



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>  
 Email: [hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au](mailto:hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au)  
 Phone (07) 3553 6344 Fax (07) 3553 6369

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

### Wednesday, 17 August 2016

Subject	Page
<b>SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2859</b>
<b>Restrictions on Naming At-Risk Children</b> .....	<b>2859</b>
<b>Sub Judice</b> .....	<b>2859</b>
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>2859</b>
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members</b> .....	<b>2859</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 16 June 2016, from the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2860
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, undated, from the member for Clayfield, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2860
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 22 June 2016, from the member for Nanango, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2860
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member</b> .....	<b>2860</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 June 2016, from the Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, and Minister for Sport, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2861
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 22 June 2016, from the member for Indooroopilly, Mr Scott Emerson MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2861
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member</b> .....	<b>2861</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, undated, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2862
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 20 June 2016, from the member for Surfers Paradise, Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House. ....	2862

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 August 2016

<b>MOTION OF CONDOLENCE</b> .....	<b>2862</b>
Hewitt, Mr NTE.....	2862
<b>PETITIONS</b> .....	<b>2866</b>
<b>TABLED PAPERS</b> .....	<b>2866</b>
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2866</b>
School Students, Website.....	2866
United States Navy, Statement of Cooperation.....	2867
Thor: Ragnarok.....	2868
Councillor Complaints review Panel, Discussion Paper.....	2868
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated August 2016, titled ‘Discussion paper: Issues and options for Queensland’s councillor conduct complaints policy, legislation and operations’ prepared by the Independent Councillor Complaints Review Panel. ....	2868
Goods and Services Tax.....	2869
Advancing Health 2026; 10,000 Steps Challenge.....	2869
Cyber Safety.....	2870
Wild Dogs, Cluster Fencing.....	2870
Coal Workers’ Pneumoconiosis.....	2871
Logan, Revitalisation.....	2871
Engaging Science Grants.....	2872
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements.....	2873
Rail Safety Week.....	2873
Multicultural Month.....	2874
<b>LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>2874</b>
Office of the Information Commissioner, Reports.....	2874
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 1 of 2016-17—Desktop Audits 2014-16: Website Compliance with Right to Information and Information Privacy—Local Government and Hospital Foundations. ....	2874
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 2 of 2016-17—2016 Right to Information and Information Privacy Electronic Audit: Queensland public sector agencies’ responses and comparative analysis with 2010 and 2013 results. ....	2874
<b>HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE</b> .....	<b>2875</b>
Report.....	2875
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 23—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 March 2016 and 10 May 2016. ....	2875
<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b> .....	<b>2875</b>
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs.....	2875
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS’ STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>2875</b>
Queensland Olympians; Bravery Awards.....	2875
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements.....	2876
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2876
Advance Queensland.....	2877
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2877
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	<b>2878</b>
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2878
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 16 August 2016, from Aunty Betty McGrady regarding cancellation of the Logan Renewal Initiative. ....	2878
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>Quest Newspapers</i> online, dated 1 August 2016, titled ‘Commonwealth Games’ Queensland State Velodrome project a month from completion’. ....	2878
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2879
Northern Oil, Advanced Biofuels Pilot Plant.....	2880
Minister for Housing and Public Works.....	2880
Major Events.....	2881
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2881
North Queensland City Deal.....	2882
Logan Renewal Initiative.....	2882
Budget.....	2883
Public Housing.....	2883
Barrett Adolescent Centre.....	2884
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email [redacted], dated 4 August 2016, from the member for Maroochydore, Ms Fiona Simpson MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding residential mental healthcare facilities for children or young people on the Sunshine Coast. ....	2884
Moreton Bay Rail Link.....	2885
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Briefing note from Queensland Rail to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, regarding Moreton Bay Rail Link signalling. ....	2885
Biofuels Industry.....	2885
Ice, Safety of Police Officers.....	2886
Biofuels and Biomanufacturing Industries.....	2886
Child Protection.....	2887
South Molle Island.....	2888

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 August 2016

<b>HMAS Tobruk</b> .....	<b>2888</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Fraser Coast Chronicle</i> , dated 16 August 2016, titled 'Don't sink that \$15m!' .....	
	2888
<b>Protected Area Estate</b> .....	<b>2889</b>
<b>HEALTH (ABORTION LAW REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2889</b>
<b>Introduction</b> .....	<b>2889</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016.....	
	2889
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes.....	
	2889
<b>First Reading</b> .....	<b>2890</b>
<b>Referral to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee</b> .....	
	2890
<b>COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2891</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>2891</b>
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>2905</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs</b> .....	<b>2905</b>
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.....	
	2910
Resolved in the negative.....	
	2910
<b>EXHIBITED ANIMALS REGULATION</b> .....	<b>2911</b>
<b>Disallowance of Statutory Instrument</b> .....	<b>2911</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry: Exhibited Animals Legislation Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement, 2013.....	
	2923
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	
	2925
Resolved in the affirmative.....	
	2925
<b>COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2925</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>2925</b>
<b>Consideration in Detail</b> .....	<b>2933</b>
Clauses 1 to 70, as read, agreed to.....	
	2933
Schedule, as read, agreed to.....	
	2933
<b>Third Reading</b> .....	<b>2933</b>
<b>Long Title</b> .....	<b>2933</b>
<b>VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (REINSTATEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>2933</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>2933</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 19—Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, government response.....	
	2937
<b>ADJOURNMENT</b> .....	<b>2948</b>
<b>Battle of Long Tan, 50th Anniversary</b> .....	<b>2948</b>
<b>Beard150, Cancer Council</b> .....	<b>2948</b>
<b>Darumbal People, Native Title</b> .....	<b>2949</b>
<b>Jabiru Island Bridges</b> .....	<b>2949</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of maps of proposed development of duplicate bridges for Jabiru Island connecting Paradise Point and Hope Island.....	
	2950
<b>Logan Women's Health and Wellbeing Centre</b> .....	<b>2950</b>
<b>Coal Reuse</b> .....	<b>2951</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 30 June 2016, from the Acting Compliance Delivery Manager, Delegate of Chief Executive, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Ms Dayna Clayborn, to the Executive Director, Coal Reuse Pty Limited, Mr Rodney Hudspeth, regarding the finalisation of a complaint investigation involving Coal Reuse Pty Ltd.....	
	2951
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 12 August 2016, from the Compliance Delivery Manager, Delegate of Chief Executive, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Ms Dayna Clayborn, to the Executive Director, Coal Reuse Pty Limited, Mr Rodney Hudspeth, regarding the finalisation of a complaint investigation involving Coal Reuse Pty Ltd.....	
	2951
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 3 May 2013, titled 'Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd Safety Data Sheet, Product Name Fly Ash—Fine Grade'.....	
	2951
<b>Banksia Beach State School Concert Band</b> .....	<b>2951</b>
<b>Protecting Childhood, Education</b> .....	<b>2952</b>
<b>Dalrymple Electorate, Road Upgrades</b> .....	<b>2952</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding a requested upgrade to Foxwell Road at Malanda.....	
	2953
<b>Prince Charles Hospital; Biomedical and Life Sciences Industry</b> .....	<b>2953</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE</b> .....	<b>2954</b>

## WEDNESDAY, 17 AUGUST 2016

---



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

### SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

#### Restrictions on Naming At-Risk Children



**Mr SPEAKER:** Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition used a cipher under standing order 117 in asking a question of the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. The key to the cipher was lodged with the Clerk, who showed the minister.

The procedure used by the Leader of the Opposition was entirely appropriate. However, as it is a procedure rarely used it is appropriate to canvass the history and rationale of the rule. Report No. 83 of the Members' Ethics and Parliamentary Privileges Committee recommended an order dealing with questions relating to children be adopted as a matter of priority. That report was in response to concerns raised about at-risk children being identified in questions without notice. The procedure now in standing order 117 was first introduced on 12 April 2000.

The procedure is aimed at enabling questions on important issues without identifying at-risk children. Overnight, the Clerk has checked the precedent and it appears that yesterday was only the third occasion in the last 16 years that the procedure has been used. The procedure was used twice in August 2007 by the current member for Currumbin. Any member of the Assembly is able to view the key to the cipher in the possession of the Clerk. It is not expressed in the standing order, but it would be totally inappropriate for the measures in the standing order to be subverted by, for example, a member later disclosing the key to the cipher in the House, committee or otherwise in the public domain.

I also take the opportunity to remind members about standing order 35, which prohibits the tabling of documents identifying a child or children. The procedure was first introduced by the sessional orders on 6 August 2002. The procedure arose out of an incident involving an inadvertent tabling of a document identifying an at-risk child. I would urge members to take some time to acquaint themselves with both of these standing orders.

#### Sub Judice



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I would like to remind members about the sub judice rule especially in its application to current issues relating to child welfare. Standing order 233(1) and (2) are the most important—

233. Sub judice rule

- (1) In general, members should exercise care to avoid saying inside the House that which would be regarded as contempt of court outside the House and could jeopardise court proceedings.
- (2) Members should not refer to in the House matters awaiting or under adjudication in all courts exercising a criminal jurisdiction (including in motions, debate or questions) from the moment the charge is made against the relevant person. This Standing Order shall cease to have effect when the verdict and sentence have been announced or judgement given, but shall again have effect should a Court of Criminal Appeal order a new trial.

All members should be aware of matters pending criminal proceedings that relate to child welfare. These matters have and will continue to cause considerable public debate outside the House. It is a matter for the courts to regulate debate in the community. However, it is vital that no privileged and prejudicial debate occurs in this House. I ask all members to be vigilant in their questions, responses to questions and general debate to avoid referring to matters before the courts.

### PRIVILEGE

#### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Members



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 16 June 2016 the Premier and Minister for the Arts wrote to me alleging that the member for Clayfield and the member for Nanango deliberately misled parliament in their questions without notice to the Premier on 15 June 2016. I have circulated a ruling on this matter.

On the evidence before me I considered that, as the wording of the questions asked by the members for Clayfield and Nanango specifically referred to the recommendation by the State Actuary, their questions were neither incorrect nor misleading.

I am satisfied with the explanations provided by the member for Clayfield and the member for Nanango and therefore I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

#### SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER:

Honourable Members,

On 16 June 2016, the Premier and Minister for the Arts wrote to me alleging that the Member for Clayfield and the Member for Nanango deliberately misled Parliament in their questions without notice to the Premier on 15 June 2016.

The Member for Clayfield asked:

*My question without notice is directed to the Premier. Premier, I refer to the State Actuary's only recommendation, and that is that a maximum of \$2 billion be taken out of public servants' super, and I ask: can the Premier identify anywhere the State Actuary actually recommends a \$4 billion raid on public servants' superannuation?*

The Member for Nanango asked:

*My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to Labor's \$4 billion raid on super and the State Actuary's only recommendation that a maximum of \$2 billion be taken out of the fund, and I ask: why is the government ignoring the one clear recommendation of the State Actuary?*

In her letter to me, the Premier contended that the questions from the members for Clayfield and Nanango were deliberately misleading because the members would have known of the subsequent advice in relation to the maximum repatriation amount of the defined benefit scheme provided by the State Actuary in a letter dated 20 May 2016, which was tabled on 14 June 2016.

I sought further information from the members for Clayfield and Nanango about the allegations made against them, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

Both the Member for Clayfield and the Member for Nanango argued that their questions were not factually or apparently incorrect because the initial letter of advice of 31 March 2016 from the State Actuary when referring to the maximum repatriation figure of \$2 billion was referenced as a recommendation in the letter, whereas the subsequent letter of advice of 20 May 2016 did not refer to the updated figure of \$5 billion as being a recommendation.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

*In considering whether the matter should be referred to the committee, the Speaker shall take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter. No matter should be referred to the ethics committee if the matter is technical or trivial and does not warrant the further attention of the House.*

On the evidence before me I considered that, as the wording of the questions asked by the members for Clayfield and Nanango specifically referred to the recommendation by the State Actuary, their questions were neither incorrect nor misleading.

I am satisfied with the explanations provided by the Member for Clayfield and the Member for Nanango and, therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 16 June 2016, from the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [[1268](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, undated, from the member for Clayfield, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [[1269](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 22 June 2016, from the member for Nanango, Mrs Deb Frecklington MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [[1270](#)].

### **Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member**



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 10 June 2016 the Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport wrote to me alleging that the member for Indooroopilly deliberately misled parliament in his question without notice. I have circulated a ruling on this matter.

On the evidence before me I considered that the member has made an adequate explanation for the basis of his statement. I have therefore decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER:

Honourable Members,

On 10 June 2016, the Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport wrote to me alleging that the Member for Indooroopilly deliberately misled Parliament in his question without notice when he asked:

*My question is to the Premier. I table the QTC half-yearly report, dated December 2015, which shows the defined benefit fund actually made a loss of \$855 million. I ask: how can the Premier justify Labor's proposed raid on the fund when it has already lost almost half a billion dollars?*

In his letter to me, the Treasurer stated that the question from the Member for Indooroopilly was deliberately misleading because the \$855 million loss refers to losses QTC incurred in managing long term assets with variable returns whilst providing a fixed 7.0% return to the state for long term obligations, including but not limited to defined benefit superannuation beneficiaries, which has no cash flow effect and no impact on its ability to meet its obligations.

I sought further information from the Member for Indooroopilly about the allegations made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Member for Indooroopilly advised that QTC's report states that QTC's long-term assets operations recorded a \$855.1 million loss, that QTC receives returns from investments which are held to meet the state's long-term obligations of primarily superannuation, and that the only superannuation liability that QTC holds assets for is the defined benefit fund.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

*In considering whether the matter should be referred to the committee, the Speaker shall take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter. No matter should be referred to the ethics committee if the matter is technical or trivial and does not warrant the further attention of the House.*

On the evidence before me I considered that, while it may have been more precise for the Member for Indooroopilly to have stated that body managing the assets funding the defined benefit fund made a loss of \$855.1 million, I think the member has made an adequate explanation for the basis for his statement.

I have therefore decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

However, I urge all members asking questions to ministers to take care and be precise in the wording of such questions.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 10 June 2016, from the Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, and Minister for Sport, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [[1271](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 22 June 2016, from the member for Indooroopilly, Mr Scott Emerson MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [[1272](#)].

### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 17 June 2016 the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services wrote to me alleging that the member for Surfers Paradise deliberately misled parliament in his private member's statement on 26 May 2016. I have circulated a ruling on this matter.

On the evidence before me I considered that, as the member for Surfers Paradise's statement was so heavily qualified as being a rumour as opposed to a definitive fact, the statement was neither inaccurate nor misleading. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I take this opportunity to remind members of my previous statements in the House about the importance of members being able to authenticate their statements and allegations. This is particularly important where it goes to the reputation or career of a person. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER:

Honourable Members,

On 17 June 2016, the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services wrote to me alleging that the Member for Surfers Paradise deliberately misled Parliament in his private member's statement on 26 May 2016 when he said:

*... in the minister's own department, the hand-picked director-general of the Premier has applied to be the director-general in New South Wales. That is the culture of this government. After 12 months, we have the same old culture.*

In his letter to me, the Minister stated that the Member for Surfers Paradise had knowingly misled Parliament as he knew his statement to be incorrect and without foundation. He advised that the Director-General of the Department of Health did not apply for the position of Director General in New South Wales, and that the statement made by the Member for Surfers Paradise caused significant disruption within the Department of Health and resulted in the Director-General being required to issue an email to all staff.

I sought further information from the Member for Surfers Paradise about the allegation made against him, in accordance with Standing Order 269(5).

The Member for Surfers Paradise advised that the Minister had selectively quoted from his statement, and that on reading his full statement it could be seen that he had prefaced his statement with the phrase 'The little birdie has also told me' and that at no stage did he refer to the potential departure of the Director-General as definitive fact, but instead as something that he 'understood' to be the case.

Standing Order 269(4) requires:

*In considering whether the matter should be referred to the committee, the Speaker shall take account of the degree of importance of the matter which has been raised and whether an adequate apology or explanation has been made in respect of the matter. No matter should be referred to the ethics committee if the matter is technical or trivial and does not warrant the further attention of the House.*

On the evidence before me, I considered that as the member for Surfers Paradise statement was so heavily qualified as being a rumour as opposed to a definitive fact that the statement was neither inaccurate or misleading.

Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, undated, from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [1273].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 20 June 2016, from the member for Surfers Paradise, Mr John-Paul Langbroek MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of misleading the House [1274].

## MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

### Hewitt, Mr NTE



**Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.07 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this state by the late Neville Hewitt, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland and Minister of the Crown.
2. That Mr Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland, in the loss they have sustained.

I pay tribute to Neville Hewitt, a former member of parliament for the Country Party and the National Party and minister of the Crown. I am honoured to stand in this House today to speak on behalf of the Queensland government. I pass on the condolences of the people of Queensland to the Hewitt family. I am advised that Lisa Hewitt, Neville's great-niece, is in the gallery today. Welcome to this parliament where your great-uncle made such an important contribution over almost a quarter of a century.

Neville Hewitt was held in the highest regard by all sides of politics. I am indebted to two members for Rockhampton, the police and corrective services minister and his predecessor, Robert Schwarten, for my contribution today. Both spoke at Neville's funeral. As the minister said at the service—

Neville Hewitt embodies the saying—a life well-lived. He served his country in wartime, he served his state at the highest level and he served his community and his family all of his lifetime.

On learning of Neville's passing, Robert Schwarten told the *Morning Bulletin* that—

The old political divide they talk about does not divide decent people.

That is a sentiment rarely expressed in this place and, when it is, more often than not it is reserved for motions such as this one. Robert and his father, the late Evan Schwarten, a stalwart of the Labor Party in Central Queensland, were close friends of Neville.

Central Queensland was a very different place when Neville Hewitt was first elected to parliament in May 1956, winning the seat of Mackenzie by just 46 votes after a recount. In his eulogy, Robert Schwarten told how Neville was in Nebo on the night of the 1956 election when he received a telegram from his wife Nancy telling him the results coming in for him were positive. Upon receiving such hopeful news, Neville decided to drive back to Theodore that night. Unfortunately, near Woorabinda his car was bogged. He spent the rest of the night in the car before the manager found him the next morning and towed him out. Politics can be a lonely business, but I am not aware of any other politician who celebrated their first victory night in such a way.

In May 1969, Neville Hewitt was appointed minister for local government and marine activities and went on to become Queensland's longest serving minister for water resources. One of his last tasks in parliament was to introduce legislation to build the Burdekin Dam. In 1971, in his capacity as minister Neville inaugurated Rockhampton's water scheme, championed by the city council and Mayor Rex Pilbeam. Respected historian Dr Lorna McDonald, who celebrated her 100th birthday in Rockhampton last week, wrote of this milestone that—

At last the city had adequate water to supply all the thirsty adjuncts of modern living, and even in drought time, to allow garden sprinklers six hours daily.

Neville's legacy is commemorated in Rockhampton with the Neville Hewitt Bridge over the Fitzroy River and near Baralaba with the Neville Hewitt Weir on the Dawson River. As a member of parliament, Neville played a part in having hospitals, secondary schools and the necessary infrastructure established to service both towns.

In terms of his military service, Neville was one of only two recipients for bravery medals for his actions in air and on land. The Airforce Medal and the Military Medal were awarded by the King at Buckingham Palace in 1944. Today I place on record our thanks for the years of service Neville gave to the institutions of our democracy and to the Queensland community.

Once again I acknowledge Lisa Hewitt, the great-niece of Neville Hewitt, who is with us in the gallery today. On behalf of the government and all members of this House, I take this opportunity to extend my sympathy to Neville's family. Vale, Neville Hewitt.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.12 pm): I join with the Premier in supporting the motion of condolence moved in the House today. Today the House is paying its respects to one of its most distinguished and long-serving members, Neville Hewitt. It is indeed appropriate that his great-niece Lisa has joined us in the parliament today to hear this condolence motion.

Neville Hewitt represented Central Queensland in the Legislative Assembly for nearly a quarter of a century. For those of us who have been here for less than that time, that seems like a lifetime. He served in various ministries for over 11 years. As has been indicated, in May 1956 Neville Hewitt was elected as the member for the electoral district of Mackenzie. Indeed, he was the last surviving member of the 1956 parliament. That means that he served in parliament when Vince Gair was still premier; in 1957 he witnessed the split within the ALP; on 12 June of that year, he participated in the defeat of the Labor government on the floor of parliament; and he saw the election of the Nicklin government, which was the first non-Labor government in Queensland in 25 years. They were indeed historic times. Indeed, the historic series of photographs appearing in Clem Lack's significant work, *Three decades of Queensland political history*, record Neville Hewitt sitting on the rear opposition bench in parliament during the critical vote as to whether the Gair government would be granted supply. At the time of his retirement from parliament in 1980, he was one of only two members who had served throughout the entire period since the election of the Nicklin government in 1957. The other was none other than the then premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Neville Hewitt's passing represents not only the loss of a much-respected and admired former member of this House but also the loss of a link with this state's rich political history.

Neville Hewitt was typical of his generation. Born on a Theodore cattle property in 1920 and raised in Central Queensland, Neville Hewitt maintained a lifetime relationship with the land and the rural communities of the area. On 12 October 1941, at the age of 21, he enlisted in the Royal Australian Air Force and was posted to No. 150 Squadron of the RAF as a flight sergeant air gunner. It was in that capacity, after the squadron had been posted to the Mediterranean, that his Wellington bomber was shot down over Tunisia in 1943. As a consequence of that action and his efforts to rescue fellow crew despite his own injuries, he was awarded the Military Medal in recognition, as his citation read, of 'initiative, courage and fortitude after bailing out'. His medal was presented by His Majesty King George VI at Buckingham Palace on 17 October 1944. Neville Hewitt also has the distinction of being awarded the Air Force Medal.

After his discharge from the Air Force in September 1945 with the rank of flying officer, he returned to Central Queensland where he worked as a stockman and as a branch manager for that well-known company Australian Estates Company. In 1956 he was elected as a Country Party member to the Central Queensland seat of Mackenzie, which was based on the Dawson, Isaac and Mackenzie River valleys. Mackenzie was the only ALP seat to change hands between government and opposition at that election. Whereas the ALP enjoyed a 10 per cent margin in 1953, Neville Hewitt managed to whittle that away with, as the Premier has indicated, a stunning 46-vote winning margin three years later. I am sure that a night in the car was a very small price to pay for that victory.

Neville Hewitt began a distinguished parliamentary career that, after a few little setbacks, in 1969 saw him elevated to the Bjelke-Petersen ministry as minister for local government and marine activities. He served as a minister for over 11 years in a variety of portfolios covering such responsibilities as conservation, Aboriginal affairs, lands and forestry. However, it was as minister for water resources that he made his mark. His period as minister saw the construction of a succession of dams throughout Queensland, including the Fairbairn Dam, the Fred Haig Dam, the Glenlyon Dam and the EJ Beardmore Dam. It should also be noted that, in his last year as minister, Neville Hewitt introduced the legislation for the construction of the Burdekin Dam, as the Premier has stated. That is a legacy of which he and his family can be truly proud. Having seen his electorate of Mackenzie abolished in 1972 and replaced by the electorate of Auburn, which covered much of the western Burnett, Neville Hewitt continued to represent the area for a further eight years.

Upon his retirement in 1980, the then deputy premier and treasurer, Dr Llew Edwards, said—

Mr Neville Hewitt is a good friend to all of us. He is a very popular member and one who has played a tremendous role in caring for the country people of Queensland ... I say without a shadow of doubt that no other member understands the rural problems as well as Neville Hewitt. His hard work for rural people and his good companionship have left a great mark on this Parliament.

I also note with interest that last month the *Morning Bulletin* recorded former ALP member for Rockhampton, someone well known to many of us in this place, Robert Schwarten as saying—

He was as straight as a gun barrel. Respected on both sides of the house, he was a true gentleman and a very sad loss to society.

Neville Hewitt enjoyed a long retirement from politics, returning to the land, managing cattle properties in Central Queensland, pursuing his interest in racing and remaining involved in community affairs. Neville Hewitt's epitaph is written in the rural and regional communities he represented and championed for nearly a quarter of a century. Through his own imagination and hard work, he sought to make Central Queensland a more productive region and, through reform and development, sought to bring prosperity to his fellow Queenslanders.

Neville Hewitt's wife, Nancy, predeceased him, but on behalf of the opposition I convey to his family, through Lisa, who is here on their behalf, our condolences at the passing of a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather and a distinguished former member of this House.

 **Mr SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (2.18 pm): Today I rise to speak on behalf of the people of my electorate and the people of Central Queensland more broadly in paying tribute to Neville Hewitt, a man who served his community and the state of Queensland for 24 years as a member of this Legislative Assembly, representing the electorate of Mackenzie and later the electorate of Auburn. Much of the area that Neville Hewitt represented is now encompassed within the boundaries of the electorate of Callide.

To put Neville Hewitt's service in this place into some perspective, I think it is appropriate that I note that Neville Hewitt was the first member of parliament whom I ever met. He presented me with a trophy at my primary school sports day in Monto in the mid-1960s. I still have the trophy. Even at that stage, he had been in this parliament for 10 years. Even at the stage where he was presenting me, as a primary school student, with a sports trophy, he had been in this parliament for 10 years. He was a legend. He was certainly a legend to us kids because he gave us a holiday when he came to the school. If only MPs today had the same authority. He certainly was a legend in Central Queensland.

As has been indicated, Neville Hewitt was born on a Theodore cattle property in 1920. He was the eldest of six children. He was educated at Theodore State School and the Rockhampton Grammar School as well as through distance education.

Like so many of his generation, he was thrown into the war and enlisted in the RAAF in Brisbane on 12 October 1941—one week before his 21st birthday. His distinguished war service has already been outlined yet it says much about the man that he tended to downplay this record and would not speak to many people at all, even his own family, about those war years. He was more comfortable talking about rural pursuits, or talking about the weather, the cattle and the crops, or following the races and talking about his own exploits.

At the end of war Neville returned to Central Queensland and resumed his involvement in rural industries. In 1956 he won the seat of Mackenzie, as has been outlined, in an election which saw the return of the Gair government. Neville Hewitt had a fairly simple philosophy when he was elected and he outlined that in his maiden speech to the Assembly on 28 August 1956 when he said—

It is up to me now to do my utmost at all times and to speak and act as my conscience dictates in the interests of the electorate and the people of Queensland generally.

In his maiden speech Neville Hewitt sought to draw attention to what he regarded as the difficulties facing his rural constituents and the way in which government could assist them to reach their potential. He spoke at length of the need for flood mitigation to assist farmers and graziers, the need for the construction of roads and bridges to bring rural communities closer together, the need to encourage doctors to come to rural communities, the problems of land tenure and the need for additional railway rolling stock to service the developing coalmines of Central Queensland. They are all subjects that are eerily familiar to those of us in this parliament today.

That maiden speech represented much of what Neville Hewitt saw as his mission in life. As a representative of the people of the Central Queensland region he regarded his role as one of giving a voice to their concerns so that those who lived away from the major population centres would receive as much attention from government as those who lived in urban areas. Through all his years in this parliament Neville Hewitt actually lived in Rockhampton, the unofficial capital of Central Queensland. He became known I think as the member for Central Queensland as much as the member for Mackenzie and Auburn.

Neville Hewitt was the member for Mackenzie when two major mining developments, Moura and Blackwater, commenced. It was through his efforts that much of the important social infrastructure was built to service those growing communities. Neville Hewitt's advocacy for the development of the brigalow lands scheme is well known. This scheme was instrumental in opening up much of Central Queensland to beef and grain industries. That productive province of Queensland now is an important part of the legacy of Neville Hewitt and his colleagues in this parliament through those years.

While Neville Hewitt was unstinting in his service to the people of Mackenzie and then the people of Auburn it was as a minister that he made the most significant contribution to the people of rural and regional Queensland. In 1969 he was appointed the minister for water resources. Nearly all of Queensland's major dams and weirs were constructed during his time as minister. He knew and understood that water was crucial to the development of the state's primary industries and that government had a responsibility to provide that crucial infrastructure.

Indeed, in his final speech to parliament just before his retirement in 1980 Neville Hewitt paid tribute to the public servants of the Water Resources Commission with whom he had worked over so many years. His retirement from this House was not the end of Neville Hewitt's community involvement or his contribution to Central Queensland.

As a young man he had been a successful amateur jockey. It is reported that he rode over 300 winners, and at least a couple of those while he was a member of parliament. He was a member of the Rockhampton Jockey Club and served as chairman for six years after his retirement from politics. At the same time he remained active in many organisations in Central Queensland, continuing to contribute to his community. His extended family continues to do that today.

Perhaps the last word should go to the *Morning Bulletin*, which wrote on 31 May 1963, one day before the state election, of Neville Hewitt that—

He is best known for his warm-hearted approach to the problems of the individual. He is indeed a reliable friend.

He has been a reliable friend for Central Queensland. I join with other honourable members in paying my respects to the late Neville Hewitt and extend my condolences to his family.

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (2.24 pm): I wish to spend a couple of moments paying my respects to Neville Hewitt. Much of what I was going to say has already been said. I cannot see the point in repeating all that. Every word that has been said here this afternoon is a true recollection of Neville Hewitt. The way that people speak about him in Central Queensland is that he was a man who stuck to his word, would do the right thing by constituents when they came to him and believed in the electorate that he represented. The electorate of Mackenzie actually took in just about all of the Mirani electorate today. I felt it was my duty, on behalf of the people who still live in that area and who knew Neville well, to say a few words.

As has been said, Neville was the chairman of the Rockhampton Jockey Club. That is where I met him most—that is, at the track. He was a good person as far as I was concerned because at least he wanted to talk to me about how the electorate was going, how our communities were going and what was happening around the electorate. He was still showing that interest even though he was getting on in years.

Neville Hewitt was a man who set standards that many people in this place have followed over the years. It would be good to look at what he did in this place and what he did as a local member to gain a good understanding of how we should do our jobs as elected members.

People around Central Queensland have told me that he was a very strong representative for individuals. He turned no-one away. He was the man who respected everybody for who they are or who they were. It did not have anything to do with politics. He was a genuine, down to earth country man doing a different job.

I pass on my condolences to the family, extended family and friends of Neville. I know that many people will miss him. I hope that he can get himself across the back of a horse and ride another winner.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

*Whereupon honourable members stood in silence.*

**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I propose that question time commence at 3.28 pm.

## PETITIONS

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

### Schools, National Curriculum

**Mrs Smith**, from 7,147 petitioners, requesting the House to observe international evidence-based best practice and ensure children are six years of age or older to commence being formally taught an incremental age-appropriate national curriculum; all learning prior to age six, including prep, is play-based; and the data collection and reporting burden on teachers is reduced to maximise engage teaching time [[1275](#), [1276](#)].

The following paper petition, sponsored by the Clerk is lodged for presentation—

### Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

From 175 petitioners, requesting the House to not support the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in its current form and reject any amendments that would water down existing property rights, remove opportunities for sustainable agricultural production, or jeopardise job creation in regional communities [[1278](#)].

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

### Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

**Mr Cripps**, from 8,581 petitioners, requesting the House to not support the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in its current form and reject any amendments that would water down existing property rights, remove opportunities for sustainable agricultural production, or jeopardise job creation in regional communities [[1277](#), [1279](#)].

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

### Woodlands and Vale Estates, Bus Service

From 212 petitioners, requesting the House to expand bus services to Woodlands and the Vale Estates by the end of 2016 [[1280](#)].

Petitions received.

## TABLED PAPERS

### SPEAKER'S PAPER

The following Speaker's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly (Hon. Wellington)—

[1281](#) Oath of Allegiance and of Office: Member for Toowoomba South (Mr Janetzki)

### MEMBER'S PAPER

The following member's paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Waterford (Hon. Fentiman)—

[1282](#) Non-conforming petition regarding bus services for residents of Woodlands and Vale Estate

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### School Students, Website

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.30 pm): Reports today that a website targeting school students in Queensland and other states in Australia are very disturbing. I have been reassured that both the Queensland Police Service and Education Queensland were swift to act after learning of these allegations. The police minister and the education minister have also met

today, and I am further advised that the Department of Education and Training is also liaising with the Catholic and independent school sectors. The police minister and the education minister will ensure there is strong interagency collaboration to ensure any allegations in relation to this matter are investigated as swiftly as possible. Investigations will help inform any steps that need to be taken to strengthen the cyber safety of Queensland students.

Queensland's Task Force Argos detectives are internationally recognised for the exceptional work they do to protect children online and they are on the case. It highlights the importance of the decision we made late last year to invest \$3.2 million in Taskforce Orion to crack down on the online sharing of child exploitation material. Officers in Taskforce Orion are tracking down and targeting those who use the internet to share disgusting images—wherever they are across the state. An initial investigation has been conducted and found that the site appears to be hosted overseas and all also appears to not contain any child exploitation material. Every parent should be reassured that the government is taking action in response to these very disturbing allegations.

Cyber safety is something the whole community needs to be aware of. Schools have a role to play in educating students and police have a role to play in enforcing the law but police and schools cannot do it alone. We also need parents and caregivers to monitor what their children are doing in cyberspace and ensure they are educated about society's expectations, the law and possible risks. As police have said today, it is important for everyone to protect themselves online and understand the risks associated with posting any image on social media.

This also highlights why we need a response to serious organised crime that targets all organised crime, including child sex exploitation. There is always someone or a group of people responsible for the operation of a website and laws need to be able to properly target those individuals.

### **United States Navy, Statement of Cooperation**

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.32 pm): Since becoming Premier I have focused heavily on the potential for Queensland to create a biofuels and biotechnology industry. Why? Because it could turbocharge regional economies and create thousands of jobs into the future.

I have appointed a biofuels minister in Minister Bailey, and my state development minister, Anthony Lynham, has produced a 10-year industry road map, giving confidence to investors and local producers. We have partnered strongly with QUT and UQ in their efforts to ramp up their research capabilities, and we have poached Southern Oil—one of the country's leading biofuels producers—to come to Queensland. Underpinning all of that have been discussions I have had with the US Navy.

Today is an historic day for Queensland and the Queensland economy. I have long been talking about the need to diversify our economy, to create new industries, to establish new partnerships, to lock in the next wave of long-term, export orientated job opportunities. Today we take a giant stride on the path to those goals.

Today I had the great honour of signing a formal statement of cooperation between the Queensland government and the US Department of the Navy. This morning a delegation from the United States, led by Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Management Thomas Hicks, visited the parliament for a formal signing ceremony. It was a great pleasure to host Mr Hicks, who kindly hosted me during meetings at the Pentagon last year. It follows my visit to the Third Fleet Headquarters in San Diego earlier this year.

In all of those previous discussions, I made it clear that I believe Queensland and the US Navy were a natural fit when it comes to the production of alternative, bio based, drop-in fuels. The US Navy, like the Royal Australian Navy, is determined to ramp up its use of alternative fuels. I want Queensland to be the place where those biofuels are produced. We have the research, we have the fuel base, we are perfectly positioned geographically, and we have the will to make this happen.

The US Navy has a goal of having 50 per cent of its total operational energy consumption coming from alternative energy sources by 2020. If Queensland can be a regional hub for biofuel production, it will mean enormous economic benefits up and down our state. That is because drop-in fuels are not just limited to military use but can be used in cars, trucks, even civilian aviation. We know Qantas and Virgin are interested in biofuels, as are most other major international airlines.

The same research used to create drop-in biofuels also produces the molecular building blocks that can be used to produce other products. Almost anything currently made from petroleum, like plastics or even cosmetics, could potentially be made from biofuel molecules. As you can see, the possibilities are immense. I have called the biofuels industry Queensland's next LNG industry, and today's events mean that we are a major step closer to making it a reality.

The formal partnership signed today between Queensland and the US sends a powerful signal to investors that Queensland is the place to be when it comes to biofuels investment. I would like to thank Mr Hicks and everyone who has worked on making this partnership a reality. I am certain it will lead to major, long-term economic benefits for Queensland.

### ***Thor: Ragnarok***

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.36 pm): Queensland has a proven track record as Australia's film destination of choice for domestic and international producers. It is no secret that Queensland is taking the lead in securing top international productions, with Marvel's *Thor: Ragnarok* filming here right now. *Thor*, starring Chris Hemsworth, Tom Hiddleston, Sir Anthony Hopkins, Jeff Goldblum, Cate Blanchett and Mark Ruffalo, is the first production to film at the new superstage at Village Roadshow Studios, constructed with investment from my government. This new stage, which is the largest in the Southern Hemisphere, demonstrates Queensland's commitment to provide world-class facilities for the local and international film and television industry to create jobs and drive economic benefit for the long term. I am proud of these achievements and am especially encouraged that key industry players also recognise our achievements.

I am also pleased to advise the House that Brisbane will be home to some Hollywood experiences next week when filming of *Thor* moves from the Gold Coast to the streets of the Brisbane CBD, and Hollywood's A-listers will be here amongst each and every one of us.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I take that interjection. As Premier, I am excited that when *Thor* is released on the big screen we will all be proud that our state will feature heavily in this blockbuster. Walt Disney Studios executive Mary Ann Hughes, who helped bring the filming of *Pirates of the Caribbean: Dead Men Tell No Tales* to Queensland, continues to sing our praises. Her encouragement and endorsement to colleagues at Marvel Studios assisted to seal the deal to film *Thor* in Queensland. *Thor* is expected to spend more than \$100 million in Queensland and has already employed at least 1,200 Queenslanders in a range of capacities. *Thor* is also bringing the world's attention to Queensland with the newly launched *Thor: Ragnarok* Facebook page already attracting more than 13 million followers. My government recognises that investing in blockbuster productions delivers significant economic and tourism benefits for Queensland.

### **Councillor Complaints review Panel, Discussion Paper**

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.38 pm): In April I advised the House that I had initiated an independent review of the councillor conduct and complaints process. This review came after the Local Government Managers Australia wrote to me expressing concerns about the role of local governments' chief executive officers in the preliminary assessment and general management of particularly councillor complaints. The Local Government Association of Queensland also sought changes to the way in which complaints are dealt with under the Local Government Act 2009, including the inability to seek a review of decisions and the need to better ensure natural justice is afforded to all parties. These procedures had not been comprehensively reviewed since their introduction in 2009.

I am pleased to announce today that the independent review panel, led by former integrity commissioner Mr David Solomon, has now released a discussion paper outlining options to better handle complaints. I table a copy of the discussion paper for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Document, dated August 2016, titled 'Discussion paper: Issues and options for Queensland's councillor conduct complaints policy, legislation and operations' prepared by the Independent Councillor Complaints Review Panel [[1283](#)].

The government welcomes the release of this discussion paper for public feedback and strongly urges the community to get involved. It is important that ratepayers and communities have a voice in any proposed changes to the complaints system, as local governments are ultimately responsible to the communities they represent.

The discussion paper poses a number of questions and suggests three different options for further consideration. The first approach is to retain the current framework, with complaints managed through the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning, but it involves a series of amendments to the Local Government Act 2009. The second approach devolves more responsibility to councils and makes use of mainstream state agencies such as the Ombudsman and the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal. It also suggests that councils establish ethics and conduct panels

themselves. The third approach is to centralise and streamline the complaints process by reconstituting the Local Government Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal to deal solely with councillor conduct matters, with its own CEO, support staff and investigative powers.

These three approaches provide a starting point for discussion and consultation to help the external independent panel assess the issues and options. The final recommendations by the panel will be informed by feedback and new ideas received during consultation. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the ongoing efforts of the review panel, and the government looks forward to hearing its final recommendations.

The people of Queensland not only deserve the best representation but also deserve to have those representatives held to the highest standard of behaviour through the best procedures possible. This review also reaffirms the Palaszczuk government's commitment to strengthen the transparency and accountability of local government for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

### Goods and Services Tax

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (2.41 pm): The central tenet of fiscal fairness in this country is horizontal fiscal equalisation. It ensures that all state and territory governments have the same capacity to deliver the services that all Australians have a right to expect. Yet on Saturday in a speech to the WA Liberal state conference the Prime Minister announced 'a percentage floor below which no state's receipts of GST can fall'. This ill-thought-out policy proposal has put horizontal fiscal equalisation at risk. Despite the wideranging consequences of the announcement, we do not know any more about the proposal than what we heard at the weekend from Perth. We do not know what the floor percentage would be or how it would be calculated. Just like his proposal to raise the GST or his plan to have the states raise their own income taxes, the Prime Minister announced this plan with no communication with the states or territories except Western Australia's embattled Liberal state government, which is facing defeat at next March's election.

Western Australia was already gifted half a billion dollars for roads after it complained about its GST allocation earlier this year, with some reports suggesting that the extra funds will be \$1 billion over two years. Let us not forget that, when Queensland wanted flexibility from the Commonwealth over asset recycling after the verdict of the last election, the federal coalition said there were no special deals, but here we have a special sweetheart deal for Western Australia.

No matter how you look at it, if one state gets more than its fair share of GST revenue, there is less money in the GST pool for everyone else. Malcolm Turnbull might not be fully frank with the states about his GST floor plan, but we know it would hurt Queensland. If a 50 per cent per capita floor had been implemented in 2016-17, it would have reduced Queensland's GST by around \$317 million. If a 75 per cent per capita floor had been implemented in 2016-17, it would have reduced Queensland's distribution by around \$720 million.

The higher the floor, the more money that goes to WA. We do not know what the floor is but we do know that this is a sweetheart deal for Western Australia, so who knows how high the floor will go? We do know that the Liberal states, including Queensland, in 2012 in a joint submission to the GST distribution review recommended that GST distribution should be on a strict per capita basis, effectively a floor of 100 per cent. This would unhook the central tenant of fiscal fairness in this country—horizontal fiscal equalisation—from the GST distribution.

The Liberal states joint submission asserted that states with greater funding needs would be met on an ad hoc basis from the Commonwealth. Given Queensland's decentralisation, this is a reckless endangerment of horizontal fiscal equalisation. This side of the House has always backed horizontal fiscal equalisation to ensure Queensland, as the most decentralised state, has the same capacity to deliver the services that all Australians have a right to expect. Queenslanders cannot afford a Turnbull raid on our GST payments. Queenslanders expect the LNP to support the government and stand up for Queensland in Canberra.

### Advancing Health 2026; 10,000 Steps Challenge

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.44 pm): Honourable members would be aware that the central aim of our government's 10-year vision and strategy for health, Advancing Health 2026, is to make Queenslanders among the healthiest people in the world by 2026. We believe strongly in partnering with community organisations to achieve

this aim. Consequently—and in delivering on one of our election commitments—we have awarded a \$27 million contract to Diabetes Queensland, which will coordinate a group of non-government organisations to deliver a statewide prevention program called Health for Life!

These organisations are the National Heart Foundation Queensland, the National Stroke Foundation, the Queensland Aboriginal and Islander Health Council, the Ethnic Communities Council of Queensland and the Queensland University of Technology. Queensland primary health networks and other healthcare providers will also be involved in this initiative. The goal of this program is to change the lives of 10,000 Queenslanders and encourage them to become fitter and healthier. The program aims to address poor diet, insufficient physical activity, being overweight or obese, high blood pressure and high blood cholesterol. These all place people at risk of developing type 2 diabetes, cardiovascular disease and lifestyle related cancers. The Health for Life! program will support people who are at high risk of developing these conditions to make positive changes so they can live a happier and healthier lifestyle.

Health for Life! will offer a free health risk assessment and structured six-month lifestyle modification program. This will be available through over-the-phone health coaching, group programs and online support options. A priority for this program will be helping people living in rural and remote locations, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The program will also target adults aged 45 and over and people living with a pre-existing condition that places them at high risk of developing chronic disease. Investments like this not only improve the health of Queenslanders but also play a part in building a stronger and more sustainable healthcare system.

Closer to home, I would like to thank you, Mr Speaker, the Clerk and Ms Lisa Rayner of the Queensland Parliamentary Service for establishing the 10,000 Steps Challenge right here at Parliament House. I would encourage all honourable members to strap on their pedometers and participate. If members and staff participate fully, they will walk a distance equivalent to walking from Port Douglas to Hobart, but they can do it without leaving the precinct. I could think of nothing better! There are signs advertising this around the parliamentary precinct, and I would encourage honourable members to sign up.

### **Cyber Safety**

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (2.46 pm): The safety and wellbeing of our students is our No. 1 priority. I understand that many parents will be alarmed after seeing reports of images of schoolchildren being distributed online. A number of Queensland high schools have been named in media reports concerning a highly offensive website containing images of female students. As the Premier said, I met with the police minister this morning. Task Force Argos advised that they have been monitoring the site and that the site currently contains no child exploitation material. Education Queensland was made aware of this site late last night and immediately activated the cyber safety response team. I can assure all members of the House that the department is providing advice and support to the state schools identified and is also working with the Catholic and independent school sectors.

Today I want to send a strong message to parents and students about cyber safety. It is important that every child learns safe, appropriate and responsible behaviour online. Schools, parents and students must all be vigilant in this regard to ensure safety. We have also made our respectful relationships curriculum available to all schools to help students from prep to year 12 build and maintain respectful relationships, self-respect and a greater understanding of gender equality. Our schools will provide guidance and support to students and families on request.

### **Wild Dogs, Cluster Fencing**

 **Hon. LE DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries) (2.48 pm): I am pleased to advise the House that work has started on the cluster fence to protect livestock from feral pests at Talwood, near Goondiwindi, funded through the Queensland Feral Pest Initiative. This project will see the construction of 142 kilometres of fence to enclose more than 55,000 hectares. Ultimately, four separate cluster fence projects at Talwood, Mount Carmel, Kindon and Gore will result in a combined length of 295 kilometres excluding feral pigs and wild dogs from around 103,000 hectares of agricultural land. This will be effective in conjunction with existing control programs in the area including baiting, trapping and aerial shooting.

We are doing more than any previous government to eradicate wild dogs and cats. Cluster fences can greatly benefit graziers as they can improve production by reducing predation by dogs and competition from kangaroos. They also provide conservation benefits through the control of weeds and pest animals, leading to improved pasture condition.

Talwood is one of 37 cluster-fencing projects planned under the Queensland Feral Pest Initiative, jointly financed by the Queensland and federal governments. The Talwood section has received \$384,000 from the initiative, with additional contributions being made by landholders. The Goondiwindi Regional Council is coordinating funding and construction with the Waggamba Landcare association and local landholders who are contributing for chain link wire fencing at a minimum height of 1.5 metres. Weather permitting, the fence should be complete in early November.

Predation by wild dogs costs up to \$67 million a year in livestock losses and disease spread in Queensland, so it is no wonder that this initiative is proving very popular. The Goondiwindi Regional Council rural services portfolio representative, Councillor Joan White, said, 'The future of pest control is definitely about better coordination, and this is another example of the benefits that can arise from working with your neighbours for landscape scale outcomes.'

My department spends about \$3 million each year on wild dog initiatives, including maintenance of the wild dog barrier fence and biosecurity officers who assist landholders meet their obligations through the provision of technical advice and the supply of and training in the use of 1080. Additionally, \$20 million has been allocated to support landholders in drought affected areas in Queensland through the Queensland Feral Pest Initiative. I am proud to be a member of a government that is getting on with the job of supporting Queensland's primary producers.

### Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.50 pm): I rise today to update the House on how the government is tackling the re-emergence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis. I am pleased to say that significant progress has been made. In July I announced our three-pronged strategy to tackle this insidious disease: first, we have to prevent new cases of coal workers' pneumoconiosis; second, we must identify new cases early; and, third, we must provide a safety net for those workers unfortunately affected.

Prevention is the key, including stricter dust management and the regular publication of dust levels. The Coal Mining Safety and Health Advisory Council will soon deliver to me their recommendations on new regulations to ensure respirable dust levels at coalmines are kept at a safe level. I thank the council, comprising representatives from industry, the union and the department, for their work on this. I expect that the recommendations will assist in developing a new level of transparency in the reporting of dust levels by mining companies, thus ensuring coalminers are not exposed to unsafe levels of dust and we can prevent future cases of the disease.

Also, key work has been undertaken in the early identification of the disease. All coalminers requiring respiratory health assessments will now have their chest X-rays double-checked by two medical experts. All new X-rays will be checked twice—once by an Australian radiologist and the other time by a US based accredited X-ray reader. This is an interim measure until Australian radiologists can take this on. Thirty X-rays have already been sent to the US and are due back next week. This second reading will serve to restore worker confidence while the new system is being developed. Furthermore, I am working with my colleague Minister Grace to ensure that all workers who have the disease can access workers compensation, providing them not only with a streamlined process but also with lump sum payments.

This is just some of the work being undertaken to rid our mines and miners of this disease and, where necessary, restore faith in the commitment of all parties to putting the health of our coalminers first. There is an enormous amount of work ahead, but I am confident that Queensland will soon have a world-class Coal Mine Workers' Health Scheme.

### Logan, Revitalisation

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (2.53 pm): I rise to inform the House that last week Queensland developers and representatives of the building and construction industry met with me to discuss a plan to revitalise Logan by taking a precinct-by-precinct approach to delivering more housing and revitalising communities. This morning I outlined the way forward to the Logan City Council. At both of these meetings I have articulated the opportunities to accelerate development through strategic partnerships, delivering achievable outcomes across Logan.

Our approach is to commence a real development plan for Logan which will include new public housing homes, new affordable homes and genuine community revitalisation and job-creating industry partnerships.

What we do in Logan will be a template for redevelopment and revitalisation across the state in places like Cairns, Townsville, the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast. In cities and towns across Queensland, there are neighbourhoods that offer a similar opportunity to deliver better housing for those in need and, at the same time, revitalise entire suburbs.

This decision means that in Logan and elsewhere across the state we will continue to be responsible for the delivery of essential services, including housing. This represents a rejection of the risky and untested program that was to be the largest single privatisation of public housing assets in Australia's history. This decision represents a rejection of mass privatisation. I can inform the House that our plan replaces the previous government's scheme that included a giveaway of up to half a billion dollars worth of public housing—that is right, a giveaway of half a billion dollars worth of public housing.

Further, I can inform the House in relation to local employment outcomes that the Queensland government has a longstanding arrangement with over 70 local contractors to provide \$10 million worth of maintenance a year for Logan housing. These arrangements were at risk under the previous government's scheme, which outsourced maintenance work to interstate companies.

Our Woodridge Housing Service Centre staff do a fantastic job and they deserve secure jobs, secure wages and security for their families. Over the last 18 months every member of the government has continued to help to deliver on improvements to front-line services. They have worked to support and create jobs. Our decision on housing delivers on our commitments to essential services and jobs in this state. We will make sure that, when it comes to decisions about housing and essential services for the most vulnerable, no-one will be left behind or put in the too-hard basket.

Our approach rejects an attitude—an attitude akin to locking the door and throwing away the keys. Over the last 18 months this government has delivered—and we will continue to deliver—essential services like housing, as we should and as Queenslanders expect.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the Minister for Innovation, I remind the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that she will have ample opportunity to speak on this matter if she wishes to on the next item, which will be private members' statements.

### Engaging Science Grants

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.57 pm): Earlier this year Brisbane hosted the World Science Festival, for which some of the world's most famous scientists and supporters of science graced our shores. These included renowned actor Alan Alda and American theoretical physicist and string theorist Professor Brian Greene. What was clear from the festival and all of these fantastic people was the utmost importance of communicating the value of science to the wider community. If we are to develop Queensland into a resilient and thriving economy, an economy capable of grabbing the opportunities presented by the changing global economy, then science communication is integral. It is integral to successfully persuade all our young people to look to science as a worthwhile and valuable career. It is also important as a multiplier of science literacy in the community and to keep the community informed of the great work our Queensland scientists are doing and how their efforts are beneficial to all of us.

A science literate community is vital to ensuring the success of a knowledge based economy. Recent research by the Office of the Queensland Chief Scientist showed that almost three-quarters of Queenslanders are interested in science, yet almost half believe there are not enough science events, activities and information in their area. Just last week 2,895 Queensland students set a new world record for the largest practical science lesson, and the positive reaction from the media and the public was enormous. With this in mind, I am pleased to inform the House that the Palaszczuk government is today launching a major program under the Advance Queensland innovation initiative that will help increase the reach of science in Queensland.

Our new Advance Queensland Engaging Science Grants program aims to create a Queensland population that engages in, recognises, supports and advocates for science. Grants of up to \$10,000 are available to scientists, researchers, science communicators, journalists, teachers, organisations and community groups to develop and deliver science engagement and communication projects, events and activities. I know these grants are going to increase our knowledge of the great science happening right here in Queensland and I hope that over time Queenslanders will become even more engaged in science. Applications for 2016-17 are now open and details are available on the Advance Queensland website. I look forward to updating the House on the outcomes of these grants.

## Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (3.00 pm): The Palaszczuk government is committed to keeping Queenslanders safe. It was a commitment we took to the last election. It is a commitment we are delivering on. We have achieved great outcomes for Queenslanders over the last 18 months. Let us look at some of the numbers that we have brought forward.

A total of 266 new police were delivered in 2015-16 and 2,200 body worn video cameras were rolled out across the state in addition to the 500 already in service—tested, trialled, procured and delivered. There is over \$39 million to tackle organised crime in addition to the \$3.2 million to fund Taskforce Orion. That is a great set of numbers. There is \$16.2 million to improve counterterrorism capabilities including operational equipment. This is something I am particularly proud of: we have risen above the populist myths and industry self-interest to take responsible, evidence based action on alcohol fuelled violence. Our comprehensive approach has been backed by extensive funding.

We know that effective policing needs community support and input. That is why we have introduced community policing boards in every police district across the state. They are meeting already and succeeding, generating very positive new ideas to addressing local issues in a local environment. We have reformed the Public Safety Business Agency in line with our election commitments and criticisms from opposition, backing our front-line staff to make the right decisions.

Our government has delivered for Fire and Emergency Services over the last 18 months. There is greater recognition of auxiliary firefighters through an auxiliary award, additional fuel and maintenance to support rural firefighters who are doing a great job across our state—and, again, that was very warmly received by the rural fireys—and, importantly, supporting women in the Fire Service through the implementation of the Allison review recommendations.

We are taking responsible action to manage the capacity issues in Queensland correctional centres and keep staff safe. There are legacy issues that will impact on Queensland taxpayers and communities for a generation. The Palaszczuk government has recognised and begun addressing those evident challenges. We are investing in smarter programs to reduce recidivism and re-admission and enhance capital works.

Promised, committed, delivered—that is our approach. There is more to be done and we are getting on with it. We will be working with Queenslanders to keep them safe.

## Rail Safety Week

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games) (3.03 pm): This week across Australia and New Zealand more than 45 organisations are uniting to deliver an important message as part of the annual Rail Safety Week. The railway network is a critical part of connecting our communities, allowing Queenslanders to holiday or visit family and friends or to commute to work and, of course, for tourists to see our great state and for goods to be transported.

Safety on railways is vital. Trains can travel up to 160 kilometres per hour. They cannot swerve or quickly slow to avoid people or vehicles. Overhead electrical wires have 25,000 volts and can kill in an instant. Railways deserve caution and respect. That is why this week Queensland Rail, G:link, the Department of Transport and Main Roads, TransLink and the Queensland Police Service have teamed up to raise awareness of rail safety in Queensland. All year round these agencies work tirelessly to keep our communities safe, and this week they will join forces and encourage people to take responsibility for their own actions.

Last year Queensland Rail recorded 249 near misses across the state and the reality is that every one of those near misses was avoidable. As part of Rail Safety Week, Queensland Rail has released shocking footage of people acting foolishly and dangerously around trains in an effort to remind people of the serious consequences of not being safe. Shockingly, this footage includes a young family pushing through the pedestrian gates at a level crossing and narrowly being missed by an oncoming train. This incident could have ended in tragedy.

The safety of the public, customers and staff is our No. 1 priority. People of all ages need to understand that reckless behaviour can have tragic consequences not only for the person involved but their family, friends and rail staff. Queensland Rail, QPS and TransLink will be visiting stations to speak with customers about rail safety and they will be visiting schools as well.

Queensland Rail works hard to make sure the safety message is reaching as many people as possible, but the bottom line is that people need to take responsibility for their own actions to keep themselves and others safe.

## Multicultural Month

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (3.05 pm): August is Queensland Multicultural Month and we are now more than halfway through. I am delighted to inform the House that it is already a resounding success. Formerly held over a week, this expanded event over an entire month has given many more Queenslanders the chance to experience culture, entertainment and cuisine from across the world. There are currently more than 70 events listed on the calendar including cultural festivals and fairs, exhibitions, musical performances and workshops, open days and market days.

Many of these events are supported through our Celebrating Multicultural Queensland Grants program. With this range of events on offer, there is sure to be something for everyone to enjoy. I have already greatly enjoyed attending a number of events from the massive Gold Coast Multicultural Festival, the Australian Italian Festival at Ingham—and wasn't that great?

**Mr Cripps:** Hear, hear!

**Ms GRACE:** I will take that interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. I also attended the Toowoomba Languages and Cultures Festival. I saw the new member in the House, the member for Toowoomba South, as well as the member for Toowoomba North. I know that many members have attended events in their local areas.

In the first week I hosted the Queensland Multicultural Month business lunch where more than 200 business representatives gathered to hear about the economic value of cultural diversity. I was also delighted to launch the artists of Culture Train at Brisbane's Roma Street station, who will tour regional Queensland delivering an exciting program of workshops, concerts and performances. Culture Train performers are visiting many regional areas including Murgon, Toowoomba, Warwick, Goondiwindi, Roma, Surat, Townsville, Rockhampton, Blackwater, Barcaldine, Longreach and Emerald just to mention a few.

I am also greatly looking forward to going to Logan on Saturday to celebrate the finalists and announce the winners of the 2016 Queensland Multicultural Awards at a special luncheon. The awards acknowledge community volunteers, groups, businesses, government agencies and media whose work with the multicultural community has helped all Queenslanders to participate in our economy and community.

Earlier this month I was also pleased to announce the members of the first Multicultural Queensland Advisory Council. The 11-member council will provide advice to the government on the needs and aspirations of people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and how services and programs can be responsive to these needs. The council will also play a significant role in giving Queenslanders from multicultural communities a voice in the development of policies and actions that affect them and help shape Queensland's multicultural future. I look forward to working with the council in coming weeks and months.

## LEGAL AFFAIRS AND COMMUNITY SAFETY COMMITTEE

### Office of the Information Commissioner, Reports

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (3.08 pm): As chair of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee I lay upon the table of the House two reports by the Office of the Information Commissioner: report No. 1 of 2016-17 titled *Desktop audits 2014-16: website compliance with right to information privacy—local government and hospital foundations*; and report No. 2 of 2016-17 titled *2016 Right to information and information privacy electronic audit: Queensland public sector agencies' responses and comparative analysis with 2010 and 2013 results*.

*Tabled paper:* Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 1 of 2016-17—Desktop Audits 2014-16: Website Compliance with Right to Information and Information Privacy—Local Government and Hospital Foundations [[1284](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Office of the Information Commissioner: Report No. 2 of 2016-17—2016 Right to Information and Information Privacy Electronic Audit: Queensland public sector agencies' responses and comparative analysis with 2010 and 2013 results [[1285](#)].

The committee chair is required to table these reports under the Right to Information Act 2009 and the Information Privacy Act 2009. I commend the reports to the House.

## HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE

### Report

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (3.09 pm): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 23 of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 March 2016 and 10 May 2016*. I commend the report to the House.

*Tabled paper:* Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 23—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 March 2016 and 10 May 2016 [[1286](#)].

### NOTICE OF MOTION

#### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (3.09 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for its failure to create jobs.

**Mr SPEAKER:** We will now proceed to 15 minutes of private members' statements and immediately at the conclusion we will commence question time.

### PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

#### Queensland Olympians; Bravery Awards

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.10 pm): Nothing—  
**Government members** interjected.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** We know the true style of the Labor Party: nothing excites them and that is because they do nothing, they have nothing and they know nothing, as they continue to demonstrate in this House.

Nothing quite gets the patriotic blood pumping faster than the Olympic Games. It is a great time to be not only an Australian but also, and importantly, a Queenslander. We have seen some fantastic efforts from our athletes at Rio, with Queenslanders leading the charge from Cate and Bronte Campbell, Cameron McEvoy, Mitch Larkin and Emily Seebohm, to all our swimmers who did us proud in the pool. While our swimmers normally get most of the attention, let us not forget the other superb athletes who have toiled away and trained for years to realise their dreams and to represent Australia. They too should be recognised and honoured: Kingaroy's beach volleyball player Taliqua Clancy, Ipswich's Leah Neale and Gympie's Matt Swann. Who could forget the Australian Women's Rugby Sevens team—a team packed with Queenslanders who won the sport's first ever gold medal. Members here will know my fondness for the sport of Rugby in all its iterations.

But there is one person who defines what it is to be a Queenslander, and that is Rockhampton's Anna Meares. Shortly before the Beijing Olympics Anna was involved in a horror crash and there were fears she could become a quadriplegic. Travelling at close to 70 kilometres an hour she hit the velodrome hard, hip first, then shoulder and then head. She fractured vertebrae near the base of her skull, but it was her sheer determination and willpower that saw Anna get back on the bike to realise her Olympic dream. Anna Meares has gone on to become one of Australia's most admired and respected athletes—indeed, carrying the flag for the team. I personally think that nothing could be more fitting than to name the state's newly built world-class velodrome at Chandler in her honour. The Anna Meares Velodrome certainly has a nice ring to it. Premier, I urge you to make the suggestion a reality sooner rather than later.

That brings me to those other Queenslanders, those unsung men and women who do extraordinary things in the face of adversity. Today we saw 49 Queenslanders honoured and recognised in the Australian Bravery Awards; ordinary men and women who find themselves in life-or-death situations and have no hesitation in stepping up to the plate for their fellow Queenslanders, and I congratulate those people.

Speaking of those heroes, we welcome home our Olympians on 2 September. I think a parade has been organised for Brisbane, and I look forward to being there. I urge all Queenslanders to be there. I look forward to welcoming home people like Anna Meares, who only yesterday said she is looking forward to—

*(Time expired)*

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (3.13 pm): I am pretty sure that I am not the only one on this side of the House that finds it ironic that the Leader of the Opposition gets up and talks about sporting infrastructure, because we are yet to hear a supporting statement around the Townsville stadium. We are yet to hear those opposite say anything which mimics a supporting statement for the Townsville stadium, but I am very happy to talk about sporting infrastructure.

**A government member:** Rugby Sevens! We can play Rugby Sevens up there!

**Ms TRAD:** Yes, Rugby Sevens, absolutely; the Invictus Games, absolutely! I am very happy to talk about sporting infrastructure. I am happy to talk about all sorts of infrastructure that we are delivering as the Palaszczuk Labor government.

This year alone we are investing more than \$10.7 billion in terms of capital works, supporting more than 31,000 jobs, and over the next four years it will be more than \$40 billion. Major projects are being delivered right now such as: Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2; Toowoomba Second Range Crossing; Gateway Upgrade North; the upgrade of Peak Downs Highway, Eton Range; and the Bruce Highway upgrade from Cooroy to Curra. Almost \$4.4 billion, or 46 per cent, is being spent outside the South-East Queensland corner, and over the next four years our new \$2 billion State Infrastructure Fund will continue to drive economic growth and jobs right across Queensland.

We are already seeing results through vital transport projects that are funded through the State Infrastructure Fund. They are reaching some very important milestones, and I can report them to the House: for example, work began in July on the \$22 million Sunshine Coast University Hospital intersection upgrade at Kawana Way and Nicklin Way. This project is supporting 43 jobs and will be completed by mid-2017. Both the \$400 million Ipswich Motorway and the \$40 million Dawson Highway Gladstone to Biloela timber bridge replacement program are underway, and we will announce the procurement commencement later on this year. Work is underway on the Bill Fulton Bridge duplication, and I think an announcement will be around the corner soon. The \$6.6 million Townsville Hospital paediatric ward project commenced procurement for construction in July and will support 24 jobs. The \$30 million Riverway Drive duplication in Townsville and the \$10 million Rockhampton Road Train Access Stage 1 are expected to begin construction later on next year.

On this side of the House we are getting on with the job of delivering infrastructure and driving job generation right throughout Queensland—particularly in regional Queensland—while those opposite have no idea; no plan for this state.

### Logan Renewal Initiative

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (3.16 pm): One thing is for sure: in relation to delivering infrastructure, the people of Logan would challenge those statements. I rise to highlight the dangerous policy platform of the current Minister for Public Works and the Premier. After two years of ducking and weaving on any policy development, we have seen a devastating announcement for the people of Logan. There is no infrastructure development for those hardworking, long-suffering people of the Logan community. What we have seen over the last week is that it could be another six years before anything happens in Logan, with more renewals, more reviews and more dithering. We have seen a commitment of \$17 million for 70 new-build social housing over the next three years. The tenants of Logan are rightly tired of broken promises. The local contracting community is ready to go and will now lose out as a result of the termination of this project.

Many important stakeholders, including the council and tenants, were not consulted prior to the minister's announcement of the termination of the project. Only suitable precinct based areas in Logan would be renewed by large development companies, which are unlikely to be based in Logan. The Logan Renewal Initiative was a comprehensive renewable program across the entire DHPW portfolio of social housing stock in Logan. The new precinct based plan likely means those areas that are not near railway stations or medium-density land areas will not be financially feasible to be renewed without the integrated model of the Logan Renewal Initiative. Large areas of Logan will be left to languish. This is a policy platform of this Labor government.

Rejecting \$300 million in federal Commonwealth Rent Assistance is a staggeringly incompetent financial management decision that is difficult to believe. The Logan Renewal Initiative should be reinstated in Logan to ensure the benefits are delivered now; not after several more years of waiting and wondering what this government is up to. I welcome the chamber, who could take a lead role with the council. Of course, they do not even know what the minister's platform is on this issue.

There is consensus amongst housing and homelessness services that this government's centric approach to the provision of social housing is unsustainable, as we have known for over a decade. In a desperate tactic over the weekend, it was clearly inappropriate to describe the Cornerstone Living project as a public-private partnership and the Logan Renewal Initiative as privatisation. It was clearly misleading and clearly disingenuous to those people of the Logan area.

Privatisation versus public-private partnerships is an important issue. It is clear that this minister is lacking the innovation or the desire to do things differently to deal with the crisis of public housing shortage. Involving the private sector must be a key component of any long-term solution. This government has forgotten about the people of Logan and Queensland, ignoring the many demographics that rely on complete housing solutions and wraparound support. It appears that the government lacks the vision to provide new directions for social housing or dependency for the people of Queensland. More importantly, a number of people continue to engage with this side of the House about the clear neglect of the Labor government.

### Advance Queensland

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algerst—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (3.20 pm): It is ironic to hear those opposite talk about consultation. I do not think that was part of their foundation in any way whatsoever. I rise to talk about the Advance Queensland initiative, which is delivering for Queenslanders now while ensuring future generations of Queenslanders can aspire to the same quality of life we enjoy today.

The massive changes we are seeing in the global economy mean that we have to be prepared to respond to disruption, meet different challenges and make the most of the opportunities presented by the new economy. The Advance Queensland initiative is about putting in place the economic framework to deliver benefits to existing industries and businesses while also preparing our state for the industries of the future. Grants and partnerships entered into through Advance Queensland have so far directly created or will directly create nearly 450 long-term sustainable jobs—121 now and a further 327 in the years to come. This investment has also attracted global companies such as Johnson & Johnson, Siemens, Emory and Boeing to set up or expand their operations in Queensland.

The job numbers I have outlined today are just the beginning. Advance Queensland has been co-designed with stakeholders—that is called consultation—from the business, start-up and research communities and based on international evidence of what has worked overseas. International programs similar to those running under the Advance Queensland initiative have shown strong long-term results. For example, in the United States, companies that participated in the Small Business Innovation Research program—a program I launched last month—generated five times as many new jobs as non-SBIR funded companies over a 10-year period. In the UK, the Knowledge Transfer Partnerships program—a program we launched earlier this year that has already seen 22 Queensland businesses employ a researcher to work on their innovative idea, with more soon to be announced—has generated returns to the economy eight times greater than the initial government investment. Just as importantly, a range of indirect jobs will continue to be created from this investment as new businesses, products and services and industries are established and grow.

We do not know where the next big idea is coming from. Just look at two of the biggest global companies: Google was created in a garage and Facebook in a college dorm. As this new industrial revolution continues to gather pace, we have to provide Queensland entrepreneurs with the opportunity to pursue their ideas, wherever that may take them. That is exactly what the Palaszczuk government is doing through our Advance Queensland initiative.

If we compare this with the performance of the former government we see that their investment in innovation, science and job creation amounted to only \$7.224 million in the whole three years, creating 41.4 jobs. We have invested four times as much in the first year of AQ but have already created 10 times as many jobs.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Mount Ommaney, I warn you under standing order 253A for your continual disorderly interjections. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

### Logan Renewal Initiative

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (3.23 pm): Of all the diabolical decisions this government has made over the past 18 months—there have been many—nothing comes close to the dumping of the Logan Renewal Initiative. The decision by the housing minister has to be the most retrograde, most negative and dumbest decision a state government can make. It has been made by a minister who is quickly gaining a reputation as the most arrogant in cabinet.

Let us be clear about the Logan Renewal Initiative and talk about the facts. The Logan Renewal Initiative was not about selling public housing. This minister continues to mislead the public about it. The Logan Renewal Initiative was an urban renewal project—a project that went over 20 years that would deliver great outcomes for the people of Logan, particularly social housing tenants. The project was going to invest \$800 million into Logan. It was going to replace a thousand outdated public housing properties with 2,600 additional properties, 1,600 of those being social and affordable housing.

The Logan Renewal Initiative was going to reduce the density of social housing to ease some of the social issues that have occurred in Logan and the surrounding areas. It was also going to provide the wraparound services that our most vulnerable need to help maintain their tenancies. It was also going to generate millions of dollars of work for local building contractors, for tradies and for service providers.

This project had the support of the Logan City Council, the service providers, the tenants and the government staff who would not lose their jobs. What is this minister's grand plan to replace the Logan Renewal Initiative? His grand plan is a \$17 million project to provide 70—that is it—public housing properties. We have 1,100 households on the public housing waiting list, yet he is going to provide 70 houses. What is he going to tell the thousand other households about where they are going to live over the next 20 years?

This is a minister who does not listen, who does not consult, who did not notify and who has still not explained. This morning he went to the Logan council. He treats them with contempt and does not provide an explanation. He does not recognise the investment. It is a facade. This whole government is an impostor.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** Question time will finish at 4.26 pm.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

### Logan Renewal Initiative



**Mr NICHOLLS** (3.26 pm): My first question is to the Premier. I table a letter from Aunty Betty McGrady, the tenant champion for the Logan regional area social housing tenants, imploring the Premier and the government to reinstate the Logan Renewal Initiative immediately.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 16 August 2016, from Aunty Betty McGrady regarding cancellation of the Logan Renewal Initiative [1287].

Will the Premier overturn what Aunty Betty describes as a dreadfully bad decision?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I will get to the fundamentals of the question, but first I table for the benefit of the House a document outlining that on 1 August the Minister for the Commonwealth Games and I visited the new velodrome and talked about naming the velodrome after Anna Meares.

*Tabled paper:* Article from *Quest Newspapers* online, dated 1 August 2016, titled 'Commonwealth Games' Queensland State Velodrome project a month from completion' [1288].

I table that in case the Leader of the Opposition is interested in keeping up. He was not just asleep during that time; he was in hibernation.

Today some issues have been raised about Logan social housing. I make it very clear to members of this House that my government values social housing in this state. We also value our tenants, unlike those opposite when they were in office. People need to hear the facts of the story. Those opposite wanted people to share their social housing. Do members remember that? Do they remember the fear they drove into pensioners and seniors? They wanted them to make them share their family home with strangers. That is their track record.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Premier, one moment. Leader of the Opposition, you have asked the question. Premier, I ask you to answer the question and stay relevant.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** And I am looking forward to answering the question because, not only that, you could not even take a holiday if you lived in social housing! You were treated as a second-class citizen under the LNP. You were treated as a second-class citizen.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members! I cannot even hear the Premier even though she is very close.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I represent an area that largely consists of social housing, as do a lot of members on this side of the House. The question asks about the Logan renewal project. When we looked at that in more detail, what the LNP wanted to do was flawed. It was flawed, it was not thought out and it was a debacle. It was an absolute debacle and it took this Minister for Housing to fix up the mess of those opposite. It was a debacle! It was a shambles!

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order, members! Pause the clock. Member for Everton, if you persist, you will be warned. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have already mentioned you this morning. If you persist, you certainly will be warned, and I will be giving no more preliminary warnings to anyone.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you. The other thing those opposite did for social housing was they axed the garden awards for social housing tenants. The LNP's plan to hand over the keys to \$2.5 billion worth of housing in Logan to private management was risky and untested. The policy was simply to throw away the keys to public housing, and Queenslanders have a right to know if this is still their plan, because what we do know is that it was flawed, it was untested and it would have been the largest scale of this kind of transfer sell-off in Australia's history. My government was not going to put at risk those social housing dwellings and those social housing tenants, because my government will stand up for social housing tenants every single day of the week. Unlike those opposite, you can put our track record against their track record and I will tell you what Queenslanders will say: they do not want any more of that!

*(Time expired)*

### Logan Renewal Initiative

**Mr NICHOLLS:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and I again refer to the letter I have tabled from Aunty Betty McGrady and the statement that no consultation has occurred with social housing tenants in Logan before or since the minister's announcement to cancel the project, and I ask: Minister, why were vulnerable Queenslanders like Aunty Betty not consulted prior to this dreadfully bad decision?

**Mr de BRENNI:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. In fact, there was nil consultation with public housing tenants in Logan before the deal was signed. Let me talk about the deal that was signed without consultation with public housing tenants—

**Mr Bleijie:** Talk about Aunty Betty.

**Mr de BRENNI:**—including Aunty Betty.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

**Mr de BRENNI:** The previous government signed up without consultation to a risky and unprecedented scheme to privatise public housing in Logan. The detail—

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, the question was quite clearly in relation to the consultation by the minister before or after the cancellation of the scheme. My point of order is in relation to relevance and answering the question.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you. I would ask the minister to make sure that your answer is relevant to the question.

**Mr de BRENNI:** Earlier this year I reported to the House of my intention to develop a new 10-year housing strategy for all Queenslanders, including those who live in public housing. When I visited places across this state and sat down with public housing tenants in their homes they told me how important it was for them to be able to rely on the Queensland government to put a roof over their heads. That was the basis on which we made this decision. That was the basis on which we decided that this government would continue to be responsible for the delivery of an essential service in this state. We were not prepared to countenance the previous government's scheme. I have heard those opposite talk about expenses in their scheme. Their proposal was to sign this government up to give away 4,900 public housing dwellings and hand over for free up to \$500 million worth, and it gets worse: the plan was to replicate this 10 times across the state—\$5 billion worth of public housing assets given away!

In the case of Logan, I have heard those opposite talk about job creation. This government, as I mentioned in my ministerial statement, has had a longstanding relationship—

**Ms Simpson** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Maroochydore, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

**Mr de BRENNI:** As I was saying, this government has a longstanding relationship with maintenance contractors in Logan that employ people on real jobs and real wages, and those arrangements will continue.

### **Northern Oil, Advanced Biofuels Pilot Plant**

**Mr BUTCHER:** My question is directed to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's announcement about the agreement on biofuels with the US Navy today, and I ask: what is the progress being made on the Northern Oil advanced biofuels pilot plant in Gladstone?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Gladstone for the question and I know how much he supports that historic signing of the agreement between the government and the US Navy because of what it means for Gladstone and regional economies up and down the state. I have advised the House in the past that Southern Oil has been poached from New South Wales and is now operating in Queensland. Today I can also advise the House that it wants to change its name to Northern Oil. It moved from down south to up here and it wants to effect a name change so it can fit better into Queensland. I can also advise the House that the Minister for Environment has confirmed a comprehensive environmental authority for the Northern Oil advanced pilot plant in Gladstone has now been approved. With an investment of \$16 million, this pilot plant aims to produce one million litres of fuel for use in field trials by the US Navy and the Royal Australian Navy. It will also supply other customers in the road transport industry and the aviation sector. It is happening. It has moved here. The environmental authority has been ticked off and work can begin.

Once the biofuel is accepted by the US Navy and our own Navy, it is envisaged that this will open the door for the pilot plant to be followed by a \$150 million commercial scale biofuel refinery which could produce up to 200 million litres of advanced biofuels every year. In the case of Northern Oil, the company will make use of waste from sugar cane, green organic waste from regional cities, woody weeds like prickly acacia and other wastes such as tyres from the mining sector, heavy transport and passenger vehicles. If the Northern Oil advanced biofuels pilot plant succeeds in its plan to establish a full commercial scale biofuels refinery at Gladstone, the benefits will not be limited to that city, and that is the exciting part of this announcement. When we went up there and visited—the Minister for State Development and the member for Gladstone came as well—Northern Oil identified 12 other regional spots across Queensland that could benefit from biofuels and the 12 areas include Mount Isa, Hughenden, Cairns, Tully, Ingham, Townsville, Ayr, Mackay, Clermont, Rockhampton, Bundaberg and Toowoomba. As members can see, this is an industry that would have a huge and lasting impact across regional Queensland. I want to join with all members of my government in thanking the US Navy for coming here today. It is indeed a deep honour to have the Deputy Under Secretary fly out from the Pentagon to be with us and he has advised me that he intends to return—

*(Time expired)*

### **Minister for Housing and Public Works**

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. Today the minister told a Logan housing initiative open forum that he does not need to explain the decisions of government to anyone and refused to do so. How does this meet the charter letter requirements to ensure integrity, accountability and consultation to underpin everything the minister does?

**Mr de BRENNI:** I thank the member for the question. The charter letter that the Premier gave me also clearly outlined my responsibility to deliver housing to those most in need in Queensland. That is a priority of this government. The expectations the Premier also had of me and everyone else on this side of the House was to protect jobs. There are 40 state government employees who work at the Woodridge Housing Service Centre. Under arrangements agreed to by the former government, staff who did not want to go to work in the private sector would have lost their jobs. There would have been more job cuts. The legacy of that government would have been job cuts after they were in government. That is what they thought of people.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, you will be warned if you continue with your repetitive interjections. I do not want to do that, but I would urge you not to persist with your behaviour.

**Mr de BRENNI:** It has been my responsibility to lead an intensive communications strategy with the community of Logan since the decision was made by this government. We have notified all key stakeholders, including the Logan City Council. In fact, the mayor of the Logan City Council was the first person who we made a call to to advise of our decision. We then called the Logan City of Choice leadership team. I contacted members of parliament who represent the area of Logan. I contacted the Logan Chamber of Commerce, other state and federal government agencies and local community housing providers. Overall, those conversations, including the ones this morning, were positive.

### Major Events

**Mr FURNER:** My question is to the Premier. What benefits are major events delivering for businesses across Queensland?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Ferny Grove for that very important question, because my government is firmly focused on securing not just national events but international events to Queensland because we know that, if we attract those events to our shores, to our regional cities, it means jobs—jobs for the tourism industry, jobs for small business and jobs for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

I want to thank the minister, Kate Jones, and also the Treasurer for working extremely hard over the past 18 months to secure a number of significant events to our shores. I want to run through some of those with the members of this House today and share with them the good news for Queensland. In terms of major events, the government has secured the Brisbane Global Rugby Tens from 2017 to 2020; the Rugby League World Cup pool games in Cairns and Townsville, a semifinal and then a final in Brisbane in 2017; the ITU World Triathlon Series grand final and age group world championships on the Gold Coast in 2018; the World Bowls championships on the Gold Coast in 2020; and the World Science Festival from 2016 to 2018 in Brisbane—and, of course, everyone knows that when we had it this year it was the first time that the World Science Festival had been held outside of New York. Brisbane secured that from the rest of the world. In addition, TEQ has renewed a number of key events over the past 18 months, including the Australian Festival of Chamber Music in Townsville from 2015 to 2017. Of course, who does not love the V8 supercars, with the Castrol Gold Coast 600 and the Castrol EDGE Townsville 400 from 2015 to 2019!

We also know that everyone has been glued to their sets watching the Rio Olympics. Of course, we have our own games coming up very shortly and that is the Commonwealth Games. Those games will deliver for Queensland 6,600 athletes and team officials, 15,000 friendly volunteers, 71 nations and territories, 18 sports and seven parasports, 18 world-class competition venues and a television audience of 1.5 billion. The games will be hosted on the Gold Coast with events in Brisbane, Townsville and Cairns and will deliver an estimated \$2 billion economic injection into the local economy and generate up to 30,000 full-time jobs.

Finally, I advise the House that the Minister for the Commonwealth Games, the Minister for Tourism, Kate Jones, and I were able to announce that officials of the Invictus Games have been out here in Queensland scouting around the Gold Coast. From all reports I have been advised that they have been very impressed. We are going to battle New South Wales in this state of origin to get the Invictus Games here in Queensland.

*(Time expired)*

### Logan Renewal Initiative

**Mr BENNETT:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. I refer the minister to the tabled letter from Auntie Betty where she says that the Queensland government has been condescending and disingenuous in relation to the Logan Renewal Initiative. I ask: does the minister agree with Auntie Betty that he has been condescending and disingenuous?

**Mr de BRENNI:** I remind those opposite that the portfolio is Housing and Public Works. They seem to put the 'Housing' last time and time again.

**Mr Bennett:** Thanks for the lesson.

**Mr de BRENNI:** I will give the member some more lessons. Quite simply, the answer to the question is that we have the highest respect for every individual living in public housing in Queensland. That is in stark contrast to those opposite. I am more than happy to sit down and have a conversation with any tenant of ours at any time.

### North Queensland City Deal

**Mr STEWART:** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier please advise how North Queensland can benefit from a North Queensland City Deal?

**Ms TRAD:** I thank the member for Townsville for the question. I know that he is a very strong advocate for the Townsville community and the North Queensland region as well. The Palaszczuk government is making big investments in Townsville that will help turbocharge the region. These include projects like the North Queensland stadium, which those opposite have yet to support. It includes a Townsville waterfront priority development area, the Townsville paediatric ward upgrade, the Riverway Drive duplication and seven accelerated works projects to drive local jobs. All up, about \$586 million is being expended in this financial year on infrastructure for the North Queensland region. That will go into supporting about 1,500 jobs.

Finally, we have seen the Turnbull government, after much lobbying from the Premier personally and from this side of the House, wake up to the needs of North Queensland and sign up \$100 million to help fund the North Queensland stadium.

**Ms Jones:** Still didn't help them in Herbert.

**Ms TRAD:** I take that interjection from the Minister for Education. It still could not save Herbert for them. I am glad that the Turnbull government has put \$100 million on the table for the North Queensland stadium, but it has said that it needs to be part of a City Deal for Townsville. We are very happy to, in fact, engage with the federal government over a City Deal plan for Townsville, because we have already indicated that we are doing work around City Deal policies for Queensland.

We know that a City Deal can be an excellent framework to progress the planning and prioritisation of key infrastructure projects for a city, for a region, across all three levels of government. We are very happy to engage with the federal government on that and, can I say, with the mayor, Jenny Hill, who is one of the best mayors that Queensland has.

This is how government should work. I am proud that Queensland is a national frontrunner in developing City Deals at this level. We know that it will drive cooperation and we know that it will ensure that we can put on the table all of those projects that are critical, such as the Townsville eastern access rail corridor, which I know my colleague the Minister for Transport is endeavouring to secure funding from the federal government to continue to drive. We will make sure that those commitments that the Turnbull government made at the last federal election are included in any discussions around a City Deal for Townsville, because we know how important those commitments are to the people of Townsville, particularly in relation to growing jobs in that region.

### Logan Renewal Initiative

**Mr EMERSON:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. How much of taxpayers' money has ripping up the Logan Renewal Initiative contracts cost Queenslanders?

**Mr de BRENNI:** I thank the member for the question. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about the cost of the housing arrangements in Logan. I mentioned in my previous answer what it would have cost. It would have cost this government \$2 million a year to manage a privatised arrangement, up to \$500 million of taxpayer's property given away—not sold, given away.

**Mr EMERSON:** I rise to a point of order. My question was very specific. It was about the contracts that the minister has ripped up and how much has that cost Queenslanders.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I call the minister.

**Mr de BRENNI:** As I said, the decisions that we have arrived at will save Queenslanders \$40 million in administrative costs over 20 years, they will retain \$500 million worth of public housing assets in public hands and they will retain management and tenancy responsibility of 4,900 homes. There were going to be up to 45 Queensland government employees who would have lost their job and if this escalated across the state, as the member for Everton had intended, 720 employees of the state government would have lost their jobs. Instead, what we will do with those savings is continue on our record of delivering for Queenslanders. We will divert that money into restoring services like the tenant's advisory service that those opposite cut, leaving Queensland as the only state without an independent advisory service.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister, I think you have answered the question.

## Budget

**Mr KING:** My question is to the Treasurer. I refer to statements in this House and elsewhere in which the Leader of the Opposition specifically rejected a number of revenue initiatives implemented under the government's whole-of-balance-sheet approach to the state budget, and I ask: will the Treasurer explain the funding implications of the Leader of the Opposition's stated position?

**Mr PITT:** I thank the honourable member for his question. We heard a bit earlier the Leader of the Opposition talking about the Olympic Games. If there was a gold medal for spreading doom, gloom and negativity the member for Clayfield certainly would have been up on the dais. If members read the *Brisbane Times* today there is some very disturbing commentary there, but particularly the line where the Leader of the Opposition says that the government is broke in Queensland. We heard Steve Ciobo, the federal Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment say a similar line which was very irresponsible. To hear the former treasurer of this state say that is absolutely disgraceful. It is irresponsible, it is reckless and it is also lazy. The Leader of the Opposition sat next to Campbell Newman when Campbell Newman was saying ridiculous things about Queensland, like having a power dive into the abyss and saying that we were the Spain of the Australian states. He was obviously then and is now too lazy to read the budget papers.

The 2016-17 forecast is a surplus of \$867 million and a cumulative surplus of \$3.2 billion over the next four years. Of course, the two state budgets that we have delivered have delivered an economic plan for Queensland which talks about investment in job-creating innovation and infrastructure—\$40 billion worth of infrastructure over the next four years. It is very important to talk about the difference between our government and the previous government. Our government is paying down \$10.4 billion worth of general government sector debt. It is that much lower than it would have been under the LNP. Those opposite like to talk about gross debt. Let us use their preferred measure. If we use that, the 2016-17 gross non-financial public sector debt is almost \$6 billion lower than it was forecast to be under the LNP. That is on their preferred measure. That is on page 63 if the Leader of the Opposition would care to take a look and read the budget papers.

By contrast, their budgets are all about slash and burn; so much so that they actually cut deeply into the economy. We saw growth slow to .8 per cent in 2014-15. That is very, very damning in terms of his time as Treasurer. Under his watch that is a disgraceful record. With his comments today talking about the state being broke, this is not somebody who could have been trusted to deliver better budgets than we saw under him. He cannot be trusted to be a Premier of this state. It is very concerning because that is an irresponsible comment to make.

It has been nearly two months since he said that he was going to be telling us his position in due course about asset sales. As I said yesterday and I will continue to say: it is not that hard. He either is for it or he is against it. He spent three years telling everyone it was the strongest and smartest choice. If he still believes that he should tell us. Growth is higher and debt is lower under Labor than it was under the LNP.

## Public Housing

**Mr MANDER:** My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works. With so much uncertainty about the future of public housing in Logan, can the minister explain why he is having closed-door meetings with property developers to discuss the sale of government land rather than meeting with social housing tenants like Auntie Betty?

**Mr de BRENNI:** I thank the member for Everton. It strikes me as curious that the member for Everton and minister at the time did little to jump to the defence of the people of Logan when the then premier Campbell Newman stood in this place and referred to the people of Logan as bogans. Where was your concern then, member for Everton?

Let me explain to the House why we last week had a meeting with developers to consider the revitalisation and renewal of Logan. We have a plan for Logan that will see revitalisation in partnership with those developers in neighbourhoods and we will do it over a shorter period of time, not over 20 years. The previous government used Logan as a test case for one of the riskiest privatisation of public housing schemes in history. Why we met with developers last week and why we met with the Logan City Council this week and why we will meet with the building and construction industry, our maintenance partners, in weeks to come, and why we will continue to meet with stakeholders and why we will continue to listen to tenants is because our plans are based on partnership models that are tried and tested and proven to work to deliver a mix of modern social housing, private housing and affordable housing. What is important is that there are many people in our community who need a roof over their

head. There are many people in our community who need to rely on public housing. There are people in our community who have told us very clearly that they would like to see our government take steps to address affordable housing and our 10-Year Housing Strategy will do that.

At these meetings, on the agenda was opportunities to accelerate development through strategic partnerships delivering achievable outcomes—not fantasy outcomes, not mass privatisation and not giveaways of publicly owned assets. The important thing is that in cities and towns across this state that I have visited, from places like Roma to Mount Isa to Charters Towers to Townsville and Cairns, there are neighbourhoods that offer a very, very similar opportunity to deliver better housing outcomes for those in need and at the same time revitalise those suburbs while at the same time provide construction work opportunities for that sector. What we do in Logan will be a template for redevelopment across this state. Our next steps will involve a market sounding exercise which I expect to see completed soon. Let us not forget that the decision of the previous government in relation to public housing tenants in Logan and across this state was to slam the door shut and throw away the keys.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Burleigh and member for Burnett, you are both warned under standing order 253A for your continual interjections. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

### **Barrett Adolescent Centre**

**Mr KELLY:** My question is of the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services. Will the minister advise the House on progress in implementing the recommendations of the Barrett Adolescent Centre Commission of Inquiry and any alternative approaches?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Greenslopes for his question. As I said yesterday, we are proceeding with the planning stage of the new extended treatment facility for young Queenslanders living with severe and persistent mental illness. We are consulting those families who were affected by the closure of the centre. I am advised they are having a meeting today with the department. I want to assure the House that we will keep them involved. At least some of the planning already exists because prior to 2012 the then Labor government prepared a costed and funded plan to build a new facility at Redlands to replace the Barrett centre. That is what the commission of inquiry concluded. As the commission of inquiry concluded, there were some obstacles to building a new facility at Redlands but these were not insurmountable. To quote from the commission report at page 49—

There is little doubt that drainage, koalas and other incidental environmental issues were obstacles impeding or delaying the Redlands project. But there is no evidence that they could not be resolved.

There were some issues but, as the inquiry has noted, nothing that could not be resolved. However, what happened when those opposite came into government? The cost-cutter-in-chief for Campbell Newman, the then treasurer and member for Clayfield, required between \$100 million and \$120 million in savings from Queensland Health. The commission found that ultimately it was the minister at the time, the member for Southern Downs, who made the decision to cut the funding for the Redlands project without any consultation with mental health experts or considering the long-term implications. Most damningly, at page 92 the commission concluded that neither the minister at the time nor any other person—nor any other member, one can infer—of that government accepted responsibility for the decision to cancel the replacement facility.

**Mr Springborg** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** They are in denial. I hear the interjections from the member for Southern Downs. They were in denial then and they are in denial now. That state of denial continues, which is evident in an email that my office received this month. In that email, a member of this House asked me—

Please can the Minister advise what residential options are available for children or young people on the Sunshine Coast who are battling with severe depression and in need of treatment in a residential mental health care facility.

I am sorry to inform the member for Maroochydore, who was a member of that government, that there is no facility in Queensland that meets that description. Why? Because the government of which she was a part, the Newman and Nicholls government, closed the Barrett centre without any replacement. I table a copy of that redacted email.

*Tabled paper:* Email [redacted], dated 4 August 2016, from the member for Maroochydore, Ms Fiona Simpson MP, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding residential mental healthcare facilities for children or young people on the Sunshine Coast [[1289](#)].

I see that those members opposite are still in denial. They are in denial about the actions that they took in government and the very severe and extreme consequences that followed their actions. There is still no apology from the Treasurer who demanded those savings and still no apology from the member for Southern Downs. However, to ask where the replacement is now, even for them, is a very low—

*(Time expired)*

### Moreton Bay Rail Link

**Mr POWELL:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games. I table a Queensland Rail briefing note dated 15 May 2016.

*Tabled paper:* Briefing note from Queensland Rail to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, regarding Moreton Bay Rail Link signalling [1290].

I refer to the briefing note and the contract with Ansaldo STS, which requires the new signalling system to interface with the ETCS. I ask: what is the minister doing to protect taxpayers and enforce the contract with Ansaldo STS?

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I thank the member for the question. The Moreton Bay Rail Link is a vital piece of transport and economic infrastructure for the growing Moreton Bay region. It consists of a 12.6 kilometre dual track passenger rail line between Petrie and Kippa Ring and includes six new rail stations, at Kallangur, Murrumba Downs, Mango Hill, Mango Hill East, Rothwell and Kippa Ring. As the member is very well aware, in May I announced that further work was needed to be completed prior to the commissioning of the new rail line, due to advice I received from QR regarding the signalling system.

The member's question goes to the very heart of what will be occurring into the future with the replacement and how we will deal with the shortcomings of the signalling system that was installed by the contractors under the arrangement with Ansaldo. It was important to get to the heart of and understand the reasons behind the decision making process and the decisions that were made that resulted in the installation of what has turned out to be an inferior product that would not provide integration with our universal train control system across the rest of the Queensland Rail network in South-East Queensland. That system had been installed. It was discovered and identified, as has since been confirmed by independent audit, that it would fail to deliver the 26 signalling instances that would need to occur at one given time, but would only deliver 15. As a consequence, it was identified that the system would not deliver the level of safety and reliability that we expect and that we want to see on this fantastic piece of infrastructure that will deliver for the people of the Moreton Bay region and the people of Queensland.

The member's question comes to the issue of ensuring that we do not lose out for Queenslanders as a result of the error that has been made. That is a very key part of the ongoing consideration of the independent audit that was received by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and is being further considered by the Department of Transport and Main Roads and QR, to ensure that we get the best possible outcome into the future. That clearly involves some commercial issues that need to be dealt with on the basis of negotiation with the contract delivery agent. That is why I look forward to ensuring that the independent audit—

*(Time expired)*

### Biofuels Industry

**Mr PEARCE:** My question is to the Minister for State Development. Will the minister update the House on plans to diversify the Queensland economy and create jobs through the development of a biofuels industry?

**Dr LYNHAM:** I thank the member for Mirani for his question. I well recall the day we toured the Sarina bioethanol plant. The member for Mackay was with us that day, as well. We witnessed what a great future there is for that region and, indeed, what a great future there is for all of Queensland as we move towards the renewable future that we all dream of. The future for Queensland is bright in this area. There is great news for Queensland as we move towards a renewable future, while also diversifying our economy.

What a great moment it was today to see the Premier and the United States Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Management, Mr Thomas Hicks, sign a statement of cooperation as part of the green fleet initiative, which is a commitment to source 50 per cent of fuel for that navy in Australia by 2020. That is a great commitment and a great initiative. It gives a huge vote of confidence to the people of Queensland, especially the people of Central Queensland and North Queensland. This morning in the Premier's Hall, and it was a packed Premier's Hall, Mr Hicks and I were joined by leading

people from industry and people interested in joining with the state in our biofuture. We were joined by representatives from universities such as the University of Queensland, QUT and the James Cook University, which are all participating as we move forward in this direction.

This government is committed to the industrial biotechnology and bioproduct sector, which has the potential to be the engine room of the state's economy. That is why we are investing \$20 million to stimulate key areas and to work with people in industry and our universities through the 10-year biofutures road map. In Queensland we already have three biorefinery plants. Let us not underestimate the Northern Oil Refinery. As the Premier mentioned in her statement, that \$16 million pilot plant has the potential to grow to a \$150 million plant and produce litres upon litres of renewable fuel for our state. Congratulations to the Minister for the Environment for granting the environmental approval that will see that realised. This government stands committed to this sector, which is providing a major opportunity to position Queensland as an industrial biotech hub for the entire Asia-Pacific region. We are telling the world that Queensland is open for business.

### **Ice, Safety of Police Officers**

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services. The ice epidemic continues to impact rural and remote communities. Will the minister detail what action is being taken to ensure the safety and security of police officers stationed at rural and remote stations?

**Mr BYRNE:** I thank the member for the question. As I have revealed earlier in my ministerial statement, members can see the measures we are rolling out across the state, including video cameras, better technology and better support systems. They are designed to protect police officers and first responders more broadly in a whole variety of circumstances that they confront on a daily basis. All members have to do is look at the operational summaries every day to see what Queensland police officers in particular are dealing with and the types of events that occur in our communities every single day. I am highly sensitised to that issue. We are always looking at better protective arrangements and better circumstances for those officers.

The point the member raises about ice is an extremely relevant one. Some of the raw data is, for example, that there has been a 30 per cent increase in criminal activity associated with drugs over the last five years. I do not think there would be a member of this House who is not aware that there is a drug problem, particularly with ice, across every jurisdiction—every state or territory—in this country. It is a matter of grave concern to me.

Ice addicts having unusually psychotic episodes, which are the ones that hit the papers, are the ones that tend to end up in the criminal justice system. We know—and these figures are off the top of my head—that 50 per cent of prisoners who go into the system have been intravenous drug users, for example. Some 70 per cent of those have used drugs intravenously—not via smoking, ingestion or other forms—in the month prior to going into the corrections process.

The interface of the Queensland Police Service and other first responders with people suffering the effects of ice is a matter of fact. I think we struggle more broadly because the ice penetration across our communities is not restricted exclusively to those in lower socio-economic areas. What the member is seeing and what is already reported across other parts of Queensland is that ice is spreading its influence. It is a known fact that it is spreading its influence across regional and remote Queensland.

I do know that the Police Service is spending an enormous amount of time and effort identifying and eliminating those networks where they materialise. It would be ludicrous for me to stand in front of this House and suggest that we are going to arrest ourselves out of the issues associated with drug addiction and the spread of drug use across other communities.

It is a fact. It is in my community. It is in most communities across Queensland. The Queensland Police Service are very attentive to it and place an enormous amount of effort on the organised crime component of it particularly. If you want to look at other symptoms have a look at the drug—

*(Time expired)*

### **Biofuels and Biomanufacturing Industries**

**Mr SAUNDERS:** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Water Supply. Will the minister please provide an update on the Palaszczuk government's progress in growing Queensland's biofuels and biomanufacturing industries?

**Mr BAILEY:** I thank the honourable member for Maryborough for his question and for his interest in jobs and job creation in Queensland. I acknowledge the member for Maryborough's interest in regional jobs growth. He is a strong advocate for Maryborough and the whole of Central Queensland.

Biofuels are certainly a great opportunity for this state. Queensland biofuels can power our vehicles, diversify our fuel mix and reduce emissions. The availability of agricultural by-product biomass in our regions provides ready fuel for biorefining industries, opportunities and jobs for Queensland. By supporting the use of biofuels we have an opportunity to drive growth in our regional areas and add value to the state's abundant agricultural resources. I note that it is a great growth industry in many parts of the world economy at the moment.

I was in the United States just last week following up the Premier's earlier visit to maximise opportunities in the area of biofuels. I met with companies like Red Rock Biofuels in Denver to further promote Queensland's credentials as a destination for biorefineries and as a US Navy refuelling location—becoming a reality today with the memorandum of understanding and the statement of cooperation signed by the Premier and the US Navy. It is a great day for Queensland and Queensland opportunities. Red Rock Biofuels is progressing through a competitive tender process with Virgin and Air New Zealand to supply 200 million litres of locally produced renewable jet fuel. I was encouraged by their enthusiasm about the potential for the development of a biorefinery right here in Queensland.

I also met with Renewable Biofuels in Texas, touring the largest biodiesel facility in North America. It achieved that from scratch in less than 10 years. RBF uses similar technology and feedstocks to those used by biodiesel producers in Australia. Their experience in the US market was informative, particularly in respect of the implementation of their mandate and related exemption framework.

An important part of our biofutures agenda is the introduction of our mandate from 1 January next year. We are actively preparing for the commencement of the mandate to support the implementation of an extensive education campaign on E10 and the benefits of biofuels. The campaign will focus on assisting consumers to understand the vehicle's compatibility with E10 and, where suitable, encourage consumers to change their fuel purchasing behaviour. It will be a very interactive campaign.

Preparing for the mandate has involved extensive consultation and ongoing engagement. We are working now on the exemption guideline with fuel sellers. My department is also developing protocols to implement a best practice approach to fuel seller compliance as well as sustainability criteria.

*(Time expired)*

### **Child Protection**

**Ms BATES:** My question is to the Minister for Child Safety. Of the 51 child deaths known to the department in the last 12 months, 2015-16, how many of these children died waiting for the department to take action?

**Ms FENTIMAN:** I thank the member for the question. I say at the outset that any child death is, of course, one too many. As I have said many times, the responsibility for the safety and protection of children is everyone's responsibility.

The number of young people and children whose death or serious injury was reviewed by the department of child safety has steadily, year on year, decreased since 2011-12 as per the Queensland Child Death Case Review Panel's annual report released in 2014-15. Importantly, the number of children who have been harmed while in care also reduced in the last 12 months, with 34 fewer children subject to substantiated harm. As I have said, though, any child death is one too many.

The oversight for child deaths, including the establishment of Child Death Case Review Panel, was established by the former government in 2014. We currently have an action plan that will result in further appointments of Child Death Case Review Panel members to strengthen this process.

The causes of death and serious injury of children known to my department in the last 12 months largely mirror the causes of death of children in the wider community. Unfortunately, most often that is from disease and fatal traffic accidents. In 2015-16 there were 51 deaths known to the department of child safety and eight serious injury cases. As I have said, the majority of these were from diseases and morbid conditions. Eight deaths were the result of accidents and road fatalities. There were a number of other deaths—for example, deaths due to house fires and drowning; all of which are extremely tragic.

The department of child safety considers every child death known to the department in the last 12 months. These are published in the annual child death reports which I have committed to make publicly available. The previous LNP government removed the requirement to publicly release annual reports of the Child Death Case Review Panel. I made the commitment last year to publicly release the

annual reports on child deaths and that is why earlier this year I released the 2014-15 annual report. It was released on the department's website. I absolutely want transparency and accountability when it comes to these serious matters. I put on the record again that we are seeing fewer and fewer child deaths known to the department every year and that certainly is a very positive sign.

### South Molle Island

**Mrs GILBERT:** My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Members would be aware that South Molle Island was recently purchased by China Capital Investment Group. Will the minister advise the House how this investment will help to rejuvenate tourism for the Whitsunday Islands?

**Ms JONES:** I thank the honourable member for Mackay for her enthusiasm for tourism. I know how excited she is about this investment by the Chinese company China Capital Investment Group in South Molle Island.

**Ms Palaszczuk** interjected.

**Ms JONES:** I take the interjection of the Premier. What gets us up every morning is jobs, jobs, jobs. That is what we get excited about and that is exactly what we are delivering. That is why when I went to China last year I had the privilege of meeting with China Capital Investment Group. I met with Mr Zhou and Mr Jiang on my mission to China where we talked about what were the opportunities for investment in tourism infrastructure here in Queensland. That is why I am so pleased, like the member for Mackay, to see that they are now investing in South Molle Island. Their priority is to rejuvenate the 188-bedroom resort on that island. That means more jobs for people in the Mackay and Whitsundays region. I know I have bipartisan support from the honourable member for Whitsunday on this in that we want to see growth and tourism jobs in the Mackay and Whitsundays area, which we know supports a \$1.5 billion industry and already 13,000 jobs in that area.

We have made it very clear that our government understands that growing tourism means growing jobs for Queenslanders right along Queensland's coastline and, indeed, in the outback. I had the great privilege of joining the member for Mount Isa on the weekend at the Mount Isa rodeo. Woo hoo! Yes, we had a good time—not that good a time, Mr Speaker; the Governor was there. It was very good. I have to say it was wonderful to see the people of Mount Isa embracing all of the visitors to the community. As we walked down the streets in Mount Isa, everybody wanted to say hello and welcome us to that community. It was a wonderful event. I thank the Premier for the opportunity to be there. I know that she was there last year.

Our government has said very clearly that, unlike the opposition who cut \$180 million from tourism despite saying it was a pillar and despite cracking away at the foundations, we understand that tourism means jobs. That is why I will be joining the Premier and the mayor of the Gold Coast, Tom Tate, in Cairns next week at our Connecting to Asia tourism forum. This is about us working with local government and industry to grow tourism opportunities in every single part of Queensland including the Sunshine Coast. We are very much looking forward to sitting down not only with local government but with business and industry to talk about our new \$33.5 million Connecting to Asia package and how they can work with their industry locally to create new opportunities and new tourism jobs in their communities, because we will continue to fight every step of the way. Despite the deafening silence from the LNP opposite in regard to the backpacker tax, despite their appalling record in cutting tourism funding here in Queensland, we will fight for tourism and tourism jobs in this state.

### HMAS *Tobruk*

**Mr SORENSEN:** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier endorse the comments of the member for Maryborough that it is a waste of money for tourism to sink the ship *Tobruk* in Hervey Bay? I will table the quotes.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Fraser Coast Chronicle*, dated 16 August 2016, titled 'Don't sink that \$15m!' [[1291](#)].

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Hervey Bay for the question. I do understand that people in this House have different views. We know that there are some members who are advocating, especially those members who live along the coastal regions, the advantages to their communities of having the *Tobruk* off the coast to revitalise the tourism industry in their particular regions.

I also note that my government has given the tick to go ahead with the tender process with the federal government. The Minister for Tourism has now invited applications from those interested councils who would like to participate, to put forward an expression of interest to the Minister for Tourism. I believe that Queensland should have this icon. I believe that it would benefit our coastal regions. I think there is a bit of a fight on amongst our regions for the *Tobruk*. I urge members of parliament—

**Ms Jones:** Get on board the boat.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I take that interjection—get on board the boat. More importantly, get talking to your local councillors. We need to see the money. I urge the member, if he is very keen on pushing this particular point of view, to talk to his council. I know there is a battle on too. I know the member for Bundaberg has been in her local paper wanting the *Tobruk* off the Bundaberg coast. I understand that the Gold Coast has expressed some interest, as well as the Sunshine Coast. Let the battle begin and may the best council win.

### Protected Area Estate

**Mrs LAUGA:** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef. Will the minister outline to the House the level of infrastructure investment the Palaszczuk government is making across Queensland's protected area estate?

**Mr SPEAKER:** I call the minister. You have two minutes.

**Dr MILES:** I thank the member for the question. She is a passionate advocate for park infrastructure and tourism infrastructure—the kinds of things that will attract people to regions like Keppel. In fact, she is such a passionate advocate that I am not sure it will be possible to properly summarise the contribution she has made in just two minutes, but I will do my best.

The Palaszczuk government's 2016-17 parks capital works program totals \$22.8 million. That is an investment in infrastructure and facilities critical to the management, enjoyment and protection of our world-class tourist destinations. We are investing in our national parks after those opposite took to the portfolio with an axe.

Our parks infrastructure investment will create regional jobs and contribute to local economies throughout Queensland, especially tourism economies like in Keppel. I appreciate the efforts of the member for Keppel in consulting with her community and contributing to and shaping the final planned works for the Keppel region. These works will be better thanks to her contribution and that of the Keppel community.

Bluff Point Conservation Park on the Capricorn Coast will receive a \$375,000 upgrade. This scenic coastal park is a popular spot for boot camps, yoga classes and daily walks. Then there is the \$350,000 redevelopment of the Red Rock camping area in Byfield State Forest. This camping area provides a unique opportunity to camp with your pet in a bushland setting. Accessible by conventional vehicle, Red Rock provides an easy and convenient camping option for the Keppel coast suiting both locals and domestic travellers.

Statewide our parks capital works program will provide much needed upgrades to facilities for visitors and staff. Through these investments, the government is strengthening the management of our world-class parks and forests, as well as enhancing tourism and visitor opportunities.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Time for questions has expired.

## HEALTH (ABORTION LAW REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

### Introduction

 **Mr PYNE** (Cairns—Ind) (4.27 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Health Act 1937 to reform the law relating to abortion. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

*Tabled paper:* Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016 [[1292](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes [[1293](#)].

**Mr SEENEY:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is already a bill before the House. I take it that this has been considered by you and the Clerk, that the introduction of a second bill on the same subject satisfies the standing orders?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Callide. The standard procedure is that we allow the bill to be introduced. After it has been introduced, the Clerk and I will consider if there is a problem with the bill. I call the member for Cairns.

**Mr PYNE:** The bill will improve clarity for health professionals and patients in the area of medical termination of pregnancy. There currently exists a lack of clarity around at what point during gestation and for what reasons a termination of pregnancy may be performed in Queensland. The bill seeks to clarify when care can be imparted to avoid prolonged approval and ethics processes not conducted for the benefit of patients' wellbeing but to substantiate lawfulness.

Section 20 provides that only a qualified health practitioner may perform an abortion. It also provides that a doctor and a registered nurse are a qualified health practitioner for performing an abortion by administering a drug at the written direction of a doctor. It also says that a woman does not commit an offence against this section for performing an abortion on herself or consenting to, or assisting in, the performance of an abortion on herself by administering a drug prescribed by a doctor.

Section 21 addresses abortion on a woman more than 24 weeks pregnant. It states that a doctor may perform an abortion or direct a registered nurse to perform an abortion by administering a drug on a woman who is more than 24 weeks pregnant only if the doctor reasonably believes the continuation of the woman's pregnancy would involve greater risk of injury to the physical or mental health of the woman than if the pregnancy were terminated and has consulted with at least one other doctor who also believes that the continuation of the woman's pregnancy would involve greater risk of injury to the physical or mental health of the woman than if the pregnancy were terminated.

Section 22 concerns the duty to perform or assist in abortion. It says that no-one is under a duty to perform or assist in performing an abortion. A person is entitled to refuse to assist in performing an abortion. However, a doctor has a duty to perform, and a registered nurse has a duty to assist a doctor in the performance of an abortion on a woman in an emergency, if the abortion is necessary to save the life of, or to prevent a serious physical injury to, the woman.

Division 3 concerns patient protection. Under section 23, 'Declarations for abortion facility', it says that the minister must, by written notice, declare an area around an abortion facility to be a protected area for the facility. An area declared to be a protected area must be at least 50 metres at any point from the abortion facility, sufficient to ensure the privacy and unimpeded access of anyone entering, trying to enter or exit the abortion facility and no bigger than necessary.

Section 24 deals with prohibited behaviour in relation to an abortion facility. It says that a person in a protected area of an abortion facility must not engage in prohibited behaviour. Prohibited behaviour, in relation to an abortion facility, means: harassment, hindering, intimidation, interference with, threatening or obstruction of a person, including by capturing images of the person, intending to stop the person from entering the facility or having or performing an abortion in the facility; or an act that can be seen or heard by a person in the protected period for the facility, and intending to stop a person from entering the facility. 'Protected period', for an abortion facility, means when the minister has declared a period to be the protected period for the facility or otherwise the period between 7 am and 6 pm on each day the facility is open.

Section 25 states that a person must not publish images of another person entering or leaving, or trying to enter or leave, an abortion facility without the other person's consent and with the intention of stopping a person from having or performing an abortion. 'Publish', in relation to images of a person entering or leaving, or trying to enter or leave, an abortion facility means publish or communicate the images in a way that makes the images likely to come to the notice of the public or a part of the public. The bill draws on existing legislation in Victoria and the ACT. It is a better time than ever to end the uncertainty surrounding medical termination of pregnancy.

### **First Reading**

**Mr PYNE** (Cairns—Ind) (4.33 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 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee**

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.

## COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 19 April (see p. 1028).

### Second Reading



**Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (4.34 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has examined the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and tabled its report on 12 July 2016. In its report, the committee made a single recommendation that the bill be passed. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for its bipartisan approach to the consideration of the bill and for the excellent work undertaken by the committee and their staff.

I know I speak for all members of this House in expressing the shock and revulsion that is felt on almost a daily basis due to the death and carnage that is occurring around the world as a result of acts of terrorism and other criminal acts directed at causing mass harm and murder. We are all aware Australia is not immune from terrorism and other criminal acts carried out with the intention of killing and harming our citizens.

Since September 2014 there have been 16 counterterrorism operations undertaken in Australia which have resulted in 45 persons being charged. Not only are we facing an unprecedented level and ongoing threat of terrorism in Australia; the rise of terrorist organisation inspired attacks, in addition to attacks coordinated and directed by terrorist organisations, has created additional challenges for police to effectively detect, disrupt and defeat terrorists.

Terrorism inspired low-tech attacks are significantly harder to identify and disrupt as there may be little or no direct communication between the attacker and the terrorist organisation. Terrorist organisations have given these criminals the tactical freedom to self-initiate and self-identify their targets. Recent events in France alone have shown the resultant atrocities criminals can achieve with the use of a knife or a vehicle.

As I said in my introductory speech for this bill, due to the nature of terrorism, police will often need to intervene early to prevent a terrorist act from occurring or act on less information than would normally be the case in more traditional policing responses. We expect our police to rapidly and effectively respond to and resolve terrorism and other emergencies which impact on the safety of the community and bring to justice those persons who are criminally responsible.

To achieve this, police need to be supported by the necessary legislative tools to enable them to protect the community. Obviously these legislative tools must contain appropriate safeguards and ensure that the powers achieve an appropriate balance between the rights and liberties of the individual and the safety of the broader community.

The bill achieves this through a range of key amendments including: enabling police during a declared emergency under the Public Safety Preservation Act to require the provision of information which is necessary for the management or resolution of the emergency; during a declared terrorist emergency, enabling the declaration of a terrorism emergency reception centre and declared evacuation areas to enable police to effectively manage the evacuation, reception, identification and assessment of persons; enabling the Premier and the Minister for Police to extend a declared terrorist emergency beyond the initial seven days up to a maximum of 28 days and thereafter only by regulation in circumstances where it is necessary to protect life or critical infrastructure; clarifying that the declaration of an area surrounding a moving activity for a terrorist emergency includes a stated area around a specified person; enabling preventative detention orders to be made in circumstances where the person's real name is not known but the person can be adequately identified by other means; and enabling an urgent application for an initial order for preventive detention to be made without the need for the preparation of a written application.

The Palaszczuk government is eminently aware that threats to community safety are constantly evolving, and this is particularly the case with terrorism and violent extremism. We can never become complacent that existing powers will always be effective in dealing with the threats we may face now and into the future. Keeping Queenslanders safe is paramount to this government. We are committed to ensuring that existing measures to protect Queenslanders are frequently reviewed and tested to ensure that they remain effective.

The bill includes a number of amendments to the Corrective Services Act that will support efficiencies in the operational practices of Queensland Corrective Services relating to the delivery of health services to prisoners, the management of corrective services facilities and the supervision of offenders. Specifically, the amendments will: allow registered nurses, as an alternative to doctors, to conduct examinations of prisoners under safety orders, maximum security orders, criminal organisation segregation orders and separate confinement orders at the prescribed intervals; clarify that a corrective services officer may use a biometric identification system for the purpose of the identification of a prisoner; clarify that a prisoner's or visitor's biometric information that is captured by the individual submitting to a biometric identification system, including any data created of such information, is information the chief executive of corrective services may keep and must destroy as provided in the act; and expand the offence for a prisoner to fail to obtain the written permission of the chief executive of corrective services before applying to change the person's name so that it applies to a name change application in any Australian jurisdiction.

The act allows for a prisoner to request reconsideration of a decision to transfer them to an alternative correctional facility, excluding any initial placement. This bill serves to clarify this process and reflect existing practice by explicitly excluding both short-term post-sentencing placements and a prisoner's initial placement. For example, a male prisoner who has been held on remand at Arthur Gorrie Correctional Centre then received at Brisbane Correctional Centre for processing purposes following sentencing and later transferred to Woodford Correctional Centre will not be allowed to request reconsideration of the decision to place them at the Woodford Correctional Centre. In this example, the prisoner's initial placement will be considered to be the Woodford Correctional Centre.

During the committee's consideration of the bill, a concern was raised by the Queensland Greens about the proposed amendment that would enable registered nurses, as an alternative to doctors, to examine certain categories of prisoners. Currently, section 57 which relates to medical examination and a safety order, section 64 which relates to medical examination and a maximum security order and section 65C which relates to medical examination and a criminal organisation segregation order of the Corrective Services Act 2006 do not reflect the general practice relating to the delivery of health services to prisoners. Since 2008 Queensland Health has been responsible for prisoner health services that are delivered by an applied nurse-led service model. The amendments allow for this health services model to be applied to the examination of prisoners under the various types of segregation orders. However, provision for examination by a doctor is retained should this be necessary or appropriate in a particular circumstance.

Visiting doctors attend all correctional centres. Registered nurses have the relevant medical skills to examine a prisoner for any health concerns. Clinical nurse coverage is already provided in most prison facilities 24 hours a day. The duties of nurses include: conducting triage assessment of prisoners who present with medical concerns to determine whether or not the prisoners need to be progressed to a visiting medical officer; risk assessments of prisoners at periods of risk; and the distribution of medication.

The Queensland Nurses' Union supports the amendments to sections 57, 64, 65C and 121 of the Corrective Services Act that enable a registered nurse to examine prisoners under safety orders, maximum security orders, criminal organisation segregation orders and separate confinement orders. The Queensland Nurses' Union supports a position that encourages registered nurses to work to their full scope of practice, provided they are, or have been, objectively assessed as competent to conduct the required examinations.

This bill forms part of the Palaszczuk government's ongoing commitment to keep Queenslanders safe. The threat of terrorism is real, and this bill provides police with strong powers to enable them to rapidly and effectively respond to and prevent acts of terrorism and other public emergencies which place the safety of the community at risk. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (4.45 pm): The recent terrorist attacks in Turkey, France, Germany and the United States have reinforced the need for our law enforcement agencies and government to be equipped with the right legislative tools they need to protect our community from harm. These major world events are but a few of the terrorist incidents that occur predominantly in the Middle East on a regular basis and continue to shock us as we see them. We do not even hear about many of these events in our media. In some parts of the world they become that frequent that they occur on a daily basis. These incidents are defined as violent attacks with political, religious, economic, ethnic or nationalistic motives.

In August alone, there have been 62 of these defined terrorist incidents worldwide. In July, there were 194 worldwide terrorist incidents which claimed more than 1,500 lives and injured over 2,200 others around the world. I do not say this to raise unnecessary fear and alarm in our community, but I

think it is important to understand the world we live in today and the nature of the issues that the police and other law enforcement agencies deal with and protect us from—many of which we do not see or hear about.

The bill before the House is part of recognising the need for our law enforcement agencies to be ready to act to either prevent and disrupt or respond to any incidents in Queensland. The LNP will always support measures that keep our community safe. We have tremendous respect for our law enforcement agencies, the Queensland Police Service and the Crime and Corruption Commission and the men and women who do what they can do to keep our community safe. In that regard, we will be supporting the bill before the House.

As stated in the explanatory notes, the key objective of the bill is to equip police with the powers to enable a swift response to any public emergencies in Queensland. In doing so, the bill enables the police to rapidly gather information, obtain authorisations and exercise powers in an endeavour to mitigate or minimise the impact of emergency situations, including natural disasters, accidents and criminal actions, terrorist incidents and other chemical, biological or radiological emergencies. It also extends the power of police to search and seize vehicles or items that may be used to cause harm.

The bill also amends the Corrective Services Act to improve the management of the health of our prisoners both in supervision and in the community. I should say at this point that one of our biggest dangers to the health of both our prisoners and also our corrective services staff is this government's failure in managing and dealing with overcrowding in our prisons. They like to blame everybody but themselves, it is always someone else's fault, but the reality is that we are unapologetic about our strong criminal law reforms because they led to a dramatic reduction in crime across the state.

On top of that we also had a \$61 million plan that was in our 2014-15 state budget to create additional capacity in our jails with an additional 650 beds across the state. As a result of this government and this minister's 'head-in-the-sand approach', our prisons are still overcrowded and have turned into fight clubs. In fact, numbers in the budget revealed that in the last 12 months prisoner-on-officer assaults have increased by 265 per cent, prisoner-on-prisoner assaults have increased by 51 per cent and prisoner-on-prisoner serious assaults have risen by 79 per cent. That is the legacy of this minister, who is asleep at the wheel and desperately scrambling to try to fix an issue that happened on his watch and yet he tries to blame everybody else for it.

The bill before the House also amends the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to enable Commonwealth intelligence agencies to utilise Queensland courts for approval to create a birth certificate for an assumed identity. There are also provisions that improve processes for declaring an emergency situation, extending the time frame for declaration of a terrorist emergency beyond 14 days, enabling the appointment of a terrorist emergency reception centre commander and declaration of a terrorist incident reception centre, and extension of the powers to stop and search without warrant certain vehicles in certain circumstances.

Finally, the bill amends the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 to enable preventative detention orders, or PDOs, to be made in respect of a person whose identity is unknown in certain circumstances. There are also other measures which improve and enhance the use of PDOs in terrorist emergencies. It should be recognised that while the police in Queensland have had the ability to seek preventative detention orders since 2005, there have not been the circumstances where it has been needed, and we can be very thankful for that.

The committee that considered the bill was the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I want to thank all the members of the committee for their deliberations and report. There were only two submissions raised with the committee, one from a private individual and another from the Queensland Greens. The concerns raised by the individual submitter related to the declaration of an emergency situation and the subsequent powers available to the police to be able to search people and vehicles within a declared area, entering or leaving a declared area or seizing property without warrant. It is noted that the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, Bar Association of Queensland, the Queensland Law Society and Public Interest Monitor among others were all consulted as part of developing this bill and none of those organisations has raised concerns with the parliamentary committee. While the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties did raise some concerns with the Queensland Police Service in the drafting of the bill, these concerns were not conveyed to the committee.

In response to the concerns raised by the individual submitter, Mr Matthews, the Public Safety Business Agency responded that currently a terrorist officer has the power to search a vehicle without a warrant within a declared area under section 8 of the act. However, there is no power to stop and

search a vehicle that is about to enter or is reasonably suspected of having just left a declared area. They added that the extension of this existing power to include a vehicle about to enter or a vehicle that has recently left a declared area is a sensible extension necessary to ensure the safety of persons within and around a declared area of a terrorist emergency.

As I mentioned earlier, the other submission that the committee received was from the Greens Queensland. We have heard a lot about the Greens this week already about their influence on the Labor government in relation to planning call-ins and other such social and environmental issues, but it is good to see that the Deputy Premier did not completely fold to their demands in relation to this bill. Their concerns were both unjustified and not considered by the government.

The Greens have long held strong opposing views to the introduction of preventative detention orders—back to when they were first introduced in Queensland in 2005 as part of the adoption of national counterterrorism reforms. In their submission to the committee, they raised a number of other issues which are fundamental to the objectives of this bill. While we recognise the importance of the right to privacy and due regard to the civil liberties of individuals, we do not believe that these provisions impinge on those rights and the bill maintains the right balance between protecting these rights and ensuring that the police and other law enforcement agencies have the appropriate legislative tools to be able to prevent, disrupt or contain a terrorist incident and protect the community from harm. As the committee report provides—

The Queensland Greens submitted that the proposed amendment requiring the provision of information to police during a declared emergency is inconsistent with the rights and liberties of individuals:

*The bill does not provide for judicial oversight of the police case to infringe on an individual's rights, requiring merely that the police commander be "satisfied on reasonable grounds" that a person may be in possession of important information. Such a system is quite clearly open to abuse, especially in the emotionally charged environment of an emergency.*

The explanatory notes argue that the proposed power is justified in the circumstances, particularly given the safeguards reflected in sections 8AE to 8AR whereby an information requirement can only be given during the period of the declared emergency situation, terrorist emergency or chemical, biological or radiological emergency, and only if the commander is satisfied on reasonable grounds that a person may be able to give information and that the information is necessary to manage or resolve the declared emergency.

The Queensland Greens also raised some issues regarding the proposed amendments to enable a terrorist emergency to be extended beyond 14 days and up to 28 days by the Premier and the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services and can be extended further via regulation in 14-day increments. In response to these concerns, the Public Safety Business Agency stated—

- The power to extend a terrorist emergency to up to 28 days is required for situations where the State is subjected to multi-faceted and protracted terrorist attacks, and it is also beneficial in circumstances where the terrorist attack is imminent and the intended target of the attack is unknown.
- A terrorist emergency can be extended beyond 28 days only by regulation if the circumstances of the terrorist act or threats of further terrorist acts necessitates the continuation of the emergency, and each regulation can only extend a terrorist emergency by a maximum of 14 days
- The ability to extend is also subject to the requirement in section 81 of the PSPA for a relevant person to end the terrorist emergency if satisfied that it is no longer necessary for police officers to continue to exercise terrorist emergency powers to maintain public safety, protect life or health at serious risk, or to protect critical infrastructure.

They were also of the view that clause 42 of the bill was inconsistent with article 17(2) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which is, 'No-one shall be arbitrarily deprived of their property.' We note the response again provided by the department and are satisfied that the intent of this provision is justified in the circumstances. This included the fact that the purpose of the power relates to the safety of persons and not for evidence collection.

Despite the fact that there were only two submissions to the committee, we are satisfied that the consultation undertaken in the preparation of this bill was both thorough and appropriate. I also recognise the extensive briefing paper provided by the department which highlighted the amount of work that has gone into the preparation of this bill and the consideration of the issues raised by submitters.

We are also satisfied that the breaches of fundamental legislative principles which have been identified and referred to in the explanatory notes are suitably justified. As I said at the outset, it is important that we recognise and understand the world we live in today and ensure that our law enforcement agencies are able to respond to counterterrorism incidents if they arise. Our support for

this bill follows on from previous amendments to counterterrorism legislation that were introduced and passed in the parliament late last year, so there is clear bipartisan support for giving the police the tools that they need to keep the community safe.

I should say that it is a pity that Labor does not extend this bipartisan spirit to protect the public from organised crime and criminal gangs who terrorise our communities and sell drugs to our kids. Unlike Labor in Victoria and South Australia, Queensland Labor choose to effectively roll out the red carpet to criminal motorcycle gangs rather than heed the advice of our law enforcement agencies, the Crime and Corruption Commission and the Queensland Police Service. Despite voting for the 2013 laws, the Palaszczuk Labor government has done everything it can to distract the attention of the community from the success of the laws and the success of Taskforce Maxima and the Crime and Corruption Commission in using the laws—

**Mr FURNER:** I rise to a point of order on relevance. The member is clearly not speaking relevantly to the current bill before the House.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Linard): Order! Member for Everton, can you please make sure that your speech is relevant to the bill.

**Mr MANDER:**—to successfully prevent and disrupt organised crime in this state. I would like to put on the record my personal appreciation for the hard work of the Queensland police force and the very brave and courageous officers who go to work every day not knowing whether they will come across some incident that will endanger their lives. We need to be very cognisant of the fact that the threat of terrorism is real, and we need to make sure that we have the appropriate laws in place to support our police. I know that the police in my district—Albany Creek, Stafford and Ferny Grove—who are responsible for keeping law and order do a fantastic job and are incredibly appreciated. We thank them for literally putting their lives on the line every day. It is important that we give them the laws and the powers they need to keep our community safe.

We need to look no further than the recent tragedy at the Lindt cafe in Sydney and the subsequent review of the processes that took place to see the pressure that our police are under in literally life-and-death situations. The decisions that they make can affect whether someone survives or does not. I must admit that I am a little bit aggrieved to see that they seem to be being criticised at the moment over situations that go beyond our understanding in trying to come to terms with the pressure they are under to make decisions on a second-by-second basis.

Let us hope that we never have to use these laws in our state. Let us hope that these laws will act as deterrence. One of the reasons that we have had a strong law and order agenda on this side of the House is not just to disrupt criminal activity and terrorist activity but also prevent it from happening in the first place. We are very supportive of this bill. We want to do everything that we can to make sure that our law enforcement officers are supported. We will always take advice about law enforcement from the relevant agencies, and our support for this bill and strong law and order reform is part of our response to ensure that Queensland is and remains the safest place to live, work and raise a family. In saying that, this side of the House gives our support to this bill.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (5.04 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and report No. 31 of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. My focus will be on the changes relevant to the terrorist activity that we have been seeing around the world, that was alluded to by the member for Everton, and more closely on our own shores.

The explanatory notes tell us that nationally we have seen an escalation in terrorist related activities. We have seen three terrorist attacks resulting in fatalities; a further six imminent planned attacks were disrupted; and 36 persons have been charged arising from 13 different operations in relation to counterterrorism matters. The explanatory notes go on to tell us that there is an ever-increasing threat of low-tech, lone-actor terrorist attacks. These threats are exponentially harder to disrupt, as there may be no visibility of planning, little or no direct communication between the terrorist group and the attackers and limited time delay between intent and action. Low-tech attacks are often inspired by terrorist groups' public calls for such acts, with the perpetrators having freedom to initiate terrorist activities and self-identify their targets.

In my mind this raises a question: where are we now incarcerating those people around Australia who have been accused of these activities prior to trial and where are we going to house them going forward? I understand from some material I looked at recently that there are two people under this

terrorist banner in Queensland prisons, 20 plus in New South Wales and I think 11 in Victoria. We have something in the order of 35 or 36, which fits in with the 36 persons being charged that the explanatory notes talk about. The concern that I have is that we are giving them an opportunity to recruit within our prison system.

Going back to what I spoke about a moment ago, in the explanatory notes it talks about public calls for acts of terrorism by groups culminating in low-tech, lone-actor terrorist attacks. It follows, therefore, that the possibility is there for recruitment to occur in our prison systems. Let's face it: other prisoners are a soft target. They are already shunned by society; they are for the most part poorly educated and easily influenced. Yes, we have toughened police power, but what are we doing about incarceration? My point is that our prisons are fertile grounds for terrorists to recruit others, and as such we have to give serious consideration to how we are going to manage the issue so that we as a society are not developing a breeding ground for other lone wolf terrorist activities in our prison system.

The key objective of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 is to equip police with powers to enable a swift response to any emergency in Queensland. Among other things, the bill is intended to instil new laws that will enable police to require any person or organisation to provide information during a declared emergency; create an offence of failure to comply with the information requirement or to give false or misleading information with penalties of up to 10 years; and extend powers to search and/or seize a vehicle as they leave or enter declared areas. There are broader powers for police to seize other things as well—such as knives, I would imagine—from a person during a declared emergency to include things that that person may use to cause harm.

Following consideration of the evidence provided to the committee, both written and verbal, the committee unanimously agreed to recommend that the bill be passed. In closing, I ask the minister to comment on the issue I raised about the housing of these suspect terrorists and ultimately prisoners if they are subsequently found to be guilty of terrorist type activities. I ask the minister to comment on where we are likely to be housing them and whether we will be potentially creating a breeding ground for other lone wolf types. What are we doing now and what plans are there for the future?

 **Mr FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (5.10 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. As we have heard this afternoon, there were only two submissions to the inquiry. However, the committee did receive a written briefing on the bill and a public briefing from the PSBA, the QPS and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. That provided the committee with valuable information about the real and present danger we face on a regular basis. As you would know, Mr Deputy Speaker, when you turn on your television, on a weekly basis you hear of a terrorist act somewhere in the world. We hope that those types of acts do not come to our shores in the future, but it is important that we have the mechanisms and laws in place to ensure our good men and women of the Queensland Police Service, who serve our community with dignity and with fearless conduct, can protect our communities any time of the day or night, seven days a week.

The bill achieves its objectives by amending four acts: the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986; the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005; the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000; and the Corrective Services Act 2006. The committee was able to reach a decision on not only the report but also the bill in recommending the bill's passage through the House. I do welcome the new era of bipartisan support that the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee is experiencing. I look forward to a continuation of that bipartisan support in the future—a bright and fresh endeavour as we welcome the new members to the committee. I am strongly looking for a continuation of that bipartisan support.

I put on record my appreciation of the former police minister, Mrs Jo-Ann Miller, and the current police minister, the Hon. Bill Byrne, in introducing the legislation that makes it possible to ensure our communities are protected. Community safety is an objective of the Palaszczuk Labor government that we take seriously. That is why we are here today debating this particular bill. In 2015 the then police minister introduced the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As a result, the committee sought submissions in reviewing that particular legislation. That informed our consideration of this piece of legislation as it amends the four acts I mentioned.

We are in a changed world. As I indicated earlier, on a regular basis we see acts of terrorism carried out around the world. I sincerely hope we never see those acts occurring on our shores. The Queensland Police Service advised the committee of terrorism related attacks that had occurred internationally, including recent acts in France and Belgium, in the past 18 months. It advised that nationally there had been a major escalation of terrorism related activity, with three terrorist attacks resulting in fatalities. With an ever-increasing threat of low-tech terrorism, police often need to intervene

early to prevent a terrorist attack or act on less information than would be the case in more traditional policing responses. At the public briefing we heard from Queensland Police Service Deputy Commissioner Condon, who said—

Terrorism has become a global issue and Queensland is not exempt from this threat ... The exercise of powers used to disrupt and stop planned terrorist attacks and to prosecute offenders engaged in terrorist related activities, whether as a facilitator or assailant, is an integral part of the Queensland Police Service's multifaceted approach to counterterrorism and protecting the Queensland community.

He went on—

This financial year, ASIO has issued adverse security assessments recommending the cancellation or refusal of over 150 passports for Australians who are linked to extremist groups. This has increased from 93 adverse security assessments in 2014-15 and 45 adverse security assessments in 2013-14.

As members can see, there is a growing influence on those in our community who would do us harm. He continued—

Many have returned from conflict areas and are considered a security threat within this country, and attacks committed within Sydney and Melbourne have demonstrated the capability of lone actor extremists to invoke fear, injury and death within our communities.

The legislative amendments within this bill are an essential component to enhance our strategic and operational capacity to face this growing global issue and defeat those who wish to cause us harm.

The QPS went on to indicate—

But where we struggle in Queensland, and this bill has highlighted it, is our ability to move quickly and to access that necessary information quickly when an incident is declared. I think that we would be criticised perhaps in an inquiry or coronial if it was found that red tape, for want of a better word, slowed our ability to protect the community.

And rightly so. It is important to ensure the QPS and its officials are well trained and are provided with legislation that meets their needs when those needs arise. The bill provides a number of additional powers, but these powers are not lightly used. Police must be satisfied 'on reasonable grounds'. We heard from the QPS that the powers are not taken lightly; they are exercised on the basis of need when it arises. The QPS did respond to issues raised by the Australian Medical Association, the Queensland Council of Civil Liberties and the Bar Association of Queensland to allay some of the concerns they had raised in consultation with the department.

The bill does provide the power to search a person and the power to search a vehicle without a warrant. Our police men and women do that on a regular basis now; however, this bill will close some loopholes relating to where a vehicle is about to enter or is reasonably suspected of having left a declared area of a terrorist emergency. That ensures the police have the capacity to inspect those vehicles. There are further amendments to the legislation about which I will not go into too much further detail.

We know that the risk profile of the state and the nation has been elevated as a result of international events. The Palaszczuk Labor government has moved quickly to ensure Queenslanders' safety, with more than \$16 million in the budget for police to improve counterterrorism capability and capacity in response to sustained national threat levels. This includes \$788,000 for operational equipment and vehicles. An amount of \$5 million has been allocated to develop a business case for a contemporary counterterrorism and community safety centre at the Westgate police academy.

I come from a policing family. My father was a policeman and I know that he never faced the current threats, and I am pleased he did not. He went through a period of time where the greatest threat that he had was picking up a crim and putting him in the back of the car and perhaps being engaged in a bit of fisticuffs when taking him in cuffs to the watch house. That was the type of terror and threat that he faced, but we are in a different world these days and that is why we need legislation like this before us. I must put on record, as I always do with respect to policing, the honour, the dignity and the ethical standards that the men and women of the Ferny Grove Police Station in my electorate of Ferny Grove show on a regular basis. Last week I was privileged to be at the headquarters representing the minister in giving bravery awards, particularly for Sergeant Rob Colthorpe who was presented an award for bravery in dealing with his operations as a serving police officer. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (5.20 pm): Australia is renowned as a peaceful, culturally diverse nation and Queensland epitomises that reputation. We need to ensure our state upholds this well-deserved reputation. While Queenslanders are predominantly respectful and nonviolent, there are some who do not follow the norm. Since September 2014 Australian law enforcement and intelligence agencies have successfully disrupted a number of terrorist plots. Nationally there has been an escalation of terrorist related activity, with three terrorist attacks resulting in fatalities. Fortunately, law

enforcement has disrupted a further six planned attacks and 45 people have been charged as a result of 16 different operations in relation to counterterrorism matters. Anti-Western sentiment means that Australians and therefore Queenslanders are targets in their own communities. I note that recently a man in Victoria with connections to far right-wing anti-immigration groups was charged under counterterrorism laws in that state. This alone highlights the need for this bill to safeguard Queenslanders, to safeguard Queensland communities and to safeguard our families and our friends.

This bill will give the Queensland police the necessary powers to enhance their ability to prevent and respond to acts of terrorism and go towards safeguarding those we love. Terrorist emergency powers under part 2A of the Public Safety Preservation Act enable a terrorist emergency forward commander to declare a terrorist emergency for a stated area. This area is to be the smallest area necessary to effectively manage the terrorist emergency. Due to the possibility of secondary devices and the potential for terrorists to be among people evacuated from the area, police might be unable to manage the evacuation and reception, identification and assessment of people leaving the area. The bill amends part 2A of the PSPA to enable the terrorist emergency commander to appoint a terrorist emergency reception centre commander, if necessary.

The TERC commander or a police officer acting on the TERC commander's instructions will have the power to control the movement of people in or about a declared area. These officers can direct people not to enter the declared evacuation area or a stated place in the declared evacuation area; or to go to, or stay at or in, a stated place in the declared evacuation area; or to go to and stay at or in another stated declared evacuation area. Police can only give these directions if the officer is satisfied that giving the direction is necessary for the safety of the person or another person; or to effectively manage the evacuation of the person to a declared evacuation area; or to effectively receive, identify or assess the person; or to otherwise effectively deal with the terrorist emergency. These terrorism emergency reception centre powers give legislative backing to the QPS's operation procedures based upon the Australia-New Zealand Counter-Terrorism Committee's guidelines for terrorism incident reception centres.

During emergencies, the need to quickly obtain significant information is vital to help bring about a resolution. This is particularly true where lives are at risk. Although the Information Privacy Act allows the disclosure of information to prevent a serious threat to life or public safety or for the prevention, investigation and prosecution of offences, there are agencies and organisations that refuse to provide necessary information due to privacy concerns. At the moment there is no legislative basis for police to require a person who, although not a suspect, has intimate knowledge of information required for the QPS to effectively manage and resolve emergencies to give them that information. There is also no requirement for a person to keep confidential the fact that information is being sought from them nor the nature of the information, even if it is likely to result in people being injured or seriously prejudicing the management or resolution of the emergency.

Clause 28 of the bill amends part 2 relating to an emergency situation of the PSPA by inserting a new scheme to provide police with the powers to require any person, including government agencies, to provide information, a document or answer questions that are necessary for the management or resolution of the declared emergency. The information requirement power applies to terrorist emergencies under part 2A and chemical, biological and radiological emergencies under part 3 of the PSPA. Most people are willing to give police information, but some are reluctant. This can be for various reasons. They might refuse due to privacy impediments or perhaps concerns that they may breach their occupational code of ethics. Sometimes negative media attention or civil litigation prevents people from sharing information. There are also those swayed by misplaced loyalty because they share a certain belief or ideology. The information requirement power is supported by offences with penalties that align with the risk to community safety.

The bill creates offences for a person to contravene the information requirement without a reasonable excuse, knowingly giving false or misleading information, without reasonable excuse disclosing information matter and without reasonable excuse a disclosure recipient disclosing information matter. This power has a list of safeguards, including that it only be during the period of the declared emergency. These safeguards create a balance between police receiving the necessary information to resolve an emergency and the protection of the community as well as the rights and liberties of individuals. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (5.27 pm): I rise to add my contribution to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 introduced into the House on 19 April this year by the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services and referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for detailed consideration. The

committee made the recommendation to the parliament that the bill be passed. I want to acknowledge the work of my fellow committee members and of course our secretariat. The committee invited written submissions from the public and from identified stakeholders. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General provided an oral briefing on 11 May.

The introduction of this bill follows the introduction of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, which was introduced into the House on 17 September 2015 by the honourable Jo-Ann Miller, the then minister for police, fire and emergency services and minister for corrective services. As referenced by the committee in report No. 31, the 2015 bill proposed to extend the sunset provision of the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005, extend the extraterritorial application of it and the Public Safety Preservation Act from three nautical miles to 200 nautical miles and extend various emergency powers under these acts so they could be exercised in other jurisdictions. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee reported on the 2015 bill in November of that year, making recommendations the bill be amended to require a stand-alone report from the minister to the parliament within six months of the use of the powers under the T(PD)A, an independent review within two years and report within three years of the act's commencement. The bill was passed with those amendments on 20 April this year.

In introducing the 2016 bill, the minister advised that Queensland's preventative detention laws and terrorist emergency powers have never had to be used. While this is a perfect record that I am sure all honourable members would like to see continue for our state, unfortunately the reality of a terrorism attack on any scale is considered by many experts to be a case of when, not if.

Therefore, the degree of preparedness of our law enforcement and counterterrorism trained officers is paramount. Since the 2015 amendments, terrorist related attacks have continued to occur internationally, including the recent attacks in France and Belgium, which cost the lives of hundreds of innocent men, women and children. It is gut-wrenching to see so many guiltless people dying as a result of terror, being the unwitting targets in the senseless, premeditated and horrific murders of harmless victims. As politicians and legislators, we have a responsibility to ensure that Queensland is best protected against attacks of this kind. The amendments proposed in this 2016 bill will provide stronger safeguards to deal with and prevent acts of terrorism. Importantly, they will help keep Queenslanders safe.

As members have heard already from the shadow minister, the LNP is fully supportive of this bill and these amendments. The bill before us proposes to amend the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986 and the Terrorism (Preventive Detention) Act 2005 to enhance public safety through the provision of counterterrorism and emergency management powers that will enable police to rapidly and effectively respond to, manage and resolve emergencies in Queensland. The proposed amendments will, among other things, enable police to require any person or organisation to provide information during a declared emergency under specified circumstances, create an offence for refusing to provide information with penalties of up to 10 years imprisonment to apply, extend a terrorist emergency in circumstances where it is necessary to protect life or health or protect critical infrastructure, extend the power to search and seize vehicles as they leave or enter declared areas, and broaden the power for police to seize things from a person during a declared emergency to include things that a person may use to cause harm.

The amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 would enable Commonwealth intelligence agencies to apply to the Supreme Court of Queensland under the Commonwealth's assumed identity legislation for approval to create a birth certificate for an assumed identity. The amendments to the Corrective Services Act 2006 aims to support efficiencies in operational practices relating to the delivery of health services to prisoners, the management of Corrective Services facilities and the supervision of offenders in the community.

In the last 12 months, in many places around the globe terror has raised its ugly head with shocking frequency—in Paris, Nice, Rouen, Brussels, Pakistan, Tunisia, Turkey and Marseille—but we, too, have experienced acts of terror. In December 2014, many Australians recall watching in horror and disbelief as the Sydney Lindt cafe siege unfolded. The siege began after lone gunman, Man Haron Monis, took 18 people hostage inside the Lindt cafe in popular Martin Place in Sydney. The 16-hour stand-off, which began on 15 December, resulted in two hostages, Katrina Dawson and Tori Johnson, being killed. Following this siege—that came from nowhere—it was made patently clear to all Australians that we, too, were vulnerable to terror attacks and far from immune to them.

As stated in the explanatory notes to this bill, since September 2014 nationally on our shores there has been a major escalation of terrorist related activities, with three terrorist attacks resulting in fatalities, a further six planned imminent attacks that were disrupted and 36 people charged as a result

of 13 different operations relating to counterterrorism matters. It is disturbing to learn that, currently, there are 300 persons on Australia's counterterrorism intelligence list. How many more people with evil intent have not yet been recognised and are in our midst?

I requested the Parliamentary Library to research terror attacks over the past five years and the groups that were responsible for them. I thank the Parliamentary Library for its prompt response. Owing to the large number of attacks, especially with countries at war included, it is not possible to list each attack. To give members an idea of the number, in November 2014 the BBC reported a total of 644 attacks and 5,042 deaths.

The United States data was clearer. Between 2012 and 2016 there were five terrorist related attacks, resulting in a total of 72 deaths, all with Islamist, ISIL or Al-Qaeda links. These attacks were the Boston Marathon attack in April 2013; the Garland, Texas attack on security officers in May 2015—there were no deaths in that attack—the Chattanooga attack on a US naval recruiting centre, killing five people, on 16 July 2015; the San Bernardino, California attack on 2 December 2015, where a husband and wife killed 14 guests at a Christmas party; and on 12 June, 2016 in Orlando, where 50 people were killed in a nightclub.

The reasoning for further amendments to the 2016 bill is owing to the elevated frequency of terrorism related incidents and the ever-increasing threat of low-tech lone-actor terrorism. Therefore, we must all establish our personal safety routines and take more notice of what is going on around us. That does not mean that we live in fear or become overly suspicious of others, just that we be more aware.

Low-tech terrorism is described by Katya Drozdova PhD in her book titled *Low-Tech Threats in the Hi-Tech Age: Subversive Networks Across Ideologies, Technologies, and Times* as a means to target our open and increasingly high-tech society. Professor Drozdova is an assistant professor of political science in the School of Business, Government, and Economics at Seattle Pacific University. Professor Drozdova has lectured extensively and taught courses on subjects ranging from research methods in social science to global security, strategy, history, information and political economy as well as carrying out a number of research projects in these areas. Katya has been actively involved with leading military, policy, law enforcement and business professionals in identifying mission-critical challenges and formulating effective global responses across multiple-organisation risk areas. Her recent work and publications have dealt with issues of US national and international security, specifically addressing the problems of hybrid and asymmetric low-tech threats in the high-tech age.

Professor Drozdova reports that terrorists and other illicit organisations rely instead on relatively rudimentary means to conceal their networks and threaten national and international security interests. These tactics challenge governments' detection and counteraction strategies built around high-tech cyber warfare components, including precision guided weaponry and electronic surveillance schemes. This low-tech challenge to high-tech solutions relies fundamentally on human networks and allegiances. It uses civilian disguise combined with face-to-face and courier communication, cash or barter transactions and basic to crude weaponry such as box cutters, homemade explosive devices and suicide bombers to sustain terrorist operations. Such asymmetric tactics make these operations difficult to trace and prevent by use of high-tech means. Low-tech threats are often harder to disrupt as there may be less visibility of planning, little or no direct communication between organised terrorist groups or individuals and limited time between intent and action. As a result of this type of attack, police are often required to intervene early, or act on less information than would be the case in more traditional policing responses, which this additional legislation will allow.

On my home front, it was reported in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* on 11 September 2014 that two men in Logan had been arrested and charged with terrorism related offences, including making funds available to terrorist organisation Jabhat al-Nusra as well as recruiting another person to become a member of Islamic State to take part in hostilities in Iraq or Syria between 18 July and 5 September.

More recently, Gold Coast police have been warning locals to be vigilant and report any suspicious activity following alerts about potential terrorists targeting regional airports. On 30 January this year, the bulletin reported that prospective terrorists attempting to use international flights to the Gold Coast as a back door to our country were snared by a new counterterrorism unit at the airport. The airport, which is located in my electorate, services several million passengers every year—locals, businesspeople and tourists. The Australian National University terrorism expert, Dr Clarke Jones, says that potential terrorists were using regional airports as a way of gaining entry to the country as it was believed that smaller airports have weaker security measures. On that occasion, we proved them wrong.

With the 2018 Commonwealth Games to be held in southern Queensland, this legislation will assist us to be at the top of our game in terms of dealing with terror threats and being able to intervene early, potentially foiling any attacks that could harm our people and our enviable reputation as a safe destination. However, that reputation rests upon the success of the major event. Undoubtedly the threat of a terror attack in Australia has grown and the occurrence of such an attack at any time would be devastating, let alone during a major event that is broadcast to billions of people.

As the former minister for tourism, major events, small business and the Commonwealth Games, I understand the critical importance of updating and upgrading enhanced safety and intervention measures for the purpose of protecting our community. In 2014 I was privileged to represent Queensland at the Glasgow Commonwealth Games and take part in the flag handover ceremony which was broadcast to over 1.4 billion people across the world. It was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity that I cherish. I experienced firsthand planning and coordination of a major event that required intense safety measures and involved hundreds of thousands of people. It was an eye-opener to what we can expect when we host the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. I also visited London and had security briefings from the Home Office.

As the largest sporting event in Australia in a decade the games will draw 6½ thousand athletes and team officials, as well as spectators and visitors from across the world, putting us front and centre on the world stage. When I introduced the Major Events Bill in 2014 I spoke of the significant contribution major events have on Queensland's economy but also the need to ensure our locals and visitors alike were kept safe.

As with any legislation, but particularly when security is at stake, an individual's basic rights and liberties—fundamental legislative principles—must be taken into consideration. The Queensland Police Service provided advice on clause 28 as to whether it provides sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of the person by providing appropriate protection against self-incrimination pursuant to section 4(3)(f) of the Legislative Standards Act 1992 and legal professional privilege, stating that when considered in its entirety clause 28 of the bill achieves an appropriate balance between protecting the rights and liberties of the individual with the protection of the broader community.

The submission goes on to say that delays caused by having to wait for legal advice to be obtained, which may be considerable prior to the provision of the information, would have dire effects on the ability for police to respond effectively to declared emergencies and counteract the intention of the legislation. Further, they have indicated that it would be possible for people who sympathise or share a common ideology with the offender to assist with achieving their criminal endeavours by delaying the giving of information through seeking legal advice. If that were to change in favour of the offender, it would be counterproductive to the objectives of the bill which, as mentioned previously, are to allow for police intervention to prevent terrorist activities. When managing and resolving declared emergencies police would not normally have the luxury of time which they often have in other more traditional policing circumstances. Their ability to rapidly acquire information is time sensitive and critical when lives are at risk, for example during a hostage situation or in circumstances where police are trying to prevent an imminent terrorist attack from occurring.

As a government minister during the G20 Summit in Brisbane in November 2013 I was very proud to be part of an LNP government which passed the G20 (Safety and Security) Bill 2013, brought in for G20 and set to expire when the G20 was over. Despite criticisms aired in the media for enforcing strict legislation to keep world leaders, delegates and the general public safe during the G20, the bill was passed. Playing host to some of the most powerful and influential world leaders, including the President of the United States of America, Barack Obama, Xi Jinping from China, Vladimir Putin from Russia and India's Narendra Modi, the G20 Summit raised extremely serious security risks. Implementation of the G20 (Safety and Security) Bill ensured we had the necessary legislation to provide this level of security. The summit was considered a success and thankfully no-one was killed as a result of any attack during this highly publicised political event.

Last week I returned from a wonderful visit to the UK to meet our new grandson and spend some time with our daughter and her husband. We did not stay in London; instead we toured some of the countryside. The BBC News was full of stories about the carnage caused by recent attacks in Rouen and Nice. The British government announced that 600 new terror police were to be trained. Speaking with locals, I was surprised that terrorism is expected by all. I guess with the UK on high threat alert for two years people have become accustomed to higher security. I noticed that there were no rubbish bins when out shopping and visiting cathedrals and outside tourist attractions. I was told it was because they posed a bomb threat. I was also told about the no-go areas for tourists. Literally everyone I spoke to was resigned to the fact that terrorism will continue to occur.

Like many I was horrified by the murder of the elderly French priest who was conducting a service for his parishioners. Where is the sense in that: the callous, senseless murder of a saintly man going about his duties? It was therefore heartening to see a Muslim who attended the priest's funeral telling media who were present how important it was to join together to support each other and condemn the attacks. He said that it was essential for Muslims to support Christians at times like this as we worship the same God. We need to hear and see more of this mutual respect and if more Muslims and other religions and individuals can speak of peace and understanding then hopefully fewer young people will become swayed by radicals.

We also have to stop tiptoeing around the stifling culture of political correctness. As Aussies we have a culture that is the envy of many. It is laid back, it is friendly and values freedom of speech and religion and it is worth standing up for. On 12 August 2016 respected journalist Mike O'Connor wrote an opinion piece in the *Courier-Mail* titled, 'Anti-political correctness fightback is long overdue'. O'Connor qualified his comments stating he had lived harmoniously and happily next door to a Muslim couple for eight years. He said—

I didn't worry that they were spending their nights making bombs or sharpening knives because, like the overwhelming majority of Australians, I take people as I find them.

He goes on—

I hesitate to speak about religion and race because those commentators who do so too frequently have empty heads and hollow hearts, moral superiority oozing from every pore.

They denounce anyone not in sympathy with the view that Australians are at heart intolerant bigots as being an intolerant bigot.

It angers me. It angers me that those who see ISIS murdering and torturing and who admit to feeling threatened by Muslims are denounced as bigots.

It angers me too, Mike O'Connor. Virtually no opposition was raised towards the contents of this bill. However, I do note that both the Greens and the Queensland Bar Association raised slight concerns regarding the extent of expanded powers and legal representation. In this House we stand united in our desire to be as well prepared for these heinous attacks as possible. The expansion of policing and government powers in the event of a suspected or imminent terrorism attack contained within the bill will hopefully offer greater protection for Queenslanders. Together with my LNP colleagues I am pleased to support the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (5.46 pm): I rise to address the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. It is not unsurprising to me that further measures are required with respect to counterterrorism not only here in Queensland but also across Australia and around the world. In Queensland, conservative politicians and their relevant political parties will always defend our liberties, our right to freedom of speech, our cultural heritage and our much cherished democratic institutions.

My previous speech on counterterrorism in 2015 and the wideranging measures and strategies I raised and suggested in our parliament are absolutely worthy of public debate despite the hysterical rhetoric at the time of senior Queensland Labor government ministers and also the Premier. It is worthy to note that since the speech I gave in 2015 there have been some dreadful atrocities in Europe and other parts of the world.

Some elected members of this Queensland parliament are only too well aware of the fact that there has been an escalation of terrorist related activity in Australia during the past couple of years. Australia has had a number of terrorist incidents resulting in fatalities, together with a number of intended or planned attacks that have been disrupted by our intelligence and law enforcement agencies. The vital work such agencies undertake on behalf of all of us needs to be acknowledged. I have been approached on a number of occasions by constituents in my electorate of Moggill seeking assurances that we have in place the most stringent laws to assist our police with preventing terrorist related activities and other atrocities.

Whilst Queensland and Australia have strict automatic and semi-automatic firearm controls, such strategies have no benefit when a terrorist inspired individual can drive a truck into a packed crowd at over 70 kilometres per hour. The Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 will provide stronger safeguards to both deal with and prevent acts of terrorism and keep Queenslanders safe. The legislative amendments contained within the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 are an essential component to enhance our strategic and operational capacity to face a growing global threat and defeat those who wish to cause us harm and destroy our freedoms, our values and our key democratic institutions.

As a result of the implementation of the legislation before us, our Queensland Police Service will be equipped with all the necessary powers to enable the QPS to respond effectively and quickly to any public emergency. The importance of our police being able to gather information quickly, to utilise such information effectively, to obtain much needed authorisations expeditiously and to exercise other statutory powers will not only improve overall law enforcement agency performance with respect to terrorism, but could be useful in dealing with natural disasters, accidents and other emergencies that occur here in Queensland. There is a significant body of evidence that extremist groups are targeting vulnerable individuals within our community, to initially groom them and then recruit them for the purposes of carrying out attacks on innocent Australians.

I support this legislation as it will provide our relevant law enforcement agencies in Queensland with the necessary tools that allow for early intervention to prevent a terrorist attack. Strengthening police powers to allow officers to force people or organisations to provide information under declared emergency situations, as outlined in the proposed legislation, is fair and reasonable. While I note the concerns of the Australian Medical Association, the Queensland Council of Civil Liberties and the Bar Association of Queensland, it is my view that it is for overall community safety and public benefit that this legislation is passed and implemented. I commend the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (5.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The National Terrorism Threat Advisory System, NTTAS, informs the public about the likelihood of an act of terrorism occurring in Australia. Sadly, the terrorist threat in Australia has not changed. The level is currently set at 'probable'. Not to be alarmist, a statement of public advice accompanying the national terrorism threat level provides that—

Credible intelligence, assessed by our security agencies indicates that individuals or groups have developed both the intent and capability to conduct a terrorist attack in Australia.

That is matter of great concern. It emphasises the importance of information in an emergency, particularly to those agencies charged with public safety. As members would appreciate, the ability to rapidly acquire relevant information is critical for the effective management and resolution of emergencies. This is particularly so when lives are in jeopardy. Furthermore, despite the Information Privacy Act 2009 allowing disclosure of information to prevent a serious threat to life or public safety or for the prevention, investigation and prosecution of offences, there are agencies and organisations that refuse to provide necessary information due to privacy concerns. Private companies are also increasingly concerned about the potential for adverse publicity and civil litigation where they voluntarily release information to the police.

Whilst the Information Privacy Act 2009 provides exemptions for an agency to disclose information, the act requires the agency must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that the disclosure is necessary. This requires the agency to be provided with sufficient information on which to form its own determination that the disclosure is reasonably necessary. That may lead to a delay in the agency releasing the information. As members would appreciate, in situations where this legislation would be invoked, the prospect of delay could seriously compromise public safety.

Currently there is no legislative basis for police to require a person, who is not a suspect but who has intimate knowledge of relevant information that is necessary for the effective management or resolution of the emergency, to provide that information. Additionally, there is no requirement for a person to keep confidential the fact that information is being sought from the person or the nature of the information being sought, even if this disclosure is likely to result in persons being harmed or seriously prejudicing the management or resolution of the emergency.

Clause 28 of the bill amends part 2, emergency situation, of the Public Safety Preservation Act by inserting a new scheme to provide police with the power to require any person, including government agencies, to provide information, a document or answer questions that are necessary for the management or resolution of a declared emergency. The information requirement power applies to terrorist emergencies under part 2 and chemical, biological and radiological emergencies under part 3 of the Public Safety Preservation Act.

Whilst most people will willingly provide information to police, there are a number of reasons why people may be reluctant or refuse to provide the information. That may be a reasonable position to take in ordinary circumstances, but in an emergency, especially of the kind envisaged by this bill, it is an objection that is more difficult to sustain.

The information requirement power is supported by offences with penalties commensurate with the level of risk posed to the community. The bill creates offences for a person to contravene the information requirement without a reasonable excuse, knowingly giving false or misleading information,

without reasonable excuse disclosing information matter and without reasonable excuse a disclosure recipient disclosing information matter. The maximum penalty for the simpliciter offence is 40 penalty units or 12 months imprisonment. Each offence contains a circumstance of aggravation where the person commits the simpliciter offence and intends to, knows or is reckless as to whether committing the offence will seriously endanger the health or safety of any person, cause serious damage to property, cause serious pollution to the environment or seriously prejudice the effective management or resolution of a declared emergency. The maximum penalty for the circumstance of aggravation is 10 years imprisonment.

The information requirement power contains a range of safeguards, including: limiting the information requirement power to applying only during the period of declared emergency; requiring that the emergency commander or delegate must be satisfied on reasonable grounds that a person may be able to give the information and that the information is necessary to manage or resolve the declared emergency; further limiting the use of the information requirement power to when it is not practicable to obtain the information from the person in any other way; prohibiting an information requirement from being given to a person who is a suspect; maintaining the privilege against self-incrimination and legal professional privilege; limiting when a person can commit a disclosure offence to the operational period of the declared emergency; enabling police to remove the prohibition on disclosure or authorised disclosure to enable the person to obtain assistance or seek legal advice; and providing extensive protection from criminal and civil liability to a person who provides the information in compliance with the information requirement.

The bill achieves an appropriate balance between enabling police to obtain necessary information for the management or resolution of an emergency to protect the community and protecting the rights and liberties of the individual. This legislation seeks to address those concerns. The legislation seeks to refine the state's counter-terrorism framework by providing police with additional powers within the context of a terrorism-related emergency. Finally, I praise the Queensland Police Service, along with that of other law enforcement agencies for their hard work in putting their lives in danger's way to keep Australia safe. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Elmes): Order! Before calling the member for Cleveland, I remind members about standing in corridors. If you need to have a conversation, the place to do that is outside.

**Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (5.57 pm): I rise to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The events of the 2002 Bali bombings are etched in the memory banks of every Australian. On 12 October 2002, 202 people were murdered by radicals from Jemaah Islamiyah in the tranquil atmosphere that is Bali. Eighty-eight Australians were killed, 209 others were injured and many more were psychologically scarred for life. Abu Bakar Bashir, the head of Jemaah Islamiyah at that time and the leader of an Islamic boarding school in Solo Central Java, was convicted as the mastermind of the Bali bombings. The Bali bombers who were caught and jailed were part of the Islamist group Jemaah Islamiyah.

The Bali bombing terrorist act had an indirect impact on me in that at the time I was studying at the University of Queensland. I had started my doctoral studies at the School of Languages and Cultural Studies on Indonesia. I was about to commit to a year of field work based in Solo Central Java when the Bali bombings occurred. As a result, the university decided that I could not go. The terror threat to Australians travelling to Indonesia was high and it was no longer safe. It was two years before I was able to return to Indonesia. Fortunately, I was able to adjust to those changes and complete my PhD. However, my inconvenience was a small matter in comparison to the suffering experienced by those in the Sari Club on that fateful night in 2002.

Prior to entering parliament in 2009 I had been travelling to Indonesia for work going back to 1988. In my career in aid and development prior to politics I had met many wonderful Indonesians—Christians, Hindus and Muslims. They are generally lovely people to work with.

I have also indirectly come across less than acceptable circumstances regarding Jihadi Islamists. Unbeknown to me, one of the orphanage projects that we partnered with in Solo Central Java was not far from the Islamic Boarding School, or Pesantren, of Abu Bakar Bashir. His radicalised sharia students, fuelled with teachings of violence from the Koran, would march down the road nearby the Christian orphanage with swords and knives and threaten to rape and kill the infidel female workers at the Christian orphanage simply because they were non-Muslim.

While I experienced the friendship of good Muslim people, I have also indirectly experienced what sharia law can do to largely friendly people in terms of radicalising young men and turning them into violent Jihadists and potential terrorists.

Debate, on motion of Dr Robinson, adjourned.

## MOTION

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Jobs

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for its failure to create jobs.

Labor is all talk and no walk when it comes to employment and jobs. Despite Labor's mantra of jobs, jobs, jobs unemployment in Queensland is trending higher and the Premier and the Treasurer have no answers. The Premier can stand in front of the cameras all day and repeat the word 'jobs' until she is blue in the face, but that does not hide the fact that more and more Queenslanders are joining the unemployment queue under her watch. Shutting down job-creating projects like West Village and the Logan Renewal Initiative have only exacerbated the problem Queensland is facing.

Evidence from the Australian Bureau of Statistics shows that it is becoming harder and harder for Queensland jobseekers. Queensland's unemployment rate is far higher than the national average and more than a full percentage point higher than New South Wales's unemployment rate. We are falling behind the rest of Australia. We are losing the economic state of origin.

Let us have a look at the latest labour force figures and the trend figures. The trend figures are the figures that the Treasurer says are his preferred figures. Almost 5,000 jobs were lost in Queensland in June. Almost all of those were full-time jobs. Some 25,700 jobs have been lost since January. Again, almost all of these jobs were full-time jobs. In fact, 23,000 full-time jobs have gone since January.

The unemployment rate has increased for five consecutive months. Let me say that again: the unemployment rate has increased month after month after month after month after month. For five consecutive months the unemployment rate has gone up. The participation rate has fallen by 0.8 per cent. People are giving up looking for work. That actually means that the unemployment rate would be higher if they were still looking for work. They are giving up. The participation rate has started to fall.

Some 10,000 more Queenslanders have joined the unemployment queue since the beginning of the year. The most recent budget demonstrates that we were already out of date. That budget forecasts an increase in unemployment. Under Labor's policies that budget forecast an increase in unemployment. Already that increase is out of date because two sets of labour force figures have come out since then and the rate is much higher than was forecast in the budget. That is despite Labor's policies forecasting an increase in unemployment.

The statistics are not any better when looking at the seasonally adjusted measure. Some 1,400 jobs were lost in June. Some 36,200 jobs have been lost since January. Again, almost all of these jobs have been full-time jobs. The participation rate under the seasonally adjusted figures has dropped 1.4 per cent since January. Behind all these figures are people. Those are real figures and they deserve the attention of this government.

We are also facing major issues around youth unemployment, with the statewide rate now sitting at 13.9 per cent. Between May and June the number of young Queenslanders in work dropped by 8,600. Again, the participation rate shows more people are giving up looking for work. Since the election almost 20,000 young Queenslanders have lost their jobs.

The unemployment problems are particularly pronounced in our major regional centres. Places like Townsville, Cairns and Mackay are struggling with huge increases in unemployment. Townsville has lost 10,700 jobs in the last 12 months. In the Cairns region the unemployment rate has increased to 8.6 per cent. More than one in four young people cannot find a job. More than 2,000 people have lost their jobs in the Mackay region in the last year. Things have become particularly bad in outback Queensland.

**Mr Costigan** interjected.

**Mr EMERSON:** I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. It is a disgrace. Things have become particularly bad in outback Queensland where the unemployment rate has jumped to 13 per cent. In the last 12 months the youth unemployment rate has increased from 14 per cent to 36.5 per cent. That is an increase of 22.5 per cent in just one year.

What is this government's response? Again I stress that they are all talk and no walk. They talk about jobs, but all they deliver is unemployment rising for five consecutive months—month after month after month after month after month after month.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (6.06 pm): I rise to oppose the motion. On this side of the House we stand for jobs. We understand how important the dignity of work is for every day Queenslanders. There is nothing more important and there is nothing that keeps me awake more at night than thinking about how many more jobs we can create for Queenslanders right across this state.

Our budget clearly demonstrated that we had a slowing economy in regional Queensland. That is why we put in place our \$100 million Back to Work program. The Minister for Employment has advised me that there are a lot of applications. Within two weeks we already have 26 people who have been employed and 16 people pending involvement.

If anything, what we should see from those opposite is an apology to the people of Queensland—an apology for cutting jobs right throughout this state. Some 14,000 public servant jobs were slashed in Tim Nicholls's first budget. Where is Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield, now? He is now the Leader of the Opposition. He was the architect and responsible for taking the axe to the Public Service. Not only that, he cut front-line services.

What have we as a Labor government been committed to? We have committed to restoring front-line services throughout this state—more nurses, more doctors, more ambulance officers, more police. That is what my government is firmly committed to. That is why our budget was firmly focused on advancing our innovation agenda, growing the economy by investment and trade and building the infrastructure we need for the growing state of Queensland.

We will always stand up for jobs in this state. I have travelled out west and spoken to those in rural and regional communities. We have a strong drought package in place—the largest drought package that Queensland has ever seen. It was delivered not by an LNP government but by a Labor government because we care about the bush. We care about all Queenslanders no matter where they live. What else did we do? We stopped asset sales which would have seen more jobs lost throughout this state. That is what we have seen.

Over the holiday breaks we have seen through our school maintenance program jobs that have kept tradies employed. It has allowed tradies to employ more people in our schools. The tradies who have spoken to me have told me very clearly that they would not have been able to keep people employed in their small regional communities if it were not for the school maintenance program that we put in place.

I find it ironic that the member for Indooroopilly has the hide to stand in this chamber and even mention the word 'jobs' because when he was transport minister 606 positions were cut from RoadTek across the state—606. You should hang your head in shame. I do not forget any minute of when we sat opposite for three years—seven of us then eight and then nine against the whole lot—and we stood up for everyday Queenslanders. We took the fight up to them. Look at this Labor government now—fighting the fight, standing up for Queenslanders, building infrastructure, delivering for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

**Mr Emerson** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Premier, I apologise for interrupting your speech. Member for Indooroopilly, you had a very good go with your contribution. It was only towards the end of your speech that there were some interjections. I urge members to be consistent.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Just on Sunday there was the announcement of the \$1.1 billion investment by Australian Unity—700 jobs in construction happening in the south-east. That is what this government stands for. We stand for delivery. We stand for delivering those front-line services. Let me say it very clearly: we stand for jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs and more jobs. I will back my record against your record any day of the week—14,000 jobs cut, slowing the economy down. Every single one of you should hang your head in shame. At the end of the day, the Queensland public spoke. They spoke through the ballot box. They spoke at—

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (6.11 pm): Nice segue, thank you. I rise to support the motion and to talk about the dangerous policy platform of this current government which is anti jobs and particularly the anti-jobs platform for the people of Logan. We have spoken about this a number of times. You might groan but it is important that the people of Queensland know about the agenda of this government. It is about highlighting that after two years we see a project that could have generated 500 construction jobs and 400 indirect jobs cancelled without a replacement and another review. The surprising and hasty actions of the minister in destroying these job opportunities make the actions of the Deen Bros look like the rolled gold benchmark when it comes to community consultation.

There are many questions about the job-destroying agenda of this government, particularly in Logan. All members in the Logan area should listen. It is just about a political get square. The project has been blocked for two years and, as I said, another inquiry—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Pause the clock. Minister for Industrial Relations, I urge you not to persist or you will be warned and the appropriate action will follow. I urge members to allow the member to make his contribution.

**Mr BENNETT:** There are questions about what compensation will be paid because it will be taxpayers' money. How many people will lose their jobs at Compass, in the construction sector, at BlueCHP and in all the not-for-profits that were gearing up for this project? This was a net gain for government of 2,600 homes over 20 years. Nothing was being sold. This was a holistic, social inclusion project that is now decimated. Contracts were signed in August 2014—and this was a Labor Party policy. It puts our sovereign risk in jeopardy. Who would invest in Queensland again with a minister and a government completely out of touch? There is no privatisation. All not-for-profits return all profits to the project and back to government after 20 years. This is a great model, the BOOT model. It means you build, you own, you operate and, heaven forbid, you transfer it back to government after 20 years.

Further disturbing evidence that was uncovered during the estimates budget review revealed a significant underspend in the capital budget. It was revealed that in 2015-16 we underspent on land, buildings and infrastructure, would you believe it, by \$28 million in Queensland, with a waiting list of 15,000 people, with people on the waiting list not even getting decent community and social housing. The Logan Renewal Initiative was a landmark project that would have brought the social housing delivery in Logan into the 21st century by providing tenants and industry tenancy management and community development services at the same time as substantially boosting the supply of housing in this region.

I want to use two local example—real examples. The government can throw around big numbers all the time, talking about thousands of jobs. Two contractors have contacted us. Maintenance contractor A—these are real people—attended all information sessions in 2014. They submitted competitive pricing to ensure success in the tender. They increased staffing levels gradually in anticipation of the start date in October 2015. Admin staff and tradespeople were all added, vehicles were bought and equipped for the October start date. When the start date was pushed back, the contractor made a decision to continue to employ the new recruits and retain the staffing levels to adequately service the Logan Renewal Initiative as the start date was imminent. The new members of staff were put to work even though the business was by no means running at its most efficient and, in effect, was barely breaking even—mostly running at a loss. This was not sustainable in the long term but the owner took the view that the pain would be short term and would ultimately pay dividends.

All field staff underwent training, inductions and various checks such as police checks which all came at a cost. Again, the owner absorbed these costs with the long-term view of providing a good service to the people of Logan. When the news was released regarding the cancellation, the owner has been put in a position of making a decision to retain staff and to lose money or to make them redundant. This is on top of the \$200,000 that has already been paid out or lost in lack of productivity. Unfortunately, it appears the commercial decision may result in a number of employees being let go. These are job losses as a result of this Labor government.

Maintenance contractor B has a long history of working in this sector in WA and Victoria and resided in Victoria up until four months ago. This contractor submitted very competitive pricing to ensure selection on the panel of providers. This contractor has sold up—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BENNETT:** I take that interjection from my colleagues. If they are laughing, it is a disgrace and they do need to listen. To meet the tender requirements, contractor B was to employ Logan based staff. He had been in contact with DATSIP with a view to engaging several Indigenous members of the community as trainees, apprentices or tradespeople if appropriate. As a direct result of the cancellation, those opportunities for local apprentices and Indigenous employment will be lost. Contractor B is weighing up his options whether to remain in Queensland to build a business or to return to Victoria. This will come with logistical costs, as well as the cost of unemployment.

There are plenty of comparisons that can be made out there about how the precinct based models are effective in Queensland. After all these years we had a project that was really important for job creation in the Queensland sector, with the potential to roll out across the state to provide real outcomes. Unfortunately, we have a failed Cornerstone Living as a guide for Queensland's long-term unsustainable provision of social housing.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (6.16 pm): I cannot be more taken aback by the utter hypocrisy of those opposite—utter hypocrisy. Let us not forget that a matter of months—weeks—after their election, after those opposite said the Public Service had nothing to fear from an LNP government, the member for Indooroopilly when he was the transport minister stood in this House and in response to a Dorothy Dixer of all things announced to 2,000 transport employees that they were going to be sacked. They found out that their jobs were for the cutting board through a Dorothy Dixer in this House. He did not have the courtesy to advise them individually before coming into this House that they would be sacked. The utter hypocrisy of the member for Indooroopilly to stand in this place and talk about job creation is astounding, as well as those opposite who stood behind the former member for Ashgrove when he said sacking people, sacking Queenslanders, was like getting out the pooper scooper and cleaning up a mess. That is the track record of those opposite.

The member for Clayfield presided over the sacking of 14,000 Queenslanders directly, but let's not talk about all of the community workers who were sacked because those opposite defunded them when they were in government. Their hypocrisy, their double standards, knows no bounds. The Premier is absolutely right. This government, the Palaszczuk Labor government, is absolutely 100 per cent committed to growing jobs in Queensland. We are focused primarily on doing that through driving investment, through building an innovative economy and also by building the infrastructure that this state needs.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the member for Nanango, who sat there laughing as she was part of a government that continued to sack Queenslanders and cut front-line services.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Honourable members! I do not need your assistance, Deputy Leader of the Opposition!

**Ms TRAD:** She wants to know where we are creating jobs. Let me list them for her. In the Darling Downs we are investing more than \$1.19 billion—

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the Leader of Opposition Business. I am talking to your backbench who think that your strategy is ridiculous. Let me tell you exactly—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Pause the clock. Deputy Premier, I would urge you to speak through the chair.

**Ms TRAD:** For the benefit of the House, let me explain exactly where we are building this infrastructure. In the Darling Downs, our infrastructure investment is supporting more than 3,500 jobs; in Wide Bay, more than 2,000 jobs; in Mackay, more than 1,500 jobs; in the outback, more than 2,000 jobs; in the far north, 2,000 jobs; in the Fitzroy region, more than 2,500 jobs; in Townsville, more than 1,500 jobs; in Logan, more than 500 jobs; in Ipswich, more than 2,500 jobs; on the Gold Coast, more than 3,000 jobs; on the Sunshine Coast, more than 4,500 jobs; and in Brisbane, more than 5,500 jobs. That is what we are delivering through our infrastructure program right across Queensland.

What did those opposite do? They sat on their hands and did nothing. They progressed nothing; they did nothing. They were happy to open projects that were built by Labor and funded by Labor. When it came to supporting the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, where were they? Nowhere. When it comes to supporting infrastructure projects like the Townsville stadium, where are they? They are nowhere because they do not believe in creating jobs. Any party which achieves government and turns around and sacks 14,000 Queenslanders has not one iota of interest in creating jobs for Queenslanders. Their hypocrisy knows no bounds.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (6.22 pm): The Premier said, 'My government will govern with humility, dignity and not arrogance.' That performance from the Deputy Premier was anything but humble; it was all arrogance. I take the interjection from the Premier earlier. The Premier said earlier that her policy is jobs, jobs, jobs. That is what the Premier said—jobs, jobs, jobs. Then she took an interjection from the Minister for Employment. How many jobs have been created under their jobs policy? Twenty-six jobs! 'My government is jobs, jobs, jobs.' Then with great excitement she took the interjection from the employment minister of 26 jobs. This is a \$100 million jobs package. That means for every 26 employees created in the state of Queensland it cost the taxpayers \$3.5 million each. It

cost \$3.5 million to create 26 jobs in the state of Queensland. Let us not mention Jobs Queensland. Let us not mention the additional 8,000 public servants working in Jobs Queensland who I do not think provide front-line services, considering there is no board even appointed.

**Mr Mander** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection from the honourable member for Everton. There are more people at a football game on a football field than jobs created under the Palaszczuk government. There are more people playing in my son's soccer match on Kawana football field than there are jobs created under Anastacia Palaszczuk's government.

This is a government that should be ashamed of its record—13.9 per cent youth unemployment. The Premier just said that they have an apprenticeship policy. Apprenticeships are on their way down in the state of Queensland. Apprenticeship completions are on their way down. Apprentice take-up rates are on their way down. Traineeships are on their way down. School based traineeships are on their way down. Whether you look at the completion rate or the take-up rate, everything is on the way down, down, down. Jobs are not being created.

The Deputy Premier says that we have an infrastructure revolution in the state of Queensland. The only thing I have seen the Deputy Premier don a hard hat for is the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, which was an LNP project and 1 William Street, which was a project started under the LNP. They opposed 1 William Street but they are going to move into it in a couple of months time. They took the media on an exclusive tour of it the other day. Then there is the Bruce Highway. They are cutting ribbons on the Bruce Highway. That was an LNP project. The only thing they can legitimately claim as their own is the Cross River Rail project, which does not have trains. They have tracks but they do not have trains. I am a fan of Thomas the Tank Engine and even the Thomas the Tank Engine movie has trains in it. This government is asleep at the wheel. This government does not have a clue.

I attended a business lunch today and the business community told me that what they know about this government is that the Premier does not know what she is doing. The business community knows that, if they want to talk and deal with the government, they do not go to the Premier; they go to the member for South Brisbane. They go to the Deputy Premier's office.

**Mr Mander:** They still get nothing there.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. They do not get anything out of the Deputy Premier, but they know that is where the power of this government lies. It is not in the Premier's office; it is in the Deputy Premier's office. The Deputy Premier said earlier that she was talking to the LNP backbench. No, she was auditioning to the Labor Party backbench. The Premier put herself on the speaking list today. Trot the Premier out. It is not often the Premier speaks on these motions, but jobs, jobs, jobs—26 jobs in the state of Queensland at a cost of \$3.5 million per job. What an achievement! Twenty-six jobs in the state of Queensland have been created. This government should hang its head in shame. They are not creating jobs. They are not creating infrastructure. They are all talk and no action. I am an Elvis fan—an impersonator at one stage in my life—and there was a song which went, 'A little less conversation, a little more action please'. That is what we need in the state of Queensland. Only the LNP will provide the action that Queensland needs. Only the LNP under Tim Nicholls will create the opportunities the business community needs to get Queensland going again.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Order! Before I call the Treasurer, I inform members that we have had people involved in the Queensland Parliamentary Research Internship program observing our proceedings in the public gallery.

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (6.28 pm): All I can say is that the member for Kawana certainly knows how to clear a room. They all left as soon as he finished his contribution.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** They couldn't wait to go.

**Mr PITT:** They could not wait to go. Some of them have handed their internships in after hearing that!

As Minister for Sport, I am a little concerned about the member for Kawana. If he thinks that soccer fields in Kawana can fit more than 36,600 people, which is how many people have come into jobs in Queensland since we have taken office, they have some big soccer fields on the Sunshine Coast. We might have to have a look at that.

I have touched on this earlier today and I see it again. This motion is nothing but a stunt and anyone worth their salt would know that. This House should reject this motion on the premise that it is false. It is false to suggest that we are not creating jobs in this state, when all of the data shows that we are outpacing the LNP in terms of job creation by a factor of more than two to one on average each

month. They were able to create 800 jobs per month on average; we have been creating 2,100 jobs per month on average since coming to office. The numbers say it all. That is something that I know the shadow Treasurer has struggled with and I hope he is going to have a good look at this. When we have the alternative treasurer and the alternative premier coming into this place talking the economy down, it is little wonder that they start believing their own information. It is very concerning.

Let me put a few other facts on the table. This government is very focused on job creation; we are not focused on job-destroying policies like we saw with the former government. We know that in the first Nicholls budget—and this has been touched on before—there were 14,000 jobs gone. The Newman-Nicholls government is very responsible for the economic growth slowdown we saw in this state, when it got down to 0.8 per cent growth in 2014-15. That in itself is a big problem.

Those opposite have criticised this side of the House for creating jobs in the public sector. I remember the former premier saying that the only real job is in the private sector, which no doubt added to the other terribly inflammatory comments he made about public sector workers in our state. In relation to the jobs that we have been creating, upwards of 86 per cent of the jobs that we have created in the public sector since coming to office have been in front-line services. Why? It is because we obviously value front-line services and we needed to restore them after the previous government tore things apart. It is also because those jobs are vital.

We are having to restore front-line services, but those opposite are constantly claiming that we have 8,000 too many staff in the public sector. What will the first LNP policy be if they take office under a government led by Tim Nicholls? Obviously it will be to sack 8,000 staff. That is clearly their line of thinking. That would be a case of *deja vu* and then some.

I have also heard the former treasurer, now opposition leader, say that one of the best predictors of future behaviour is past behaviour. If we take that logic, we know what will happen if there is an LNP government in Queensland again. They have already said that we have 8,000 too many staff in the public sector and that we should not have hired them and that we should not be providing front-line services to people. We also know that the same rhetoric that we have heard time and time again from the member for Clayfield will be coming through into an LNP government if they took office. That would mean there would be only three choices—massively raising taxes, fees and charges; cutting jobs and services; or selling assets.

We have apparently had some of those ruled out. The \$8 billion black hole that is being created each and every time the member for Clayfield and the member for Indooroopilly stand on their feet is because they refuse to back the government's approach. The government's approach has been to very sensibly go about our business, to restore confidence in the state, to make sure we are creating jobs and to make sure we have an economic plan which is laid out very clearly in the budget. That plan is about investing in infrastructure, getting an additional investment into the state and having a focus on innovation.

The announcement today was a great one. We have a very clear view, including our biofutures roadmap, in terms of a very big future in renewables and biofuels in this state. Those jobs are jobs that the LNP did not even think of. When I heard the US Navy's Tom Hicks today directly reference the leadership of this Premier as the reason why they were there, as the reason why the US Navy wants to come and actually be a very significant customer of this state, I could not have been prouder. It reinforces the motto that the Premier says time and time again: 'This government is about jobs, jobs, jobs.'

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

**AYES, 41:**

**LNP, 41**—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

**NOES, 44:**

**ALP, 41**—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**INDEPENDENT, 1**—Gordon.

Pair: Howard, Nicholls.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.38 pm to 7.38 pm.

## EXHIBITED ANIMALS REGULATION

### Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (7.38 pm): I move—

That the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016, subordinate legislation No. 69 of 2016, tabled in the House on 14 June 2016, be disallowed.

From the outset, I would like to strenuously point out that I along with my fellow LNP members in this House support stringent biosecurity measures for the protection of Queensland's food production, our native flora and fauna, as well as animal welfare in this state. However, the regulatory burden placed on our animal exhibitors across the state with this regulation puts the industry at risk of becoming extinct.

At the heart of this disallowance motion is the unfair targeting of animal exhibitors in this state by a government which is driven to shut down business, especially small business, by slapping them with uncomprehensive fees and burdening them with ridiculous red tape. It is also about job losses. I have fielded calls from across the state in relation to this legislation. In my own electorate of the Burdekin, these new regulations are set to impact on a small business, Hands on Wildlife. Ranger Dan and Jackie Hasling started Hands on Wildlife seven years ago. They are based in Townsville and provide educational programs to day care centres, schools and community events, like school fetes and shows, throughout the state but their primary focus is in the North Queensland region between Bowen, Ingham and Mount Isa. It is not just about showing animals; it is about educating the public on animals. They also offer snake-handling and dangerous wildlife awareness courses and wildlife rescue and relocation services.

Their mission is to bring people and animals closer than ever before in an effort to inspire everyone to appreciate, protect and conserve wildlife and wild places. Unfortunately, these types of businesses are now at risk through excessive red tape associated with the preparation of extensive management plans, record-keeping requirements and extremely high fees despite the industry repeatedly stating that these requirements would have a negative impact on their industry. Under the new act and with the new regulations, operators are now required to submit a management plan to the department for each species that they wish to exhibit. Existing operators will have to generate management plans for each species for which they already have a permit. There is not sufficient time to produce these retrospective management plans for existing operators. The management plans are lengthy and while there has been some indication that exhibitors may be able to group some animals together, it is still unclear what groupings will be accepted by the department.

In the case of Hands on Wildlife they have about 75 species, which translates to the production of between 200 and 400 pages of management plans. They have had permission to keep most of the species for the past seven years. Add to this the fact that it can take up to 40 days for the department to assess a management plan and honourable members begin to understand the level of frustration from the zoo industry. This puts operators at a disadvantage for acquiring individual animals, especially if they are animals which can be kept by recreational keepers, who do not have to complete management plans.

Operators believe that the solutions to this issue are: no retrospective management plans; if retrospective management plans are required, allow existing operators sufficient time to generate these plans; no management plan requirement for category A, and that is commonly kept, low-risk, native recreational animals such as the blue-tongue skink or the carpet python because these are low-risk animals and anyone over 13 can apply to keep them as a pet with no management plan required; and a better definition of groupings for management plans. The entire industry has raised the exorbitant amendment fee as a concern since the RIS in 2013. They believe their concerns were consistently dismissed and they were told that the fees were not set in stone until the regulation was ratified. However, the fees actually increased when the draft regulations came out with the fee structures not reflecting the actual risk. For example, the public can buy a common native species in a pet shop by applying for a recreational permit via an online app and they are not required to demonstrate a management plan. However, zoos holding these species are now expected to pay the same fee as if they were applying to keep a tiger or a lion and submit an extensive species management plan.

The department's prescribed fees which must be paid upon licence application are based on full-time-equivalent staff numbers, with the new exhibition licence fee for those having up to three full-time-equivalent staff costing \$3,169.15 or \$1,584.60 for a renewal; then \$4,981.45 for a new licence if you have between four and 15 full-time-equivalent staff and \$2,490.20 to renew a licence; and \$7,547.20 for a new licence if they have 16 or more full-time-equivalent staff. As the fees relate to the number of staff employed, this will ultimately cost jobs.

The fees are based on either a minor or a major change to the newly required management plan. The fee to add a species of animal or change an enclosure has increased by over 2,700 per cent, from \$16.80 to \$453. Minor changes are said to have a fee of \$153. There is no stated definition of minor versus major amendment; it will come down to the government's discretion. In the case of Hands on Wildlife, they have just submitted applications to add 40 new species and upgrade four enclosures under the old permit system. What was the cost? It was \$370. If they were to make application under the new regulations, the cost would be between \$6,732 if they are all minor and \$19,932 if they are deemed major. As honourable members can appreciate, these figures would cripple small businesses like Hands on Wildlife.

It appears that there is the potential for it to cost—determined only at the discretion of the assessing officer—the same to add a blue-tongue skink as it will to add a tiger to a licence. This does not reflect the cost of assessing the risk associated with each of those species. For example, under the proposed regulations, a blue-tongue skink would be a major amendment costing \$453. It is worth noting that this species is available to children in a pet shop to purchase without a licence.

What does the zoo industry recognise and what do they want? The zoo industry welcomes reform that reduces red tape and supports viable business and tourism activity. This includes the imposition of reasonable fees. As a national industry, the zoo community wants to work with government to develop an approach that recognises national industry best practice, accreditation and taxon standards and does not create a separate standard for the state of Queensland. The zoo industry wants the parameters of any fees clearly laid out without ambiguity. They want an equitable and level playing field on species available to be obtained freely by pet owners. Why should zoos be burdened with a management plan when the same species can be purchased in a pet shop without such need?

The zoo industry needs the confidence as to what taxon groups will be classified as 'species' and therefore require separate plans. Lack of consultation time has prevented this. For example, how will owners group animals together in the management plan? As an example, if we talk about venomous snakes we start to appreciate what that means. They recognised that there are varying risks with species held. Effort from biosecurity should be on exotic or dangerous animals. Any required management plans should be practice/risk based to allow for whole-of-business approaches to risk rather than a repetitive and cumbersome species-by-species approach. Operators should have SOPs that are inclusive of overarching management plans, not specific plans for each animal.

At the present time existing operators will not have the ability to adjust to the new legislation and add species at renewal. If they want to add species at renewal of their licences they will be charged for a new permit fee, which is double the renewal fee. The solution is: to allow existing operators to add additional species at the time of renewal for the cost of a renewal fee; to reduce major and minor amendment fees; to clearly define major and minor amendment fees and the associated categories; no amendment fee for category A animals or to expand an existing enclosure; minor amendment fee for category B animals; major amendment fee for category C/C1 or completely new enclosure.

The industry have been very clear that the additional red tape and increased fees will limit their ability to grow and diversify. Operators will not be able to easily take advantage of new animals or business opportunities. They may not be able to afford to make upgrades or changes to enclosures as frequently as they have in the past. Other parts of their business such as marketing will also get pushed aside in order to keep up with the plans and records required under the new regulations.

I believe the industry as a whole supports strong legislation and regulations. I most certainly do. It is in the industry's best interests to ensure that their animal welfare standards are the highest standards and that they do all that they can to mitigate any risk to themselves, their animals, the public and the environment. The exhibited animals industry has a good reputation in Queensland and they do not need unnecessary red tape and exorbitant fees to put their livelihoods at risk.

The government says these laws better manage risks to animals but businesses such as the Darling Downs Zoo say it will cost them 600 per cent more to introduce a new species. The amendment fees do not fairly address the risk. By pricing and classifying all new species as major amendments, the department is implying the risk is the same. The other point to make is that no exhibited animal facility will be able to hold a species for captive breeding, research or re-release. Historically, exhibitors have been the driving force behind many endangered species programs. Under this regulation they will not be able to take part unless animals are removed from these vital programs and operators are forced into meeting the minimum display obligations.

I note the committee's comments that management plans are not currently required for animals other than declared pests under the land protection act, which aligns with category C animals in the bill, and this therefore is an area where red tape and regulatory burden has in fact increased for industry.

Furthermore, I note the committee has not contemplated a specific amendment in relation to management plans per se but sees merit in limiting the scope and reach of the management plan requirements to reduce the regulatory impact and costs for animal exhibitors.

I will not stand by and see these industries suffer. The only sensible resolution tonight is for this regulation to be disallowed and for the government to go back to the industry and consult with them as they should have done in the first place.

 **Mr GORDON** (Cook—Ind) (7.49 pm): I move—

That the motion be amended by inserting after the word 'That', the following words 'Schedule 3 only of'.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (7.50 pm): I rise to speak against the disallowance motion before the House tonight. I do so because I am proud to be a member of a government that puts a premium on fairness and which values consultation. On both of these measures, fairness and consultation, the Exhibited Animals Act 2015 and the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016 pass the test with flying colours. Fees under the previous legislation were anything but fair. They resulted in small exhibitors subsidising larger ones. Fees for the licensing of exotic animals were only about 10 per cent of the fee for native animals. When it comes to rates, the same principle is in play when home owners pay rates to their local councils. It would not be fair if the owner of a mansion set in a hectare of grounds paid the same fee as someone in a small one-bedroom unit. There is an assumption that someone with a larger, more elaborate and highly valued home can afford to pay more than someone who lives in a flat. Is there anyone in this House who questions the fairness of that principle?

For much the same reason, the fees are structured to take into account the size of the business and level of risk associated with its operation. The result is that the majority of exhibitors now pay less or about the same as they did under the previous legislation. A few larger exhibitors have seen their fees rise to higher levels, but it is in line with their ability to pay. Those who exhibit exotic animals only—for example, magicians, circuses and zoos—also pay higher fees compared to the previous lower rate. By the same token, I believe that the majority of Queenslanders will find it reasonable that fees payable to the government reflect the cost of the service that the government provides. If an assessment by a suitably qualified professional can be completed in one hour, surely it should cost less than one by the same person that takes two or three hours. That is precisely what happens now under the regulation the LNP wants to scrap.

Under the previous legislation operators were charged just \$16 for an amendment to their licence for a native species. There was no fee for an amendment to add an exotic animal to a licence even though the risks are significantly higher. By any measure, \$16 is not a fair or reasonable fee for anything in 2016 other than a cup of coffee and a cheese sandwich. Does anyone know a plumber who charges a \$16 call-out fee to change a leaky tap? I do not think so. Can anyone name a lawyer who will charge you \$16 to come to your home or place of work to provide a legal service?

**A government member** interjected.

**Mr BUTCHER:** A good friend of mine on this side probably would; he is a good bloke. As we are talking about welfare and risk threats associated with animals, perhaps we should be considering how much a vet might charge for a home visit to treat a sick dog or a horse. I dare say it is more than \$16.

I think I have dealt with the fairness issue, so I would now like to turn my attention to the question of whether there was adequate consultation on the act and regulation before it was implemented. By my reckoning there were approximately five years of consultation with stakeholders. Do I think that is adequate? I do not think any Queenslander would conclude that the government of the day rushed into these reforms without considering the possible consequences. Workshops were first conducted on key principles of legislation as long ago as April 2011 in Brisbane, Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Gladstone, Rockhampton and Cairns. In November 2013 the previous LNP government continued the consultation process through a regulatory impact statement. A number of options were proposed and the majority of respondents favoured this new legislation. Fees and detailed assessments of costs and benefits were considered as part of this consultation. In July 2014—again during the previous LNP government—there was consultation on a draft bill which informed further development of the 2015 bill. In April 2015 the Agriculture and Environment Committee held a public hearing to provide industry and stakeholders with an opportunity to submit responses to the proposed Exhibited Animals Bill 2015.

In October last year the industry was consulted on the process for meeting the criteria for category C1 species. C1 species are exotic species that are deemed suitable for mobile exhibition—an opportunity that the regulation provides and which was not previously available to this sector of the industry. That consultation resulted in industry nominating species being assessed and listed in the

regulation. Finally, in March 2016 consultation was undertaken on an exposure draft of this regulation. This last consultation related to fees, record keeping, mandatory conditions of licences and national tax on specific codes. As a result of feedback received, the tax on codes were omitted to provide more time for these to be agreed nationally and for further consultation within the industry.

I cannot imagine what more could have been done in terms of liaising with stakeholders and acting upon concerns that they raised prior to the introduction of these regulations. Throughout this lengthy process the fee structure—the principle of users being charged fairly—and the appropriate work involved in the granting and amending of licences and the various obligations for exhibitors were discussed openly and with stakeholders affected.

**An honourable member:** They were long the whole time.

**Mr BUTCHER:** They were long and they were thorough. There has been no sleight of hand here: only honest, open, transparent lawmaking. For the reasons that I have described, and because the regulations represent sensible and overdue reform, the motion before the House deserves to fail. The opposition has not provided a convincing case for this disallowance.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (7.56 pm): In addressing the contribution by the member for Gladstone, who, I must add, was actually a good chair of the Agriculture and Environment Committee—and I have a lot of respect for the way that he conducted the committee—I do point out that when this bill was done a year or so ago I do not remember any consultation about being in line with your ability to pay. I do not think a modern democracy would talk about people's capacity to pay based on their earnings. This disallowance motion is not about wanting to scrap the regulation at all; it is about wanting the department to go back and start to deal with the key stakeholders about fair regulation. The industry never said they were against paying what is fair and reasonable; what they are objecting to is how they have not been consulted. I think they would take offence to three-year-old debate references being used. You must be talking to different people, member for Gladstone, if you have had industry feedback that says they have been consulted. Clearly they want to be charged fairly, and all we are asking is that the department take the time to go back to this industry and put what is fair and reasonable. I think Queenslanders deserve that as well.

There is a need for a disallowance motion, as the unintended consequences of this are an unfair burden on an innocent industry. There is a need for a disallowance motion, as the real outcome is that the minister must finally make just one decision in the interests of important community concerns. We need the minister to facilitate real industry engagement to find a fair and workable solution while facilitating community discussion to resolve the issue. We would also expect an apology for the many offensive and insulting comments in the media referring to the Zoo and Aquarium Association, particularly in the local media. We expect more from a local member who should be fighting for this sector. The industry was quite upset and insulted by the reference to it not being efficient or having the genuine interests of animal welfare at heart. The zoo industry deserves better recognition of the value and professionalism it brings to the state and the national economy, tourism and education.

The policy objectives are in the explanatory notes. It is important that the members of the agriculture committee remember what happened. The objective of the bill was to provide for exhibiting and dealing with exhibited animals while ensuring that animal welfare, biosecurity and safety risks are minimised. The bill also seeks to consolidate and streamline regulation of the exhibited animals industry which is currently spread across several acts. Clearly these regulations fail.

Reforms that reduce red tape and support viable business and tourism activity are what we all in this place want to achieve. No-one can argue, and the industry recognises, that a reasonable fee for processing is fair, but at the first test the minister has allowed an obscene increase in regulatory burden. Last year the committee heard that the bill would reduce the regulatory burden on exhibitors—that has not happened—and that it is consistent with the government's red-tape-reduction commitments. We all hoped that would be the case when the regulations were brought forward some months ago.

Exhibitors raised concerns with the committee about the requirement to prepare management plans, potential duplication with other legislation, application and renewal processes for authorities, and administrative requirements associated with reporting, notification and record keeping. The industry needs an equitable and level playing field on species available to be obtained freely by pet owners. Why should zoos be burdened by a management plan when the same species can be purchased in a pet shop without such need?

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr BENNETT:** It is a good question. Maybe the member could answer it.

Problems and concerns in relation to management plans led to a committee comment, which states—

The committee acknowledges the intent and potential value of management plans but are concerned that the scope of this requirement, extending to all exhibitors for all species of animals including lower risk species and those that may be kept by private citizens for recreational use ...

...

This is therefore an area where red tape and regulatory burden has in fact increased for industry.

...

The committee has not contemplated a specific amendment in relation to management plans but sees merit in limiting the scope and reach of the management plan requirements to reduce the regulatory impact and costs for animal exhibitors.

If government members of the Agriculture and Environment Committee want to rewrite the report on the Exhibited Animals Bill from a year ago, maybe they need to go back to the words they put their names to and signed off on. Clearly, tonight they are in contradiction of that committee report, which was a bipartisan report based on the understanding that the committee's recommendations would be listened to. The committee comment continues—

It may be necessary to review the consistency of provisions including clauses 37, 53, 58, 63-65, 69, 77, 80, 132-133 ...

Members can guess what happened. All were ignored. Point for clarification A states—

The committee invites the Minister to inform the House how his department will consult animal exhibitors, including mobile exhibitors not represented by a peak body, during the development of regulations, guidelines, codes and template documents ...

They say they have not even heard from the minister. Point for clarification C states—

The committee invites the Minister to assure the House that the department will consult with animal exhibitors before prescribing any matters by regulation ...

The disallowance is supported with the committee report and the department's assurances to the committee, which state—

Broad communication to the general public about these Acts, which both include a general obligation that will impact keepers of animals, will occur in the lead up to their commencement which must occur before 1 July 2016. The communication strategy will include internal communication to ensure government officers are able to engage and educate stakeholders on the changes ...

The Zoo and Aquarium Association challenges that assumption. Of course, they did talk about doing an information session on social media. It is another example of clear failure which further justifies this disallowance motion.

At the time, the committee was satisfied with the assurances that have clearly not been undertaken. We do not support the new regulations as they stand due to a lack of meaningful industry consultation, a lack of documented transparency in the application of fees, excessive cost increases and an unworkable level of new regulatory burden. The disallowance motion will force the department to go back to the table and engage with key stakeholders including the Zoo and Aquarium Association Australasia—something that is fair and reasonable.

There will be increased red-tape burden as a result of these regulations. Permit holders will now be required to generate an extensive management plan for each species on the permit. For most zoos with even moderate sized collections this may represent several hundred pages of new work. The public can buy a common native species in a pet shop by applying for a recreational permit online and they are not required to demonstrate a management plan. Zoos holding these same species are now expected to pay the same fee as if applying to keep a tiger or a lion. All holders are expected to transition to the new system as of 1 July as each licence is due for renewal. This results in entire applications for some facilities requiring collation before the application process has been developed. This represents a huge administrative burden, and there is not even a phased roll-out. The department has advised that in some cases it will be cheaper to simply apply for an entirely new permit, at some thousands of dollars, than to try to effect amendments to existing ones where a host of changes are sought.

Fees are based on either a minor or a major change to the newly required management plan. The fee to add a species of animal or change an enclosure has increased by over 2,700 per cent. Minor changes are set to have a fee of over \$150. Fees are set for minor and major changes to permits of approximately \$150 and \$453 respectively and will increase annually with CPI. There is no stated definition of a 'minor' versus 'major' amendment. It will come down to the government's discretion. This is unworkable and open to bias. This is in addition to licence renewal fees, which can amount to thousands of dollars.

All members should support this disallowance motion, if the intention is to facilitate good policy outcomes. Members of the Agriculture and Environment Committee should be offended and should support their recommendations, which have been ignored. Let us allow the department to engage and develop consultative policy that is fair and meets the expectations of Queenslanders. I ask the minister to start to fight for Queenslanders and show real leadership. Let us strive for good policy in Queensland.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8.05 pm): I add my support to the disallowance motion relating to the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016. As the former shadow minister for agriculture I am particularly interested in this issue, as I have followed the path of these regulations since the passing of the exhibited animals legislation in May 2015. I thank my colleagues the new shadow minister for agriculture and the member for Burnett, who are very much across this issue. They have had to explain to those opposite that this is not about us opposing the legislation; we are seeking to disallow the regulation. Those opposite who will speak may wish to adjust their talking points. It will be interesting to follow the debate of this disallowance motion.

During the time we were considering the legislation and looking at the draft regulations I was contacted by Mr Ben Bawden of Bawden's Cockatoo Chaos. He highlighted his concerns and those of his small business about the contents of the then draft regulations. Ben is a great, dedicated young man who runs his own mobile wildlife demonstration business. He is a professional, he is committed and he is passionate about wildlife.

There are about 70 family owned wildlife demonstration businesses like Ben's around Queensland providing education and awareness for our community. It is businesses like this that take the time to go to the small country shows, like the eight country shows in my electorate and those in the electorate of Callide. It is disappointing that the Minister for Agriculture does not seem to get the value of these businesses. Perhaps that is because there are only 70 of them. I will get to the lack of consultation that seems to be a thread of this Palaszczuk Labor government. It is disappointing that this minister just does not seem to get it.

These people were hugely disappointed by the minister's dreadful comments in relation to the zoo industry. As a result of those comments they just do not feel supported. It is disappointing that the minister would be so overt in her comments, sideswiping this whole industry. As I said, she has probably looked at it and thought, 'There are only 70.' It is a bit like 'we have created only 26 jobs in Queensland'.

It is these businesses that introduce our children to native wildlife. They teach them how to care for them and how to look after our fauna. We have all enjoyed their performances at our local shows, our schools, our festivals, birthday parties and, for some of the more urban members, shopping centres. For children in our cities, this can sometimes be the only opportunity they have to see wild animals in real life. I thank Ben for his obvious commitment to this industry and congratulate him on his tireless efforts, working with the opposition to shine a light on these onerous regulations.

It was wonderful to see Ben and his family at the Toogoolawah Show recently. He told me how he started his business on the Darling Downs. When he started that business it cost him \$2,000 in fees and permits. He gradually added the 26 species to his collection of animals. He does not dispute the need to pay fees. Let us fast forward to today. If this same gentleman was to start this business with this Minister for Agriculture's proposed regulations, it would now cost him around \$15,000. He and other industry members are distraught that there has been widespread condemnation from stakeholders who believed the new regulations were rushed, poorly thought through and showed blatant disregard for industry feedback. There are two key problems. The first is the exorbitant permit fee hikes. Again, those in the industry understand that they have to pay, and I note that the former minister for agriculture is in the chamber and I am sure he gets this. They know they have to pay fees, but in this case it is a 2,700 per cent increase. The second key problem is the over-the-top requirements for species management plans.

I believe it is the job of governments to support small businesses, support innovators and entrepreneurs and support people like Ben who do want to start their own business and who do want to employ people. When we see regulations like this that have been rushed through and that have the potential to make businesses unviable, it is extremely concerning. In my speech in this House in May 2015 in debate on the legislation I highlighted these industry concerns and I asked the department through the minister—if I have my history right, it was Minister Bill Byrne at the time—to aim to reduce the regulatory burden rather than increase it. Whether through the crossover to the new minister it has just gone through to the keeper we will never know. Instead, we now have a group of small businesses that will be bogged down in this onerous paperwork and they also face a huge increase of their fees and permits. Again, they are happy to pay fees but I ask those opposite to consider a 2,700 per cent increase in fees. Is that supporting small business? Is that supporting rural and regional Queensland? Obviously it is not and it certainly should not happen.

I again ask the Minister for Agriculture, who is in the chamber tonight, and her department to go back to those stakeholders. How about consulting with these stakeholders, because those in the industry who are talking to our side of the chamber are certainly saying loud and clear that they have not been consulted by this Labor government? They know and understand that that is the thread of what this Labor government is about: 'If it's in rural and regional Queensland, we just will ignore it and we certainly won't listen to their concerns.' I again ask this minister that she take another look at the regulation, she listen to the industry and she actually consults with the industry and develops a more practical, workable solution including a fee structure that these businesses can simply afford.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (8.12 pm): In rising to speak against the motion, I want to highlight some of the benefits of the Exhibited Animals Act 2015 and the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016. One of the most important functions we can perform as members of the House is to reform and modernise legislation when it has become outdated and inappropriate, and I think that is one of the main reasons why all of us came into this chamber. There is no doubt that the previous hotchpotch of laws and regulations governing exhibited animals were in desperate need of reform. They were: confusing—a little bit like some members of the opposition; cumbersome—again like some members of the opposition; ineffective—do I need to say it again; and restrictive. The legislation and regulation those opposite are seeking to disallow tonight were specifically drafted to modernise, simplify and streamline old unwieldy laws. That is why I am confused why members on the other side of the chamber are not supporting these laws.

These laws were restricting our exhibited animals sector and preventing efficient and effective risk management in the industry. Again I am confused why those opposite are opposing these laws. The act replaces six licensing schemes and provisions previously spread across four acts with a single licensing scheme. It is a great example of practical and sensible red-tape reduction. It is strange that on the other side we have a group that are always saying that they want to reduce red tape, but tonight they are opposing it. Tonight they want to keep red tape. It is puzzling then that those opposite have their hearts now set on scrapping reforms which so effectively simplify how the government authorises the exhibition of animals in Queensland.

The reforms allow zoos, circuses, magicians, animal sanctuaries and tourist attractions with feature animal exhibits greater freedom to react to the wishes of their customers. Those exhibitors who previously required a number of licences can now operate under a single licence contained under a single act—again, more red-tape reduction. This single licence is valid for three years and gives licence holders authority to exhibit a greater range of species, including species not previously permitted for exhibition in Queensland. The opposition is opposing a bill that will allow more exotic animals to be exhibited in Queensland. I just do not understand it.

**Mr Perrett** interjected.

**Mr MADDEN:** For the first time Queensland operators are able to compete on a level playing field with their competitors in other states—why do you hate competitors in other states, member for Gympie?—provided of course that they can demonstrate their ability to adequately manage the risks. They can continue to offer world-class wildlife experiences for tourists and their local communities with new and exciting species. Operators also have the flexibility to choose how best to look after their animals, so this act and regulation are an animal welfare issue as well and how best to handle safety and biosecurity risks through the development of management plans. The act better manages risks to the welfare of exhibited animals. It improves management risks of animals escaping into the wild where they would be a danger to native animals and humans whilst at the same time continuing to manage the potential for diseases to spread by exhibited animals.

The regulation outlines obligations for operators to keep certain records—obligations not covered in the previous legislation. Records are important for a licence holder to demonstrate how they are meeting their minimum exhibition requirement for both native and exotic animals and ensure the department has the means to underpin an effective compliance and enforcement program for the act. Without records it would be impossible to regulate the sale and acquisition of animals. It would make it impossible to know whether animals have been acquired legitimately or whether they are being taken illegally from the wild. Without records it would be impossible to monitor adequately whether a licence holder is acquiring animals for public display or whether they are simply obtaining animals for private collections. Records are also important to monitor an animal's welfare and health. I ask members opposite: what is there not to like about the obligation to keep records? What is so bad about the obligation to keep records?

I also point out that years of preparatory work went into the act and regulation. No-one can claim that reforms introduced through the act were drafted in haste. The first workshops to discuss the proposed changes with industry representatives were way back in 2011.

Every aspect of the reforms, including the likely fee structures, was the subject of painstaking consultation over many years including, sadly, during the term of the previous LNP government. Yet the LNP now seeks to render all of those countless hours of careful consideration by all stakeholders null and void. The LNP is seeking to declare that process a gigantic waste of time.

I would also like to refer to the fee reforms. The new fees better reflect the cost of providing the licensing structure and the resources that are required to authorise and monitor exhibitors. It is worth considering that the previous charge for licence amendments has been used as the baseline when calculating the percentage increases under the new legislation. There is no justification for the disallowance motion before the House and it should be dismissed.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (8.20 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the motion to disallow the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016. The exhibited animals industry is of great importance to the economy of Australia and to the education of all Australians. Australian zoos are worth more than \$540 million to the Australian economy annually. They employ more than 5,300 people Australia wide and welcome 15 million people through their gates, including 3.3 million overseas tourists. Zoos play an important role in educating the public about animals, with more than 600,000 school students visiting zoos every year. A third of those zoos, aquariums and wildlife parks are located in Queensland and the majority of them are operated as private concerns. The flow-on effect of tourists going to zoos and aquariums is immeasurable, with accommodation and food providers, other tourist attractions and small local businesses also benefiting from people visiting these zoos.

One would think that, with such statistics that show the benefits of zoos to the economy, the Queensland Labor government would be encouraged to maintain and assist the exhibited animals industry by reducing red tape and supporting innovation and small business. That does not seem to be the case with this government. The Labor government has presented the exhibited animals industry with more bureaucracy and, to add insult to injury, like most of the legislation that comes through this House, the development and consultation process has been minimal and rushed. The exorbitant and unnecessary fees that the Labor government wants to inflict upon the exhibited animals industry could see smaller zoos and aquariums go out of business.

The fee to add a species of animal or change an enclosure has increased from approximately \$15.70 to approximately \$453. According to an answer to a question on notice to Minister Donaldson, these new fees take into account annual indexation increases and charges in line with government policy. This fee increase is well in excess of 2,000 per cent which, I am pretty sure, is a much larger figure than the current annual indexation figure. Not only is there an increase in fees; there are still no clear definitions to address many of the concerns of the industry.

The exhibited animals industry recognises that fees need to apply for the processing of applications and wants to work with the state government to enhance their business. However, with little to no consultation and large increases in fees, the exhibited animals industry is bewildered by the rapid increase in red tape that is aimed directly at their industry and are asking why. Many animal exhibitors are family owned businesses. They do not have the administrative capacity to duplicate work that has already been successfully completed in previous years, such as the management plans that are required retrospectively for each species already kept by the exhibitor. Does the department have the staffing capability or specialised expertise to properly assess the huge number of repeat management plans that will result from this requirement?

I have one zoo in my electorate of Condamine, the Darling Downs Zoo, which is located at Clifton. This zoo is a privately owned zoo that is run by the Robinson family, who are passionate about the exhibited animals industry. They employ 10 full-time staff and, in 2015, had over 50,000 people through their gates. The Darling Downs Zoo supports the local contractors, who supply them with their plumbing, electrical and building requirements to maintain their facilities. The Robinsons source as much feed as possible for the animals within the zoo locally and support other local tourism businesses on the Darling Downs.

These fee changes and the requirement to generate management plans of over 200 pages for each species on each permit will mean that small family owned zoos are going to be weighed down by paperwork and red tape. That could result in the demise of many small family owned exhibited animal businesses in Queensland.

If this government were serious about small business and tourism, it would support this motion. I ask the House to consider the concerns of the exhibited animals industry and vote for a disallowance of this regulation.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (8.24 pm): I rise to speak to this motion to disallow the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016. It seems that, whenever this government has to address issues around the management of animals and the environment, it resorts to demonising those industries and businesses involved and introduces onerous, unfair and excessive penalties and regulations. The government's record is appalling. It still does not seem to get the message that resorting to more regulation places a greater burden on businesses and reduces potential growth and unemployment. Let me make this very clear: Queensland does not have the luxury of indulging in making it harder for business to do business.

In its arrogance, the government has ignored key recommendations made by its own members who sit on and chair the Agriculture and Environment Committee. This disallowance motion has been moved because the red tape and compliance level being imposed is onerous. Many of the fee increases are unjustifiable and exorbitant. These regulations, which came into effect on 1 July, are justifiably condemned as bureaucratic, rushed and poorly developed with inadequate consultation with stakeholders.

Under the new act and regulation, operators have to submit management plans for every species that they wish to exhibit. Despite already having permits for each species, operators have to generate four- to five-page retrospective management plans. It is time consuming and simply unmanageable. Although some exhibitors may be able to group some animals together, it is still unclear what groupings will be acceptable. This bureaucratic nightmare means that a North Queensland business that has 75 different species will now have to produce 200 to 400 pages of management plans. That is despite having had permission over the past seven years for most of the species.

The fee structure appears to be an exercise in gouging by the government to make up for budget shortfalls. Queensland is not some South American banana republic where governments charge whatever takes its fancy and ignores the consequences. For many wildlife demonstrators, the fee hikes are 30-fold. The Zoo and Aquarium Association reports that some licence fees have increased by over 2,000 per cent. Other organisations have calculated increases of over 2,800 per cent. The Darling Downs Zoo advises that it will cost 600 per cent more to introduce new species.

When mobile wildlife education business Bawden's Cockatoo Chaos started, it grew over three years to holding 26 species, which would now cost nearly \$6,000; whereas before July it was \$15 to add two new species. The Fraser Coast Wildlife Sanctuary curator Ray Revill said that the cost to acquire a new species and have its enclosure approved is so extravagant that zoo and sanctuary operators are seriously having to consider closure.

The fees are based on either a minor or major change to the new management plans. However, there is no definition of what is a minor or major change. As this is a government that has absolutely no idea of what it is doing, that decision will be at the government's discretion, leaving the system unworkable and open to bias and interpretation.

These fees are in addition to licence renewal fees, which cost thousands. If existing operators want to add a species when renewing their licences, they will be charged a new permit fee—double the renewal fee. To add a species or change an enclosure, the fee has increased by over 2,700 per cent. As the fees are calculated in relation to full-time-equivalent staff employed, this increase will clearly hurt small business, cost jobs and make it harder for businesses to stay afloat, or even to establish new businesses.

Industry consultation has been tokenistic, completely dismissing the effects of these increases in fees on stakeholders. Overwhelmingly, exhibitors say that their concerns are consistently dismissed. Despite being told that the new fees were not set in stone until the regulation was put in place, the fees were increased when the draft regulation was released.

Despite claiming the laws better manage risk to animals, the amendment fees do not fairly reflect the actual risk. By pricing and classifying all new species as major amendments, the implication is that the risk is the same; in effect costing the same to add a blue-tongue skink as a tiger to a licence. Claims that the new fees reflect the cost of providing the licensing service are deceptive. Somehow it costs \$345 to add a new finch, skink or python, yet a domestic buyer using a smartphone can get a cheap recreational licence and buy the same animal from a pet shop. The government needs to talk with industry stakeholders to address their concerns and come up with practical, workable solutions and a fee structure that industry can afford. This disallowance motion should be supported.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (8.30 pm): I rise to speak against this disallowance motion and in favour of the changes that will reduce red tape for an industry sector that makes an important contribution to the Queensland economy. In speaking against the motion, I will refer to a speech made in the House in support of the Exhibited Animals Bill 2015 on 21 May just last year. The speech is an enthusiastic endorsement of the laws introduced on 1 July and the rationale behind their introduction.

It notes that most of the industry supports the bill as it seeks to ensure new opportunities for the industry and it deals with community expectations of risk while minimising risks to animal welfare, biosecurity and safety. The speech acknowledges the legislation current at the time was fragmented, insufficient and disjointed and its author recognises the extensive consultation process that was undertaken during 2014 and 2015. It was a speech given by the member for Burnett, who was careful to mention that the bill had been introduced by the previous LNP minister for agriculture, the former member for Toowoomba South.

It is tempting to ponder what has changed since 21 May 2015 given that the fee structure for new and renewed licences and amended licences are as the Decision Regulatory Impact Statement recommended—that is to say, that they are set to achieve full cost recovery. That was the intention of the previous Nicholls-Newman government when it introduced the legislation and that is why today's disallowance motion is an act of base hypocrisy.

To offer greater insight on why the House should not support the disallowance motion I would like to quote verbatim from the member for Burnett's speech. I am happy to table the Hansard record. He said—

All governments should be looking at reducing the regulatory burden and providing Queenslanders with opportunity. We want to see innovation and adaption by business in what should be an evolving industry. As a result, we have some animals that are not able to be exhibited at all. Of course, Queensland needs this opportunity and we need to be able to manage the risks that are involved. In the past, safety and animal welfare risks posed by exhibiting animals have not been appropriately regulated.

The bill will simplify how government authorises the exhibition of animals that generally cannot be kept in Queensland without a licence. Only those exhibitors who need a licence under the current legislation will need a licence under this new legislation. The Exhibited Animals Bill 2015 will consolidate the regulatory burden and licensing schemes for the successful exhibition of native and exotic animals into a best practice legislative framework by requiring exhibitors, the best people, to take a more active role in identifying and managing animal welfare and important biosecurity and safety risks that impact when exhibiting these important species.

I will end the quote there, but I recommend that everybody should read the member for Burnett's previous contribution to the debate, especially what he has to say about risk based licensing decisions. If this disallowance motion is passed by the House today the opportunity to foster world-class wildlife experiences for tourists and the Queensland community will be lost. Disallowance will mean that certain pests will be less regulated. For example, an exhibitor can apply to keep and exhibit a rabbit. However, there will be no requirement to desex the rabbit which currently exists in the regulation. We know how important it is to ensure that rabbits are effectively managed to protect our agricultural industries. It will mean fees cannot be charged for new licences, renewal of licences or amendment to licences, limiting the government's capacity to monitor and regulate the industry.

The Exhibited Animals Regulation reforms make sense. They previously attracted bipartisan support in this House and, as we have seen, they were enthusiastically welcomed by the member for Burnett when he was a member of the Agriculture and Environment Committee which scrutinised the bill. They provide a more effective way to manage risks to the welfare of exhibited animals, the risks of animals escaping and becoming pests and the risks of spreading disease or injuring people.

I have previously made mention of the extensive consultation undertaken on these regulations. The exhibited animals industry has been consulted over a period of years on the development of the legislation. In fact, workshops were first conducted on it in Brisbane, Gold Coast, Gladstone, Rockhampton and Cairns as far back as 2011. Further workshops were held during 2012, and in November 2013 industry was consulted through a public consultation regulatory impact statement. A number of options were proposed with the majority of industry respondents favouring new legislation. Fees and detailed assessments of costs and benefits were considered as part of this consultation. It was consultation with a purpose and with a tangible outcome. It was clear during face-to-face meetings between exhibitors and departmental staff that small businesses felt it was unfair that they should have to pay the same for their licences as much larger zoos and circuses. This is not a cash grab; it is sensible, needed reform, and the disallowance motion is a piece of hypocritical grandstanding.

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (8.37 pm): I will keep my comments relevant to the regulations. In Minister Byrne's introductory speech he said that the Palaszczuk government will continue to work with the exhibitors. That is what we are encouraging them to do: continue to work with the exhibitors who are being ripped off as a result of this regulation. The minister also said that accredited assessors will be required to disclose any conflicts of interest. There are no accredited assessors! Minister, tell us how many accredited assessors there are in Queensland for these regulations?

I originally came from the horticultural industry. To be a supplier to any of the major supermarkets you have to have quality assurance programs in place, systems such as HACCP—Hazard Analysis Critical Control Point. People making ice-cream and people selling food do not have government inspectors and that is a lot more dangerous than most of these animals that are in cages.

**Mr Madden:** Tigers aren't dangerous?

**Mr RICKUSS:** In Queensland more people die of food poisoning than get eaten by tigers. I will bet you on that. It is self-assessment. If there are quality assurance programs there will need to be accredited assessors to make sure they are doing the right thing. It is not about that. What we are talking about is the rip-off of the schedule of fees. This is a rip-off. If you employ three full-time-equivalent employees or less, it will cost you somewhere between \$1,100 and \$3,000 an employee. If you are a big player and you employ over 15 people—you might employ 100 people if you are one of the bigger zoos around the place—it will cost you \$75 an employee. How is that justifiable? It is a rip-off. It costs \$179 an hour for a bureaucrat to do an assessment. This should be self-assessable with accreditation and then the department can do inspections. That is what every other industry does—for example, the food industry.

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr RICKUSS:** I can hear the comments of the member for Logan, but he does not actually understand how the legislation works. The regulations come in after the legislation is passed. And guess what?

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order, member for Logan!

**Mr RICKUSS:** He is being very disruptive. The member for Mackay really struggled with the fact that we are talking about the regulation, not the bill. We all agree that we want good biosecurity around animals and so on, but this is about the regulations and the ridiculous fees. The deputy opposition leader spoke about Ben Bawden from Bawden's Cockatoo Chaos: it was \$2,000 and now will be \$15,000. Ben presented at the 2014 inquiry. He said that the proposed bill will increase the amount of red tape and impact on small businesses in this state. That is what he said then about our bill and I totally agreed with him.

There should more self-assessment and regulations that they can manage. That is what businesses do. Do we have inspectors checking on Boeing aeroplanes? Of course we do not! They do self-assessment on all of their planes. There are 500 people flying in the sky and it is all self-assessed. However, if you have three goannas and two blue-tongue lizards, we want bloody government inspectors going to check on them. Bugger me dead! How stupid are we?

**Mrs Frecklington:** A 3,700 per cent increase in the fees.

**Mr RICKUSS:** That is right. I just mentioned the jump from \$2,000 to \$15,000. It just goes on and on. The fees have increased dramatically and they are unfair as well. I expect full support from this side of the House and I will be very surprised if the motion is not supported.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (8.42 pm): I pick up where the member for Lockyer also started, by calling into question the member for Mackay's contribution. She quoted the shadow minister for agriculture in his contribution to what was then the legislation around exhibited animals. I can tell the House that, when I was the minister for environment, everyone in the exhibited animals industry was hanging out for that legislation to come through. They were waiting for the day when we would modernise the legislation that sits around the regulating of their industry. It was well and truly overdue. It started under the LNP, it concluded under the ALP and that is why it had our support. However, there is a difference between the legislation itself and the regulation that followed and, therefore, tonight the LNP is moving to disallow that regulation.

Even when the LNP was in government, the animal exhibitors had concerns about where the regulation could go. It was always a case of the devil being in the detail. Even then they were talking to myself and my good colleague the honourable Dr John McVeigh, who was then the agriculture minister, about what was going to appear in the regulation. We gave them assurances that we would hear their concerns and therefore reflect the regulation. Unfortunately, the Palaszczuk Labor government ended up being not only the one to introduce and pass the legislation but also the one to force through the regulation that we are debating this evening.

I hate to say this, but the exhibitors were spot-on. They had every reason to be concerned about the devil in the detail, because what we are debating tonight is exactly that. Under the new act and regulation, operators are required to submit management plans to the agriculture department for every species they wish to exhibit. Exhibitors will be required to generate management plans for each species they already have a permit for and they believe that there is simply not enough time to produce those retrospective management plans, which are lengthy and time consuming to produce being between four and five pages long. While some exhibitors may be able to group some animals together, it is unclear what groupings will be accepted by the department.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you and I both know that one of the greatest animal exhibitors in the state is Australia Zoo. It is a true wildlife warrior that also offers employment through what is probably the iconic tourism attraction on the Sunshine Coast. This evening I looked quickly at the Australia Zoo website. It has 86 different animals. That may not include different species, because as we all know there are four different species of kangaroo alone. On the basis that there are 86 different species, we are looking at in the order of 400 pages of management plans, most for species that Australia Zoo has had in its keeping for more than seven years. That is unrealistic. It is unfair that that be imposed on an organisation such as Australia Zoo. Some may say, 'It's fine. Australia Zoo can do it because they are large enough. That is a drop in the ocean to them.' I am sorry, but every minute that Australia Zoo staff spend preparing those management plans for species that they have held for more than seven years means hours and minutes that they cannot spend caring for those animals, caring for the broader environment and caring for the tourism industry on the Sunshine Coast, creating jobs and attracting tourists, whether they be domestic or international, to Australia Zoo.

I think what the exhibitors want is quite reasonable. They do not want retrospective management plans. If the management plans must be retrospective, then allow exiting operators sufficient time to prepare those plans. No management plans should be required for what is known as category A or commonly kept low-risk native recreational animals, such as the blue-tongue lizard or the carpet python, because those are low-risk animals and anyone over the age of 13 can apply to keep them as a pet, with no management plan at all.

**Mr Costigan** interjected.

**Mr POWELL:** I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. I hear he has a couple of blue-tongue lizards up at his place. Maybe it is his 13-year-old who cares for them. The exhibitors want a better definition on groupings for their management plans and I think that is fair enough. Tonight the LNP is moving this disallowance motion so that we can throw out this regulation and start again. We can get it right by consulting with the exhibitors and having some common sense around what is proposed.

A number of my colleagues have talked about the fees for new exhibition licences and the fees based on the number of staff. I come back to the point that, whilst those fees may not seem much, you need to add them to the cost of rates, the cost of feed, the cost of the staff themselves, and the cost of marketing and promoting exhibitions. We are seeing yet another greedy tax grab by this broke Palaszczuk Labor government that touts that it is all about creating jobs, but again tonight we see it standing up for a job-destroying levy. It is on that basis that I also cannot support this motion.

In addition, no exhibited animal facility will be able to hold a species for captive breeding, research or re-release. Mr Deputy Speaker, you and I both know that exhibitors have been the driving force behind many endangered species programs. Under this regulation, they will not be able to take part unless the animals are removed from those vital programs and exhibitors are forced into meeting the minimum display obligation.

One of my proudest moments was working with the Save the Bilby Fund during my time as the minister for environment. Guess what? The only way we are saving the bilby is by captive breeding programs. Who is driving that? It is Dreamworld—an animal exhibitor. If we take away the ability for these exhibitors to participate in captive breeding programs, participate in research like we know Terry, Bindi and Bob Irwin do at Australia Zoo and not participate in the release of animals bred in captivity then we can kiss a number of Queensland species, Australian species and international species goodbye. It is as simple as that. They are basically the only ones who have the capacity, the interest, the facilities, the ability and the people with the skills, the knowledge and connections to our universities and our educational precincts to be able to pull off the kind of captive breeding programs we need to ensure some of our most endangered species actually continue to thrive.

The LNP supports red-tape reduction. That is why we supported the legislation. It had the support of the exhibitors themselves. I go back to where I began. Even when we were preparing the legislation the exhibitors had concerns around what would appear in the regulation. That is why the honourable Dr John McVeigh and I were meeting with them to ensure we considered their very sensible and rational explanations around what should appear in those regulations. This government touts that it listens and consults but it clearly has not when it comes to developing this regulation. Therefore, I stand alongside the animal exhibitors of Queensland and call on all in this House to disallow this regulation this evening.

 **Hon. LE DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries) (8.51 pm): I rise to oppose the disallowance motion moved by the LNP. If those opposite are interested in unintended consequences then I am sure they will be very interested in what I have to say.

Regulations surrounding the Exhibited Animals Act 2015 are too important to be playing politics with. Those members opposite should be aware that if the disallowance motion passes the regulation will no longer be considered legislation and redrafting will have to commence again. Redrafting will take time and it is imperative for Queensland that this regulation remains in place.

For the information of the House, the Exhibited Animals Act 2015 and the supporting Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016 have been designed to modernise and streamline the legislation for exhibited animals. The act replaces six licensing schemes and provisions previously spread across four acts with a single licensing scheme. Magicians, zoos, circuses and other travelling animal exhibits residing within Queensland, who previously required multiple licences, can operate under a single licence contained under a single act. This single licence is valid for three years.

Licence holders can now exhibit and deal with a greater range of species, not previously permitted for exhibition in Queensland, provided they are able to demonstrate that they can manage the risks associated with the exhibited animal. This act was passed by this parliament last year. I remind the House of recommendation 1 of the report that the bill be passed with the amendments proposed in the report.

The regulation that the opposition now seeks to disallow has also had proper scrutiny. I can inform the House that the exhibited animals industry has been consulted widely during the development of the act and regulation, providing significant opportunity for feedback on the drafting process. Consultation began early when in April 2011 there were workshops. In 2012 there were more workshops.

Issues raised and discussed included the scope of the legislation, the general exhibition and dealing obligation, standards and the proposed fee structure for licensing applications and site visits. Industry attendees at workshops indicated general support for the proposed legislation, including the proposed fee structure. In November 2013 industry was consulted through a public consultation regulatory impact statement. I will table the RIS for the information of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Department of Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry: Exhibited Animals Legislation Consultation Regulatory Impact Statement, 2013 [[1294](#)].

Fees and detailed assessments of costs and benefits were considered as part of this consultation. In July 2014 consultation was undertaken on an exposure draft of the Exhibited Animals Bill 2014. Feedback from this consultation helped inform the further development of the 2015 bill.

In April 2015 the Agriculture and Environment Committee held a public hearing to provide industry and stakeholders an opportunity to submit responses to the proposed Exhibited Animals Bill 2015. In March 2016 consultation was undertaken on an exposure draft of the regulation. Again, issues discussed related to fees, record keeping, mandatory conditions of licences and national tax on specific codes. As a result of the feedback received, the tax on codes were omitted to provide more time for these to be agreed nationally and for further consultation with the industry.

The Palaszczuk government is a government that believes in consultation. That is exactly what we have done here. It must be remembered that it was the Newman-Nicholls government that released the regulatory impact statement. The regulatory impact statement was taken into account when the committee examined the bill. The RIS released by the former government in 2013 included a proposal for fees prescribed by the regulation under the act.

Licence fees under the previous legislation were inequitable, resulting in small exhibitors subsidising larger ones and fees for an exotic animal licence being about 10 per cent of licensing fees for native animals. Discussions with industry made it clear that smaller businesses felt they should not pay as much for their licences as large zoos and circuses.

I remind the House again that the RIS and proposed fees were available to the committee. I note that the committee stated—

The committee notes the department's advice and is satisfied by the department's plans for the implementation of provisions contained in the bill.

The requirement on exhibitors to keep and maintain records and have management plans in place has led to some incorrect comments being made. It is important that the facts around this requirement are outlined. Records are important to demonstrate that a licence holder is meeting their general exhibiting and dealing obligations under the Exhibited Animals Act 2015 and to underpin an effective compliance and enforcement program for the act.

The identification of animals frequently being exhibited outside of the licensed premises is important due to the increased chance of escape given that the animals will be constantly moved. Identification is important so that animals can be identified in the event of an escape, for monitoring of their welfare and for informing approved management plans.

Identification requirements assist in identifying animals that are approved for use in public interaction programs and for monitoring their welfare due to the increased risk that this activity poses. The identification of particular animals in the prescribed way only applies to certain categories of native animals and to exotic species when exhibited outside their regular enclosure. Generally identification is not required for those species that are commonly available for recreational permit holders.

It must be made clear that the dingo and European rabbit are category B species that must be identifiable at all times regardless of the activity proposed. This is because both species are classed as serious pests within Queensland. The government invests considerable resources and funding to control feral populations and implement eradication programs so it is important that species are identifiable at all times.

In relation to management plans, an applicant for an exhibition licence must demonstrate how they propose to manage the risks and any adverse effects of exhibiting and dealing with a species through the development of a management plan. Risks and effects cover the welfare of the animal, biosecurity risks and risks to the general public. If a variety of species of a taxonomic group are managed in a same or similar way and the risks of exhibiting and dealing with those species are the same or similar, they may all be recorded on the one management plan.

Licence holders proposing to make amendments to their licence, such as including additional species on the licence, must do so by submitting a management plan outlining the risks and the way they will be managed. An amendment fee will be charged for the inclusion of the species on the licence. To assist, my department has developed a number of example management plans for various commonly kept native and exotic species.

People who are displaying animals to the public should have regulations surrounding them to ensure that the public is safe and the animal's welfare maintained and chance of escape is minimised. This is especially important when the animals are being transported and displayed at different venues, as opposed to a fixed enclosure where the surroundings and environment are controlled and the animal is never taken outside of the enclosure. Do we want a circumstance where a brown snake can be exhibited without any obligation to keep records of the activities they undertake and the ability to monitor their activities to ensure compliance with their approved management plan? If the opposition have their way, this will be the case.

Finally, those opposite have not learnt of unintended consequences. Primary producers will remember the LNP supported this disallowance. The disallowance of the regulation will make it easier for rabbits to be owned in Queensland. They will be owned without any control or monitoring as a pest that costs the state millions of dollars in control and eradication programs.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! When there is order, we will continue. I call the minister.

**Ms DONALDSON:** As I was saying, the disallowance of the regulation will make it easier for the rabbits to be owned in Queensland. They will be owned without any control or monitoring as a pest that costs the state millions of dollars in control and eradication programs. It has been a longstanding view of governments of all persuasions not to allow rabbits into Queensland, except to those with a genuine reason such as full-time magicians who can own a desexed rabbit.

Provisions regarding rabbit ownership by magicians falls under this regulation. If the disallowance motion by those opposite is successful, a private citizen may claim that they are a magician and own a rabbit without any regulation surrounding record-keeping requirements, desexing requirements or licence fees payable. The members opposite obviously have not read or understood the regulation properly. It only takes one male and one female rabbit that are not desexed to severely impact the environment. Primary producers know the devastating impact rabbits can have on their land.

Lastly, the opposition are now railing against the regulations that they when in government approved of. The current Leader of the Opposition when treasurer no doubt approved the release of the RIS that stated—

It would recover the full cost of services and ensure that fees are more equitable and better reflect the resources required to authorise and monitor exhibitors of different scale and complexity.

The RIS makes it clear that full-cost recovery was the LNP government's preferred option. I conclude that the LNP support for this disallowance motion is support for the reduced regulation surrounding rabbits in Queensland and an acknowledgement that the RIS released in November 2013 by the now Leader of the Opposition was flawed. It is this government's view that this legislation is good for Queensland and will ultimately benefit the industry and the state as a whole.

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

**AYES, 43:**

**ALP, 41**—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

**INDEPENDENT, 2**—Gordon, Pyne.

**NOES, 42:**

**LNP, 41**—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

**KAP, 1**—Knuth.

Pair: Howard, Nicholls.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion, as agreed—

That Schedule 3 only of the Exhibited Animals Regulation 2016, subordinate legislation No. 69 of 2016, tabled in the House on 14 June 2016, be disallowed.

## COUNTER-TERRORISM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2904, on motion of Mr Byrne—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Cleveland—LNP) (9.09 pm), continuing: In September 2014, ASIO raised the national terrorist alert level to high where it has remained. Since September 2014, nationally there has been an escalation of terrorist related activity which has been well documented in terms of the statistics by other members, so I will not repeat all of those facts. The majority, almost all, of the attacks are due to Islamist terrorists and involve the infiltration of radical and dangerous forms of Islam into our nation. Who could ever forget the Lindt cafe siege by Islamic extremist Man Monis in which two people were killed in Martin Place, Sydney, or the Islamic radical who shot dead Curtis Cheng, a police civilian worker in Parramatta in 2015?

Today what is clear is that Australia is facing the most significant ongoing threat from Islamist terrorism in our nation's history. The threat of Islamist terrorism is increasing as the number of Islamists living in Australia grows through a number of sources—immigration, biological growth and radicalisation. Fortunately, to date our federal and state agencies have been able to intervene early to prevent many Islamist terrorist attacks, often on very little intelligence. I congratulate them on their fine work.

In terms of policy objectives, I agree with the policy objectives of the bill in regard to providing further security, safety and protection for Queenslanders from all forms of terrorism. I also agree with the measures taken towards those objectives that are outlined in the bill. However, I am of the view that the measures do not go far enough in order to counter terrorism most effectively in Queensland in two ways—one, in terms of the main specific source of this threat and, two, in regard to education and prevention measures that could further be taken.

The bill fails to address the specifics of the main source of terrorism, and that is jihadi Islam. The huge majority of terrorist acts in recent times in Europe, the UK, USA and Australia were committed by violent jihadi followers of sharia law. Sharia law itself is dangerous because it is the breeding ground for violent jihadi Islamism. The problem is not the majority of peace-abiding Muslims who now live in Australia and those who will come and live in Australia but those who follow sharia law.

A common definition of sharia Islamic law is the religious legal system governing the members of the Islamic faith derived from the religious precepts of Islam. Sharia is a form of law—a legal system of governance that affects many aspects of life. Most disturbingly and relevant to countering terrorism is that strict observance of sharia law can involve violent jihad. It can also involve interpretations of life very different to our Australian way. Due to time today, I will not get into the details of aspects of family law, banking and finance, eating and dietary restrictions, and even clothing. I will not go there, but to varying degrees these aspects of sharia law are in conflict with Western democracy and our Australian way of life. The violent jihad teaching that has led to violent radicalisation is of great concern.

Indonesia, again, is a good example of what I am saying. While Indonesia is not modelled on the Westminster system, it is a democracy—a multiparty, multireligious, multiracial democracy. The majority of states and islands operate democratically also. However, one state, Aceh—and there may be others—in North Sumatra is governed as a sharia state. The people are subjected to sharia law. This means that non-Muslims are second-rate citizens. Women are not equal with men. Violent jihad is acceptable—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Furner): Order! Member for Cleveland, I have been listening closely to your contribution and I find your contribution at this stage irrelevant. I bring you back to the relevance of the bill.

**Dr ROBINSON**: I am talking about counterterrorism.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**: No, sharia law has nothing to do with this bill. I bring you back to the relevance of the bill.

**Dr ROBINSON**: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Sharia law in Australia radicalises young men into violent jihadists. It concerns me greatly when we are talking about counterterrorism to see that some aspects of sharia law are reported to be creeping into Australia and impacting on our counterterrorism measures. Recently, a Channel 7 news report showed that in some Sydney suburbs a form of legal pluralism is operating, one that involves mediation sessions where sharia law is being used to settle disputes on matters generally covered and usually covered by Australian law. Sheikh Abdul Salam Zoud, a possible successor to the current Grand Mufti, until 2014 was also a key figure in a group called Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah—

**Mr BYRNE**: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My point of order is that this discussion is not within the long title of the bill by any stretch. I understand the member's convictions, but there is no reference that identifies people by race, religion or any other criteria that is relevant to the discussion of this bill. Respectfully, I ask that relevance to the long title be adhered to.

**Dr ROBINSON**: Mr Deputy Speaker, in defence—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! Member for Cleveland, once again I bring you back to the contents of the bill.

**Dr ROBINSON**: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, and I am talking about counterterrorism here in Australia. This sheikh was also a key figure in a group called Ahlus Sunnah Wal Jama'ah, a group in Australia that has alleged ties with terrorist organisations Al-Qaeda and Jemaah Islamiyah. The possible links of some of these sharia Islamic groups to known terrorist organisations and the expansion of the rule of sharia law creeping into Australia is of great concern because it is a substantial source of concern about terrorism and terrorist acts in Australia. Sometimes it is low-tech terrorism.

The main concern is that sharia law is a governance system that is completely incompatible with Queensland's Westminster system. We have one system of law that governs Australia. A critical element of countering terrorism in Queensland, in my view, is to deal with one of the main issues which is the spreading of sharia law. We could do it by making sharia law illegal in Queensland so that good peaceful Muslims who live here and those who come in the future will steer away from the more violent forms. In an increasing number of American states and in a growing number of European jurisdictions, sharia law is not allowed. It is being banned at a state level.

**Mr RUSSO**: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My understanding of this legislation is that it is about making Queenslanders safer, not about outlawing a religion.

**Dr ROBINSON**: How else do you make it safer?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! Member for Cleveland, you will be seated while I am dealing with the point of order.

**Mr RUSSO**: All we have heard here is a story about a religion which is not part of the bill.

**An opposition member**: Is this a point of order?

**Mr RUSSO**: I ask for a ruling and I ask the member for Cleveland to be relevant to the bill.

**Dr ROBINSON**: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am relevant to the subject of counterterrorism.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER**: Order! Member for Cleveland, wait until I give you the call. This is the third time I have asked you to be relevant and it is the last time. I bring you back to the relevance of this bill.

**Dr ROBINSON**: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I appreciate your ruling. I am certainly just trying to address the issue of counterterrorism. In doing so, I have agreed with the measures in the bill as partly going towards dealing with the issue. I am supporting the bill but saying we should go further.

With respect to state government education, we should be considering extending current radicalisation programs which are considered very important in counterterrorism measures. The federal minister, Simon Birmingham, has raised this in terms of the need to look at Islamic schools and various government and non-government schools. Every Queensland student should be educated in the terrorism threat and the link to sharia forms of Islam and jihadi violence.

In conclusion, I support the bill. It goes a little way to help but I believe we must identify the sources of terrorism and the very real risks in our nation and respond to them. I believe that we need to look further at sharia law in Queensland and follow the trend in other nations and other states in dealing with it.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.20 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill. For my government, public and community safety is paramount. The national terrorism threat level in Australia continues to be 'probable' and, in light of the increased frequency of terrorism attacks overseas, in Nice and elsewhere, we need to ensure that Queensland's laws continually evolve to keep pace with an ever-changing environment and to provide our police with the best and most effective tools for countering violent extremism.

As Premier, I am conscious that the security environment is increasingly complex and challenging. It is a priority for this government to ensure that our law enforcement agencies are able to respond effectively to the threats of terrorism now and into the future. The laws proposed in this bill today will expand the capability of the Queensland Police Service when responding to acts of terrorism and natural disasters. Not only will these laws sharpen the tools available to police in handling an emergency, they will also ensure that our laws are consistent with the national approach to countering terrorism. Importantly, there are also appropriate limitations and additional safeguards to ensure these powers are used appropriately.

Significant improvements contained in the bill include enabling a preventative detention order to be made for a person where that person's real name may not be known to police. A police officer will also be able to apply for a preventative detention order electronically, rather than having to physically go before a court or provide a written application prior to making the application. This will save crucial time when a suspected attack is thought to be imminent or when evidence is urgently required to be preserved following an attack. The amendments will also provide police with more effective powers during a declared emergency situation, and this will be particularly critical when lives are at risk. These changes represent a step forward in countering criminal terrorist behaviour. However, the additional powers come with appropriate limitations and additional safeguards to ensure that our fundamental legal principles are upheld.

This important legislation was developed in consultation with other departments and the broader legal community. Once the bill was introduced, it was referred to the parliament's Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for detailed consideration. In considering the bill, the committee invited written submissions from the public and from stakeholders. The committee also received a written briefing from the Public Safety Business Agency as well as oral briefings provided by the Queensland Police Service and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. The committee also considered the policy behind the bill and the application of fundamental legal principles. Following this consultation and after giving the bill detailed consideration, the committee has provided bipartisan support for the bill. The only recommendation made by the committee was that the bill be passed without amendment.

This legislation is in line with Queensland's national obligations to achieve consistency in legislation with the Commonwealth and the other Australian states and territories. This government supports the current raft of proposed changes to Commonwealth legislation which are due to be reintroduced into the Australian parliament in the next parliamentary sittings.

At COAG in April this year, I gave in principle support to a range of other Commonwealth measures currently being developed to better prevent and deal with terrorist activity on our shores. My government has been working alongside the Commonwealth government and has been actively involved in a national committee tasked with developing the most consistent and effective way forward. Queensland is committed to playing its part to ensure that Australia's counterterrorism framework remains responsive to the evolving national security threat and hopes to continue in a collaborative approach to tackling the risk of terrorism. That said, I also recognise the importance of balancing the need to protect Queenslanders with the need to protect basic legal rights. Queensland will continue to ensure that our Public Interest Monitor has an oversight role in national and state level counterterrorism preventative regimes. Queensland was the first state in Australia to introduce a Public Interest Monitor whose role is to ensure that our state has one of the most accountable and transparent police services in Australia.

The Queensland government will also be ensuring that appropriate safeguards and limitations are placed on the laws without compromising the operational effectiveness of these measures. It is important that the right balance be reached between effective counterterrorism laws and effective protection for citizens, and these laws continue to strike this balance. Such laws are only effective if the agencies using the powers are effectively resourced. In addition to the government's existing commitment to resource counterterrorism operations in Queensland, in this year's budget the government allocated additional funding of \$16.2 million over four years for sworn officers and contracted specialists, as well as for operating, training and ancillary costs. This will strengthen the current capability of the Queensland Police Service to profile and assess persons of interest, source intelligence and conduct surveillance and monitoring of those people who are at risk of committing acts of violence, who are proposing to travel to support ISIL or who are returning from these war zones.

My government will also provide \$5 million to develop a business case for a new counterterrorism and community safety centre at the Westgate police training facility. This facility, with its necessary equipment, will boost the counterterrorism capability of police—a necessary step given the increasing number of incidents and operations across Australia. Queensland's counterterrorism arrangements are well entrenched and regularly exercised to ensure they meet the needs of the current threat environment. The Queensland Police Service works closely with the Australian Federal Police and ASIO to identify and investigate security concerns.

Queensland is currently collaborating with the experts in the field on nationwide counterterrorism strategies and effective policies to best manage potential terrorist threats in Australia. My government is also actively implementing initiatives with other Australian jurisdictions. This includes a nationally consistent intervention program initially led by the Queensland Police Service to identify and divert people at risk of violent extremism to intervention services. These laws are an important part of the fight to combat terrorism. The government is also conscious of the need to proactively prevent extremism from occurring in the first place. My government is therefore also committed to enhancing the social cohesion of our communities which, among other things, will contribute towards ensuring Queensland remains a welcoming and safe place. That is something that as Premier I am very conscious of. I want to make sure that we have a respectful debate in Queensland, that we respect one another, that we respect religions. I believe that we have a very diverse community in our state, but better measures targeted towards enhancing social cohesion will make Queensland an even better and safer place to live.

Queensland has allocated \$5 million over three years to deliver a coordinated approach to build social cohesion and reduce the risk of antisocial behaviours and associated violence. To that end, I have appointed the member for Townsville as chair of that committee. That committee is meeting regularly. He is doing an outstanding job, bringing people together from across the state from different backgrounds—

**Mr Mander:** What is the relevance?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** It is extremely relevant because we are talking about social cohesion.

**Mr Mander:** It is not relevant to the counterterrorism bill.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Absolutely it is.

**Mr Mander:** It has nothing to do with it.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** The member for Everton is showing his complete ignorance. As I attend COAG meetings and raise issues about counterterrorism, I know that building social cohesion in the state is fundamental. That is what will make sure that Queensland stands in good stead with the other states as we move forward on this very important issue. As I said, the amendments proposed in the bill before the parliament today will complement Queensland's suite of social cohesion initiatives by ensuring that our laws are effective, balanced and robust. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (9.29 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Firstly, I thank all the members of the committee who worked on this legislation, the staff and all those who participated in the committee process.

Through the media we are buffeted by news reports of acts of terrorism around the world and here in Australia. Terrorism is nothing new. Throughout history terrorism has been well documented in all forms from state sponsored to radical idealists. It is used to hurt those most innocent in our society without discrimination. No better examples can be found than the callous brutality of the Bastille Day atrocities where 84 people were killed including 10 children. As we know, this attack has not been the only one. In Pakistan on 8 August 2016, 77 people were killed by a suicide bomber at a government

hospital. In France on 26 July 2016, a priest had his throat slit and four nuns were taken hostage. In Germany on 24 July, there was a suicide bombing outside a wine bar. In Iraq on 3 July two coordinated bomb attacks killed over 300 people. We can go on and on.

Unfortunately, Australia is not immune to these activities. As we heard from the previous speaker, the member for Cleveland, in 2015 there was the Parramatta shooting in which a New South Wales police civilian was murdered in cold blood; the Lindt Chocolate Cafe siege in Martin Place; and the Endeavour Hills stabbings. Add to this the sixth imminent planned attacks foiled within the borders of Australia resulting in 36 people being charged and we continue to see the very real threat of terrorism in this country. We continue to see terrorism cells carry out mass casualty attacks, but as time goes on we have seen more and more low-tech lone-wolf style assaults which, in turn, are harder to detect and disrupt as there may not be any telltale signs or any communication between terrorist groups. These styles of attack are normally inspired by hate preaching from an idealist and target those who have become disconnected from society. In turn, this has created a certain amount of unease in our communities whether it is the very notion of sharia law or halal stamped on our food packaging. Add this to what we see in the mainstream media and it further cements the constant fear and reminder our community has to endure. These thoughts are placed front and centre in our minds and our residents are becoming more and more concerned and it is becoming more and more of a common topic.

It is destiny that history repeats itself. We do not need to look too far back in history to see other beliefs and philosophies have resulted in people committing the most abhorrent attacks on innocent people, even their own neighbours. Therefore it is the role of parliamentarians to implement laws that enhance public safety by enabling law enforcement agencies to have the tools to rapidly deal with emergency situations. This bill certainly goes a long way to deal with that. It introduces amendments that will: enable police to require any person or organisation to provide information during a declared emergency under specific circumstances and balanced by a range of safeguards; create an offence to refuse to provide information sought by police or give false or misleading information with penalties of up to 10 years imprisonment to apply; extend a terrorist emergency in circumstances where it is necessary to protect life or health or protect critical infrastructure; extend the powers to search and seize vehicles as they leave or enter a declared area; and broaden powers for police to seize things from a person during a declared emergency including things that a person may use to cause harm.

Whilst the threat of terrorism is certainly very real in our community, we cannot live in fear and allow it to ruin our lives. We have to thank our law enforcement agencies for all their efforts in keeping our community safe and for their continued efforts in dealing with the threats in a professional manner. They place themselves on the front line, at risk. They need laws to protect us. Also as a community we must be vigilant and take steps to report suspicious activities. Together as a community we can make it extremely difficult for minority groups to prosecute these murderous acts.

When it comes to convicted terrorists who wish to commit maximum carnage, who prey on the innocent, why should they ever be released from prison as they have proven they are not fit for society? As the member for Coomera previously said, more needs to be done in preventing radicals from recruiting other individuals while in prison, but that is a debate for another time.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.35 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Before I do so, I would like to thank the hardworking members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, particularly my old colleagues the members for Ferny Grove and Beaudesert. I would also like to thank the committee secretariat and the submitters.

As the Minister for Police and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services outlined in his first reading speech, the bill will provide strong safeguards to deal with and prevent acts of terrorism. Importantly, they will keep Queenslanders safe. As we all know, the threat of terrorism and violent extremism is no longer something that can only happen overseas or somewhere else. Terrorist organisations like al-Qaeda and ISIL have repeatedly advocated attacks on people in western nations at home as well as abroad. The shocking events in London, Paris, Brussels, Turkey and now in Australia at Martin Place and Parramatta highlight the very serious risks to public safety and the dangers ordinary people face from acts of such terrorism. Thankfully, Queensland's preventative detention laws and terrorist emergency powers have never had to be used, but they have been tested in national and counterterrorism exercises. These exercises as well as terrorism linked incidents in New South Wales and Victoria have highlighted the need for the changes we are now proposing.

As RAAF Base Amberley is located in my electorate of Ipswich West, my constituents support and expect strong antiterrorism laws. RAAF Base Amberley is currently home to No. 1 Squadron and No. 6 Squadron that operates the F/A-18F Super Hornet, No. 33 Squadron, which is currently taking

delivery of Airbus KC-30A, and No. 36 Squadron that is operating the Boeing C-17 Globemaster III jet transport. RAAF Base Amberley is also home to Army units making up the 9th Force Support Battalion. RAAF Base Amberley is the largest operational Air Force base in Australia, employing over 5,000 uniformed and civilian personnel. There are a variety of other formations on the base such as training colleges and maintenance areas. RAAF Base Amberley's largest squadron in terms of personnel is No. 382 Expeditionary Combat Support Squadron—RAAF ECSS—providing both garrison and employment combat support.

RAAF Base Amberley is currently undergoing a \$64 million redevelopment program. It is one of only two airfields in Australia that were listed as transoceanic abort landing sites for the space shuttle. The new laws proposed by this bill will equip the police with the powers they need to swiftly respond to any emergency should there be an incident that affects or has the potential to affect the security of Amberley RAAF base. Due to the nature of terrorism, police will often need to intervene early to prevent a terrorist act or to act on less information than would normally be the case in their more traditional policing responses.

This bill amends the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986 and the Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005 so as to enhance public safety through augmenting counterterrorism and emergency management powers to ensure that police can rapidly and effectively respond to manage and resolve emergencies. This includes a declared emergency situation, terrorist emergency or chemical, biological or radiological emergency under the PSPA.

Nationally since September 2014 there has been an escalation in the number of terrorist related activities with three terrorist attacks resulting in fatalities, a further six imminent planned attacks disrupted and 36 people being charged as a result of 13 different operations in relation to counterterrorism matters. Australia is facing one of the most significant ongoing threats from terrorism in our nation's history. Not only is the threat of terrorism increasing; it is becoming harder for law enforcement and intelligence agencies to detect and defeat.

The ever-increasing threat of low-tech lone-actor terrorist attacks is exponentially harder to disrupt, as there may be no visibility of planning, little or no direct communication between the terrorist groups and the attackers, and limited time delay between intent and action. Due to the nature of terrorism, police will often need to intervene early to prevent a terrorist act or act on less information than would normally be the case. Rightly, the priority for police is community safety; however, this does come at the cost of being able to fully identify the nature of the attack, the identification of all persons involved and enabling the collection of sufficient evidence to prosecute those intent on causing harm.

Not all threatened or actual acts of violence against the community will be immediately identifiable as terrorism. In fact, it may be some time after the intervention or the attack occurring that it is identified that the act was undertaken with the intent of advancing a political, religious or ideological cause and that the attack was done with the intent of coercing or influencing—by intimidation—a government or the public; furthermore, threats to community safety are not the sole domain of terrorism. Man-made or natural disasters or criminal acts such as mass murder, sabotage and the destruction of critical infrastructure have a devastating impact on society.

Another objective of the bill is to amend the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to enable Commonwealth intelligence agencies to apply to the Supreme Court of Queensland under the Commonwealth's assumed identity legislation, contained in part 1AC of the Commonwealth Crimes Act, for the approval of a birth certificate for an assumed identity.

The final objective of the bill is to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 to support efficiencies in operational practices relating to the delivery of health services to prisoners; the management of Corrective Services facilities, including prisoners; and the supervision of offenders in the community. The bill amends the Corrective Services Act: to allow a registered nurse, as an alternative to a doctor, to examine at specific intervals prisoners under safety orders, section 57; maximum security orders, section 64; criminal organisation segregation orders, section 65C; and separate confinement orders, section 121(3). The bill also clarifies that the purpose of the examination is to ensure that the medical needs of the prisoners are not neglected or overlooked. Empowering registered nurses to examine prisoners under orders will support greater efficiencies in the delivery of health services to prisoners. It also better reflects the applied nurse-led service delivery model provided by Queensland Health's prisoner health services.

Section 10(1) of the Corrective Services Act, 'Record of a prisoner's details', provides that the chief executive must establish a record of the prisoner's details, including details about the identification of the prisoner. Section 10(2) provides that a Corrective Services Officer may take a photograph, fingerprint, palm print, footprint, toe print, eye print or voice print from a prisoner for identification of the

prisoner. The bill amends section 10 to clarify that a CSO may also use a biometric identification system to collect and store a prisoner's biometric information for the identification of the prisoner. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRAMP** (Gaven—LNP) (9.44 pm): I rise tonight to speak to the Counter-Terrorism and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. Terrorism is, without doubt, one of the most prominent threats to Australian society today. With terrorist organisations around the world naming Australia and Australians as legitimate targets, as regulators we need to ensure that our Police Service in Queensland is equipped with contemporary legislation which allows them to carry out their duty to protect the Queensland public.

Whilst many terrorist organisations seek to carry out coordinated medium- to large-scale group attacks on targets throughout the world, in recent years we have also seen these organisations encourage individuals to commit single-person, lone-actor-style attacks against unarmed civilian citizens such as the Lindt cafe siege in Sydney. These lone-actor attacks are random, difficult to prevent and, as we have seen, can lead to the deaths of innocent Australians.

The key objective of the bill is to equip police with powers to enable a swift response to any public emergency in Queensland. The bill makes a number of amendments which are designed to improve the management and resolution of emergencies by enabling the Queensland Police Service to rapidly gather information, obtain authorisations and exercise powers in an endeavour to mitigate or minimise the impacts of emergency situations, including natural disasters, accidents and criminal actions, terrorist emergencies and chemical, biological and radiological emergencies by: enabling police to require any person or organisation to provide information during a declared emergency; creating an offence for refusing to provide information sought by police or to give false or misleading information with penalties of up to 10 years imprisonment; extending the power to search and seize vehicles as they leave or enter a declared area; and broaden the power for police to seize things from a person during a declared emergency to include things that a person may use to cause harm.

With the Gold Coast due to host the Commonwealth Games in just over 18 months, any opportunity to update legislation to improve police powers—especially in the area of counterterrorism—would be very welcome by Gold Coast locals. With the Gaven electorate being home to the Metricon Stadium and Carrara Sports Complex, which are hosting many of the Commonwealth Games sports, and with Nerang hosting the mountain bike event, there is obviously a large amount of excitement building amongst local communities in Gaven. As an active representative of my area I take every opportunity to meet and speak with fellow locals. Local communities and community groups immediately around the Metricon Stadium and Carrara Sports Complex, whilst excited about the games, are also becoming increasingly concerned about the safety of their properties and families during the event due to the threat of terrorism.

To assist in informing and allaying the concerns of community members, I asked the Queensland Police Service to come and meet with locals to discuss their issues. I would like to take this opportunity to give a quick vote of thanks to the officers and the service. The response of the Police Service to my request was nothing short of exemplary. I would like to thank Senior Sergeant Ben Nielsen, officer in charge of helicopter support for the Gold Coast South-Eastern Region located in Carrara in the Gaven electorate, who attended meetings and was able to provide relevant information to local residents' inquiries from a localised perspective which took into account police operations in and around Metricon Stadium.

Senior Sergeant Nielsen also placed me in contact with Acting Senior Sergeant Spiros Lentakis and Senior Sergeant Steve Batterham from the Queensland Police Service Commonwealth Games Group—Engagement. The professionalism of Senior Sergeant Batterham and Acting Senior Sergeant Lentakis when engaging with me and the community was exceptional. They ensured that local residents' concerns were addressed regarding community safety aspects of the Commonwealth Games while also genuinely connecting with each of the community groups we met and the specific leaders and opinion makers within each of these groups. Senior Sergeant Batterham and Acting Senior Sergeant Lentakis ensured that these connections would become partnerships between the community and the Queensland Police Service by highlighting their desire to build a genuine partnership with each community group.

This ongoing connection will no doubt allow the Police Service to identify any questionable issues or cause for concern with regard to matters of public security, including the threat of terrorism, and I wholeheartedly endorse and sincerely thank Senior Sergeant Batterham and Acting Senior Sergeant Lentakis for their efforts on behalf of the Gaven community.

Whilst this high level of professionalism and engagement by the Queensland Police Service is absolutely necessary to ensure public safety, they cannot do their job without this chamber taking a strong and determined stance to ensure they have the legislative framework to perform their role to the fullest extent. The LNP has continued to provide clear, bipartisan support for giving the police the tools they need to keep the community safe, including previous amendments to the counterterrorism legislation that was introduced and passed in the parliament late last year.

As noted earlier by the shadow minister, it is a pity that Labor did not have this same degree of bipartisanship when it comes to keeping the community safe from organised crime and criminal gangs that terrorise our community and sell drugs to our kids. This is especially prevalent for the Gold Coast, including the Gaven electorate, where we have seen criminal bikie clubhouses closed down and criminal bikie gang members move out of our community. Our area has become an increasingly safer place to live, work and raise a family. It is disappointing for Gaven residents that Queensland Labor is now effectively rolling out the red carpet to criminal bikie gangs. Unlike Queensland Labor, the LNP will always support measures that keep—

**Mr BYRNE:** Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As illuminating as this is, it has nothing to do with the long title of the bill. I ask the member to be relevant to this bill.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! That is what I was just going to say. I ask the member to be relevant to the bill.

**Mr CRAMP:** I will read the last line and a half of my speech. Unlike Queensland Labor, the LNP will always support measures that keep our communities safe from all levels of crime and criminal organisations.

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.51 pm), in reply: I thank members for their bipartisan support for the bill. This is about as warm and fuzzy as it gets in this House, apparently.

**Mr Springborg** interjected.

**Mr BYRNE:** Sometimes. All members here this evening appreciate the need to stay on the front foot with the development of laws that enhance a professional and timely response to terrorism and other emergent situations in this state. I thank the Queensland Police Service for their vigilance and expertise in addressing the persistent threat that terrorism poses to our community. Resolving terrorist incidents is a difficult and dangerous task, and we must make every endeavour to ensure our police officers have the right tools to complete that task.

The least desirable circumstance in a time of crisis is to have any delay or procrastination that may affect the safe resolution of an emergency incident. As an emergency incident unfolds, the identity of the person, their motivation and whether any accomplices are involved is often unclear. Rapid information exchange in these early stages is vital. Of course, intentional incidents such as terrorist related emergencies are not the only circumstance to which the information requirement provisions will apply. Gathering information during a cyclone or flood event about vulnerable persons who may reside in an area or who need priority evacuation is just one example of where the exchange of information between agencies will prove valuable. I acknowledge Queensland Corrective Services for having the foresight to progress a number of efficiencies including the collection and storage of biometric information of prisoners for the purposes of identification and the enabling of registered nurses to examine certain prisoners to ensure their medical needs are met.

I will now address a couple of specific issues raised by members during the debate. I note concerns of the member for Coomera about the potential influence that people who hold extremist views can exert over vulnerable persons and specifically how this might flourish in correctional facilities. Queensland Corrective Services works closely with various law enforcement agencies in this state, nationally and internationally regarding this significant concern. Prisoners, whether charged with terrorism related offences or otherwise identified as holding violent extremist beliefs, are proactively managed by QCS according to specific risk factors. We are currently managing two prisoners charged with terrorism related offences. QCS maintains dedicated intelligence portfolios to ensure relevant information and intelligence is readily sourced and considered in the management of these prisoners.

This government has shown, through two tranches of counterterrorism legislation in less than 12 months, that it is committed to providing our law enforcement agencies with all the tools necessary to combat terrorism. We will continue to do this through a number of measures. An integral part of the government's strategy includes developing effective relationships within our diverse community to promote solidarity and thereby reduce the effects and influence of extremist views. A strong but measured approach has been taken to protect Queensland to the greatest extent possible through the

effective management and resolution of any type of emergency. The Palaszczuk government has responded quickly to the ever-changing landscape of the terrorism threat, enhancing our state's reputation as a safe and secure place to live and visit.

I take this opportunity to emphasise that this bill is essential in ensuring our law enforcement agencies can respond rapidly to a terrorist incident. Acting quickly has the potential to reduce the impact of terrorist acts and prevent further terrorist activities. In saving lives, minutes matter and seconds count.

I conclude by acknowledging one enlightening part of the debate, which was the member for Currumbin talking about asymmetric threats. I thought that was fantastic and I cannot wait for her to illuminate us further on fourth-generation warfare.

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 70, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

### Third Reading

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.57 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. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.57 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.

## VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (REINSTATEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 17 March (see p. 970).

### Second Reading

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.58 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am proud to stand in the parliament tonight to deliver on Queensland Labor's election commitment to restore balance to our state's vegetation management laws through the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This bill follows in the great tradition of Labor governments before us that have acted in the interests of all Queenslanders on this issue. Unfortunately, there has never been a consensus on vegetation management in Queensland. Despite the difficult and contentious nature of tree clearing, I want to again acknowledge that it has always been Labor governments in this state that have taken action on this issue on behalf of all Queenslanders.

This time it is no different. We recognise that we have a moral obligation to act for future generations. When it comes to vegetation management, Labor will not hide from this issue because it is difficult or because it is hard. It is the Labor way to champion reform that is based on science, that is based on evidence, that is based on fact. Let us not forget that those opposite did not even want this

bill to go to the committee for community consultation and they did not even want to have a debate in this House about this important issue as it affects the future of Queensland. Ultimately, the facts will win out. Queenslanders are smart, despite what those opposite think. Queenslanders understand that the level of native vegetation destruction in our state is unsustainable and lawmakers and leaders just cannot stand by and do nothing. While vegetation management has always been a significant issue in Queensland going back decades, I hope tonight's debate can be argued not on emotion or careless fearmongering but on science and the facts—a debate that looks beyond short-term self-interests and instead focuses on the type of Queensland we want to leave our children and our grandchildren.

The key changes in this bill include stopping the broadscale clearing of remnant vegetation for high-value and irrigated high-value agriculture. The inclusion of high-value and irrigated high-value agriculture as purposes for clearing our most ecologically important vegetation in Queensland was nothing short of a rort. There are no greater examples of this than the permits that were granted for clearing at Olive Vale and Strathmore Station. Under the Newman-Nicholls government, landholders were granted permits to clear thousands of hectares of remnant vegetation without proper land suitability and financial surety assessments. There was also no requirement included for landholders who were granted these permits to actually demonstrate that the land they cleared was for high-value crops.

The second element of the bill is to re-regulate clearing of high-value regrowth vegetation on freehold and Indigenous land. High-value regrowth is native vegetation that has not been cleared since 1989, some 27 years. These are mature trees that are home to large numbers of wildlife and contribute to Queensland's biodiversity. These trees also have the ability to store large volumes of carbon and are critical to ensuring that we create a carbon sink in Queensland in an effort to fight climate change.

The third key change this bill will implement is extending the existing regulation applying to the clearing of riparian vegetation from three Great Barrier Reef catchments to all six Great Barrier Reef catchments. Currently, riparian vegetation is only protected in three out of six Great Barrier Reef catchments. Riparian vegetation slows down run-off and prevents erosion which keeps sediment in the ground and out of our Great Barrier Reef. This is vital, as sediment reduces the light available to seagrass ecosystems and suffocates inshore coral reefs.

Fourthly, the bill will amend the Water Act to reinstate the application of riverine protection provisions to the destruction of vegetation in a watercourse, lake or spring. This will stop soil erosion, improve water quality and provide permanent wildlife habitat. This bill will also amend the Environmental Offsets Act to require any residual impacts to be offset, not just significant residual impacts as is currently required. The bill will also enable Commonwealth offsets to be legally secured and payments placed in offsets accounts under the Environmental Offsets Act.

The fact is Queensland has a shameful history on the issue of broadscale tree clearing. In 1997 we were clearing over 400,000 hectares annually and, according to the Society for Conservation Biology Oceania's scientific declaration, it is estimated that 100 million native animals were dying each year between the years of 1997 and 1999. That is why successive Labor governments acted. In 1999 the Beattie Labor government introduced the Vegetation Management Bill. In 2004 the Beattie Labor government introduced amendments to prohibit clearing of endangered ecosystems on freehold land.

In 2006 the broadscale clearing of remnant vegetation was phased out along with the introduction of environmental offsets and in 2009 the Bligh Labor government regulated the clearing of high-value regrowth vegetation on freehold and Indigenous land. These reforms were not rushed or knee jerk. They were based on years of consultation with the agricultural sector, environmentalists and everyday Queenslanders, and in some cases they even had bipartisan support in this place when there was a Liberal Party in Queensland back in 2004 when the Liberal Party in this place voted in support of better protections for native vegetation. Let me say that in 1999, in 2004, in 2006 and in 2009 these changes were put to the Queensland people and on every occasion they were given an endorsement at the ballot box.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** I take that interjection from the member for Nanango. We will get to the lies put before the people of Queensland in a minute. Compare this balanced, considered approach with how the Newman-Nicholls government acted in 2012-13. On 28 February 2012, only weeks before the state election, the then opposition leader Campbell Newman sought to reassure voters of his party's environmental credentials, claiming on vegetation management that the LNP will be retaining the legislation. Then, just to back it up and to be absolutely crystal clear, he went on to say in black and white to the World Wildlife Fund that the LNP will retain the current level of statutory vegetation

protection. Less than a month after being elected, the member for Hinchinbrook announced a review of the way penalty provisions within the Vegetation Management Act had been applied to alleged breaches of the act. He also suspended all prosecutions for alleged illegal clearing. He stressed—

This action does not signal changes to the Vegetation Management Act 1999.

Don't we know now how misleading that was! Suspending prosecutions within a month of being elected was a clear signal landholders would not be held accountable for illegal clearing. Within months there were amendments drafted to the Vegetation Management Act and then in early 2013, while the proposed legislation was still out for public consultation, the member for Hinchinbrook delivered a speech that was titled 'Taking an axe to Queensland's tree clearing laws'. The member for Hinchinbrook and all of those opposite have no credibility when it comes to the issue of vegetation protections and delivering on their commitments to Queenslanders. They did, they will and they will always peddle misinformation. Not only did those opposite break their commitment to the people of Queensland—something that we have become all too familiar with in this place—but they ignored the experts and denied the science and the results have been nothing short of dangerous.

The Statewide Landcover and Trees Study, also known as the SLATS report, undertaken by some of the most credentialed scientists in Australia found that under the Newman-Nicholls government annual land clearing rates almost doubled. The latest SLATS report released last week confirmed tree clearing is continuing at an unacceptable level of almost 300,000 hectares per year since the LNP gutted tree clearing laws in 2013. That is approximately 360,000 rugby league fields cleared every single year. As a result, emissions in Queensland have grown from 15 million tonnes in 2011 to 30 million tonnes in 2014. This is almost back to the levels they were before the end of broadscale clearing in 2006.

In 2006, we marked the end of broadscale clearing, which made a significant contribution to reducing greenhouse gas emissions in our nation. This led to a major milestone for Australia: we met Kyoto emission targets. In 2013, amendments as enacted by the Newman-Nicholls government have, in effect, erased this significant achievement. Alarming, of the 11 world regions highlighted as global deforestation fronts, eastern Australia is the only one in a developed country. This is truly disturbing.

The verdict on the Newman-Nicholls tree-clearing laws is in. The LNP's legislation had nothing to do with science, or our state's interests; they were laws created in the self-interest—or, more specifically, in the interests—of the old National Party of Queensland. When the Palaszczuk government came to government in February last year it inherited tree-clearing rates that had—

**Ms Jones** interjected.

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! I ask the Minister for Education in particular and also the member for Nanango to cease interjecting. This is going to be a long night.

**Ms TRAD:** When the Palaszczuk government came to office in February last year, it inherited tree-clearing rates that had skyrocketed, emission rates that were rising and a reef on the verge of being listed as in danger by UNESCO. Since 2011-12, clearing in Great Barrier Reef catchments has increased by 46 per cent. In 2014-15, 108,000 hectares in Great Barrier Reef catchment areas were cleared, representing more than a third of the vegetation cleared statewide. It is a complete mess of Newman's and Nicholls' making and it is completely unsustainable.

In June 2015 I travelled to Bonn in Germany for the UNESCO meeting along with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef. Whilst attending the UNESCO committee hearing in Bonn along with my cabinet colleague the Minister for the Environment, I argued strongly on behalf of the Queensland government, and on behalf of all Queenslanders, that the Great Barrier Reef should remain off the in danger list. I told member nations present that Queenslanders loved their reef. They loved it so much that they voted in a new government to protect it. I can tell members—

**Mr Watts:** Based on a brochure with a picture of the Philippines.

**Ms TRAD:** I will take that interjection from the member. They voted in favour of keeping the Great Barrier Reef off the list because we promised to prohibit dumping of dredge spoil, we promised to reinstate Labor's vegetation clearing laws and we provided \$100 million to clean up water going into the reef. You do not know what you are talking about.

**Mr WATTS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! I make several points here. All speakers must direct their comments through the chair and there will be no more cross-chamber conversations or interjections. What is your point of order?

**Mr WATTS:** My title is the member for Toowoomba North, not 'you'.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I have just dealt with that.

**Ms TRAD:** I can tell members that it was a tough fight to keep the Great Barrier Reef off the in danger list, but one of the main reasons we won the fight was our commitment to keeping our native trees in the ground, containing massive amounts of carbon and keeping sediment out of the reef. This commitment was central to the Reef 2050 Long-term Sustainability Plan agreed to by the Australian government. If this legislation does not pass, there is serious concern that UNESCO will question this state's commitment to the reef and may, in fact, declare it as in danger. UNESCO has confirmed that the committee will consider the progress of Australia's Reef 2050 Plan in December and can act if it decides that Australia is not complying with its own promises for action. Let us be clear: it is not just about the world's largest coral reef and one of our most beautiful natural icons; there are 69,000 jobs and \$6 billion at stake if we do not act.

The Turnbull government is even growing concerned about clearing in Queensland and its impact on the reef. In fact, the federal government has moved to freeze land clearing at several agricultural projects previously approved under the Queensland LNP's laws. That demonstrates, at least at a federal level, that there is still a Liberal Party. This is clearly not the case in Queensland. Just look at how far the member for Clayfield has come since his time as a councillor and member of former lord mayor Campbell Newman's leadership team. In the last budget he prepared for the then lord mayor, he allocated \$10 million to plant trees in Brisbane. He is now looking to retain a system that is destroying more than 40 million trees annually under the LNP's reckless laws. This is just a rearguard action from the member for Clayfield to pander to the Nationals and the extreme right out in regional Queensland.

Instead of addressing these facts and finding solutions to the issues that we face, opponents of this legislation, including those opposite, have run an almighty scare campaign. Tonight, I want to take some time to address directly some of the myths surrounding this legislation. Firstly, if we listened to those opposite, we would think that this legislation has the ability to single-handedly kill off the agricultural sector in Queensland. Except, like with so many other arguments made by those opposite, the facts simply do not back up the spin. The latest SLATS report revealed that 91 per cent of clearing that occurred in 2014-15 was cleared for pasture—91 per cent cleared for pasture—and not for cropping.

Contrary to the claims from those opposite and AgForce, the ban on broadscale clearing in 2006 and restrictions on regrowth clearing in 2009 did not directly impact on employment in the agricultural sector. In fact, the fastest decline in primary industries employment occurred prior to the ban on broadscale clearing in 2006. That was in line with the nationwide trend. The decline in primary industries employment appeared to come to a halt from 2006 and bounced back up slightly, in contrast to the rest of Australia, in 2009. Employment began to decline again and it appeared unaffected by the change of government and the regressive changes to the clearing laws in 2012-13. We know that, under a decade of Labor's tree-clearing protection laws, agricultural production thrived, growing by more than \$2 billion in sector profitability during that period.

This proves that we can get the balance right between growing the agricultural sector and protecting our environment. Secondly, opponents of this legislation would have Queenslanders believe that these laws stop farmers from ever clearing their land. That is simply incorrect. The bill aims to protect our most ecologically valuable vegetation and regulates the purposes for which this vegetation can be cleared. Where this vegetation is not present clearing is not regulated. Furthermore, clearing for agricultural expansion and development will still be able to be undertaken through a range of mechanisms, including self-assessable codes under which smaller parcels of land can be cleared for numerous agricultural purposes, through the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 under which large agricultural projects can be assessed and approved and, importantly, under the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007 under which approval to clear Indigenous land for agriculture can be granted.

These laws will not remove the ability for Indigenous landholders and the Cape York community to benefit from, and develop, their land and a range of opportunities will still exist. In fact, applications to clear for agricultural purposes on Aboriginal land in the Cape York Peninsula can still be applied for under the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007. I have heard firsthand from traditional owners and Cape York residents. The minister for the environment and I travelled up to Cairns at the request of the member for Cook to meet with traditional owners and community leaders about their ambitions for economic development for their communities. While the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007 provides a framework to allow clearing for Indigenous development, no applications have been pursued

to date. That is why tonight I am making a commitment to undertake a Cape York development and sustainability review and appoint a Cape York development and sustainability steering group consisting of Indigenous leaders, NGOs and government agencies.

Broadscale clearing of remnant vegetation has been prevented by previous Labor governments since 2006. Despite the doom and gloom peddled by those opposite, agricultural production did not stop. Landholders continued to produce high-quality produce for us and the rest of the world for which our state is renowned, but our biodiversity, our reef and our climate were much better off.

I thank the Agriculture and Environment Committee for its consideration and report on the bill, which was tabled on 30 June 2016. I also thank those who made submissions on the bill, of whom there were over 680, as well as those who participated in public hearings. I would particularly like to acknowledge some key stakeholders who contributed enormously to the public discussion around vegetation protection: the group of independent environmental scientists across Queensland led by Associate Professor Martine Maron and the conservation sector, including the Wilderness Society, WWF and the Australian Marine Conservation Society. After careful consideration of the submissions and the committee's report I am pleased to table the government's response.

*Tabled paper:* Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 19—Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, government response [[1295](#)].

I will now address the committee's report and the five recommendations made by the committee in relation to the bill. The first recommendation is that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines explains the consultation process that will be undertaken on the updated self-assessable codes, including details of who will be consulted. The Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines will speak to this matter. However, I can say that this government has consistently stated that it would retain the self-assessable codes. The government is undertaking a review of the self-assessable codes to ensure they align with the latest scientific information, that they are practical for landholders to implement and to ensure environmental values are protected. The review of the self-assessable codes is an opportunity for landholders, interest groups and the general public to comment on the revised codes and I would encourage anyone with an interest in the codes to do so.

Recommendation 2 is that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines provides an update and time frame that will be taken to improve the accuracy of vegetation mapping and proactively engage with landholders to provide them with updated property maps of assessable vegetation which correct any inaccuracies. The Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines will also speak to this matter. However, I can say that the government has already implemented this recommendation. The high-value regrowth, or proposed category C mapping, has been reviewed with the objective of improving its accuracy. I am pleased with the work undertaken by the Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation, the Queensland Herbarium and the Department of Natural Resources and Mines in reviewing the existing category C mapping.

I want to put on record my sincere thanks to the agencies involved, particularly the Queensland Herbarium under the leadership of Dr Gordon Guymer, for their mighty efforts to manually check the high-value regrowth mapping. Further, anyone who has requested a proposed regulated vegetation management map or who has previously requested a map has been advised of the updated mapping and can assess this mapping through a number of different formats. Additionally, the government's vegetation management web pages have also been changed to alert the public to the availability of the updated mapping.

Recommendation 3 is that the reverse onus of proof provisions in relation to vegetation clearing offences be omitted. Prior to the winding back of vegetation management protections by the previous government in 2013, the vegetation management framework contained provisions that place the responsibility on the owner to prove that they did not undertake unlawful clearing on their land—or reverse onus of proof. This provision has been in the Vegetation Management Act since 2003. The policy justification for this provision was that illegal clearing often occurs in remote areas where remotely sensed images are often the basis of a prosecution due to a lack of other evidence such as witnesses, contracts or receipts with regard to other persons undertaking the clearing. It is also unlikely that an unknown third party would undertake costly clearing without the occupier's invitation or approval due to the high cost of clearing and the personal benefit any third party would derive from this clearing.

It is acknowledged that the committee gave this provision serious consideration and recommended that this provision be removed. However, the Department of Natural Resources and Mines has made widely available at no, or very little, charge all the information required by landholders

to ensure they clear in accordance with the vegetation management laws. It is still the government's intention that the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill reinstate Queensland's nation-leading land-clearing laws and fulfils its election commitment. This includes the offence provisions in the VMA. It is important to note that the landholder is still able to provide evidence to prove that another person undertook the clearing without their knowledge or consent. There are precedents for this approach in the Forestry Act 1959 and for traffic offences, for example, red-light and speed cameras.

Recommendations 4 and 5 are that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection engage with the property, resources and development sectors to assess and establish the full impact of the proposed amendments on the environmental offsets regime in Queensland and inform the House of the outcomes of the assessment of the impacts, including potential costs of the proposed amendments to the environmental offsets regime and if any actions will be taken. The Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef will speak to this matter. However, I can say that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has prepared guidance materials clarifying which impacts will come within the definition of 'residual impact' for each state significant environmental matter that could be subject to an offset consideration. In addition, the department has consulted with the property, resources and development sectors on this guide and considered the ramifications for these sectors.

In conclusion, I again lay out the facts. They are stark and they are disturbing. Almost one million hectares has been cleared since the dark days of the Newman government. Over 84,000 hectares of koala habitat has been cleared since the passage of the Newman government laws. That occurred after the koala was listed as vulnerable under federal laws and it is incomprehensible that that clearing was undertaken without any proper oversight. In 2014-15 alone, in Queensland more than 40 million trees were destroyed. Clearing in the Great Barrier Reef catchments increased by 46 per cent to 108,000 hectares and 71 per cent of the clearing was untouched forests or vegetation over 28 years old. In Queensland emissions have increased from 15 million tonnes in 2011 to 35 million tonnes in 2014.

These statistics are alarming and the Palaszczuk Labor government recognises the need for action. We are not alone. Across Australia the scientific community recognises this and requires action. UNESCO recognised this and required action. Thousands of Queenslanders and Australians recognised that action is urgently needed and they are looking to us as lawmakers to do the right thing and do what is fair for our economy, our environment and, most importantly, for future generations.

Tonight, a vote for the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is a vote to restore effective, sensible laws that stop the devastation of broadscale tree clearing while allowing farmers to grow their agricultural production. This is a vote to protect our precious native habitat and, in turn, conserve our wildlife and Queensland's unique biodiversity. This is a vote to act on climate change and immediately reduce Queensland's emissions. This is a vote to take action to save the Great Barrier Reef.

I am enormously proud of the fact that it is this side of the House—it is Labor members—that understands both the enormity and the responsibility of supporting this bill. It is only ever Labor governments that can and will get the balance right between development and the environment. As this debate unfolds over the many hours ahead, it will be Labor that proves yet again that we are the only party in this place that will champion reform for today's Queenslanders and for those yet to be born. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (10.32 pm): The introduction of this bill into the House on 17 March this year was an act of calculated political retribution. It was the culmination of a series of dishonest actions by the Palaszczuk government. In the five months since its introduction, Labor and the Greens have mounted a concerted campaign of scaremongering, contrived misinformation and outright untruths. This legislation was conceived exclusively between Labor and the Greens, despite the Palaszczuk government giving repeated undertakings to rural stakeholder groups that they would be consulted. That never happened. In the end, at the recent estimates committee hearings, we had the portfolio minister, the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, shrug his shoulders with indifference about this lack of consultation.

Labor and the Greens have spent the past five months vilifying Queensland's farmers and landowners, seeking to characterise them as cavalier vandals of the environment, when the truth is exactly the opposite. Labor and the Greens have tried to influence the views of urban communities by trashing the reputations of our primary producers. This bill proposes amendments to Queensland's

vegetation management framework that will take us back to the bad old days of unbalanced, punitive restrictions on farmers and landowners, where people's basic civil liberties will be denied and economic opportunities in regional Queensland, including for Indigenous Queenslanders, will be lost.

In responding to this bill on behalf of the LNP, I will be dealing not only with its provisions but also with the history of this issue, the facts about the important and overdue reforms implemented by the former LNP government in 2013, the Agriculture and Environment Committee report, the Statewide Landcover and Trees Survey report and other matters. Since European settlement, in Queensland the clearing of vegetation has been regulated on crown land. In the first 100 years of this state, the focus was on developing our agricultural sector and providing infrastructure for at first a growing colony and later a growing state. That development resulted in the lifestyle, opportunities and prosperity that we have today. Successive governments of all political colours supported that development, so much so that agricultural and grazing leases issued over state land actually had conditions requiring land to be cleared and developed to ensure that this time-consuming and costly work would be done. Failure to comply with those conditions would mean forfeiture of the lease.

Times have certainly changed and the unregulated clearing of vegetation in Queensland is no longer permitted. However, between 1999 and 2013, under both the Beattie and Bligh governments the escalation of regulations and restrictions in the Vegetation Management Act made the very wrong assumption that ecosystems are static and trees do not grow. Of course, that is not true; in fact, trees do grow. Across Australia, including Queensland, in the absence of widespread controlled burns previously undertaken for tens of thousands of years by Indigenous Australians, European settlement has in fact seen the widespread thickening of woody vegetation and, believe it or not, to this day trees continue to grow.

In 1994, the then Goss government introduced the first efforts to reduce rates of vegetation clearing on state owned land. That was to be achieved through the development of clearing guidelines on leasehold land. Landholders participated in good faith and contributed their own time and practical experience to develop common-sense guidelines. Those guidelines contained environmental requirements to protect watercourses, lagoons and swamps, which are now called wetlands, slope limits for clearing and limits on clearing certain types of vegetation. That demonstrates that landholders recognised the need for sensible vegetation management controls that protected the environment.

However, the working relationship between the government and landholders was abandoned by another Labor government, the Beattie government. In 1999, the Beattie government scrapped those guidelines and introduced the Vegetation Management Bill, which was the first in a long line of politically motivated attacks on Queensland's rural industries and rural communities. In 1999, the VMA meant for the first time the management of vegetation on freehold land across Queensland was rigidly regulated. Of course, landholders reacted to this threat to the viability of their businesses and the erosion of their property rights with vocal opposition. Little did they know that that was just the start of more than a decade of political persecution by Labor.

During the 2004 state election campaign, Labor announced that it intended to end broadscale tree clearing in Queensland. The then natural resources minister, Stephen Robertson, stated that the implementation of that ban signalled the end of Labor's interest in the agenda and that the amended laws provided much needed certainty to Queensland's primary producers. Minister Robertson said that a line in the sand had been drawn, that Labor took the concerns of landowners seriously and that he had given them many assurances that regrowth would be exempt from those controls. We now know that statement from Minister Robertson was not truthful, just as undertakings from the current minister to Queensland landowners have not been truthful.

As we now know, restrictions on the management of regrowth vegetation on freehold land were introduced after the 2009 state election. On that occasion, regulating remnant vegetation was no longer enough for Labor and the Greens. By now, the agenda of the Bligh government and the greens had widened to expand vegetation regulations to regrowth on freehold land. Imagine trying to run a sustainable rural business when the state government continually changes the goalposts, keeps ramping up penalties and compliance, keeps limiting the availability of the resource that your business depends on and ties you up in so much red tape that you do not know which way to turn and you end up surrendering, exhausted, frustrated and depressed.

This is the very real and sad reality of what happened to rural communities, farmers and landowners across Queensland between 1999 and 2012. The development and expansion of a farm business is usually staged, reflecting the financial position of the landowner. Most farm businesses in

Queensland are still family owned and in many cases are multigenerational. In most cases it is not a matter of clearing vegetation as quickly as possible; it is a matter of considering how the finances of the business are travelling and whether the enterprise can afford to expand its operation.

I believe deeply that there is a strong level of commitment to the land by people who purchase property with the intention of pursuing a farm business. Logically, the land is the principal asset in that farm business and it is clearly in the best interests of the landowner to look after that asset. Purchasing property is a significant financial investment and very often the land has vegetation on it. If they do not intend expanding the farm business the decision to clear vegetation can be a costly exercise for no return on that investment.

The point that I make is that it is a nonsense to suggest, as Labor and the Greens have done, that the clearing of vegetation is undertaken indiscriminately or without a reasonable expectation that a farm business will expand as a result. When people buy land there is an expectation that the clearing of vegetation will occur and bringing that land into production will occur as a result.

The landholder will invariably have a plan for the management of that property to be viable, sustainable and productive farm businesses in the long term. As a result, members can imagine how very concerning it would be for landowners to be told when they have made such a significant investment that their plans have been thrown into disarray by a government for political reasons.

Since the VMA was established in 1999 the LNP has always expressed considerable concerns about its impacts on the agriculture sector and on individual farms and landowners. In many cases landowners have been put in untenable positions as far as the viability of their enterprises are concerned, including purchasing land with the intention to develop it in good faith.

These were the circumstances in which the previous LNP government found the Queensland vegetation management framework in March 2012: laden with ideology, heavy on regulation, devoid of opportunity, breaching civil liberties and fundamental legislative principles and holding back the state's economy, particularly in regional and rural Queensland. I am proud to say that one of the most personally satisfying reforms was—

**Ms Trad:** Why did you lie?

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer):** Order! That is unparliamentary language. It is in an interjection. Could I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw?

**Ms TRAD:** I withdraw.

**Mr CRIPPS:** I am proud to say that one of the most personally satisfying reforms that I was associated with as the minister for natural resources in the former LNP government was our landmark reforms to Queensland's vegetation management framework. These reforms were balanced and responsible. They were implemented well and rigorously. That is notwithstanding some of the allegations that have been levelled at them by those opposite.

After more than a decade of constant ideological persecution by successive Beattie and Bligh Labor governments driven by several election preference deals with the Greens, the former LNP government's changes delivered some much needed relief to landowners and some common sense to the legislation. Firstly, our amendments addressed some longstanding matters in the VMA that were offensive to people's individual rights and established fundamental legislative principles of the Queensland parliament. This included correcting the reversal of the onus of proof, making mistake of fact available as a defence and removing the compulsion to give evidence against oneself.

Secondly, the LNP restored the right of landowners to manage regrowth vegetation on their freehold land. This was a property right that was removed by the zealous overreach of the Bligh government after the 2009 state election when the relationship between Labor and the Greens had reached an ugly symbiosis. Handing those property rights back was a big achievement for the previous LNP government.

The former LNP government also established a number of self-assessable codes for routine land management practices such as managing encroachment, managing regrowth on leasehold land, managing woody weeds, fodder harvesting and thinning. We eventually developed 15 self-assessable codes covering management activities in different vegetation bioregions. These codes have been very successful at reducing the time and the costs of complying with and administering the VMA for landowners and the Queensland government respectively. Unfortunately, the Palaszczuk government has already commenced a process to reduce the flexibility and usefulness of these codes, which I will touch on in more detail later.

However, arguably the most important reform to the VMA was the new exemption to clear remnant vegetation for high-value agriculture and high-value irrigated agriculture. This mechanism provided a pathway for the sustainable growth of Queensland's agriculture sector that was not previously allowed for under Labor's prescriptive and inflexible VMA. A robust assessment process was established for HVA applications involving soil tests, financial viability tests and, where irrigation was proposed, a demonstration that the necessary volume of water entitlements were available. The HVA framework has been utilised to expand existing and create new high-value agriculture projects across Queensland.

These positive steps forward for Queensland's vegetation management framework are under serious threat from the Palaszczuk government and yet another pre-election preference deal with the Greens. There is enormous angst in regional and rural Queensland that we are going back to the bad old days of the Beattie and Bligh governments.

The bill before the House was conceived illegitimately. Its life did not begin well because late last year we saw Premier, under intense pressure from green activists, humiliate the natural resources minister by publicly stripping him of responsibility for this bill and handing it over to the Deputy Premier. That was certainly an ominous sign for farmers and landowners in Queensland.

The supposedly ironclad commitment Queensland's agriculture peak bodies and landowners had earlier received from the Minister for Natural Resources that Labor would only make changes to the vegetation management framework after a consultative roundtable process produced a report with recommendations lay in tatters when that happened, along with the credibility of the Minister for Natural Resources. Looking back now, we know the stakeholder round table met only once and never produced a report or any recommendations. We know that the extreme green groups refused to attend the roundtable discussions until their demands were agreed to. The complete failure of the Minister for Natural Resources' roundtable process laid the foundations for his political emasculation by the Premier.

Instead the Greens lobbied the Palaszczuk government directly, demanding that Labor implement their preferred changes to the VMA. This is a disturbingly familiar course of events for the agriculture sector and farmers in Queensland. For a government that committed itself to being accountable and transparent and to being open and consultative it seems that this only applies when it is convenient to Labor.

This bill is a good example of Labor's total indifference towards regional communities. In contrast, the LNP is committed to defending these sensible and balanced reforms that we delivered in 2013. As Labor gears up for another assault on the property rights of landowners in Queensland, we are absolutely committed to defending those property rights.

During the public debate on this bill since it was introduced on the 17 March this year, assertions have been made that the reforms implemented by the former LNP government gutted Queensland's vegetation management framework in 2013. In particular, the Deputy Premier has been prolific with this allegation. It is of course false and now I will outline why.

Under the current vegetation management framework in Queensland all remnant vegetation is protected under the Vegetation Management Act. Let me say that again slowly for the benefit of those opposite. Under the act and following the LNP's reforms in 2013 all remnant vegetation remained regulated. That is not a gutting of the legislation. The only circumstances in which a landowner or proponent may clear remnant vegetation is when the proposed activity is subject to an exemption, such as building a residential house or a piece of public infrastructure, a properly assessed and granted permit, such as for high-value agriculture, or a routine management practice under a self-assessable code.

In 2013 the LNP's reforms did deregulate the management of regrowth vegetation that had been previously cleared on freehold land, returning property rights that had been taken away by the Bligh government in 2009. Again, this is not remnant vegetation. Indeed, the 2014-15 SLATS report shows this accounted for about 62 per cent of the vegetation clearing in that period. However, this regrowth deregulation did not extend to leasehold land, which covers about two-thirds of Queensland. As I outlined earlier, restrictions on managing regrowth on leasehold land extended back beyond the first VMA in 1999 to the Land Act reforms of 1994. The state retains a level of interest in this land that justifies the ongoing oversight of the management of regrowth vegetation. As I mentioned earlier, the self-assessable codes cover routine management practices such as woody weed control, fodder harvesting and thinning. Anyone who has even an elementary understanding of the management of a rural property understands the need to undertake these types of activities and would consider them uncontroversial—no gutting to see here.

Lastly, the key element of the LNP's reforms was the new purpose to provide permits for high-value agriculture to sustainably grow Queensland's agriculture sector. As I mentioned earlier, a robust application process was established which included soil and financial assessments and has been used to expand existing and create new HVA programs across Queensland. Furthermore, successful HVA assessments issued under the former LNP government routinely mapped riparian vegetation, areas covered by essential habitat mapping, wetlands, areas of ecological concern and other environmentally sensitive areas out of permits issued for high-value agriculture. The assessment process was rigorous. Again, it is wrong to describe the legislation as having been gutted.

The release of the most recent Statewide Landcover and Trees Study, or SLATS report, has set off a fresh wave of protests amongst the green activists and prompted their political surrogates in the Palaszczuk government—the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment—to step up their attacks on Queensland's farmers and landowners. As usual, we have seen a combination of the selective use of data and hyperbole to stir up public angst and fear about this issue. The Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection in particular have been quick to use the total or global figures in the SLATS report to try to shock people but have spent little time genuinely exploring the details of the report.

Labor and the Greens consistently and conveniently ignore key facts that are spelt out in black and white in the SLATS report. For example, in 2012-13 more than 260,000 hectares of vegetation was cleared in Queensland under laws put in place by the Bligh government. This clearly demonstrates that vegetation management rates have not blown out following the LNP's reforms in 2013. The Palaszczuk government is now arguing for the content of this bill which will restore those very same rules, claiming they will protect the Great Barrier Reef. Yet the SLATS report shows that the arrangements that Labor and the Greens are arguing for lawfully allowed for the clearing of more than 260,000 hectares of vegetation in the financial year 2012-13 reporting period.

The key to understanding the SLATS report is to put an effort into understanding what type of vegetation management activities were undertaken, where and for what purpose. Quoting a global figure to manipulate a public debate is just base politics. The Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection have been doing exactly that. For example, in their public commentary, and indeed in the SLATS report, they have deliberately failed to differentiate fodder harvesting in severely drought affected areas and selective thinning to maintain tree densities from other vegetation management activities, instead classifying them as broadscale clearing, which is both inappropriate and inaccurate.

Another important statistic in the SLATS report, as I mentioned earlier, is that 62 per cent of all vegetation management activities in the 2014-15 reporting period involved regrowth vegetation on previously cleared land. This is not pristine or untouched vegetation or endangered ecosystems. This is vegetation that has previously been cleared for whatever reason and has regrown over a period of time. Fancy that—examples of trees growing again! Furthermore, in relation to the remaining 38 per cent of vegetation management activities involving remnant vegetation, all of those activities, as I have outlined earlier, occurred with an assessed and approved permit, involved activities that were subject to a self-assessable code or had an appropriate exemption such as a house or a piece of public infrastructure.

The 2014-15 SLATS report also states clearly that woody vegetation covers about 51 per cent of Queensland and that the vegetation management activities reported in that year accounted for about 0.3 per cent of that woody vegetation. Less than one per cent—less than half of one per cent—of woody vegetation in Queensland was impacted in the 2014-15 reporting period. Logically, if that is true, given woody vegetation covers about half of Queensland, it means that the area on which vegetation management activities were undertaken in the 2014-15 reporting period was about half the area the SLATS report says was disturbed—about 0.15 per cent of the state of Queensland, a very modest footprint across the whole state of Queensland when it is put into proper perspective.

I therefore submit that the accusation that the former LNP government's 2013 reforms resulted in an unsustainable escalation in vegetation management activities is untruthful and misleading. A proper assessment of the SLATS report and an objective analysis as to the purpose and the nature of vegetation management activities in Queensland reveals the truth. The former LNP government's 2013 reforms of Queensland's vegetation management framework were sensible and they were balanced. Labor and the Greens would prefer to debate this issue in an idealistic vacuum, pretending that real people in real communities based on real industries will not be hurt if this bill succeeds, but the reality is that this assumption is very, very wrong.

It was not long after the January 2015 state election that the Palaszczuk government began to demonstrate how two-faced it intended to be regarding Queensland's vegetation management framework. The Minister for Natural Resources even issued a media statement reassuring farmers and landowners that it was business as usual in Queensland regarding the VMA. The minister promised, as he did so often in 2015, consultation with the agriculture sector before any changes were proposed. I said at the time that the minister's statement was disingenuous and deceptive. Labor had violently opposed the sensible changes that the LNP had made to the vegetation management framework in 2013, and the Deputy Premier in particular was vitriolic during the debate.

Since then we have seen the deep green bias that controls the ALP exposed. I have no doubt that rural industry groups pleaded with the Minister for Natural Resources to try to save the sensible and balanced reforms that the LNP made to the Vegetation Management Act from being overturned in the face of rampant lobbying from the Greens. That media statement from the Minister for Natural Resources was obviously designed to try to calm people down, to calm anxious farmers and landowners down, in the face of clear undertakings by Labor in opposition that they would seek to overturn the LNP's reforms.

What we have seen unfold since then would indicate that the Minister for Natural Resources has been misleading people deliberately. Even at this very early stage the natural resources minister was promising to consult with industry, with farmers and landowners but was failing to come clean with the facts that Labor had already done a deal with the Greens. It was certainly reminiscent of previous experiences that regional communities and the agriculture sector had had regarding consultation with the Labor Party on this issue.

Within a few months, the natural resources minister had caught himself in a trap. He was stuck between a Labor election commitment to reverse the LNP's changes to the legislation and a commitment that he gave during the 2015 estimates committee hearings that the work of the stakeholder roundtable group appointed to review the VMA would be unfettered. Indeed, the natural resources minister clearly stated that he believed it would be improper of him to place any parameters around the outcomes of that roundtable review process. Frankly, I was surprised that the minister made such a commitment, especially with the Greens in charge of Labor's policy.

I certainly asked him on several occasions at that estimates committee hearing how he would resolve the inconsistency between his commitment and Labor's policy to repeal the LNP's changes to the VMA. The minister could not explain how he would reconcile Labor's election commitments to repeal the LNP's changes with the roundtable review process. The reality is that, regardless of the commitments that were given by the Minister for Natural Resources, this roundtable process was always going to be a sham because the intentions of the Palaszczuk government regarding the Vegetation Management Act were always predetermined. Again, we see a pattern of misleading and deceptive behaviour from Labor.

However, it was late in 2015 that the Minister for Natural Resources suffered his humiliating political defeat when the Premier stripped him of his responsibility for handling the development of Labor's changes to Queensland's vegetation management framework, handing it over to the Deputy Premier. At that time the Palaszczuk government also announced that it would introduce legislation into the Queensland parliament to amend the vegetation management framework in early 2016, violating a commitment that the Minister for Natural Resources gave in September to rural stakeholders in Queensland about the consultation process that would occur. On 15 September last year Minister Lynham told the Queensland parliament—

I have repeatedly said that a key element of achieving this commitment will be through thorough consultation with a range of stakeholders. As such, a vegetation management community roundtable process will be used to achieve this outcome through participation from representatives from the agricultural and conservation sectors, the natural resource management collective and Indigenous interests. Once I receive the report from the round table, the government will carefully consider the recommended actions in the context of our election commitments.

By the time the Premier sin-binned the Minister for Natural Resources in late 2015 we know that the vegetation management round table had met only once and had not provided any report or any recommendations to the minister or to the Palaszczuk government. The bottom line is that there had been no consultation at all with Queensland's farmers and landowners. These details about how this bill came to the House for the consideration of all members during this debate is important because of the first remarks that I made when I commenced my contribution to this debate.

Members will recall that I said that the introduction of this bill into the House on 17 March this year was an act of calculated political retribution. I said that the bill was the culmination of a series of dishonest actions by the government and that in the five months since its introduction Labor and the

Greens had mounted a concerted campaign of scaremongering, contrived misinformation and outright untruths. What I have submitted to the House so far has been all about demonstrating the accuracy of that statement. I said when I commenced this contribution that this legislation was conceived exclusively between Labor and the Greens, and despite the Palaszczuk government giving repeated undertakings to rural stakeholder groups that they would be consulted this consultation never happened. Indeed, I have previously outlined these concerns to the House.

On 15 March this year, with rumours of the imminent introduction of the bill into the House, I gave notice that the LNP opposition would move to protect the rights of Queensland's farmers and landholders to responsibly manage vegetation on their properties by voting against the introduction of any bill to change vegetation management laws on its first reading. I explained to the House that the LNP would do this because of the dismal failure of the Palaszczuk government to consult with the key stakeholders that would be severely affected by this legislation.

Suddenly and subsequently there was some mock outrage expressed from those opposite that no member had ever voted against the introduction of a bill into the Queensland parliament on its first reading. To be quite honest, I have never followed up on whether or not that accusation is true. If it is, quite frankly, I do not care. I will not apologise for calling out what I consider to be a blatant case of a minister making commitments, making undertakings to directly affected stakeholders that they will be consulted and then the government and the minister doing exactly the opposite of what he committed to do.

That is why I say that this bill is illegitimate. That is why I argued that it ought not be read for the first time and that I divided on its introduction into the House. On 15 May this year I clearly outlined the evidence that the Minister for Natural Resources had not once, not twice, not thrice but on four separate occasions given clear commitments and undertakings during the proceedings of this House that have not been honoured. I pointed out that the Palaszczuk government had promised to be a listening government. We were told the Palaszczuk government would be accountable and that it would consult with Queenslanders on the public policy issues that it made decisions about.

I pointed out that the natural resources minister appointed a community round table for consultation purposes, and I tabled four extracts from the *Record of Proceedings* of this House. They were from the estimates committee hearing of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee from 19 August last year when the minister outlined his commitment for that consultation process to occur before any changes to the vegetation management framework would come into the House; from 15 September 2015 when this House debated the estimates committee report from that committee when the minister said, 'Once I receive the report from the round table, the government will carefully consider the recommended actions in the context of our election commitments'; from 27 October last year when the minister repeated his commitment to that roundtable process; and from 24 February this year when in a motion the minister reiterated that the Palaszczuk government and he, in particular, would focus on the consultation process involved in that roundtable process before any changes would be made.

On 15 March this year I referred directly to what most people in this place already knew: what was really behind this bill was a letter of demand from September 2015 to the Premier from the Wilderness Society demanding that the preference deal that was agreed to between Labor and the Greens be honoured. The Greens were demanding their quid pro quo in return for delivering Greens preferences at the 2015 state election which delivered seats like South Brisbane, Mount Coot-tha and others to Labor, with Queensland farmers, landholders, our regional communities and our agricultural sector paying the price with reduced property values, lost production opportunities and lost regional jobs.

I know that the affected stakeholders who have been deceived by the Palaszczuk government feel very strongly that the so-called consultation process was a complete joke and a very bad one at that. No-one is laughing in regional, rural and remote Queensland about how Labor has doublecrossed people who live and work in the agriculture sector. In a press release on 28 November last year, AgForce Queensland stated that the Premier had turned her back on farmers battling Queensland's worst ever drought and turned her back on the government's own consultation process. The Palaszczuk government is not a listening government or a consultative government. It is dishonest and it is false. Equally, the Minister for Natural Resources has not honoured the commitments and undertakings that he gave to AgForce and others about the consultation process on this bill.

As I said on 15 March in the House this year, he should consider carefully what this complete failure means for his reputation and try to understand what the consequences have been for the people that he has misled. The minister reacted negatively to questions about his integrity on this matter at

recent estimates hearings. However, if a minister stands up in this House four times and gives a commitment to something, isn't it a legitimate question to scrutinise him about that issue and demand that he explain himself, which he has failed to do?

With respect to the inquiry undertaken by the Agriculture and Environment Committee, the Palaszczuk government has missed an opportunity to save face and amend its unfair and unnecessary proposals to change Queensland's vegetation management framework. Labor continues to refuse to listen to the wave of angry objections coming from regional communities. The report from the Agriculture and Environment Committee was an opportunity for Labor to acknowledge its failure to consult the bill's unjustifiable content and abandon its attack on farmers and landowners. The committee report recommended the removal of the reversal of the onus of proof provision. This was no surprise, given it was almost unanimously condemned by every single submission that was received by the committee during its inquiry.

However, I was surprised that the committee failed to recommend the equally offensive provisions—withdrawing mistake of fact as an available defence and the retrospectivity of the bill to 17 March 2016—also be removed. In my view, these provisions are no less objectionable to the civil liberties of individuals and violate the fundamental legislative principles of the Queensland parliament.

Nevertheless, the Palaszczuk government appears to be unable to accept even this minor level of direction from the Agriculture and Environment Committee, despite MPs on the committee having the opportunity to travel extensively across Queensland, hearing evidence from affected farmers and landholders. Instead, Labor has put politics ahead of good policy outcomes. The Palaszczuk government is so beholden to the Greens that Labor MPs on the committee ignored all the evidence about the responsible work being done by farmers and landowners and the sustainable expansion of the agriculture sector in this state. The committee instead handed down a series of bland and unremarkable recommendations asking ministers for more information.

One redeeming feature of the report was the statement of reservation lodged by the deputy chair, the member for Gympie, which dealt comprehensively with the flaws in Labor's bill that were exposed through the extensive evidence considered during the committee hearings. It is a pity that the Labor MPs on the committee did not pay more attention to the member for Gympie. Even at this late stage in the public debate on this issue, I would encourage those members opposite to pick up the committee report and consider the well-articulated points made by the member for Gympie in his statement of reservation. I would also point out that the committee could not provide a recommendation to the House that the bill be passed, which all members should also consider. I repeat: the committee did not provide a recommendation to the House that the bill be passed.

Nevertheless, the Palaszczuk government appears to have defied the unanimous recommendation of the parliamentary committee to withdraw the reversal of the onus of proof provision from their proposed changes to Queensland's vegetation management framework. This decision is obviously very arrogant and shows a dreadful level of contempt for the parliament.

Labor's decision to try and ram this bill through unchanged demonstrates its bloody-mindedness on the issue of vegetation management in Queensland. This is a clear message that the whole process has been driven by ideology, with the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection determined to steamroll these draconian provisions through the parliament to satisfy the Greens.

Furthermore, the Palaszczuk government has given Queensland's agriculture sector an insight into their future under Labor's new vegetation management framework. Last week Labor tried to placate Queensland's farmers and landowners by suggesting that everything they could do now they would still be able to do after the repeal of the LNP's 2013 reforms. The Palaszczuk government suggested that farmers and landowners would still be able to use the self-assessable codes to undertake a range of vegetation activities, go through the Coordinator-General to clear vegetation to expand the agriculture sector, and that Indigenous people could use the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act to pursue new opportunities.

Unfortunately, we already know that Labor has moved to reduce the flexibility and usefulness of the highly successful self-assessable codes for routine management activities. It is clear that Labor's plans for these self-assessable codes will drive up the costs and reduce the productivity outcomes of Queensland's agriculture sector with unhelpful and rigid regulations.

Under the Palaszczuk government, it is clear the only pathway for expanding high-value agriculture anywhere in Queensland will be through a full-blown, expensive and time-consuming Coordinator-General's process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act—

legislation that is usually reserved for huge projects of state significance. This arrangement will favour large corporate agriculture proponents that have the finances and resources to make such applications. However, these arrangements will not be accessible and will be far too expensive for the overwhelming majority of farming businesses which are owned by farming families, and many of those have been operating for generations.

I would be very surprised if many of the Labor MPs opposite have spent much time considering the fact that this legislation will favour large corporate agriculture at the expense of family farming businesses. I ask them through you, Madam Deputy Speaker: is this your intention; does that sit well with your values; have you read the bill; do you know what is in it; and, if you missed this, what else have you missed?

Finally, Labor has moved to reassure Indigenous communities on Cape York Peninsula that they will be able to rely on the provisions of the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act to manage vegetation and deliver future economic opportunities. This is despite the poor reputation of this legislation as being inflexible and rarely used over the last decade for that reason. I noticed that the Deputy Premier touched on the availability of the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act and indicated to the House that in fact it has not been accessed by Indigenous communities on Cape York Peninsula to provide any job opportunities since it has been in place over the last decade.

Instead of Labor MPs blindly lining up behind this bill, it would be worth asking the Deputy Premier, the natural resources minister and the environment minister straight out how many times the provisions of the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act have actually been utilised over the last 10 years to create jobs on Cape York. Indeed, the member for Cook might be interested to know the answer to that question.

When the Deputy Premier introduced this bill on 17 March this year, she proposed a ridiculous committee inquiry period of only one month and wanted the committee report to come back by the middle of April—no doubt with a view to rush that legislation through the House as soon as possible with a minimum of parliamentary and public scrutiny. I am glad that the Labor Party did not get their way in March because it has allowed the people of Queensland—especially those who will be adversely impacted if this bill is agreed to—the opportunity to become aware of the outrageous, unfair and unnecessary changes to the Vegetation Management Act that are proposed in this bill. I have certainly been participating in that process myself.

The committee has travelled and they have taken a large volume of evidence. There is no recommendation to pass the bill in the committee report. We have a committee report but it is of limited use because the Labor MPs on that committee are toeing the party line. The committee hearings were very well attended. Everywhere that the committee went, it was very well attended, yet the report suggests just one amendment to the bill—albeit an important one.

When I spoke in the debate on 17 March this year, I pointed out that the bill did not just contain amendments to the vegetation management framework that would reverse the reforms put in place by the LNP in 2013; the bill in fact goes much further. Certainly, that is the case with respect to the expansion of category R vegetation management restrictions to the Fitzroy, Burnett-Mary and eastern Cape York Peninsula catchments. As such, this bill is more punitive and more restrictive and impinges on the property rights of more landowners in Queensland than the vegetation management framework that Labor had in place prior to the amendments put in place by the LNP in 2013. It does so again without any compensation being provided to affected landowners despite the fact that their property values, their income-earning capacity and their job opportunities will be reduced as a result.

Since 17 March I have travelled extensively to raise awareness about the implications of this bill for regional communities. I have spoken at community forums at Lakeland on Cape York, Bowen, Gympie, Beaudesert, Aratula, Kingaroy, Toogoolawah, Augathella, Roma, Clermont, Rockhampton and Emerald. I am happy to admit that, in a first for me, I marched in protest rallies in Gordonvale, in Townsville, in the Brisbane CBD and in Bundaberg. I have done this because the community, in particular those stakeholders who will be adversely impacted by Labor's proposed changes to the Vegetation Management Act, have not been properly consulted by this government. Their industry leaders and their representatives have not been consulted. They are as angry about being ignored as they are about the bill itself. For those who could not attend a forum or could not march at a rally, for those who could not make a written submission to the parliamentary committee or appear in person to give evidence, we established a petition for those people to support so they could send a message to the Palaszczuk government that they did not support this assault on Queensland's farmers and

landholders. More than 8,700 Queenslanders signed that petition. It articulated the petitioners' concerns in respect of the negative impact of this bill on landholders' property rights, agriculture sector productivity and jobs in regional communities and called on all MPs not to support the Vegetation Management (Reinstatement) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

One of the low points in the public debate on this bill from the Palaszczuk government was when the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection criticised Queensland's farmers and landowners for planning a rally in the Brisbane CBD against Labor's proposed changes to the Vegetation Management Act ahead of the start of the recent Royal Queensland Show because it was too political. This was another shocking display of how disconnected Labor is from regional Queensland. As I said at this time, you cannot have the Ekka without Queensland's farmers and landholders and the fact is the Royal Queensland Show has always been the week that the city meets the country in Brisbane. The farmers and landowners of Queensland should not have to leave their opinions at the farm gate to be allowed into town. This smacks of hypocrisy from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection because he is more than happy—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Order! Please do not use that word.

**Mr CRIPPS:** This smacks of double standards from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection because he is more than happy for his mates in the union movement to march through the streets and rally outside the Queensland parliament. However, when farmers and landowners from across Queensland want to send a message to this arrogant government, it is too political to allow them to hold a street march in the Brisbane CBD. What a load of nonsense!

While the Minister for Environment lashes out at farmers and landowners for wanting to have their say, surely the Premier needs to be asking herself the question: why are Queensland's agriculture sector and rural communities marching in the streets of Brisbane? The Palaszczuk government is out of touch with regional Queensland and the Ekka was, in fact, a perfect platform for urban residents to hear a message loud and clear from the bush that Labor is threatening our livelihoods, our jobs and our communities.

To conclude, in 2013 as natural resources minister in the former LNP government, I was proud to deliver balanced, common-sense reforms to Queensland's vegetation management framework. After more than a decade of being attacked and persecuted by Labor, the LNP provided some relief, some confidence and some hope to Queensland's farmers and landowners. Sadly, the latest preference deal between Labor and the Greens has seen the Palaszczuk government move to repay the political debt by seeking to overturn these reforms. Labor's proposed changes strip away property rights, they reduce property values and they compromise the future opportunities of hardworking farming families across regional and rural Queensland. Labor and the Greens have dishonestly painted Queensland's farmers and landowners as environmental vandals and misrepresented statistics about vegetation management activities in Queensland to frighten people in urban communities about the survival of wildlife and the Great Barrier Reef when, in fact, their campaign is a political and an ideological one.

Queensland's primary producers are some of the state's leading conservationists. The malicious scaremongering by Labor and the Greens suggesting that they cannot be trusted to manage vegetation responsibly on their own properties is disgraceful and, quite frankly, disrespectful. This issue is critical for future economic development opportunities in regional and rural Queensland.

There are many complex issues associated with the debate about vegetation management in Queensland. However, the vexatious hyperventilation being undertaken by the Deputy Premier, the environment minister and their extreme green activist mates has been irresponsible and dishonest. I hope—I pray—that the majority of good, hardworking, decent Queenslanders can see through their nonsense. As the LNP shadow minister for natural resources, I am absolutely committed to defending Queensland's primary producers and the sensible reforms undertaken by the LNP in 2013. The LNP remains steadfastly against Labor's proposed changes to Queensland's vegetation management framework, and we will continue to advocate and defend the merits of the reforms that we undertook in 2013.

During the debate when this bill was introduced on 17 March this year, I said that I would oppose this legislation vigorously. Although the Deputy Premier said in her introductory speech that it was her responsibility to see this bill passed through the parliament because she had been to Bonn, I oppose this bill because she has never been to Barcardine, she has never been to Biloela, she has never been to Bundaberg, she has never been to Bamaga, she has never been to Bowen, she has never been to Beaudesert, she has never been to Bollon and she has never been to Babinda to talk about the impact that this legislation will have on farmers and landowners across the state, and that is the key difference

between Labor and the LNP. The Deputy Premier might have gone to Bonn with her little lap-dog, the environment minister, but she has not been out into regional and rural Queensland and talked to the real people of this state about the impact that this legislation will have on their lives and on their livelihoods.

I oppose this legislation vigorously. This legislation should not be supported by any member in this House.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hinchliffe, adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT



**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.28 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### Battle of Long Tan, 50th Anniversary



**Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (11.28 pm): Tomorrow there will be a service to commemorate the 50th anniversary of the Battle of Long Tan in the rubber plantations just a few kilometres from the former military base at Nui Dat. While it was not the longest battle of the Vietnam conflict, it was certainly the bloodiest: almost one-third of the soldiers were either wounded or lost their lives. I was humbled to be invited to attend the commemorative dinner held in Vung Tau on Australia Day this year for those who fought in Operation Coburg. It was 48 years ago that those soldiers fought in that operation. I did have the privilege of going out to the memorial and the cross where the battle was, and it is a very sacred place. If anybody ever gets the opportunity I suggest you go and see it. I suppose it is like going to Gallipoli and remembering the fallen soldiers there because it is a very special place.

Hervey Bay has one of the largest populations of Vietnam veterans in Australia, and over the past few weeks a number of veterans and members of the wider community attended memorial services for Anzac Day, Korea and the Rimau service in Hervey Bay for people who trained on Fraser Island and went on the crate into Singapore. Fraser Island has a real history of military training. Tomorrow the service takes place in Hervey Bay and Canberra. It was going to be held at Long Tan in Vietnam, and it was sad to see that officials over there have stopped that ceremony. I am not quite sure why, but it is sad to see that happen. A lot of Australians go to Gallipoli every year to see the service there, and it would have been great to have that at Long Tan. Over the past few days a number of events leading up to Long Tan Day have been held in Vietnam: the Sundowners Dinner in Ho Chi Minh City was held last Tuesday and Little Patty was going to hold a concert tonight. I am not sure whether that has happened.

I would like to pay tribute to the former commander Harry Smith and congratulate him on the recent positive outcome he has had to ensure that his soldiers are recognised for their gallantry during the Battle of Long Tan. He has fought for this for many years—ever since the Vietnam War—and those soldiers will now receive medals for their gallantry during that battle.

### Beard150, Cancer Council



**Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (11.31 pm): I rise to do a bit of an advertising campaign tonight for Beard150 for the Queensland Cancer Council. A few of my colleagues in the House may have noticed that I have a bit of growth on my face. It is not because I have become lazy and I do not want to shave; it is because I am going to advertise for the Cancer Council. I am going to make a whole lot of men in this room aware that we all need to get out there and talk about men's health, which is something I promised I would do.

I have a few statistics: one of every two men who reach the age of 85 is going to have cancer, and that in itself is just a terrible thing; one in 10 men will be diagnosed with a melanoma by the time they reach 85; and one in five men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer by the time they reach 85. Of the 4,000 men who are diagnosed with prostate cancer in Queensland every year, 600 of them will die. There are 150 men involved right throughout Queensland. I am sure no ladies are involved unless they have a bit of extra growth going on. On a very serious note, this is a great opportunity to donate a few dollars towards what I believe is a very worthy cause. I am not saving money on razor blades for nothing. This is something that I would love everybody to become involved in. If you have any guys in your electorate who are doing this very thing, please support them. If you get on to everydayheroes.com

you can look them up. It is for a very, very worthy cause if we can all get involved looking after our brothers, our husbands and our sons in this state. So many men live their lives without understanding what the implications of cancer can be.

Bowel cancer is another big thing which hits many men across the state. I am involved with the Buderim Men's Shed and we have lots to do. Buderim has the biggest Men's Shed in Australia. It gives men an opportunity to come together and talk about things that impact upon them as men. They talk about cancer and they talk about things that blokes normally do not talk about. When you go back to your electorates please promote the Men's Shed and promote Beard150. I am only looking to raise \$750. There is a lady by the name of Marni Brown who has already donated \$210 for me to shave my beard off. If you could gather \$5 or \$10 each, I personally would greatly appreciate it. It is not very much to ask of everybody in the House. Promote what you can and look after our brothers in kind. We do not do it too often. I am not going to conduct advertising campaigns in parliament too much, but this is a good cause. Let us be bipartisan and let us look after one another: husbands, brothers and fathers-in-law are the blokes that we want to help.

### Darumbal People, Native Title

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (11.34 pm): Gudamulli, Mr Speaker! 'Gudamulli' of course means hello in Darumbal language, the traditional owners of the land which I represent in this place. Tuesday, 21 June 2016 was an historic day for the Darumbal people and also for Central Queensland. It was an honour and privilege to witness the native title rights of the Darumbal people formally recognised at a session of the Federal Court in Rockhampton—all past, present and future generations and the Darumbal people's continued connection to their traditional homelands. June's native title determination acknowledges that the Darumbal people have been connected to these lands since before sovereignty, and it means their undeniable connection to their traditional homelands can continue on. The Darumbal people have worked for over 23 years on this native title claim. The Commonwealth Shoalwater Bay commission of inquiry into sandmining in the Shoalwater Bay military training area and Byfield to its south provided an initial impetus for Darumbal people to meet and discuss preparing a native title claim in 1993.

Congratulations to native title applicants Mr Doug Hatfield, Ms Pauline Cora, Mr Warren Malone, Mr Rodney Mann, Ms Amanda Meredith, Ms Vanessa Ross and to all of the Darumbal people, other respondents and the Federal Court for the diligence and spirit of cooperation required to achieve such a wonderful outcome. Uncle Bob Blair told me a story a few days after the determination which I think is a great example of just how important this determination was for all Darumbal people, even the young ones. Uncle Bob Blair told me about a group of young Darumbal children who were playing at the Dreamtime Centre on the day of the determination. Their mother called out and told them it was time to go home. The children smiled and told their mother that, as a matter of fact, they would not be going home any time soon because, 'Mum, we just got our land back!'

Good spirit and celebrations continued on from the native title determination into NAIDOC Week in July. I attended the flag-raising ceremony at Yeppoon and the NAIDOC march at Emu Park. It was great to see numbers in the march up on last year. We were also treated to a wonderful re-enactment of King O'Malley and Coowonga, a great story of comradery and compassion involving an Aboriginal man who nursed a sick O'Malley back to health. The amazing Darumbal dancers entertained us all, and it was an honour to be asked to join in on the dancing. Congratulations to Aunty Sally, Uncle Billy Mann and all of the elders and team who organised yet another amazing NAIDOC Week at Emu Park. Thank you also for the very special gumbi gumbi tree which I have already planted in my yard. I am looking forward to trying the leaves as a tea.

Following on from NAIDOC Week I met with Aunty Nicky Hatfield, Aunty Sally Vea Vea, Malcolm Mann and Khristina Hatfield to talk about ways we can work together to promote our region's Indigenous history. Each time I learn more amazing things—and some very sad things—about our region's history. We must share these stories more amongst our broader community and with visitors to the region. I look forward to continuing to work with the traditional owners—and now native title holders—in Keppel. Yadaba!

### Jabiru Island Bridges

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (11.37 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise in the House this evening and thank my good friend and colleague the member for Glass House and shadow minister for transport, main roads and local government for visiting the great electorate of Broadwater last Friday to join our good friend and colleague the member for Coomera, Michael Crandon, in calling on this

Labor government to fund the duplication of the bridges at Jabiru Island that connect the great electorate of Broadwater and the great electorate of Coomera. What we have seen this Labor government prove time and time again is that they are asleep at the wheel and they are incapable of funding the infrastructure that Queensland—and particularly the Gold Coast—needs. Last Friday the shadow minister for main roads, the member for Coomera and I stood on Jabiru Island and called on this Labor government to fund the vital duplication of the Jabiru Island Bridge.

**Mr Powell:** Bridges.

**Miss BARTON:** Bridges. Thank you, member for Glass House. For those who do not know, the bridges connect Paradise Point and Hope Island. We have a situation where, in the lead-up to the first bridge it is two lanes that have to merge into one to go over the island, and then it opens up to two lanes. I will in a moment table some Google maps and images. As we saw, there is space and there is opportunity to duplicate these bridges to ensure the connection and the thoroughfare so that people who live at Paradise Point and Runaway Bay going out to the M1 at exit 57, or people at Hope Island and Sanctuary Cove coming through to Southport, are able to do so without needing to battle congestion daily.

We see this government continuing to fail the Gold Coast when it comes to delivering infrastructure. In the lead-up to the election last year the Labor Party said that they could fund infrastructure. The Labor Party continue to fail the Gold Coast, because they have not duplicated the bridges at Jabiru Island. They are not funding the vital infrastructure needed by my community and the community of the member for Coomera. People in my community continually approach me and raise this as a key and critical issue for them.

I have taken the time to lobby the shadow minister for main roads and the shadow minister for infrastructure, and I appreciate their support in my campaign to fight for the vital duplication of these bridges. The member for Coomera and I know that our communities need this infrastructure, particularly in the lead-up to the 2018 Commonwealth Games. I table those maps for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Bundle of maps of proposed development of duplicate bridges for Jabiru Island connecting Paradise Point and Hope Island [1296].

I thank the shadow minister for joining me in my fight to make Labor fund this vital infrastructure in my community.

### **Logan Women's Health and Wellbeing Centre**



**Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (11.40 pm): I rise tonight to congratulate a strong and successful organisation in my community, the Logan Women's Health and Wellbeing Centre, on the amazing work they are doing for women in Logan and on their brand-new home in Beenleigh.

I was a proud board member of the Logan Women's Health and Wellbeing Centre before being elected to parliament and have seen them go from strength to strength, offering countless opportunities for women in Logan to live a better, healthier and more connected life. The manager, Stacey Ross, and her team have moved from Springwood—sorry to my good friend the Minister for Housing, Minister de Brenni—into my electorate, at George Street, Beenleigh. This beautiful big new space will be a one-stop shop for women needing assistance, counselling and friendship. The move was made possible by many Logan based businesses and social enterprise group WorkCrew. Local businesses such as Langs Building Supplies, Roscrete 1, Superior Steel Jimboomba, SB digger hire, Jim's Skip Bins, Kennards Hire Beenleigh, Modern Flooring Xtra, Lighting Direct, Builders Discount Warehouse, Discount Tile Warehouse, Bunnings Underwood and Lendlease all chipped in to make this transition a smooth and affordable one. Lendlease, in particular, have gone above and beyond, planning a community day for 40 of their staff to come and finish the renovations on the new property.

It is so wonderful to see community partnerships working for the benefit of local residents, and this project by Logan women's health I think is the benchmark. The move has also shown the emphasis my community has placed on expanding access to women's support services. Again, as the Minister for Women and a Logan local, this makes me extremely proud. The member for Springwood and I were at the working bee of the new property a few weeks ago. I also place on record my appreciation of him and his support for the organisation over many years. This organisation changes lives. I hear it from people in my community all the time.

I take this opportunity to congratulate Logan women's health on their new social enterprise. A couple of years ago Logan women's started a conversation about developing ideas to become financially sustainable while still being able to focus on providing support to vulnerable women. As a result, BE Enterprise was born. They now provide six different innovative training packages and professional development packages for businesses, all focused on the empowerment of women. All of the profits are reinvested into this wonderful organisation and into other important social projects.

I again congratulate Logan women's health on all the work they are doing to support women in Logan, on helping build a better, healthier and safer Logan and on their new home in Beenleigh. They really are one of the unsung heroes of my community.

### Coal Reuse

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (11.43 pm): I rise to make a statement about Coal Reuse Pty Ltd, a company that has been contracted by Stanwell Corporation at Tarong to distribute fly ash. Unfortunately, they seem to have run themselves into some real trouble. I have here two letters from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. The first letter highlights the fact that environmentally relevant activities were being conducted without an approval. It states—

... Coal Reuse is not beneficially using the coal combustion products ...

It also states—

The department is satisfied that ERA ... is being carried out ... without the appropriate approvals.

It also states—

Following the site inspection conducted by Authorised Officers on the 13 June ... the department is satisfied that Coal Reuse is conducting ERA ... Regulated Waste Storage at ... Wadell Street, Two Mile, Queensland ...

Quite amazingly, a month later the EPA sent out a letter saying that Coal Reuse had done nothing wrong, that its investigations did not identify any breaches but that 'we are going to change the regulations'. It looks a bit like a protection racket for a couple of ministers and Stanwell.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member, I do not think that is a fitting term in this parliament. Will you withdraw?

**Mr RICKUSS:** I withdraw. I think that if it looks like a duck, walks like a duck and quacks like a duck, it is a duck. I think this has been changed purely because the ministers and Stanwell could be embarrassed by this whole process. I table the letters.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 30 June 2016, from the Acting Compliance Delivery Manager, Delegate of Chief Executive, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Ms Dayna Clayborn, to the Executive Director, Coal Reuse Pty Limited, Mr Rodney Hudspeth, regarding the finalisation of a complaint investigation involving Coal Reuse Pty Ltd [[1298](#)].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 12 August 2016, from the Compliance Delivery Manager, Delegate of Chief Executive, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Ms Dayna Clayborn, to the Executive Director, Coal Reuse Pty Limited, Mr Rodney Hudspeth, regarding the finalisation of a complaint investigation involving Coal Reuse Pty Ltd [[1297](#)].

What really concerns me is the fact that there really are some problems with fly ash. Fly ash is a fairly safe product, but it has to be treated with respect. I table a safety data sheet from one of the cement companies.

*Tabled paper:* Document, dated 3 May 2013, titled 'Adelaide Brighton Cement Ltd Safety Data Sheet, Product Name Fly Ash—Fine Grade' [[1299](#)].

I will ask the ministers what sorts of safety data sheets Coal Reuse and Stanwell have in place for the fly ash they are using. It mostly consists of silica, aluminium oxide and so on. If it is managed appropriately it is quite a safe product, but I do not feel that it can be managed properly by Coal Reuse.

The real problem with Coal Reuse is that they have taxation problems and they are not paying their contractors. Their list of errors to the community appear to be building up, yet they are being protected by either someone in the EPA or someone higher than the EPA. I am quite disgusted by their actions.

### Banksia Beach State School Concert Band

 **Mr WILLIAMS** (Pumicestone—ALP) (11.47 pm): It is my pleasure to enlighten the House about the Banksia Beach State School concert band and to congratulate them on their achievements. This band is made up of children aged between eight and 11 years—year 3 to year 6—in a state primary school. Members might have seen bands before but not like this. Their achievements are outstanding. They win nearly all competitions they enter in Queensland.

Recently they travelled to Sydney and gave an absolutely brilliant performance at an international music competition at the Opera House. They were up against university and high school bands from across the world. This primary school band, up against world-class opposition, shone. They won silver, second only to the Cincinnati University all-adult band. Other bands came from Taiwan, China and New Zealand, to mention a few. These children shone against those bands.

These young men and women are truly wonderful. The teaching team, Principal Jacqui King and conductor Martin O'Callaghan deserve an enormous amount of credit for the encouragement, guidance and skill they impart to these children. Of course, none of this would have happened without the support of the parents, Bribie Island Coaches, Bribie Caltex, Bribie Lions, their patron Mrs June Sainty, Verve Constructions, Nextra and R & W real estate. We thank them all for their contributions, which helped these children get down to the Opera House and back.

It is my absolute delight to announce that at 6.30 on Tuesday, 30 August in the Speakers' Hall at the next sitting of parliament these extremely talented young people will demonstrate their craft in playing a short concert for the Premier, the Minister for Education, Kate Jones, and Mr Speaker. I invite all other members of the House. This will truly be a memorable occasion for these are truly brilliant young people.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will have to make sure that the House rises to be able to attend that special performance on the 30th at 6.30 pm. Thank you.

### Protecting Childhood, Education

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (11.50 pm): Age-appropriate education makes for happy, healthy teachers, children and parents. That was the message given to me by a group called Protecting Childhood when it met with me in my electorate office in April 2016. My role as the local MP for Mount Ommaney is to raise concerns of individuals and local groups and advocate on their behalf, and one such way is by sponsoring petitions.

Protecting Childhood told me that teachers in Queensland are being forced to teach an age-inappropriate and crowded curriculum which is pushing students too hard too fast. Teachers feel that their role has effectively turned them into data collectors where they administer copious numbers of standardised tests and reports which did not inform them of the knowledge or the understanding of each child's abilities or needs. This does nothing to enhance their learning or give children the best possible start in life. Protecting Childhood feels that children are disengaging from learning in a system which sets many of them up to fail. The self-esteem of some children is being damaged, and both teachers and children in the system are suffering from stress and anxiety.

As a local member and a mother of three, I know that Queensland teachers go to work every day with the children's learning needs as their main focus and we need to ensure that children's and teachers' best interests are at heart when considering the content of this petition. Protecting Childhood through its petition, which garnered over 7,000 signatures, calls on this House to—

1. Observe international evidence-based best practice and ensure:
  - (a) children are six years of age or older to commence being formally taught an incremental age-appropriate national curriculum
  - (b) all learning prior to age six, including prep, is play-based
  - (c) the data collection and reporting burden on teachers is reduced to maximise engage teaching time
2. Organise an independent investigation into the true depth of child and teacher distress in primary schools related to current age-inappropriate curricula and top down pressure to perform and assess too soon.

One of the things we did when in government was give the power back to local schools to make local decisions. Local schools and parents know best about the educational needs of their children rather than bureaucrats in the city. We should continue to empower our local schools and school communities to find the right balance to meet the educational needs of our students. I am supportive of any initiative that will ensure that Queensland students receive the education they deserve, and I look forward to hearing the feedback from local parents, schools and educators regarding the results of this petition. Finally, I want to acknowledge the Protecting Childhood group. Its efforts to galvanise parents and teachers to stand up for their children and teachers, and for children and teachers who are yet to experience the classroom, should be placed on the record and commended.

### Dalrymple Electorate, Road Upgrades

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.53 pm): Yesterday I tabled a petition of 1,807 signatures for the upgrade of the Return Creek Bridge at Mount Garnet on the southern Atherton Tablelands. The petition calls for the upgrade and widening of Return Creek Bridge. The petition requests that Return

Creek Bridge in Mount Garnet is widened to a two-lane bridge as a priority for the safety of all those who use this crossing. The bridge is too narrow for traffic it services and the give-way signs are regularly ignored by a large proportion of drivers. Locals regularly report near misses between vehicles and prime movers due to the narrow signal lane bridge, forcing vehicles into a dangerous situation on a daily basis. This petition calls on the House to upgrade the bridge as a matter of urgency to ensure the flow of traffic and the safety of all drivers. Return Creek Bridge is a B-double route and is renowned for numerous near misses. This is evidenced by the many skid marks on the road approaching the bridge which could be fatal accidents. Recently I inspected the bridge with department of main roads representatives and while at the site there were two near misses and a near head-on between a prime mover and a caravan. This route currently is being hammered by grey nomads and tourists and it is only a matter of time before there is a fatality. This is the only single-lane bridge from Ravenshoe through the inland highway to Emerald.

I also table a nonconforming petition of 38 signatures for an upgrade to the Foxwell Road turn-off at Malanda. The petition requests the installation of turning lanes on the Malanda side of the Foxwell Road and Collins Road T-intersection as this is a very dangerous corner. This is a key part of the designated B-double transport route servicing key agricultural production areas. Residents do not want a serious accident to be a trigger for something to happen. I fully support this nonconforming petition.

*Tabled paper:* Nonconforming petition regarding a requested upgrade to Foxwell Road at Malanda [\[1300\]](#).

### **Prince Charles Hospital; Biomedical and Life Sciences Industry**

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (11.55 pm): Tonight I rise to share with the House the great work done by the Prince Charles Hospital in the electorate of Stafford. The Ekka was in town the past week and a half and thousands of people enjoyed a traditional strawberry sundae. Five stalls at the Ekka were raising money for the Prince Charles Hospital. I personally blistered on behalf of the Prince Charles Hospital scooping out the strawberry sundaes. Every sundae contributed to funding a total of about 4,000 hours of innovative medical research.

Over the course of more than 20 years of being a doctor I saw firsthand the benefit of these lifesaving developments, especially those developed right here in Queensland. I am very proud to represent an electorate that has a hospital doing such wonderful things for not only the people of Queensland but also the global medical industry. I am also very proud to continue this innovation as Minister for State Development.

Last month I invited North Brisbane's sciences sector to contribute to the development of Queensland's burgeoning biomedical and life sciences industry. I hosted a special forum at the Prince Charles Hospital where experts from my Department of State Development briefed industry leaders on the Palaszczuk government's recently released biomedical and life sciences road map discussion paper. The forum was just one in a series of forums to be held across Queensland.

Northern Brisbane is a biomedical and life sciences hub with exciting practices being undertaken in hospitals such as the Prince Charles and the Holy Spirit Northside Private Hospital. The highest concentration of healthcare workers in Queensland is in my electorate of Stafford. As both the Minister for State Development and a doctor, I am extremely interested in hearing from the district's science community about further developing Queensland's biomedical and life sciences sector and generating more jobs of the future for the students of today.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to generating high-tech jobs of the future by taking our growing community of research centres and start-up companies to not only a national but also a global level. We have a robust research sector and existing strengths in a range of areas, including genetic-genomic services, biofabrication, early phase clinical trials and manufacturing of niche pharmaceutical products, medical devices and diagnostics. We want input from industry, academia and the community about how and where we can turn ideas into products and start-ups into leaders to generate jobs and business opportunities. We want jobs not just for the people of my electorate of Stafford but for all Queenslanders. The latest figures show that the biomedical industry in Queensland has a total annual income of \$2.7 billion. The therapeutic medicines and devices subsector employs more than 6,000 people in Queensland. When I release the biomedical and life sciences action plan later this year I want it to be a 10-year road map to high-tech jobs for the students and researchers in our schools and universities now.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.58 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, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, 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