee recommends that this bill be passed.

During my time in this House I have held a number of positions, including shadow minister for women, child safety and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community development. Of all women who are victims of domestic violence, it those in our Indigenous communities who are the most vulnerable and unheard. To ensure their voices are heard in relation to the court processes amended by this bill, we will need to look at ways of approaching them so they feel secure in sharing their views. This is particularly true of Indigenous women. Shy by nature, it takes enormous guts to report and go to court—to go on television though is monumental. We saw two brave women do that in recent months. For no charges to be laid against the alleged perpetrator must have been a huge blow to them and lessen their trust in the white man's system.

I recall exposing the fact a few years ago that grade 7 girls from Woorabinda were having contraceptive implants lodged under their skin as a pregnancy prevention measure. A 12-year-old child cannot give informed consent, but the Labor Party condoned this activity that actually encouraged domestic violence against children. The Labor government would not own up to who was doing these procedures and wanted it swept under the carpet. My husband, a GP, was outraged that children would be put in harm's way like this. Whilst Implanon or other contraceptive implants prevent pregnancy, where was the sex education about STDs and other contagious sexual diseases, let alone the young age of these girls? As I said at the time, imagine if this were happening here in schools in South-East Queensland? I want, through this piece of legislation, to call on the Palaszczuk government to guarantee these practices are no longer happening and that all children in Queensland receive the same degree of protection.

Over the years my husband has visited a number of women in refuges or safe houses in his role as a GP. He has told me some terribly sad and disturbing accounts of what these women went through. Their fear is unfathomable unless you have witnessed it. More refuges are needed as this campaign gives more women the confidence to come forward and crimes, particularly those fuelled by new-age drugs, become more violent and more deadly. I acknowledge yesterday's announcement of two new shelters in Brisbane and Townsville. I hope the Gold Coast is next on the list.

Domestic violence is not a new problem, nor is it a passing fad. Often unreported, it has occurred in homes behind closed doors and in remote communities for decades. Whilst the ouster conditions are welcomed, recent deplorable incidents on the Gold Coast occurred outside of the family home with television footage shocking viewers. The ferocity and callousness of these attacks, where former loved ones cold-bloodedly murdered their defenceless partners, has shaken many of us to the core. The community must step up and unite in their disgust with, and intolerance of, abusive and violent behaviour. Awareness days and early education must be fast-tracked to maximise the effect.

Domestic violence affects the elderly as well and their frail voices must be heard too. Last weekend I read Kylie Lang's article. Her comments about language being the precursor in many cases is a valid point. From disparaging comments about physical appearance to controlling behaviours and hurling abuse, this behaviour in all too many cases helps to desensitise and lay the foundations for violence to creep into relationships. The culture must change. Bills such as this make one draw upon their own experiences, their youth and growing up. Perhaps as politicians we could take a leaf out of Kylie Lang's book, so to speak, and reduce the number of deeply personalised verbal attacks tossed across the chamber and stick to legislating good policy debated in a robust manner with performance based objections. Minister Cameron Dick's cheap political pointscoring attack a few weeks ago here in this House on my comments about vaccinating autistic children was not only offensive to me but also to thousands of children and their families who suffer from autism. When I write to these groups and include my speech and the minister's comments, I am sure they will be as disgusted as I was that my genuine attempts to see more children vaccinated were mocked by Cameron Dick, a man who should know better.

The role of women has changed drastically since I was a child in postwar years when most women stayed home, raised families, there was no internet and people minded their own business. Many advances have been made, but the scourge that is domestic violence remains. I have listened to many of the speeches here today and tonight and the conviction of the honourable members in this House should give hope to victims and vulnerable individuals that we are united in our condemnation of domestic violence and in our sincere attempts to stamp it out. This legislation is an important step

towards realising the goal of the task force report *Not now, not ever* and will pave the way forward for a safer community for all Queenslanders to enjoy. I am very proud it was an LNP government which commenced this task force last year and I am happy to support this Labor government's legislation.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (8.48 pm): Tonight I rise to proudly support the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill. Earlier this year the Palaszczuk Labor government was presented with the comprehensive *Not now, not ever* report from the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence. That report was the result of extensive consultation, including with almost 370 different groups of victims, service providers and community leaders. Our government has committed to implementing all 140 recommendations proposed. Tonight we debate a bill to enhance the level of protection in place for victims of domestic and family violence and I am very pleased to support it.

This bill is designed to ensure that our courts protect those most in need of protection. It acknowledges the distress experienced by domestic violence victims who live in the same homes as their abusers and acts to empower the courts to consider imposing conditions to exclude the perpetrators from those living spaces. Often domestic violence victims feel that their voices are falling on deaf ears and that they are somewhat lost in the system of the courts. This bill moves, in part, to rectify this by recognising the importance of domestic violence victims being able to express their views and wishes in relation to decisions under the act.

Each of us, not only in our private lives but also in our public lives, must act within our own areas of power and influence to implement what we can do to stop domestic and family violence. I take this opportunity to put on the parliamentary record some of the work that is underway within my own portfolio. One of the recommendations proposed in the report of the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence is for our government to work with the health sector to ensure more widespread best practice amongst GPs and midwives when dealing with domestic and family violence. Queensland Health is leading the development of tools and training for all health professionals statewide, both public and private. They are also developing a specialist support and referral model for all maternity and emergency departments. We are already screening the women who attend public antenatal clinics through a number of questions about domestic and family violence and offering them support and referrals when a situation is identified. Currently, Queensland Health is undertaking an evaluation of our antenatal screening for violence.

In April this year, I took 15 recommendations from the *Not now, not ever* report to the COAG health ministers' council. At my request, the COAG health ministers' council meeting in November was provided with an update on the implementation of the *Not now, not ever* recommendations.

Several weeks ago, I was proud to stand with my colleagues the state members for Waterford and Algester and members of the Woodridge electorate and the Logan community to join in a walk against domestic violence and to take the Logan pledge to put a stop to violence against women and families. The walk and the pledge both represent what we know: while we are doing what we can, it cannot be up to the government alone to tackle this issue. Together we must refuse to turn a blind eye to violence and say with a united voice that enough is enough.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (8.51 pm): Tonight it is with great pleasure that I rise to speak in favour of the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. One of the great things about this particular bill is that it has bipartisan support. This is an incredibly serious issue and it is very encouraging to see that everybody from both sides of the House agrees that this bill needs to be passed. I am proud to be part of the previous government that commissioned the original Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence. I congratulate former premier Campbell Newman, who personally had the foresight to initiate the task force and to select somebody as reputable and capable as Dame Quentin Bryce to head it. I commend the current government for continuing with the reforms that were recommended. As I said, it is great to see that there is bipartisan support on this issue.

Violence against anybody is unacceptable. Violence against women, particularly when it is perpetrated by men, is even more abhorrent. I cannot speak strongly enough about how I feel on this particular issue. It is very important that men themselves speak out about this abhorrent behaviour. I have a strong background in the sporting world, which is obviously very male dominated. Recently when the shadow minister and member for Aspley and I attended the Premier's White Ribbon breakfast, I was very encouraged to see somebody such as Darren Lockyer working as an ambassador and spokesperson against domestic violence. Having people such as Darren and other men in male dominated sectors—sport, business or whatever it might be—speak out is one of the ways that we can stop this scourge from taking place.

Over the past few months, the publicity about domestic violence has motivated me to apply to become a White Ribbon ambassador, which is quite an impressive process. To become a White Ribbon ambassador, you need to go through an online course, which takes quite a few hours. It requires you to sit down, think and learn about the issues. I must say, I have been very encouraged by that. I have done that part and I have passed, which is encouraging. The next part of the process is an interview, which I think is incredibly important. This is not something that you just ask for and get; you need to go through a process so that you fully understand the sometimes quite complex issues involved with domestic violence. I am looking forward to my interview, which will be held next week, so that hopefully I can become a fully-fledged White Ribbon ambassador.

On 25 November, White Ribbon Day, I was very proud to be the co-host of the inaugural walk for resilience in my community. I co-hosted that with a group called The Nest, which is located in my community. I think the minister may have recently met with Roz from The Nest. The Nest is an incredibly innovative and creative venture that I am really excited about and I know the minister is as well. Roz is incredibly passionate. I will do the organisation a disservice if I do not read straight from their vision statement, which states—

We support the wellbeing of women and children by creating public homes, gardens and studio spaces to build resilient and connected communities. Our philosophy is community regeneration through social enterprise initiatives and leveraging stakeholders to channel collective action through handmade living. We believe our philosophy will provide a pathway to develop social resilience to address the issues that women face with regard to domestic violence, social isolation and mental health issues.

Roz is passionate about this. She has 60 or 70 volunteers. They have a great heritage house on South Pine Road that has great visibility. They are struggling to stay open. They require funding. As I mentioned, I know they met with the minister and I really do hope that the minister sees the potential for their great work, as I do. This is just another part of the puzzle of trying to help women connect, to feel supported and to feel like they can play their role in this as well. Roz was telling me that one of the great things about this community is that many of the women who come to The Nest are victims of domestic violence themselves, but they really want to make a contribution. They really want to come in and help others, which is very inspiring.

I was incredibly encouraged by our inaugural walk. We did it at relatively short notice. I reckon we had around about 150 people attend. The local Everton State Park High School students led off the walk and representatives from Mt Maria College were there as well. It was really encouraging that representatives from the local football clubs attended. Roger McIntosh from the Mitchelton Football Club and David Campbell from the West Mitchie rugby league football club were there. The West Mitchie club has a great history and was home to players such as Fatty Vautin and John Rebo. Those guys realise that they have to make a statement as well, and they came out to represent their clubs. The Bunya Lions Club was represented and Norm Wyndham, Andrew Wines from the Brisbane City Council and Mike Charlton from the Moreton Bay Regional Council were also there. It was great. It was really good to do that walk. We walked from Teralba Park at Mitchie to The Nest, which is only about 800 metres. We had a barbecue and listened to a bit of music, and there was an expo of what happens at The Nest. It was really encouraging. Of course, we had a moment of silence to remember those women, in particular, who are the victims of domestic violence and have suffered greatly through it and, of course, the many who unfortunately have lost their lives.

This bill increases protections for victims of domestic and family violence. Therefore, it has my full support and, I am sure, that of my parliamentary colleagues as well.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (8.58 pm): I am delighted to rise to speak on this bill which is an important element of our government's package of reforms that will tackle the scourge of domestic violence on our state. This is a subject which I feel passionately about and one which no community in Queensland can escape from, including my own. In the 2014-15 financial year the Capricornia region recorded 3,777 domestic violence occurrences and 588 breaches of DV orders. Sadly, over the past five years the number of domestic violence occurrences in Capricornia has increased by 26 per cent, with domestic violence order breaches 68 per cent higher for the region compared with the rest of Queensland. These figures are shocking.

That is why in September of this year I called a high-level round table among Keppel's community leaders and stakeholders to discuss ways to tackle the growing issue of domestic and family violence and its destructive impact. The round table brought together key stakeholders from social services, the legal community, emergency services, health, community leaders and state and local government. I have been so heartened by the widespread determination and want to work together as a community to tackle this terrible problem.

I would like to acknowledge the work of Belinda Lindel and her team at the Rockhampton Women's Health Centre; Bev Schimke and her team at Rockhampton Women's Shelter; Superintendent Ron van Saane from the Rockhampton police, who is also a passionate White Ribbon ambassador; and all the people who are so dedicated and passionate about eradicating domestic and family violence in my community.

I acknowledge my brother, Lewis McKee, who is one of four White Ribbon ambassadors in Rockhampton and the Capricorn Coast. His commitment to eliminating domestic and family violence in our community is admirable. He wears his white ribbon with pride and raises awareness at local community events and forums that domestic violence is not okay—not now, not ever. He tells me that other men ask him about how they too can become a White Ribbon ambassador and take a stand against domestic and family violence. I am so very proud of you, Lew, for your commitment to ensure that all women live in safety, free from all forms of men's violence.

Domestic and family violence is everybody's business and only by working together can we hope to eliminate it. The community effort is one strand of a wide range of actions to tackle domestic and family violence and it is vital. However, we must also look at legislation, as we do here in the House this evening, and how we can reform penalties and court processes in order to protect victims and hold perpetrators to account. I am pleased that the amendments introduce a principle for the right for victims to have their views and wishes heard.

Domestic violence is, at its very heart, an ugly issue of control and domination of men over women. While I in no way want to diminish the experience of the small number of men who are victims of domestic and family violence, the fact is that the majority of victims are women. Often this abuse can take the form of silencing a woman, making her fearful to express her views.

That is why it is so important that this legislation has a principle that victims of domestic and family violence do have their views and wishes heard if it is appropriate and practical. The minister has made very clear that this is not a victim impact statement. It is the introduction of an overall guiding principle that women be considered and consulted as part of the process and issues which relate to them and their circumstances. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (9.02 pm): I too rise to speak in support of this bill. The reason I am particularly pleased that this bill has come before the House—and I congratulate the minister for doing this—is that it is all about protecting the victims. That is something that we have to ensure in our laws. Victims must come first.

This bill enshrines that it is the victims of domestic or family violence who will be at the forefront when people are making decisions about their wellbeing. We are ensuring that the courts consider that the needs of those most in need are protected. This legislation is about protecting the most vulnerable in these situations. We all know the horrific nature of domestic and family violence.

I was lucky enough to attend three domestic violence round tables held in my electorate—the legal round table, the religious round table and the LGBTIQ round table. I listened to the various speeches made tonight, and in particular to the very moving speech by the member for Mudgeeraba.

The common thread that came through in all of those round tables and the speeches that we have heard in this debate is the need to protect the victims. They must come first. This bill, which is a result of the recommendations from the *Not now, not ever* report, is all about giving victims the confidence they will need to report instances of domestic and family violence and the confidence that someone has their best interests at heart and their best interests at the forefront of their mind. We must ensure the protection of victims of these heinous acts that happen in our community.

All of us in this House—members from both sides of the House—are repulsed by domestic and family violence. It is amazing how widespread it is. Going around my electorate the stories that come forward are heartbreaking. They are often harrowing. They are like some of the stories we have heard during this debate. I also mention the member for Aspley who recounted the stories of a couple of friends of hers who fell victim to this.

I strongly support the policy objectives of this bill which are to ensure that those who are in most need are protected and ensure that the protection for domestic violence victims is maximised and the disruption in their lives is minimised. The perpetrators of domestic violence need to be considered when it comes to protecting the victims. With domestic violence we recognise the importance of victims being able to express their views.

We have to ensure that police officers using body worn cameras are using them lawfully when conducting their duties. I am very proud tonight to be speaking in favour of this bill. We must protect victims. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (9.05 pm): I rise to make a very short contribution to the debate on the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. Firstly, I thank the committee and the chair and the deputy chair of the committee for their input on this bill and for their recommendations. After hearing the member for Mudgeeraba's contribution today, I honestly do not feel anything I say will come close to the heartbreaking experiences that the individuals she was speaking about endured. It is a scourge on our society. It is scourge on modern Western society, especially our country. I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for her passionate plea and passionate speech.

We have all witnessed and heard the harrowing tales of domestic violence. I have certainly had individuals come to my office and I have met people out in the public arena who have told me what has transpired in their lives. I must say it is something I find extremely hard to comprehend. I lived in a family with good parents. We were not subject to anything like this. I lived in an area where there would have been a reasonably high rate of domestic violence. As a child I could see this in the community, but it was unfortunately swept under the carpet. It did not receive the attention it does today—especially not the attention it receives today after the recommendations in the *Not now, not ever* report. I thank Dame Quentin Bryce and members of the domestic and family violence task force for their recommendations which are aimed at extinguishing this blight on our society.

A lot of people have spoken in the debate on this bill. I highlight the provision around protecting the right of the victim to return to their home. There is nothing worse for children than having to move away from their friends and their school. That creates enormous disruption. That is not fair for those poor individuals. I commend that provision in the bill. That will go a long way in the healing process.

The bill also allows victims to express what has actually transpired in their lives to a magistrate in victim impact statements. I believe that that is certainly a way for them to try to get on with their lives and to move forward. I must say that of all the speeches I have done in this parliament this is something I find very difficult to talk about. After speaking to quite a few of my constituents, I am ashamed to say that in parts of my electorate we do have high rates of domestic violence. I admit that. It is something I am very ashamed about. But my local police at Coomera are doing a fantastic job of trying to get on top of this issue. They are very professional about it.

That leads me to my last comment. The police officers at Coomera are overworked. They are working extremely hard. There are 59 officers at the Coomera Police Station looking after 107,000 people in the Coomera district. We need to allocate a lot more resources to that police station to help those police officers get out there in the community and look after people who are in need. I wholeheartedly support the direction this bill is taking.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.10 pm), in reply: I would like to thank all members for their contributions to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Another Act Amendment Bill 2015. It is great to see so many members of parliament standing up and speaking out about domestic violence, which tragically is an issue that touches every electorate across our state. One of the most heartening aspects of the debate of this bill is to hear the support from both sides of the House. I would particularly like to thank the member for Mudgeeraba for having the courage to share her story tonight and other members who have shared their personal reflections as part of this debate.

I would like to respond to some of the comments made by the member for Caloundra. The member for Caloundra raised some concerns that during the committee process it was unclear as to whether this government was introducing provisions relating to victim impact statements. In my second reading speech I have again clarified that the introduction of a new principle to recognise the views and wishes of victims did not amount to the introduction of victim impact statements. The member for Caloundra also sought clarification about cross-applications lodged in different court registries and the potential for delays. Firstly, it should be noted that over the last three years roughly 82 per cent of cross-applications were lodged in the same court location, resulting in only 18 per cent lodged in separate locations.

It is possible there may be delays where a court is required to adjourn proceedings to enable cross-applications to be heard together. However, any delay is outweighed by the benefits of courts being able to hear cross-applications together to determine the person most in need of protection. In order to ensure there is no gap in protection, where the hearing of an application is adjourned, a court will always be required to consider whether a temporary protection order should be made to protect any person named in an application from harm. Currently, a magistrate making a decision to adjourn the matter to another court location will generally hear from the parties before making such a decision.

As I mentioned earlier, consideration is being given to a new practice direction to be issued by the Chief Magistrate setting out a framework for the hearing of cross-applications and providing submission about the transfer of proceedings. Advice from the Office of the Chief Magistrate is that it is intended that the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012 bench book will be updated to provide guidance on amendments to the act.

With regard to ouster conditions, which some members raised, it is important to note that the legislative changes in this bill are supported by the necessary support services on the ground to make these changes workable in practice. The Department of Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services has allocated \$1.38 million in 2015-16 for safety upgrades to be provided as part of the suite of service responses available to victims. These programs are not stand-alone programs but are delivered by specialist domestic violence counselling services as one component of a response to meet the safety and support needs of victims.

Safety upgrades are undertaken in the context of a safety plan where an assessment of a client's level of risk and other circumstances has been considered. Where safe and appropriate to do so, services undertake an assessment of the safety and security needs of the client's home and arrange the work required to address the identified home security needs including physical security enhancements such as changing locks, installing door and window locks, installing screens and sensor lights.

Amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 provide certainty about the lawfulness of the use of body worn cameras by police in the performance of their duties. Body worn cameras are a new tool being used by police to assist them in responding to all types of policing priorities, including domestic and family violence incidents, to which they are often the first responders. Supporting the use of body worn cameras will assist police officers in gathering the best possible evidence in their investigations into domestic and family violence incidents.

The bill will provide important protections for victims and help to ensure perpetrators are held to account. I am proud that this is the first piece of legislation that I have introduced into parliament. I thank the members of the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee for their examination of the bill and their contributions to today's debate. I also thank Megan Giles, Executive Director, Legislative Reform, her team and colleagues from the Queensland police. Thanks also to my chief of staff Cynthia Kennedy and policy adviser Laura Manton.

The government and my department are working tirelessly to implement the recommendations of the special task force's *Not now, not ever* report. These are landmark changes which will forever change the response to domestic and family violence in Queensland. I am proud to be a part of a government that has put this issue front and centre of our agenda. We are equally committed to changing attitudes that underpin the cycle of violence, as well as delivering on providing the necessary legislative framework, support services and funding. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 20, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.16 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.16 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY

Resumed from 1 December (see p. 3044).



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (9.17 pm): It is my absolute pleasure to rise to deliver my speech on the address-in-reply as the member for Redcliffe. I know every member stands here and says it but I certainly am grateful to have such an amazing electorate, being the electorate of Redcliffe. The electorate is made up of the suburbs of Clontarf, Woody Point, Margate, Kippa-Ring, Redcliffe, Scarborough, Newport and, of course, Moreton Island.

Of course, the electorate is not just made up of suburbs; it is made up of people and a community—a community that is extremely generous and is known for its amazing volunteers and, as a community, when things get tough people pull together and support their neighbours. That does not mean that we do not have our challenges. Redcliffe is certainly not unique there. We know that we have our struggles. We have high youth unemployment—around 18 per cent. We have just had a debate on domestic violence legislation again in this House, and we know that unfortunately Redcliffe is also experiencing a significant increase in the number of domestic and family violence applications coming into our local courthouse. That is all the more reason why we as a community need to pull together and support each other. It is certainly why the Palaszczuk government has taken the actions it has since coming into government at the start of this year to implement a range of initiatives to support our communities.

When I talk about my community, I want to talk about some of the amazing events and organisations within my electorate. This year we again saw amazing sporting events. The Murri Rugby League Carnival came back to Redcliffe this year. It started down the coast, it then went to Ipswich, it came to Redcliffe last year as part of the Arthur Beetson Foundation and it came back again this year. I am really hoping they will call Redcliffe home permanently now. It is an amazing carnival that brings Indigenous adults and youth together to play Rugby League over a number of days. What is great about this particular event is that for the participants to be allowed to be involved they all have to go through a health check, and the youth are not allowed to play unless they have had I think 90 per cent attendance at school for the previous three months. I think that is fantastic, but I have said that I would like to see that three months extended a bit longer to encourage those young people to value staying at school and understand the value of being at school.

This year alone they picked up a number of health related issues, including heart conditions, simply from those health checks. Through this event and the Deadly Choices campaign, an incredible number of Indigenous people are now doing health checks. It has significantly increased and it is such a worthy campaign. I want to thank everyone involved in the Murri Rugby League Carnival, the Arthur Beetson Foundation and Deadly Choices. I see those Deadly Choices shirts all over the Redcliffe peninsula and I see them in the youth detention centres, because we know we have a high proportion of Indigenous and Torres Strait Islander youths there. You cannot just go and buy one of those shirts; they have got to be earned—and that is what is great about this program. If you are wearing a Deadly Choices shirt, you know you have earned it and that is fantastic.

I also want to acknowledge what was previously called the Our Village Foundation and what is now known as MBRIT, Moreton Bay Region Industry and Tourism, which has been established through Shane Newcombe and his team. This organisation is working across the Moreton Bay region with the Moreton Bay Regional Council and all levels of government to increase our tourism, to support businesses and to grow our local economy. They do this through a whole range of initiatives and looking at investments and infrastructure in the community. They also put on amazing events. I know that you, Mr Deputy Speaker Ryan, are well aware of the fantastic events that MBRIT have been putting on in the Moreton Bay region.

Just this year, we had the Redcliffe Festival which brought tens of thousands of people to the Redcliffe peninsula. The Redcliffe Festival used to be known as the Redcliffe KiteFest and it was held over two days—the Saturday and Sunday—but now the Redcliffe Festival stretches over two full weeks and three weekends with the Redcliffe KiteFest, the Scarborough Sounds and the Jetty Fiesta. It is an amazing event and, as I said, it brings in tens of thousands of people from all across Brisbane and interstate. They stay and they spend money in our local community and that is all good for local business. So I want to congratulate MBRIT, Shane Newcombe and his team for the great work and investment they are making in our local communities.

The Moreton Bay Rail Link is well underway. I am extremely proud of this program. I lobbied very hard as the federal member to get over \$1 billion. We had funding from the council, the state government and the federal government all coming together to make this a reality. That commitment

was made back in 2010. I am bemused at times when I read the social media from certain people claiming that it was other political parties and other governments which made this happen—that I simply advocated for it but they are the ones who delivered it. I can assure everyone in this House that it was federal Labor funding, it was state Labor funding and it was funding through Moreton Bay Regional Council which saw this become a reality. We are the ones who signed the contract with Thiess. We are the ones who made this happen. Next year we will see the opening of that 12.6 kilometre dual track with six stations. That rail line has been promised for over 100 years and it will finally come to the Redcliffe peninsula. It will be a boom for our local area, it will increase housing values, it will support local businesses and it will certainly provide great opportunities for our school students as well.

What is great about this rail line is that a lot of thought has gone into planning it. It is not just the train stations, the track and how many cars it gets off the road; it is also the fact that the entire 12.6 kilometres from the Petrie station all the way through to Kippa-Ring has a cycle and walking track alongside it. I already have parents saying, 'My kids don't even have to use the train. They are going to be able to ride their bike all the way from home to school on this safe walking track without going on Anzac Avenue anymore and dealing with the traffic.' So we are making it safer for cyclists as well as pedestrians and public transport users.

I want to acknowledge our amazing schools. I have to give a big shout out to our F1 students. The F1 racing car competition happens throughout Queensland and across the country every year. Incredibly, four young girls in year 12 at Redcliffe State High School who were studying engineering, mathematics, science—all our STEM subjects—

Ms Jones: Hear, hear! That's very good to hear.

Mrs D'ATH: The Minister for Education will be very pleased to hear about this. These amazing young ladies won the states, they went on to the nationals and ended up winning the nationals and then they went on to compete at the world competition in Singapore this year. These were four year 12 girls and the only all-girls team from Australia. These girls had an amazing time and they did very well in the competition.

One of these young ladies is one of only 11 students from across the world who were chosen to do a cadetship with the F1 Williams Racing Academy. She is going to spend the next few years going through training, programs and assessment. Of these 11 students, certain ones will drop off as they go along—those who are not achieving as much—and at the end of the day, when all of this is finished, the one student who is still standing will be offered a permanent job with the F1 racing team. I congratulate these amazing girls—Freya, you are incredible and we are all so proud of you. It is just terrific. This is one of those things—whether it is the F1 racing competition or the Lego robotics with the aviation and aeroskills courses in our high schools—that is catching kids' imagination and getting them into those STEM subjects. That is what we really need. I congratulate all of the organisations that are involved in those things.

We have the artificial reef that has been named after the late Bill Turner which is off Scarborough. It is wonderful to see this artificial reef in place and I know the recreational fishers are loving it.

I was very pleased to advocate on behalf of my local seniors who live at the Azure Blue retirement village. There is a new shopping strip across the road and they were struggling to cross the road safely. One woman took a fall and broke a bone. We had a chat with Main Roads last year to find out what we could do about this and they were great. They came out and assessed it, and they have put in a safety island. The seniors can now cross Anzac Avenue very safely because of this new pedestrian safety island. I will come back to talking about departments shortly but Main Roads were terrific there.

I want to acknowledge the amazing community groups, and I cannot mention all of them—the Lions, the Lioness Club, the Rotary groups, Zonta, Quota, Breakaway, Cascade Place, ROPE, Chameleon House, Circle and the CWA. All of our amazing groups do such a tremendous job supporting our local community. I want to acknowledge all of my support team and my staff—Jenny, Karl and Eddie who are working with me. Jenny has been with me for a long time and she is absolutely incredible. We all know that you cannot do your job as a local member without great staff, and they are an incredible team.

I also want to mention Laura Gowdie, who has been by my side for so many years. Although she is no longer with me, she is in a much better job now working for another minister. This is a person to whom I owe so much. She has always been a huge supporter of mine. I am her biggest fan. I think she is amazing and I thank her for all of the great work she has done in my electorate office over the years and with my campaigns.

I am not going to try to name everyone who helped out on the campaign because it is all too difficult and the list is way too long. I say thank you to everyone who doorknocked and who stood out in the heat in January. It was a very hot campaign, as we all know, being in the middle of summer. They were incredible, out there every day at the street stall, standing on the side of the road with me from 5.30 in the morning and out there every afternoon. There were sausage sizzles, other things that we did and the markets on Sundays. There was the kind person who walked past with a big watermelon. I said, 'Oh gee, that looks great. I wouldn't mind some of that.' He came back an hour later with his children. They had cut it all up and put it on plates for us to support us with the campaign. They are incredible people. I thank them so much for their tireless work.

I do have to talk about last year, 2014, and what it has been like since the election. It was a tough year. Last week I celebrated eight years since I was first elected in the federal parliament, and those eight years have gone very quickly and a lot has happened. I have to say that last year was the most difficult for me as an elected representative. The reason is not that I was sitting in opposition—and this is important for me to raise because I think we all need to remember why we are here and learn from our past. It was a shocking year because I have never seen a government treat an elected representative in the way I was treated last year. It was absolutely disgusting to hear the sorts of responses I got from ministers on the other side when I was seeking information as a sitting member of parliament on behalf of my constituents and groups: the dismissive emails, the utter contempt that was shown to me last year, the absolute fear from government departments and public servants who were not allowed to talk to me. They made it very clear they were not allowed to talk to me. They had very clear directions that they were not allowed to talk to me in my own electorate as an elected member of parliament. They feared for their jobs. They would talk to me in whispers in corners to tell me what was going on. They feared for their jobs. No public servant should fear for their jobs simply because they are doing their job and talking to an elected member of parliament. It was absolutely disgusting. I raise this because no matter who is in government, honourable members have to remember these things and they have to think about how they treat people every single day.

After this election and we came in here and all the new members were sworn in, it put a huge smile on my face to watch people cross over and congratulate each other after their maiden speech. That is what I was used to seeing. That is what happened after every election in federal parliament: we would cross over to the other side, shake their hand and say, 'Good speech, well done, congratulations.' When I made my speech last year, not one person in this entire chamber moved to come over and say, 'Well done, Yvette, welcome.' It was absolutely astounding. I have never seen such arrogance and contempt for people who have been elected to represent their community. I raise this just so that we can learn to be more respectful.

Today we have been having debates about respect, domestic violence, equality and everything else. We have to respect each other across this chamber. I said last year in my maiden speech that we need to try to be parliamentarians, not politicians, and I stand by that comment. We have to show respect for each other. I am glad that I have definitely seen a change in this chamber this year. The most common question I was asked last year is, 'What's the difference between federal and state parliament?' The sad thing is I had to say: the conduct in this chamber. I had to say that. It was astounding. I spent six years of everyone going, 'Gee, you federal politicians. In question time you act like kids. It's appalling.' I can say that the federal parliament was the height of professionalism compared to what I saw here last year. It was appalling. It was disgusting. It was embarrassing. There are kids in the gallery who watch this. We have to learn. We have to look at our behaviour. We are role models; whether we want to be or not, we are role models. We are elected representatives and we should look at how we behave and how we treat each other.

I did not intend to spend that long on that issue, but I felt it was important to make those points. I am so proud of my community. I want to take the last couple of minutes, firstly, to say thank you to my family because none of us can ever be here without the support of our families. To my husband and children, I say I will definitely spend some time with you over Christmas; I promise. They are my amazing support and I could not do what I do without them and I would not want to. It is because of them that I do this. To the Premier I say thank you for putting your faith in me, for appointing me as the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills. Thank you very much. I have loved every minute of doing this job this year. It is such an honour. I believe we have achieved so much already in the justice system and in Training and Skills in such a short period of time. We have a lot more to do, but I am just so proud of all the work we have already done, including what we did here today with civil partnerships. I am so proud of it.

Of course, all of us on both sides need to remember why we are here in government and that was the attacks we saw on public servants, on jobs, on so many people, the communities, the legal profession and the doctors. I will never forget it. I will never forget those who came out and supported me in the Redcliffe by-election. I will never forget those who came out and supported me this year. Every day that I am here I get up to make a difference. I will continue to do so. We are all here to create a legacy and leave behind a better place than when we came to it. That is certainly my objective. I look forward to spending every day as the elected member for Redcliffe doing just that.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.37 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise as Premier to speak in the address-in-reply debate. From the outset I would like to acknowledge the Governor for the speech that he made and also our Speaker, Peter Wellington.

I have had the privilege of representing the people of Inala in this place since 2006 and I can say quite honestly that it gets no less humbling as the years go by. I am always mindful of the trust and responsibility the people of the Inala electorate have placed in me to represent them and their best interests. It is something that drives me each and every day because I know how tough people can do it in their lives and the daily challenges that they face. Whether it is trying to find a dollar or two to pay the outstanding electricity bill or putting food on the table, people in my electorate do it tough, but they are resilient like Queenslanders right across the state. On reflection, what makes our state so great is its greatest asset, and that is our people. It does not matter whether it is the communities I go to or my own local electorate—walking around the old Inala Civic Centre or going up to Cairns, out to Yeppoon which was damaged by the cyclones, out to the west where people are going through drought—our people in our communities are resilient.

They want decent pay for a decent day's work; they want hope; they want opportunity; they want the very best for their kids; and they want to make sure that they are able to prosper and grow in a great state. Queensland is a great state, and we should never lose sight of the fact that we live in what I believe is the best state in our country. Our people are our heart and our soul. I reflect on what the Attorney-General has just said, and what drove us in opposition and continues to drive us each and every day is that the people of Queensland did not want to see the arrogant and out-of-touch government they were confronted with for three years led by the person whose name is no longer mentioned in this House: the former premier, Campbell Newman.

We went to the election believing that there was a better way for Queensland, and our first budget clearly delivered on that election promise in so many ways. When I look around at my ministers, my Minister for Education is driving an innovation agenda. She wants the best for our students and is putting in more front-line services. My health minister values our nurses and our doctors and is working hard to restore dignity back to the workplace. My Attorney-General: no more fights; the courts are getting on with the job; there is a clear separation of powers, and it is something that my government treasures and we pride ourselves on. My Minister for Science and Innovation and Minister for Housing is in the House and day in, day out she is making sure that people have a roof over their head, driving our agenda of Advance Queensland to make sure that we have the jobs of the future. What a great team! All of my team, every single backbencher—and a special welcome to all of the newly elected members of this House—work hard every day out in their electorates, out in the coalface, to make a difference to people's lives. They make strong representations to the ministers to ensure that change comes about: getting that extra maintenance that is needed for the school; getting the extra nurses that are needed for the hospital; representing their constituents. Why do they do that? Because that is what we were elected to do.

There is no greater honour than to be elected as a member of this House. It is an honour and a privilege that no-one here should ever lose sight of. Very few people have the opportunity to serve here, and every day that I stand here I feel the honour that the people of Inala have given me. With that comes enormous responsibility as well, and now as the Premier of this state I do not shirk from that every step of the way. What drives me is getting up every day to make a change and a difference. It is about making sure that when we are no longer here we leave this place in good hands: that we have protected the environment, that we have saved the Great Barrier Reef, and that we are making sure that we have a prosperous future for all.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Grace): Order! Member for Lockyer, really there is no need for the interjection. The Premier has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, member for Lockyer, for that interjection. I reflect on some of the growers out in his electorate and the amazing export opportunities that they are forging at the moment with countries such as Japan. We are driving that trade, and I have just come back tonight from a reception—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lockyer, I have given you some leeway. The next time I will not hesitate to warn you. There is no provocation; there is no reason for it.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. Labor governments have jobs at the forefront of their agenda, and we will always drive jobs in this state. Not only do we have a very clear economic agenda; we have a clear social responsibility as well. I think about the minister for disabilities, who is driving that workforce change to make sure that the National Disability Insurance Scheme is rolled out in this state. My government achieved that new launch site, and we are delivering on the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

I reflect on the Grantham floods inquiry which Walter Sofronoff was commissioned to conduct so that people could have the answers they so desperately needed. We let their voices be heard. One of the cornerstones of this government is that it is a consultative government with integrity and accountability. What we saw from those opposite over the last three years was them throwing out the rule book when it came to integrity and accountability. One only needs to look at the last two reports of the Auditor-General which have been handed down to see how the previous government ran an administration where accountability and transparency were thrown away.

I thank my cabinet and my caucus members for the consultative approach that they have adopted in terms of decision-making. They come together as one for the best outcomes in the best interests of the people of Queensland. They do not pick fights and they work together. This is in stark contrast to what we saw over the past three years. In closing I want to pay tribute to my electorate staff, because they work hard and they know that because of my job now I have to travel right across the state. I thank Mel, Charles, Matt and David—and Michelle was there for a while as well—for all the hard work that they do day in, day out talking to my constituents and raising issues of concern with me.

I also want to thank my family. I think every person in this House should remember that we spend many hours in this House, but we also spend a lot of time travelling and representing our electorates and doing various jobs, whether it is a minister, a member of a committee, a shadow minister or members representing large electorates in this state, and it is family that is always there for you when you go home. It is family that is prepared to listen and to show you support, and we should never lose sight of that. For those reasons, I thank them for their support.

I support the address-in-reply. I thank the Governor very much for his comments. Each and every day my government will work hard to continue to have the trust of the people of our wonderful state.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (9.47 pm): It is indeed a great honour to rise in support of the address-in-reply motion as it stands before the House. In doing so I wish to first extend my appreciation to His Excellency Governor Paul de Jersey, who has been an exemplary public servant to the people of Queensland. His Excellency has proven himself a highly respected judicial leader and now a steadfast and compassionate governor to the people of Queensland, particularly in their time of need as we witnessed after Tropical Cyclone Marcia.

My first and unreserved thanks go to the electors of South Brisbane for having entrusted their confidence in me to represent them in the Queensland parliament. To represent my community in this place, to participate in our stable but robust democratic system, to influence and contribute to good ideas, public policy and laws for the people and places of our state is as high an honour as any that an individual could aspire to in their lifetime. I am truly humbled and honoured that I have had this opportunity because of the people of South Brisbane.

The inner south has been my home for almost the entirety of my life. Like many new migrants who settled in Brisbane at the time, my father, Victor, chose the inner south and started his new life in Australia as a factory worker and then as a proud small business owner. In the many decades that have ensued, I have seen the inner south grow and change as Brisbane has emerged into a metropolis. The suburbs of the South Brisbane electorate have been the beneficiary of much of this modernisation and metamorphosis: from celebrated and renowned cultural institutions, to a city parkland in South Bank which is unrivalled in its public amenity and accessibility; from the mighty Gabba cricket ground, to

Brisbane State High School, Brisbane's only GPS state school; from world-class tertiary hospitals like the PA Hospital and Lady Cilento Children's Hospital, to the myriad of small businesses populating old and new retail and dining precincts throughout the electorate.

South Brisbane is well and truly a destination for many outside the electorate, the state and, in fact, the nation for work and pleasure. However, while it is true that South Brisbane has been the beneficiary of this progress and transformation, it is also the case that it has borne the brunt of the challenges that accompany rapid development. How we as a local community accommodate for increased population growth while preserving the livability and character of our suburbs is an issue of significant concern to my local community and to me. Many local schools are at capacity, local roads and public transport accommodate commuters travelling into the CBD from the whole south side of the river and open green space is a shrinking amenity in the inner south. These concerns were heightened when the former LNP government released the Kurilpa Riverfront Renewal draft master plan. Not only was the plan announced at an exclusive \$150-a-seat lunch; the local community was given barely 30 days to give feedback on a 20-year local neighbourhood plan for their community. Is it any surprise that with this approach to consultation the LNP alienated such a large part of the community during their time in government?

I know that development is an issue of great concern, not just for the residents in South Brisbane but also for many local communities across the Brisbane metropolitan area. As planning minister, I am pleased to have already delivered significant planning reform; for example, releasing the Better Planning for Queensland discussion paper and introducing the planning bills, currently being considered by a parliamentary committee. These are big steps in our suite of planning reforms for our regions and our cities to give confidence to our partners in local government, certainty for the development industry and, importantly, a say for residents and communities around how their streets and suburbs evolve and grow.

Of course, I have the title of Minister for Planning because of the confidence entrusted in me by the Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk. In addition to planning, my portfolios include transport, local government, infrastructure and trade. Whilst the array of policy areas is wide, the connection and synergies between them present the Palaszczuk Labor government with great opportunities to plan for transport infrastructure and economic growth in a much more efficient and transparent way.

I am honoured by the level of responsibility entrusted in me by the Premier, and I am even more honoured to serve her in her government as the Deputy Premier of Queensland. Just like every other Palaszczuk Labor government minister, I have been incredibly busy since we came to government in February this year. Some of the achievements to date—I will not go through all of them, because they have been quite significant—have been focused mainly on delivering our election commitments, particularly around establishing Building Queensland, getting out the draft Infrastructure Plan, accelerating the planning reform process, progressing Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2 and delivering on a number of key infrastructure projects, particularly the Coomera interchange upgrade, the train-stabling project and major urban renewal projects that have been underway for some time such as Yeerongpilly Green and Northshore Hamilton.

Of course, we also had to establish and implement the Severe Tropical Cyclone Marcia Recovery Plan after Tropical Cyclone Marcia hit a week after we were sworn in as a ministry. I am very pleased that this state budget delivered in terms of Central Queensland a \$40 million package to see reconstruction efforts and iconic projects delivered for that local community. Additionally, I have made two trade missions on behalf of the Queensland government: to the Asia-Pacific region and also to Europe.

The thing that highlights the contrast between this government and the previous government is our commitment to consultation, as the Premier has just discussed. The Palaszczuk Labor government has promised to be a consultative government—a government that works with Queenslanders, not fights with Queenslanders. We are delivering on that promise. When we compare this approach of collaboration and consultation to the last three years of the LNP government, it is clear why the electorate turned so quickly against them. Yet those opposite needed a postelection review to outline what Queenslanders had been trying to tell them the entire time they were in government.

The LNP was arrogant and untrustworthy—all spin and no substance. Whether it was the fantasy BaT tunnel or the wait-time guarantee that was more about propaganda than patient care, Queenslanders could not trust the LNP at its word. The South Brisbane community was not immune from the LNP's callous cuts, inflicted without warning and often without any consultation. I was very proud to work with my local community over the past three years running strong, local, grassroots campaigns against bad LNP decisions. Whether it was about amalgamating schools in the local

electorate that were kilometres away from each other, closing train stations or cutting bus services, I was proud to stand with the local community to oppose these bad decisions. In comparison to the LNP's arrogant approach, the Palaszczuk Labor government has come to government not only with a suite of job-generating and integrity-lifting policies but also with an attitude to govern for Queenslanders, not despite Queenslanders.

The key iconic reform, principally being driven by my friend the member for Algester, is the Advance Queensland program. I am very proud of this program, which seeks to build on achievements of past Labor governments, to continue to build Queensland into a smart state and a smart economy, ready for the challenges of the future.

In my first trade mission I was very pleased to lead the Queensland delegation that represented our interests in Bonn when UNESCO considered whether or not to put the Great Barrier Reef on the in-danger list. I am very pleased that it was Labor's election policies that saw the UNESCO committee give serious consideration and ultimately determine not to put the Great Barrier Reef on the in-danger list.

I am incredibly proud, after the work I did over the past three years as shadow environment minister, to see election policies now come to fruition in government. These included an additional \$100 million over five years to improving water quality and meeting ambitious new targets to reduce pollution and run-off into the Great Barrier Reef catchment; banning the dumping of capital dredge spoil in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area; and limiting the expansion of ports along the Great Barrier Reef coastline. I know that good policies are not enough and that we have to continue to deliver on our commitments if we are to put the future of the reef beyond any doubt.

Indeed, we can only meet the challenges of the future if we are future focused, and the Labor Party has always governed for the future by delivering laws and policy to secure our values of opportunity, equality, fairness and social justice. For almost 20 years, successive Queensland Labor governments under the premierships of Wayne Goss, Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh have governed for Queensland's future, unlike the LNP, which only ever believed in a four-pillar economy, shrinking opportunities to only 27 per cent of the Queensland economy—the same Liberal National Party which took a gigantic backward leap away from equality when repealing civil unions without consulting with the LGBTI community. I am very proud that today is the day we have installed civil partnerships in this state.

The LNP is the party that threw fairness out of the window, after promising workers that they had nothing to fear from an LNP government and then sacking tens of thousands of them after winning government. The LNP is the party that trampled hope and justice for people with a disability and their families when it declined the invitation to participate in the trial of the National Disability Insurance Scheme, the single biggest social reform in our nation since Medicare. I am very proud of the fact that Coralee O'Rourke, the member for Mundingburra, has now identified three trial sites to ensure we are part of this big social reform.

The LNP is not a party focused on the future, as we saw last night in the sugar debate; it is a political party focused on itself. When Queenslanders were given a chance to have a say on its performance, they sent a clear message that they had had enough—after only three years.

The cause of the Labor Party and the labour movement was so aptly captured by Australia's 16th Prime Minister, Ben Chifley, when he said—

I try to think of the labour movement not as putting an extra sixpence into somebody's pocket, or making somebody Prime Minister or Premier, but as a movement bringing something better to the people, better standards of living, greater happiness to the mass of the people. We have a great objective—the light on the hill—which we aim to reach by working for the betterment of mankind not only here but anywhere we may give a helping hand.

I am privileged to be part of a Labor family that believes in this cause as much today as when Ben Chifley was Prime Minister of our nation. I want to particularly acknowledge and thank the Queensland Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, for her leadership and friendship and particularly her dedication and hard work over the previous three years with a very difficult government in place. I want to thank all of my cabinet colleagues and particularly acknowledge all of the hard work that they have done over the past 10 months, but I particularly want to acknowledge Shannon Fentiman, Kate Jones, Steven Miles and Mark Bailey for their friendship and support. I want to acknowledge each and every one of the new Labor members who come into this place to serve the people of Queensland with such distinction and privilege. I also want to acknowledge Evan Moorhead and Anthony Chisholm and everyone over at the Labor Party headquarters for their hard work. I want to acknowledge Rohan Webb from the AMWU, Gary Bullock from United Voice and Julie Bignall, the former state secretary of the

ASU. I want to acknowledge my colleagues on the south side—Terri Butler and Helen Abrahams—for being excellent local representatives and great friends. I also want to acknowledge my campaign team. I want to thank Nicole Lessio, my campaign director who volunteered countless days and weekends overseeing the campaign and who is now the candidate for the Gabba ward. I want to acknowledge Elly Desmarchelier, my assistant campaign director who did such an amazing job not only as my assistant campaign director but also as my electorate officer during the time in opposition.

Ms Jones: All-round awesomeness.

Ms TRAD: Yes, all-round awesomeness; I take the interjection from the member for Ashgrove. I also want to acknowledge Carolyn Nicholas, who is a fundraising genius and prepoll coordinator; Josh Nicholas, who did a great job in terms of social media; Hayden Schofield; Sarah Bowman; William Akol; Tom Whibley; and Mark Woodley. To every single South Brisbane ALP branch member and local volunteer who knocked on a door, made a phone call, sat on street stalls, made a small regular donation or stuffed envelopes: every contribution big and small helped secure us a strong result for Labor in South Brisbane.

Of course I can only do this job with the love and the support of my husband, Damien, and my sons, Leo and Vincent. I do go home every night and I do appreciate the fact that their love and their support ensures that I can do the job that I do. I particularly want to pay tribute to my mother, whom I could not do this job without. She primarily assists in taking care of my boys when I am absent for long periods of time and I want to acknowledge that it is her work ethic that I bring to this place and I want to acknowledge that I could not do this work without her. I want to end by acknowledging that this year marks the 20th anniversary of my father's death and every day I am deeply, deeply conscious of the fact that the opportunities and successes that I have experienced in my life have only been made possible because of the huge sacrifices that he made in his life from an unimaginably young age. It is in the honour of his memory that I dedicate my contribution to this important debate before us. I commend the motion to the House.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (10.02 pm): It is a real honour to stand in this parliament during the address-in-reply debate as the member for Ashgrove, and as members can appreciate it has been a long journey to get back here! I was reflecting on this speech and I decided that I wanted to speak from the heart tonight. I think I have earned that. I want to start by saying that I got a really good insight into what the Newman government was going to be like at the last debate held in my electorate in 2012. It was meant to be a local debate in my community. Everyone knew that Campbell Newman was going to win. Everyone knew locally and everyone knew across the state that in less than six days Campbell Newman was going to become Premier of Queensland. There was one last debate, which he got dragged kicking and screaming to, in my local community at Oakleigh State School. What they chose to do was to bus in a whole heap of people from outside the electorate into Ashgrove—

Mr Furner: Rent-a-crowd.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection. They brought a rent-a-crowd into the local community to outnumber the local people who had come to have their say. With regard to the behaviour that day—it was well televised that Campbell Newman refused to shake my hand—they came in, they booed and hissed and they spoke over local people: genuine local community members who attended that debate, not my supporters, not their supporters but genuine local residents.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: They spoke over them like they are speaking over me now. Shannon Fentiman was my organiser at the time. That was the one time when I left sad, the one time in the whole campaign where I was almost brought to tears. I was almost brought to tears because I saw firsthand what was going to happen to the state that I love. I saw firsthand the arrogance, the speaking over people, the self-belief—'We've got this. This is ours and we're going to take it for all it is and we don't care what that means for ordinary people.' I saw it firsthand and I remember thinking, 'Please God. If he can act like this when he knows it's in the bag, what is he going to be like as Premier?' I went home and I was emotional, as I am now, and I really hoped that it would not be like that. I honestly hoped and thought, 'Please do not govern like that. I don't want to be a mother of children in a state where that is the behaviour of the leader of my state.'

But, as we know and as we saw happen over the last three years, that is exactly the government they became. They promised that they would save people's jobs, and I watched that video since I have been elected where Campbell Newman stood there and said, 'You don't have to worry. You can trust

me. Your jobs are safe.' He was smiling in front of the union sign and only months later he turned around and sacked thousands of people. In my electorate there is a high concentration of public servants in the community and I had a number of people come up to me during that campaign and in the three years when I lay low. It was well documented that I lay low. I retreated to my community of Ashgrove where I live because it is where I love to live and where I want to raise my family. People would stop me at the shops, when I was walking my dog, when I was exercising—I do not do that as much these days; I am working on it—and say, 'Please, Kate. Please, Kate, will you run? He promised me that my job would be safe. I have to sell my house. My child doesn't have a job. We went from three incomes in this household to one income in this household.' I spoke to a mother whose daughter in her 20s was paying her mortgage for her. People came up to me in tears—crying—saying, 'I was fooled. I believed him when he told me that my job was safe and, Kate, I wanted to vote for you last time. I knew how hard you'd worked, but I thought I had to send your government a message and I thought I could trust him.'

Mr Stevens: And she did.

Ms JONES: Yes, we did, and the member knows that. The people of the community that you were not being honest with—that is all I can say in this parliament—also sent a very clear message to the LNP that you cannot treat people like that. Queenslanders are better than that and they made it very clear that they will not tolerate a government in this state—knowing the history of our state, knowing the reforms we saw in the Joh Bjelke-Petersen era and with the Fitzgerald report—that came into power with all the hubris, with the large majority it had and which delivered attacks on our judiciary, attacks on the social fabric of our community, attacks on fairness and equity and attacks on the basic things that people have a right to—a job, a decent education and a decent hospital system. That is what we stand for and that is what we will fight for every day. As I said at the beginning, it was well documented as to whether I was going to run because I knew what they would throw at me. I knew how nasty it would be and I knew what that would mean for my family. But I could not not stand when I saw the way that they treated people in our community. I could not walk away from those people who would stop me in the street and beg me to run.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Grace): Order! Minister, just a moment please. Member for Mermaid Beach, I have given you significant latitude. I am not going to debate the issue with you. The minister has the call. Next time I intend to warn you. The minister has the call.

Ms JONES: It will not be too much longer. In the end I felt like I had no choice—like everybody on this side. As the Deputy Premier said so eloquently in her speech, you do not stand for the Labor Party, for government, unless you want to change other people's lives, unless you want to improve the lives of people who are less fortunate than yourself. That is exactly what we have fought for every single day since we became the government in Queensland, whether it is through the amazing progressive domestic violence reforms that the Minister for Communities and Women is pushing through, the record funding in Education that I talk about every day—and I thank the Treasurer—or the work that we are doing to restore fairness in our industrial system. We are making sure that people are no longer scared.

I heard some of the comments of my colleagues tonight. I had people who could not be in a photo with me because they were so scared of the repercussions that would happen in their workplace. I see members nodding. Those people were genuinely scared that they would lose their jobs. I had friends whom I met in the Public Service—and I worked in government until I was 21 years old—who denied that they knew me. They got shirtfronted at government functions because they were accused of knowing Kate Jones and their jobs were threatened. That was the kind of Queensland you delivered for the people of this state and it is a disgrace. So you wonder why you—

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. The minister is using the word 'you'.

Ms JONES: Okay, I will say 'that mob'—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Grace): Order! The minister has the call.

Ms JONES: I am sorry if the member took offence to the word 'you' but I was talking about the people who were so threatened by his government that they had to deny that they were a friend of mine because they could lose their job. That is the state of Queensland that they created. That is why I am standing here today. That is why I will always fight for decency and fairness in this state. That is why we have a Labor government after the short stint, the short experiment of the LNP.

The fact that the members opposite come into this House day in, day out attacking unions, attacking the workers in this state just makes me think, 'Did they learn nothing in three years? Did they not learn that people have a right to stand together for fairness, to demand a better workplace?' These

are basic rights that we have fought for over a long period of time and thank goodness we take that responsibility seriously. I want to assure all Queenslanders that with all of my cabinet colleagues we will always stand together and fight for fairness.

It is really critical to say here tonight that I could not be here without all the brave people—and they were brave—who joined my campaign. I remember the first campaign meeting I held. I thought I would get about 20 or 30 people. I had been doorknocking all day. I came back to this campaign meeting, I walked in and there were more than 100 people all standing there. The next week, there were 200 people. Then the week after that there were 300 people. Then the week after that there were 400 people. By the end of that campaign, 500 people were working in the Ashgrove electorate to restore fairness in Queensland. It was not about me; it was about restoring fairness in Queensland.

I really want to acknowledge my campaign director—and I see Jimmy Pearce nodding back there—Angela Bell. He knows the Bell family very well. Angela is fantastic. As of today, she can have a civil partnership if she wants one. I do not know if she wants one. But at least now we know she can have one. My media adviser, Emma Smith, who is now Emma Freeman—she got married three weeks ago—is amazing. I met her when I was standing on a street corner. She came up to me and said, 'I want to be part of your campaign. I do not like what is happening to my state and I want to be part of that.' I thank her sincerely for her continued hard work. I want to acknowledge Robert Schwarten for everything—

A government member: Schwarto.

Ms JONES: Yes, Schwarto. What would I like to say about Schwarto? I love him. He is like a dad to me. That is all I will say. I also acknowledge my wonderful electorate officer, Amanda Ronan-Hearn, who is a dynamo. She is an asset to the people of Queensland in the work that she does. Connor is my assistant electorate officer. I gave him his seniors badge when he was at primary school at Oakleigh. Now I feel old. I also acknowledge Ashanthi, Sharon, Donna, the Bevis family, particularly Shane, Toby and Paula Ridler. I think everybody in the government knows Paula Ridler. She has been a tireless campaigner. We joined the Labor Party on the same day in 1998 and we have stood together through every election on street corners, out the front of Woolies, every single day since. I thank her for her hard work. I also acknowledge Norm and Jeannie Harradine; Mick the butcher, who would come and stand at the train stations with me; the beautiful, divine Maxine, who made me beautiful healthy meals the whole way through—that was very helpful—and Helen Lunn. I think many people in this room know Helen. I also acknowledge Anthony Chisholm, who was a big part of my decision.

I acknowledge those members of the parliament who served in opposition when I was not here. I want to thank them for their strength, their dedication and their hard work. I cannot imagine what they went through. Believe me, sometimes I did not want to be where I was, but I certainly did not think that I wanted to be where they were. So I thank those members so much for their hard work. All of us—every single one of us—want to thank them for the hard work that they did in restoring that credibility.

Ms Trad interjected.

Ms JONES: Yes. I am sure Tim Nicholls is very grateful that I am back. I want to finish by thanking my family: my husband and my children, my mum and my grandfather, who died the week after I was elected. I am so grateful that he got to see that front page of the paper showing that his granddaughter had done it. I pay tribute to my sister-in-law who died during the campaign. She wanted me to run and I did.

I finish by saying to all the government members that it is a privilege to serve the Labor Party and it is a privilege to serve the Labor Party with every single one of them, because they share my values. They are the decent values of ordinary Queenslanders. While we have a strong and cohesive Labor Party in Queensland we will have a strong and cohesive Queensland. That is what we fight for and we have seen that demonstrated this week, whether that be the recklessness from the opposition in regard to the sugar bill or whether that be the Auditor-General's report that clearly found that it used the Royalties for the Regions program to bankroll its own seats at the expense of other communities.

I should not have talked about my sister-in-law, but I wanted to get her name on the record. It is a privilege to be here. I am very proud to be the member for Ashgrove, which is the community I love, the community where I will always live, hopefully, until I am taken out in a casket. It is an honour to be here. I thank very much everyone who has shown their faith in me and all of those who made sure that I would stand again in Ashgrove. I am so proud to be part of a community that stood up for what is right and now I am serving them in the capacity of the portfolios that I have, particularly Education, where we are making a real difference to children's lives. I thank them so much.

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (10.17 pm): I certainly congratulate the member for Ashgrove on such a heartfelt speech. It really is telling the journey that she has gone through, like so many others have gone through, with having been here before and having returned. I can certainly say that from my family's experience. My father left this place twice, one time of his choosing and one time not of his choosing. I wear his parliamentary mace that all members wear when they leave this place as a mark of respect for the work that he did. I also started wearing it because, frankly, most of the people I knew whom I used to serve with got one. I started wearing it in the last term to remind me that nobody is a political immortal. Everyone has an end date. All of us are dispensable. While we are here we serve at the absolute pleasure of our constituents and the people of Queensland.

I firstly want to congratulate all the newly elected members of this place on both sides of the aisle. I am sure that the opening week seems like such a long time ago—a distant memory—such is the time that has elapsed since the Governor's address. Madam Deputy Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Nicklin on his elevation to the Speaker of this House and you on becoming the Deputy Speaker. They are important offices, as are most of the offices in the parliament.

I want to thank the very good people of Mulgrave for their continued support and faith in me to be their representative in this House. It is an enormous privilege to represent my local electorate in this place. It is a responsibility that I do not take lightly, nor do I take lightly the office that I now hold as the state's Treasurer. I thank the Premier and my colleagues for their faith in me to manage our \$300 billion economy and oversee our more than \$50 billion annual budget. I will use the first part of my reply to address the amendments put forward by the member for Southern Downs which I and every other member of this government will be opposing. We are an open, transparent and accountable government when it comes to fiscal accountability and reporting. The Palaszczuk government has and will continue to uphold the integrity of the Queensland Treasury. Last term the LNP increased the state's debt by over \$14 billion and now the member for Southern Downs wants his own personal report on how we will pay it off. His hypocrisy is astounding. The member for Southern Downs spent his budget estimates time attacking the member for Bundamba and showed no interest in our balanced and measured Queensland budget.

Let us take a moment to look back at the last parliament. Those opposite did everything they could in government to avoid fiscal scrutiny. Oh how quickly they changed their tune. When the LNP came to government it delayed the budget until September of that year, despite the election being in March. They scrapped the annual economic review. They hid the reporting on the Queensland state accounts when the economy was tanking under their mismanagement. They only released the fiscal tables for the state accounts on the Treasury website under sustained pressure by the Labor opposition.

The Palaszczuk government's first budget demonstrated robust financial accountability. We will continue to do this through the fiscal reporting program set out by the independent Queensland Treasury. If those opposite bothered to look, there is a suite of fiscal documents presented throughout the course of the financial year. Queensland Treasury Corporation prepare a large number of public reports that provide detailed information on government borrowing. Most importantly, the QTC blue book, available online anytime if those opposite chose to look, sets out the state's borrowing program. I took great pleasure in taking my own version of the Queensland Treasury Corporation blue book in my post-budget mission overseas when I went to Singapore, Tokyo, Hong Kong, Seoul, London and New York to talk about the budget. When travelling overseas there are no institutional investors or people who buy a Queensland paper who vote. They know a good set of numbers when they see them and they were very impressed with the budget. They were very impressed with how we are doing and the fiscal direction in which we are taking this state. The latest version of the blue book is available publicly on the QTC website. Treasury reporting that is publicly released on a regular basis includes the Consolidated Fund financial report published in February each year; the QTC annual report and half-yearly reports, which also contain state borrowing information; the Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review published each year, and I will certainly be providing my MYFER update this month; reports on the state finances as required under the Financial Accountability Act; and, as promised, in case the member for Southern Downs missed it, we released the Review of State Finances prepared by the independent Queensland Treasury—and not the former Liberal Party treasurer—with the Queensland budget in July.

I will save the member for Southern Downs the trip to the Parliamentary Library or the budget website. The Palaszczuk government's first Labor budget included a forecast surplus of \$1.2 billion for 2015-16, the biggest seen since 2006-07; through our Debt Action Plan a reduction in general

government debt by approximately \$7.5 billion in 2015-16, with further reductions across the forward estimates resulting in a reduction of \$9.6 billion in 2017-18 compared to the level of debt in the absence of these measures. Total borrowing is forecast to be lower every year over the forward estimates compared to those forecast by the previous government. After factoring in revenue writedowns and critically needed funding for Health and Education, general government borrowings are still forecast to be more than \$3.7 billion lower in 2017-18 than they were in 2014-15. All this without the need for asset sales, without mass sackings, without cuts to services or introducing new taxes, fees and charges.

We have been absolutely up-front with Queenslanders on the fiscal metrics that we will be measured against. We will return to the operating balance as our core fiscal metric. Every other state and territory uses the operating balance, as Queensland did before the Newman government and will again. The fiscal balance was recommended by Peter Costello. We know the real reason why he wanted to use the fiscal balance: because it allowed them to count the assets sales proceeds. This was all about providing an argument to sell assets, which would have ripped a \$2 billion a year structural hole in the budget bottom line. There is already a large amount of publicly available information on government debt. Any potential greater level of public accountability would be outweighed by the resources required to carry out the onerous reporting that the member for Southern Downs is requesting in his amendments. It will add costs. What those opposite fail to realise is that Treasury officials are in a constant state of reporting on Queensland's fiscal position—at least they are under our government. They are preparing figures for the upcoming financial year. They are reviewing figures for the previous financial year. They are submitting material for auditing. They are providing regular financial information to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. This continuing reporting meets all the state's requirements under the uniform presentation framework, the UPF, agreed between all Australian jurisdictions. The UPF is aligned with the whole-of-government and general government sector financial reporting accounting standard. The UPF requires the publication of special financial statements, including a balance sheet for the various sectors of government in the Mid Year Fiscal and Economic Review, in the budget and the Report on State Finances. The UPF is an important framework for ensuring comparability of financial information across jurisdictions. This level of reporting has been maintained across successive governments in a bipartisan way.

If the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Opposition are agreed to, those opposite will be directly responsible for adding red tape and burdening the independent Treasury with an unnecessary layer of reporting. Surely the LNP, who have become self-anointed fighters of red tape—although nobody believes it—would not dream of consciously adding to that burden. Those opposite would be responsible for Treasury employing additional staff to prepare additional quarterly reporting. There is a stark contrast between us and those opposite. We have a plan to reduce debt and those opposite do not.

Let me address the final amendment of the member for Southern Downs regarding Labor's no asset sales pledge. It is now absolutely clear that the opposition leader has not read past page 3 of Labor's fiscal strategy and Debt Action Plan. The government's commitment has always been in relation to not selling the state's income-generating GOCs as part of a \$37 billion sellout. The state of Queensland owns these assets on behalf of the people of Queensland. These entities are owned by the state for key strategic purposes and deliver critical, often essential, services to the people of Queensland. These services include providing energy, water, transport and port services. Our GOC entities, as commercial organisations, also deliver critical revenue to the state budget in the form of dividend and tax equivalent payments from the profits generated. These are profits generated after meeting all their obligations, including interest on debt raised to support their commercial operations. These organisations are and continue to be managed commercially under Labor. In fact, we are working hard to ensure they become even more customer focused and are equipped to deliver services with maximum efficiency and effectiveness. That is what we have a policy to do with the restructure of our energy GOCs, which I will be updating the Queensland public on later this month.

I will finish by focusing in this component of my address-in-reply speech on what I believe is really behind the amendments put forward by the member for Southern Downs: a guilty conscience. It is instructive to look at what the member for Southern Downs heard in the Governor's opening speech prior to the 54th Parliament. In the 54th Parliament the opening speech in relation to debt stated—

... the current position is unsustainable with our debt headed for unprecedented levels.

Those opposite then set about loading up over \$14 billion in additional debt over the last term in office and tried to blame the former Labor government. The opening speech said that the government was—

... committed to reducing unemployment to four per cent in six years. This target is underpinning all of my Government's work.

Those opposite then drove our unemployment rate up to as high as 6.7 per cent and left our rate at 6.5 per cent—mind you, after inheriting a rate of 5.5 per cent. The opening speech said the government would—

... regain Queensland's fiscal strength ...

It would restore confidence, restore Queensland's reputation and re-invigorate our economy. They left out that they would have a revisionist view on history when they failed to deliver on those promises. By comparison, the opening speech of this parliament was clear and unambiguous when it came to asset sales. Those opposite appear to be developing a word association complex, and right they should. The opening speech consistently defined our opposition to asset sales in connection with a \$37 billion fire sale—or \$47 billion as suggested by Campbell Newman towards the end of the campaign by the LNP. Let me quote again, for the member for Southern Downs, from the Governor's opening speech—

My government came to office after making clear to voters its opposition to asset sales proposed by the former government.

It believes asset sales cause job losses and that income-producing government-owned corporations earmarked for sale by the former government should be retained.

To fulfil its promises to voters, my government has already put in place steps to halt work associated with the sale of those assets which contribute an estimated \$2 billion a year to the State Budget.

Those opposite are still in denial about the rejection by Queenslanders of their 'wrong choices' propaganda about asset sales. It has, of course, emerged since the member for Southern Downs moved his amendment that the former government spent tens of millions of dollars on preparatory work for asset sales for which they had no mandate. Without any mandate whatsoever \$100 million was spent on asset sales preparation and Strong Choices propaganda. That money could have been spent on schools, hospitals, roads and unemployment programs. The money that those opposite wasted could have paid for, and then some, the entire \$70 million regional capital fund as part of Labor's Building our Regions program. Endless reporting and a new definition of the LNP's asset sales will not change the fact that Queenslanders rejected the LNP's fiscal agenda on 31 January 2015.

I had to get all of that out of the way, because this is an unusual situation with the Leader of the Opposition. Very rarely do we see anyone moving amendments to the Governor's address and the address-in-reply debate, but sadly I have had to use more than half of my time to address those amendments, which is unusual.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr PITT: He will never learn. He has been here for 26 years this week and still he has not got it. To finish where I started, I want to use my remaining time to thank people who were instrumental over the previous term and during January's election campaign. I must start with the 'significant seven': the small but mighty Labor caucus that I was so fortunate to be a part of last term. I thank the member for Inala, Annastacia Palaszczuk; the member for Bundamba, Jo-Ann Miller; the member for Rockhampton, Bill Byrne; and the member for South Brisbane, Jackie Trad. We later became the 'amazing eight' with the addition of the member for Stafford and then the 'noteworthy nine' after victory by the member for Redcliffe, when they both won comprehensive by-elections.

I take a moment to thank two members of the former Labor caucus who retired at the last election: Desley Scott and Tim Mulherin. Desley Scott, or Saint Desley as we would often refer to her, was the rock on which we built our parliamentary week. She was the constant anchor in the chamber, who for decades served the people of Woodridge so well in her capacity as the local member of parliament, as the electorate officer for previous members or in the local community. Similarly, Tim Mulherin was a parliamentary veteran and one of my best mates who had a distinguished career as the member for Mackay, as a cabinet minister and as the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. I would spend many evenings in this place having to hear from a man who sat as premier in this chair right next to me; a man who had never sat in this place before becoming premier. The stories we could tell! The former member for Cairns has written a book about the bloke who used to sit in this chair, although book sales have not been going well. I think that even those opposite would have to agree that if Tim Mulherin ever wrote a book, it would be an absolute corker.

Over those three years I learned so much about myself and I learned so much from all of my colleagues. Sometimes you have to go through difficult periods in your life to grow and to realise just what you are capable of. I think all of those members who served the Labor Party in this place over the previous three years had an awfully big task, but they took to it with aplomb and they worked their way through it. We have a bond that no others can understand and we shared an experience that I would

not trade for anything. Of course, in 2012 I was a survivor of one of the biggest electoral defeats, which is part of political history at that time. At the 2015 election, it was great to be part of history for all the right reasons. It may be the biggest comeback in Australia's political history.

I could not do what I do without my family. A big 'thank you' to my wife, Kerry, and my wonderful children, Tristan, Layla and Kobi. All members of this House know that the life of a member of parliament can be hard and being a regional member of parliament can be even harder. Being the shadow Treasurer from the Far North meant that I had even more time away. Now that I am Treasurer, I have to miss many more moments than I would like in the lives of my kids. However, my wife Kerry is the most amazing woman—wait. She is the most amazing person I know. Essentially, she is a single mum and carries an enormous burden. Through it all, she is totally supportive and must sacrifice so much of herself. There are no words except thank you and I love you.

My parents, Warren and Linda Pitt, are the backstop for Kerry. If they were not my parents, I swear they would be people whom I would look up to in my own local community, such is their calibre. Often I am told that I have a great dad and I have to remind them that I have a great mum, as well. I thank my sister, Dionne, her husband, David, and their kids, who made the move from the tropical north to sunny Bellerive in Tasmania in May this year. They could have timed it a little better. My grandma, Doreen Dodd, my amazing aunts, uncles and cousins have been a great source of help and support. I particularly thank my cousin Anita Cummins, who is a paramedic and was one of the first responders at the Ravenshoe tragedy, and her brother Ben Cummins, who successfully refereed the Cowboys this year in their maiden NRL grand final win this year. Tim Mander, that is how it is done! I thank my father-in-law, Bill Grant, his wife, Patricia, and Uncle Bill Dodd.

In terms of my campaign, I say thanks to Jim Smith, my campaign director, and his wife, Ros; David Berry, my campaign manager; Bronwyn and Mick Hodgkins, the superstars who once again helped with the entire campaign; Diana and John O'Brien, for once again coordinating the Innisfail campaign; and the Innisfail based councillors Mark Nolan, Ian Rule and Kylie Farinelli. A big thank you to a former North Queensland organiser, Travis Dawson, for his contribution to the campaign, as well as to Tom Kenny. I thank my former electorate officer, Andrew Talbot, and the amazing Coral-Leah Kemp, who has been with me since April 2011. I have joked to the Minister for Science and Innovation that we must get to work on cloning techniques, because Coral would be a worthy candidate. Every EO needs a Coral.

I thank all of the booth captains and workers who volunteered their time, either on the day or at busy pre-polling locations leading up to the election, as well as those who financially contributed to the campaign. Special mention goes to Tracy and Andrew Morris, Leigh and Glen Dall'Osto, Beryl Ball, Ken and Vivien Robertson, Tom McCarthy and Eleanor Gregory, Simon Cotton, Bradley Higgins, Steven and Sonya Struber, Peter Rowles, Sandra Charlton, Michael Pappa, Cherie Fapani, Kylie Swales, Bruce and Brendan Slade, Adam Hooper, Nola Jappe, John Rhiel, Gordon and Joan Dilger, Ian and Leanne Kruger, Adrian Hooper, Joy Murgatroyd, Anne Holden, Joy Taylor, Delia Merlo, Peter Gunsberger, Shannon James, Fred James, Matt Thompson, Aaquib Abdulala and Sherry Karban.

Thank you to the broader Labor movement, union members and officials for their support, particularly the National Union of Workers, the Queensland Nurses' Union, the Queensland Teachers' Union, the ETU, the CFMEU, the AMWU, the Services Union, the Plumbers Union, the Maritime Union of Australia, the United Firefighters Union, Together Queensland, the Australian Workers' Union and United Voice. I mention all of those because, quite simply, to win government back in such a short time required two very important things: a united Labor movement, which we saw, as well as, of course, being aided and abetted by Campbell Newman.

Special mention must go to all of those people who were working at the QCU, particularly, Ron Monaghan, who I hold in such high esteem. Lots of people thought that we could come back, but the person who believed it more than anyone else was Ron. He always believed that a win was possible. I thank all of the hardworking staff of the former opposition office, many of whom have transitioned to positions in the government, particularly Angela McDonough, Lindsay Marshall who ran media, Peter Nibbs and a very special thank you to Tim Linley. I thank everyone at the ALP state branch: President Dick Williams, new state secretary Evan Moorhead, former campaign director Anthony Chisolm and all in the campaign strategy team who ran a fantastic campaign that every Labor member in this state can be proud of. I also thank Gurinder Mavi from the Sikh community for hosting yet another delicious Indian banquet as a fundraiser for the election. It is always an enjoyable evening and I am looking forward to

the next election because it means we will have a chance to hopefully retain government and, of course, have another Sikh Indian dinner. It is something we look forward to, even if it only comes around every three years. With those comments, I wish all members a very successful and enjoyable time for the remainder of this term.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (10.37 pm): It is a great honour to be elected to the 55th Parliament. I agree with what the Premier said before: it is a great honour to be a member of parliament. There are 4.7 million Queenslanders and there are only 89 members of parliament, which highlights what a great honour it is to be here. I really believe that it is very special. I congratulate the new members who have come into this place this year. I remember when I was first elected in 2004 and, when I saw Peter Beattie, Anna Bligh and all of those old politicians, I thought I was dreaming.

An opposition member: And now you are one of them.

Mr KNUTH: Thank you for the kind comments. I think Lawrence Springborg might have been one of those faces, as well. Being a member of parliament is a lot of hard work. I wanted to be a member of parliament, because I wanted to be able to take on the politicians who were annoying us. I bought a book by Fred Daly, the longest-serving politician in Australian history. He was a Labor politician. The book was called *The Numbers*. I read that book. It showed me how to get the numbers. I spent five years behind the scenes working to be a candidate. I became a candidate and worked hard. Fred Daly spoke about how his seat was abolished a number of times. He spoke about all the difficulties that he had within his own party to try to secure a seat when his seat was abolished. He spoke about how he had been knifed in the back and all of those things that can come with politics. I studied up and eventually ended up getting into parliament. I thank Fred Daly for his involvement in my journey into this parliament.

When I first entered parliament I was the member for Charters Towers. That electorate covered 270,000 square kilometres. It took in the Georgetown region. It nearly went out to Julia Creek. My electorate included the towns of Alpha, Jericho, Aramac, Muttaborra, Capella, Claremont, Moranbah, Tieri. Then I woke up and the seat was abolished. I then had to run for the new seat which stretches from Moranbah to the Atherton Tablelands. I had to take on another member of parliament.

It is a lot of hard work, but we cannot do it on our own. I thank my family—my wife, Heather, and children, Anna, Joel, Daniel and Naomi. It is sad when we cannot get to our kids sports days. I have missed some of their birthdays. There are touching moments that hurt us. I love my children and am so proud of them. I appreciate that my wife, Heather, has a husband who is never home, but she is 100 per cent behind my efforts and the work I put in.

The last election was very difficult, particularly as the campaign was called at short notice. My children were out letterbox dropping in 40 degree heat. They were trying to get the message across. My daughter Anna went to Lourdes Hill College. Members in this House still remember when my daughter would come to visit me in parliament dressed in her school uniform.

My son Daniel was born with a condition that meant that he had to have quite a few operations. He became very close to those in parliament. A former speaker of the House sat him in a chair beside his chair and called him his adviser. There are very special moments in this place. I have to mention my mum. I do go to her sometimes when things are tough. She is a wonderful lady. My dad is 79 years old. Over the last 11 years he has handed out how-to-vote cards for me at Ravenswood. I thank my father for that.

I want to mention my electorate officers as well. One of my staff members Verna is 75 years old. She is a pocket dynamo. I said to her the other day, 'You leave when you want to leave.' She could be there if I am here in five years time. I do not know. She may be there when she is 80. This woman never stops. I will say to Verna, 'You can go home half an hour early.' She will say, 'No, Shane. I cannot be at home and think that somebody could be ringing. If I were not there when they rang I would not feel comfortable at the home.' This is the wonderful lady that Verna is.

I also have Lorraine who is dedicated, hardworking and a wonderful personality. I want to mention Scott. He has run two of my campaigns. He has resigned five times and I have employed him five times. Now he is the pastor of the Destiny Church. Sometimes we do have him work on a part-time basis. He is partly there. I have Kate who is efficient and a workaholic. Sally and Tammy job share. They have bubbly personalities and present well to constituents.

I thank the branch members and my family and friends who have been out there for me over the last 11 or 12 years handing out how-to-vote cards. I appreciate their support so much. I thank them for their efforts. It is always a combined effort.

I can catch a plane to Mackay and go west and I am in my electorate. I can catch a plane to Townsville and go west and I am in my electorate. I can catch a plane to Cairns and go west and I am still in my electorate.

I am not going to bring up all of the issues in my electorate, but I point out that we do need a new hospital in Atherton. We had a petition with over 5,700 signatories. I acknowledge the positive response from the minister. The hinterland health service is exploring options in terms of this hospital and Dimbulah and Charters Towers as well.

We have a \$300 million biofuel project in my electorate that has much potential. A lot of work has been put into it. I believe there is a federal government grant of over \$3 million to help pursue this project. We are seeking support from the present Queensland government to get enough water from the Burdekin to actually get this project up and running.

North Queensland Motor Sports association comprises many community representatives. We have land just outside Charters Towers that has been developed into a speedway. There is buggy cart and motorised car racing there. There is gold prospecting there.

There are issues around the Gregory Developmental Road. I will not bring up all the creeks and river crossings that need to be upgraded. I have brought this issue up in the parliament before. All that is needed is 38 kilometres of sealing and widening and the upgrading of the crossings at Cape River, Snake Creek, Stockyard Creek, Hann Creek, Clarke River and Basalt River. These are the main crossings. If we upgrade them we have an inland highway stretching from the Tablelands down to Rockhampton. There are many other things I could mention, but will not.

It has been a great honour and privilege to serve in this parliament and to work with every member of the House. A motto that I have embraced is the Lions motto. This has helped me dedicate myself to running as a candidate and winning a seat. The motto is 'It is an honour to serve'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Grace): Order! The question is that the address-in-reply to the Governor's opening speech delivered by His Excellency in opening this the first session of the 55th Parliament of Queensland be adopted, since which it has been proposed that the motion be amended by inserting the words contained in the Leader of the Opposition's amendment. The question now is that the amendment be agreed to.

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 40—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Pyne, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pairs: Lynham, Cripps.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Springborg) negatived.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.52 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Friday, 4 December 2015.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.53 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Fuller, Mr G

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (10.53 pm): Sometimes the job of being a representative of the Queensland parliament is very humbling. This was exactly the case when I joined the health and ambulance services minister, Cameron Dick, to honour Logan West ambulance officer-in-charge Gary Fuller and present him with his 30-year long service medal at the Logan West station last week. Gary Fuller has served the Ambulance Service for 30 years and continues to serve as the station's OIC at the Logan West Ambulance Station on Wineglass Drive.

He was one of the first paramedics to complete the flight paramedic course and served in regional Queensland before coming to Logan West 23 years ago. Throughout his 30 years of service to Queensland as an ambulance officer, hundreds and hundreds of Queenslanders depended on Gary in their hour of greatest need. He was among those who worked tirelessly at the scene of the infamous Mount Tamborine bus crash in 1990, where 11 died and 37 were injured.

As Minister Cameron Dick spoke at the award ceremony of the horrors of the bus crash, I was looking at Gary Fuller's face. I thought I could see him reliving some of the traumatic memories that so many ambulance officers carry around in their heads well into retirement. One paramedic even told me that every time he hears an ambulance siren the memories come flooding back. Their service stays with them, and for that alone they deserve our respect.

It was not only at tragic events where Gary served Queenslanders. During his career he also delivered seven babies. He said five were born in the back of the ambulance at the side of the road and two in their homes. That is seven Queenslanders around our great state who can say that they were brought into this world by the Ambulance Service at the hands of officer Gary Fuller.

Gary took Cameron Dick and me through the workings of a modern ambulance and explained that when he first started the ambulances were very basic. They were simply Holden WB panel vans that were fitted with a stretcher in the back. In the past 30 years ambulance officers have become much more skilled at administering advanced emergency care and now form the first line of our health system, saving thousands of lives.

Paramedics from across South Brisbane turned out to recognise Gary's achievement. However, even on a day that was supposed to be all about Gary, he wanted to recognise the whole Ambulance Service and especially the fantastic team at Logan West. He was so dedicated that when I first turned up to the ambulance station he was yet to arrive because he was out shopping for the catering that we would later put on to celebrate his own 30 years of service.

Although Gary deserved to be in the spotlight that day, he was also right to share it with others. In Logan West, in Jimboomba and throughout Logan, Queensland ambulance officers come to work every day to serve us not knowing what they might have to face and how their skills might be tested. The traumatic accident on the M1 Motorway in the past week is testament to that. Next time you see an ambulance officer or a police officer or someone else who works in the service of Queensland, take the time to let them know you appreciate what they do every day to make us safer and healthier.

Thanks, Gary, for all you have done for us in the last 30 years, and thank you to all of our great servants of the public who are in the Queensland Public Service who do so much for Queensland every year.

Coomera Springs State School

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (10.56 pm): I rise tonight to speak about the rapid population growth in my electorate, which includes the northern Gold Coast and southern Logan City. This continues to place enormous pressure on our local services and infrastructure. Under the previous LNP government, we finally saw long-awaited action to upgrade the exit 54 interchange at Upper Coomera. This upgrade is critical to ensure the continued economic and employment growth in my region. This was the first major interchange upgrade to the M1 within the boundaries of the Albert electorate since 2000. Just a little bit further south we have exit 57 at Oxenford, which desperately needs additional work to reduce congestion, as the current design is incredibly confusing and continues to cause motorists severe congestion during peak hour.

However, the main reason I rise tonight is to speak about one of my local schools and how this Labor government is stonewalling Coomera Springs State School in their desperate bid to obtain additional classrooms in order to meet substantial growth in the local student population. Coomera Springs State School sits right in the middle of one of the fastest growing regions in our state. With current housing development, this is set to grow even further.

Today we witnessed the Labor government claiming that they have a wonderful building program in our schools, but they seem to ignore the pleas of Coomera Springs State School. The school has been allocated 37 teachers for next year, yet it will only have 36 classrooms in 2016. Since the school's inception, it has seen dramatic growth over the last seven years, expanding from 165 students in 2008 to 835 students in 2015. As of 11 November, the school's population sits at 855 and, on conservative projections for next year, we are looking at 907 students. The department has allocated only one demountable classroom block, which includes two classrooms, when we desperately need two demountable classroom blocks.

Coomera Springs State School has a fantastic reputation and specialises in some programs which are sought after by parents in the local area. There are a lot of parents moving into the Coomera Springs area just so that they can send their children to this school because of its reputation. My residents are demanding action when it comes to this issue. They are demanding more classrooms for their school so their children are not turned away. They are demanding stability for their kids' future. This government needs to stop looking after their mates and put our schools first.

Mount Ommaney Electorate

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (10.59 pm): As parliament draws to a close and the end of year is near, I am pleased to rise and update the House on the wonderful events in my electorate of Mount Ommaney. It certainly is a great privilege to represent the community of Mount Ommaney here in this place. Over the past few weeks, I have been attending many community organisations' end-of-year meetings and Christmas break-up parties. What has been on display has been the Mount Ommaney community's rich dedication to serving others, with those many hundreds of people who serve others every day.

I want to take this opportunity to recognise those unsung volunteering heroes across our diverse region who contribute so much. Day in, day out, this year and for many years, the community of Mount Ommaney has been working hard and dedicating themselves to helping the less fortunate in our area and running the community organisations that keep our area ticking over. It is these everyday people who do extraordinary things, and often without acknowledgement or fanfare. Sometimes we forget that those who serve in our community are everyday people—plumbers, teachers, retirees, mums and dads. As the local member for Mount Ommaney, I would like to sincerely thank the individuals who are committed to our community. It is the strength of our community organisations and the commitment of our volunteers that shape the community we want to live in. And what a great community the electorate of Mount Ommaney is. I look forward to saying thank you, along with local Brisbane City Councillor Matthew Bourke, to around 200 of these community volunteers at our annual Mount Ommaney community Christmas party next week. I would also like to take a moment to remember the community members who passed away this year—such as Irene Dunning from the Jindalee Lions Club; Dave McDonnell from Kiwanis, the RSL and the Sinnamon Park residents association; and Rowdy from our Darra bowls club.

Time does not permit me to talk about the many wonderful events I have enjoyed and sponsored. I have had the opportunity of hosting here in parliament the Mount Ommaney Probus Club, the Centenary and Districts Chamber of Commerce and the Jamboree Heights State School. We recently saw the wonderful graduation of the Corinda State High School. We had a wonderful day at the Oxley Blues Day Soft Shoe Shuffle. Our small business awards—which we did for the first time this year in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce—was a great success. That was about encouraging the small businesses in our area. As I have said before, we have over 3,000 small businesses in the Mount Ommaney electorate. We ran our seniors forum with our local police as well as an ice forum just before schoolies. I would also like to take this opportunity to wish everybody in my community, across Queensland and in this place a very merry Christmas and a safe new year's break. I look forward to returning next year.

Hampson, Mr T

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (11.03 pm): Last Sunday, 29 November, I had the honour and privilege of attending the launch of a new biography titled *Boots and All: Terry Hampson AM: Biography of a Queensland Environmentalist* at the Chermside Historical Precinct. This was a very fitting location for that event. It also gave me an opportunity to visit the former Sandgate Drill Hall which has been moved from Sandgate to that location. Written and self-published by Fran Ross, a Sandgate constituent, this book is a great opportunity to celebrate the life of a great Queenslander. Terry passed away on 22 September last year and he is missed by many in this community. I know the member for Aspley would join me in saying that.

The book was launched by the former premier of Queensland, Peter Beattie, who was a very close associate of Terry Hampson during the days of reform of the Labor Party in the 1970s and 1980s. The launch was chaired by Terry's other key associate in his activism—that is, John Sinclair, the FIDO president. It included a performance by the Combined Unions Choir, which was very fitting because of his love of music.

Peter Beattie said that Terry's greatest achievement and legacy was saving Fraser Island from logging and achieving its World Heritage listing and national park status. He, along with many others, was involved in that long campaign but he did so much more than many. I note that the biography records one of the comments I made to the author, Fran Ross—that is, that Terry worked hard to make the environment a mainstream part of the Labor Party and the labour movement.

Terry was born in Toowoomba and raised in Allora. He met his wife, Ann, when he first came to Brisbane and was living at Shorncliffe before they built their family home in Bald Hills, where he was still living with her when he passed away. His party involvement included every role—from being elected as the local branch secretary at his first meeting of the Bald Hills branch to being state secretary and then on to being a local councillor in the Marchant ward—by the way, after he beat me in the preselection. He worked very assiduously for environmental sustainability. He was the only life member of the Fabian Society of Queensland and he was involved in party reform, as I said.

He helped modernise the ALP and Queensland through to the election of the first Labor government in 32 years. He was a very passionate advocate for party democracy. He was a real all-rounder in many ways. As a councillor, he was a great advocate for his local area and a great community builder. He helped create social capital infrastructure through initiatives like Kidspace and the Chermside and District Historical Society. He was a great mentor to me and many others over the years.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (11.06 pm): On Tuesday I was making some remarks about the performance of this government in relation to the resources sector. Earlier this year, I prepared a report card for the first 100 days of the Palaszczuk government, and I will go through some of those things that occurred.

This government commenced a parliamentary inquiry into FIFO employment arrangements in the resources sector at the direction of the CFMEU and with the inquiry chaired by a member of the CFMEU. It delayed the expansion of the Abbot Point port by superficially amending the project dredge spoil disposal proposal and undertaking a further unnecessary EIS process. It cast doubt and uncertainty over the approval of New Hope's Acland stage 3 coalmining project, putting investment and jobs in jeopardy in southern inland Queensland. It banned uranium mining in Queensland, denying new investment opportunities and jobs to local communities in the north-west minerals province. It claimed credit for the latest round of the collaborative drilling program funded by the former LNP government's \$30 million Future Resources Program. It claimed credit for the expansion of the GSQ drill core library at Zillmere, funded by the former LNP government. And it claimed credit for signing the MOU with the South Australian government to develop the Cooper Basin—another initiative of the former LNP government. I table that report card.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Queensland's 100 Days of Hard Labor Under Lynham—A Report Card: for the Minister for State Development, Natural Resources and Mines in the Palaszczuk Government' [\[1849\]](#).

I wish I could talk about the ridiculous and destructive policy of this government to end sandmining on North Stradbroke Island, but I cannot because there is a bill before the House, so I will just leave that issue there.

All of this uncertainty has culminated in the results of the fifth annual Queensland exploration scorecard, which was released earlier this month, which revealed that confidence in the resources exploration sector has declined steeply under this government. The scorecard very clearly shows that industry uncertainty about Labor's resource policies has significantly increased under the Palaszczuk government and is heading back to levels similar to the bad old days under the Bligh government. The former LNP government dramatically reduced the levels of policy uncertainty expressed by explorers in Queensland, almost halving it in two years. After nine months of Labor in office, this measure is again heading in the wrong direction.

Despite all of that, the resources sector is forging on in Queensland—notwithstanding the policies of this government. I welcome the announcement by Rio Tinto that it will go ahead with its \$2.6 billion investment in a bauxite project on the west coast of Cape York Peninsula. The approval of that was provided by the Coordinator-General under the former LNP government in 2012, and we certainly recognise the contribution that will give to Cape York and Far North Queensland.

The biggest policy that the Premier could deliver to the QRC lunch last week, of course, was the announcement of another task force for the north-west minerals province, another holding pattern decision from a clueless government with no positive policies for the Queensland resources sector.

In conclusion, this government may say that it recognises the importance of the resources sector in terms of jobs, but its real support for this sector is pretty much non-existent. The actions of this government have only increased uncertainty for the resources sector. If honourable members look at the evidence, they will see that their policies only contribute to growing uncertainty and volatility in the resources sector in Queensland.

Ainsworth, Mr H

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (11.09 pm): I am privileged to have the community radio station 4MBS Classic FM in my electorate. I could devote several adjournment speeches to this great organisation and the amazing contribution they make to the arts in our community and the entire state. However, tonight I want to focus on remembering the life of one of their great volunteers, Howard Ainsworth. Howard passed away after a short battle with cancer. He is survived by his partner, Dr Kerry Vann; his children, Charles and Lindel; and his four grandchildren, Colin, Daniel, Jessica and Martin. I wish to pass on my sincere condolences to Howard's family and to his many friends at 4MBS, particularly Gary and Gail Thorpe.

Howard was the voice of classical music in Brisbane for 50 years. Howard had volunteered at 4MBS since 1993. He was best known for his signature program *Music Lover's Choice*. This program ran on a Saturday morning for 40 years, first on 4QG and then on 4MBS for the last 23 years. It has been said that, if you give a person a job they love, they will never work a day in their life. Howard continued doing what he loved right up until very close to the end of his life. To promote the Greenslopes State School's 125th anniversary, I and a former student of the school were interviewed on his program. Sadly, Howard was too ill to conduct the interview, but he selected the music, bringing it into the studio, educating us about each piece and providing advice to the stand-in presenter, Gary Thorpe, on how to get the most out of his subjects. Howard passed away less than two weeks after that interview. I will always consider it a great honour to have met Howard and to have appeared on his show.

Music Lover's Choice was a classical music institution. During each week's program Howard's guest would select their favourite classical music and Howard would interview them about their life and the music they loved. Over the years guests included governors-general, governors, archbishops, arts ministers, musicians, authors, artists, scientists and people from many other walks of life. On its own, creating and hosting a program that becomes an institution over 40 years is an incredible achievement, but there was so much more to Howard's life and career. Sadly, it would be impossible in the time available to run through the many and varied ways that Howard contributed to his community, to the arts, to classical music, to cricket, to his family. However, I can assure the House that he made significant contributions in all these areas.

So I will leave the final word to Howard. Here is how he summed up his life, 'I am surrounded by what I love: great personal friends and classical music. There is nothing like it. You have it all your life. It's my hobby, it's my work and I love it.'

Vale Howard Ainsworth.

Gaven Electorate, Police Resources

 **Mr CRAMP** (Gaven—LNP) (11.12 pm): As I have said many times in this chamber, I love living in the Gaven electorate due to its strong sense of community and relaxed family environment. Having served as a Queensland Ambulance Service officer for over 14 years and as a father of three young children, I support tough action on crime and I continue to be a strong advocate for improving community safety in our electorate including in the northern communities of Pacific Pines, Park Lake Maudsland and Gaven. All of these communities are positively impacted in varying forms by the presence of the fantastic officers at the Pacific Pines Police Beat. I also live in this area, so I have absolutely the same understanding as my fellow locals that we need a constant and regular police presence.

I have previously taken the opportunity on several occasions in this chamber to note the need for an increased police presence in these communities. In fact, during the last state election campaign the Labor government supported the construction of a police station at Pacific Pines. It is, therefore, disappointing that we now see that the police presence in Pacific Pines has actually been reduced with

the closing of the Pacific Pines Police Beat on weekends. My intent here, however, is not to score political points but to work for the safety of our ever-growing community. The one thing I can assure this House is that Pacific Pines and the surrounding areas will continue to grow. The current population of this area sits at close to 20,000 people, which is the size of a large regional town. It is worth noting that Queensland cities of a similar size, which include Gympie and Nambour, have their own police stations manned across the week.

My concerns about this are shared by all in our community, including the Pacific Pines Residents Group who are working with me to improve community safety. I was very proud last week to sponsor a parliamentary e-petition from the residents group with the chairperson, Ms Anne Brims, requesting the House to address the weekend closure of the police beat at Pacific Pines by ensuring it is manned by officers seven days a week to respond to incidents as they occur in the area.

We are not asking for an extreme request here, only for an achievable and credible outcome that the police beat is manned seven days a week. To the best of my knowledge, this will be based on the current system of two officers on a shift per day, totalling four extra shifts per week, with the time of the rostered shifts to be determined based on the best operational outcome. For example, shifts may be day or afternoon depending on requirements.

Calling for four shifts per week for the safety of our community absolutely pales in comparison to asking for the millions of dollars that Labor asked for in terms of the construction of a police station and at least 13 officers to collectively man the station being rostered in excess of 500 hours per week to man that construction. It pales in comparison. I will, however, state that it is very foreseeable that we will need to look beyond this initial request of four extra shifts on a weekend and actually see more police resources as the northern Gold Coast area continues to grow.

Algeria Electorate

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algeria—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Science and Innovation) (11.16 pm): At the beginning of this year I became the first Aboriginal woman to ever rise in this House. Every day since it has been an absolute privilege and honour to serve the people of Algeria and the people of Queensland. It has been a privilege and honour to be the Minister for Housing and Public Works where I have had the opportunity to oversee the reinstatement of an independent tenant advice and advocacy service, something that was defunded by the previous government and something that we have been proud as a Labor government to reinstate. I have been proud to remove the gag clauses from contracts to ensure that service providers can advocate on behalf of the people whom they serve. I have been absolutely privileged and honoured to work with the incredibly passionate plumbing industry on the plumbing and drainage amendment bill and to work on the Building Act review with an incredibly passionate building industry.

It has also been a privilege and honour to be the Minister for Science and Innovation and to lead the work that we are doing as a government around Advance Queensland, preparing our state for the economies of the future, ensuring that our students, our kids, are well equipped with the skills that they are going to need for future economies in this state to be globally competitive. Of course, it has been an absolute pleasure to be the member for Algeria and to serve the people of Algeria. I have had the opportunity to work with Neighbourhood Watch groups from right across my electorate, from Hillcrest to Forestdale and from Heathwood to Algeria, working with The Spot at Parkinson, the Greenbank RSL Men's Shed and their photography group—

A government member: A great group.

Ms ENOCH: It is a fantastic group. I go on: the Fifty Plus Club in Forest Lake and the National Seniors groups in Parkinson, Algeria and Forest Lake.

Today, as we are almost at the end of the school year, I want to pay special tribute to the incredible schools I have in my electorate. I am very fortunate to have very passionate, hardworking teachers and incredibly talented students right across my electorate. There is St John's Anglican College, where Suzanne Bain is the principal and where I will be celebrating the Forest Lake Christmas carols this weekend; Boronia Heights State School, where Dan Nielsen is the principal, celebrated their 25th anniversary this year; Grand Avenue State School, where Mick Quinn has been doing an incredible job; Colin Torr from Algeria State School; Phil Manitta from St Stephen's Catholic Primary School; and Pallara State School, where Lauren Sturges has been holding the fort while we prepare the brand-new school in Pallara, a brand-new school for the community where the wonderful Mark Johnstone will be the new principal.

I want to wish all the students in my electorate a very safe and festive season and a fantastic new year. They have a government that is working for them, making sure that they live in a fair Queensland and a Queensland that is prepared for the future.

Nanango Electorate, School Bus Services

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (11.19 pm): I had to sit in this House tonight and listen to those opposite talking about the supposed cuts under the previous government, but let me give you an example of why Labor cuts just from the regions. I am so disappointed to hear that not one, not two, not three, not four, not five, not six but seven school bus runs are being cut from my electorate in the Somerset. The minister is laughing over there because he does not care about regional Queensland. Seven school buses have been cut from the Somerset electorate, and they sit there and say that they support regional Queensland. What a load of baloney! It is incredible.

Over the last few months I have received many inquiries from families from Harlin, Coominya and Toogoolawah. I have asked the department for a briefing on this, and I understand that some services may have to be reviewed from time to time, but there is a negative impact on these country families. Those opposite do not understand how much this bus service means to these people. In small country towns, in regional areas like Harlin, Coominya and Toogoolawah, it is a highly valued service in the community. It is often run by a small local operator who is well known in the community and has an excellent relationship with families and students.

It is really important that regional areas like ours do not lose essential bus services. These are bus services for school kids, and I will not accept these changes. I know that the school community of Harlin is very concerned about their bus run because it has been combined with the larger bus run from the coast, resulting in them losing their local operator. That particular bus run has been owned and operated by a local family for the past 41 years. The bus is also hired by the Harlin State School for excursions and to travel to the pool for swimming lessons. Small schools are often considerable distances from events, and transportation costs to hire larger buses from larger companies can be prohibitive.

There are other flow-on effects: they buy their fuel from the local town as well. The community is questioning why they would change operators, and the timetabling of the route could be more cost-effective. There are also concerns about the proposed larger bus using a single-lane dirt road and the ramifications of earlier pick-up and later drop-off times for students. I am completely dismayed by this Labor government but unfortunately not surprised, because again we see cuts to regional Queensland.

Woodridge Electorate, Year 12 Graduations

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.22 pm): We have arrived at the beginning of the end. I speak not just of the parliamentary sitting year but of 2015 itself. Tonight I would like to acknowledge what a wonderful 2015 it has been for the electorate of Woodridge and all of those it encompasses. As this year draws to a close, I would like to take this opportunity to fix a spotlight on some of the inspiring young people of the Woodridge community. I have had the privilege of sharing in some of the final school year events in the Woodridge electorate, in particular events involving the year 12 graduating class of 2015. Tonight I want to put the spotlight on people like Tony Laga'aia, one of this year's outstanding Woodridge State High School captains who delivered a heartfelt speech to his peers at his graduation last month.

Ms Enoch interjected.

Mr DICK: I take the interjection from one of the former distinguished students of Woodridge State High School, my parliamentary colleague and the member for Algeester.

I speak about students like Sam, Logan City Special School's whiz-kid, who has such a knack for technology there is no telling where it might lead him. I speak about students like Mark Van Luyn and Arianna Murray from Groves Christian College; Rylee Ruhi, Sau Fao and Kalina Johnson from Mabel Park State High School; and Renee Dobbyn and Conner Ingham from Kingston State College. I have been delighted to host those students for lunch in recent weeks at Parliament House.

But when I speak of talent, I do not just refer to these particular students: I refer to all of the students at all of the Woodridge high schools—in fact, all schools in the Woodridge electorate—who are kicking personal goals in all disciplines. I also want to acknowledge the incredible principals, teachers and staff at schools in the Woodridge electorate who work tirelessly to ensure that every student embraces their ability to be the best they can possibly be.

I would like to take this opportunity to close tonight with words from the valedictory speech recently delivered by Paige Emmett, a graduating student at St Francis College in Crestmead. Paige is an extremely talented young woman. She has her sights set on becoming a paramedic. I am sure that Paige would make a wonderful contribution to the Queensland Ambulance Service should her talents take her in that direction. In the words of Paige to her peers at her graduation on 19 November—

Today is a day of hope, joy, nostalgia and probably tears. But Michael Dell, CEO of the maker of our badly treated laptops said, "As you start your journey, the first thing you should do is throw away that store-bought map and begin to draw your own."

I think I can speak for all that we are unsure about what's to come. However, even though we haven't graduated high school just yet, we have lived through two centuries, three decades and approximately 18 years of existence. We are millennials—a strong, forward-thinking generation who are not afraid to fight for what we believe in, and we stand for ourselves, for each other and for our future, and despite everything we stand united.

I ask you not to be afraid of change: thrive on it. Build your success on it and embrace it. I will define my fear of change today. I will hold my head high and do what I once thought was impossible: walk away.

Now it's your turn to abandon all you hold dear to pursue grander ambitions, and it will be scary at first—no, actually maybe the entire time. When tomorrow comes there will be no epiphany. You will be as clueless as ever. But boy, you will have the world at your feet!

Thank you, Paige. You and the graduating 2015 year 12 students have the world at your feet.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Error in Division Tally

 **Mr SPEAKER:** The opposition whip has advised an error in the tally of the last division. The result of the last division was ayes 39 and noes 43, not ayes 40 as was announced in the House. The tally sheet has been altered accordingly.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.25 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, McVeigh, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams