ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 28 February 2017

Subject Page

PW WELLINGTON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

TUESDAY, 28 FEBRUARY 2017

The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

For the sitting week, Mr Speaker acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land upon which this parliament is assembled.

REPORT

Office of the Speaker

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I lay upon the table of the House the *Statement of public disclosure: expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2016 to 31 December 2016*.

Tabled paper: Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker for the period 1 July 2016 to 31 December 2016 [231].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Same Question Rule

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 14 February 2017 the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills introduced the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The explanatory notes for the bill indicate the main objective of the bill is to address the findings of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Act interim evaluation report. The explanatory notes provide that the findings of the interim evaluation report are addressed by making a range of amendments to reverse various parts of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Act, which was passed by the House on 17 February 2016. The amendments include repealing lockout provisions and the 3 am safe night precincts model.

Standing order 87(1) provides that, unless the standing orders otherwise provide, a question or amendment shall not be proposed which is the same as any question which, during the same session, has been resolved in the affirmative or negative. Given that the bill is clearly reversing aspects of the Tackling Alcohol-Fuelled Violence Legislation Amendment Bill, which has already been decided by the House in this session, the same question rule is enlivened.

Previous Speakers' rulings indicate that, where a bill contains provisions dealing with the same issue as another bill (a) if the bill contains only a few clauses that deal with issues considered by another bill, the bill can proceed but the offending clauses are ruled out of order in consideration in detail; or (b) if the bill is substantially the same in that it predominantly deals with issues contained in another bill that has been passed, the second bill cannot proceed further. I am satisfied that in relation to the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill category (a) above is relevant and the bill can proceed to the second reading. However, the same question rule will be enlivened in consideration in detail on certain clauses. I foreshadow that I will be ruling relevant clauses out of order at the time, unless the House orders otherwise.

PRIVILEGE

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

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 2 November 2016 the member for Burnett wrote to me alleging that the member for Maryborough deliberately misled the parliament in his matter of public interest. On the evidence before me I am satisfied with the member for Maryborough's explanation and that his statement was a personal observation rather than a definitive statement about roadworks activity as alleged. 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 and seek leave to incorporate the ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 2 November 2016, the Member for Burnett wrote to me alleging that the Member for Maryborough deliberately misled Parliament in his Matter of Public Interest when he stated:

> In the three years of the former government, in my electorate I never saw one bit of roadwork construction going on.

In his letter to me, the Member for Burnett stated the Member for Maryborough's statement clearly placed on the record the claim that no roadwork activity was undertaken in the Maryborough electorate over the term of the former LNP government. The Member for Burnett then listed a number of roadwork projects that were undertaken in the Maryborough electorate during that period.

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

The Member for Maryborough refuted the allegation, contending that his statement was a personal observation as opposed to a definitive statement.

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 am satisfied with the Member for Maryborough's explanation, and that his statement was a personal observation rather than a definitive statement about roadwork activity as alleged.

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: Correspondence from the member for Burnett, Mr Stephen Bennett MP, and the member for Maryborough, Mr Bruce Sanders MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of deliberately misleading the House [232].

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

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 23 December 2016 the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply wrote to me alleging that the member for Burleigh deliberately misled the House in making eight statements and including a newspaper clipping in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016 as part of his question without notice. On the evidence before me I consider that the matter concerning the inclusion of the newspaper clippings was trivial and therefore did not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee. With respect to the remaining matters, I consider that the member for Burleigh had either made an adequate explanation in relation to his statements or that there was no evidence presented to indicate he knew his statements were 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 remind members that if you are making an allegation against another member you must provide evidence to support each of the elements of the alleged contempt. In the case of an allegation of deliberately misleading the House, it is not enough to provide evidence that the statement was incorrect and misleading. You must also attempt to present some evidence that the member knew or ought to have known the statement was misleading and that they deliberately intended to mislead the House. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling in my name.

Leave granted.

SPEAKER'S RULING—ALLEGED DELIBERATELY MISLEADING THE HOUSE

MR SPEAKER: Honourable Members,

On 23 December 2016, the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy Biofuels and Water Supply wrote to me alleging that the Member for Burleigh deliberately misled the House in in making eight statements and including a newspaper clipping in a document he tabled on 1 December 2016, as part of his Question Without Notice.

The statements were:

> Slugged motorists with a car rego 3.5% increase of over twice the inflation rate and refused to match the LNP's policy to cap rego increases for family cars at the inflation rate.
>
> Labor criticised the LNP's plans for the development of Abbott Point in the lead up to the election—but then back-flipped and implanted exactly what the LNP had proposed after the election.

Labor failed to respond to an offer of funding from the Federal Government and has delayed $318 million of road projects including:

- Kennedy Development Road (Mount Garnet to The Lynd)
- Kennedy Development Road (The Lynd to Hughenden)
- Flinders Highway (Townsville—Torrens Creek)
- Flinders Highway Charters Towers to Richmond Culvert
- Capricorn Highway (Rockhampton to Duaringa) Duplication
- Barkly Highway (Cloncurry to Mount Isa)

Is pushing an aggressive 50% renewable energy target that will drive up electricity prices and cost tax payers over $18 billion.

Advocating for a carbon tax of $25 to $80 that would drive up electricity prices.

Delayed introducing competition in South East Queensland electricity market costing average households up to $400 a year.

Delayed $20 million worth of water feasibility studies for Queensland dam and irrigation projects while fighting with the Federal Government.

Failed to provide a solution to Townsville's current insecure water supply.

In his letter to me, the Minister stated the tabled document contained inaccurate and misleading claims, information and headlines and that the Member for Burleigh had accordingly breached Standing Order 266(2) and misled the House.

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

The Member for Burleigh refuted the claim and contended as Shadow Minister he was keeping the government to account, and that the allegations were frivolous and a waste of time and resources.

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 the matter concerning the inclusion of the newspaper clipping was trivial, and therefore did not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee.

With respect to the remaining matters, I considered that the Member for Burleigh had either made an adequate explanation in relation to his statements or there was no evidence presented to indicate he knew his statements were misleading.

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

However, I would like to remind members that if you are making an allegation against another member, you must provide evidence to support each of the elements of the alleged contempt. In the case of an allegation of deliberately misleading the House, it is not enough to provide evidence that the statement was incorrect and misleading. You must also attempt to present some evidence that the member knew or ought to have known the statement was misleading, and that they deliberately intended to mislead the House.

Also, if a member refers to evidence, but has not provided it as part of their submission, that evidence will not be taken into consideration. It is incumbent on both the complainant and the subject member to provide any evidence to support their claim.

I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

Tabled paper: Correspondence from the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy Biofuels and Water Supply, Hon. Mark Bailey, and the member for Burleigh, Mr Michael Hart MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an allegation of deliberately misleading the House [233].

PETITIONS

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

Firearms, Category D Weapons

Hon. Springborg, from 22 petitioners, requesting the House to allow category D weapons to be available to sporting shooters [234].

Howard Police Station, Vehicles

Mr Saunders, from 491 petitioners, requesting the House to facilitate the acquisition of a second police vehicle for the Howard Police Station [235].

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

Eudlo Creek, Key Resource Area

Mr Dickson, from 4,671 petitioners, requesting the House to refuse the application for approval of Key Resource Area at 162 Eudlo Creek and to recognise there is an overriding public interest for an alternative use of the land as an educational nature reserve [236, 237].

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

Stormwater and Drainage Outlets, Debris Traps

Mrs Lauga, from 165 petitioners, requesting the House to engage with local government about introducing compulsory debris traps on storm water and other drainage outlets to reduce the amount of waste entering Queensland waterways, including the Great Barrier Reef [238].

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

Daylight Saving, Referendum

From 23,041 petitioners, requesting the House to commit to a new referendum on daylight saving to give Queenslanders the opportunity to have their democratic say on this matter. Ideally, the referendum should be preceded by a trial of daylight saving across the State [239].

Petitions tabled.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

17 February 2017—

211 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 46—Subordinate legislation tabled between 12 October and 1 November 2016

212 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 33, 55th Parliament—Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016

20 February 2017—

213 Queensland Family and Child Commission: Deaths of children and young people Queensland—Annual Report 2015-16

21 February 2017—

214 Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee: Report No. 40, 55th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 12 October 2016 and 1 November 2016

215 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 34, 55th Parliament—Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016

216 Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 35, 55th Parliament—Water Legislation (Dam Safety) Amendment Bill 2016

217 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 47, 55th Parliament—Criminal Law Amendment Bill 2016

23 February 2017—

218 Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee: Report No. 27, 55th Parliament—Subordinate Legislation tabled from 12 October to 1 November 2016

24 February 2017—

219 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 33, 55th Parliament—Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016: Erratum

220 Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 33a, 55th Parliament—Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill 2016 [incorporating erratum tabled 24 February 2017]

221 Electoral Act 1992: Electoral (Reporting Periods) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 27

222 Electoral Act 1992: Electoral (Reporting Periods) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 27, explanatory notes

223 Electoral Commission of Queensland: Procedure for Electronic Disclosure

224 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 48, 55th Parliament—Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017

27 February 2017—

225 Public Interest Monitor—18th Annual Report for the period 1 July 2015 to 30 June 2016

226 Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions—Annual Report 2015-16

227 District Court of Queensland—Annual Report 2015-16

228 Queensland Ombudsman—Review of the Public Interest Disclosure Act 2010

229 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 49, 55th Parliament—Victims of Crime Assistance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016

230 Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee: Report No. 99—Report on a complaint by Mr Darren Hall, government response

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Fisheries Act 1994—

240 Fisheries (East Coast Trawl) (TED Requirement) Amendment Management Plan 2017, No. 10

241 Fisheries (East Coast Trawl) (TED Requirement) Amendment Management Plan 2017, No. 10, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

242 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 11

243 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 11, explanatory notes

Forestry Act 1959—

244 Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 12

245 Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 12, explanatory notes

Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

246 Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Universities) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 13

247 Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements (Universities) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 13, explanatory notes

Public Health (Medicinal Cannabis) Act 2016—

248 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 14

249 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 14, explanatory notes

Public Health (Medicinal Cannabis) Act 2016—

250 Public Health (Medicinal Cannabis) Regulation 2017, No. 15

251 Public Health (Medicinal Cannabis) Regulation 2017, No. 15, explanatory notes

Child Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2004, Forensic Disability Act 2011, Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, Mental Health Act 2016, Public Sector Ethics Act 1994, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991, Weapons Act 1990—

252 Mental Health Regulation 2017, No. 16

253 Mental Health Regulation 2017, No. 16, explanatory notes

Mental Health Act 2016—

254 Mental Health (Transitional) Regulation 2017, No. 17

255 Mental Health (Transitional) Regulation 2017, No. 17, explanatory notes

Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991—

256 Uniform Civil Procedure (Representative Proceedings) Amendment Rule 2017, No. 18

257 Uniform Civil Procedure (Representative Proceedings) Amendment Rule 2017, No. 18, explanatory notes

Limitation of Actions (Child Sexual Abuse) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016—

258 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 19

259 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 19, explanatory notes

Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994, Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995—

260 Transport Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 20

261 Transport Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2017, No. 20, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

262 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) (Appointment of Trustee of Wongaloo Conservation Park) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 21

263 Nature Conservation (Protected Areas Management) (Appointment of Trustee of Wongaloo Conservation Park) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 21, explanatory notes

Gene Technology (Queensland) Act 2016—

264 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 22

265 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 22, explanatory notes

Public Records Act 2002—

266 Public Records (Independent Review of Youth Detention) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 23

267 Public Records (Independent Review of Youth Detention) Amendment Regulation 2017, No. 23, explanatory notes

Industrial Relations Act 2016—

268 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 24

269 Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 24, explanatory notes

Industrial Relations Act 2016—

270 Industrial Relations (Transitional) Regulation 2017, No. 25

271 Industrial Relations (Transitional) Regulation 2017, No. 25, explanatory notes

Industrial Relations Act 2016—

272 Industrial Relations (Tribunals) (Reform of Act) Amendment Rule 2017, No. 26

273 Industrial Relations (Tribunals) (Reform of Act) Amendment Rule 2017, No. 26, explanatory notes

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

274 Report pursuant to Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any Bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by His Excellency the Governor, viz—

Transport Operations (Road Use Management) (Offensive Advertising) Amendment Bill 2016

Amendments made to Bill

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Transport Operations (Road Use Management) (Offensive Advertising) Amendment Act 2016'

Insert—

'Transport Operations (Road Use Management) (Offensive Advertising) Amendment Act 2017'.

Water (Local Management Arrangements) Amendment Bill 2016

Amendments made to Bill*

Short title and consequential references to short title—

Omit—

'Water (Local Management Arrangements) Amendment Act 2016'

Insert—

'Water (Local Management Arrangements) Amendment Act 2017'.

Clause 4 (Insertion of new ch 4A)—

Page 32, line 25, 'Sunwater'—

Omit, Insert—

'SunWater'.

Page 33, line 21, 'Sunwater'—

Omit, Insert—

'SunWater'.

* Page and line number references relate to the Bill, as amended.

MINISTERIAL PAPERS

Mental Health Court and Mental Health Review Tribunal, Errata to Annual Reports

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.37 am): I table errata to the Mental Health Court annual report 2015-16 which was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 21 October 2016 and the Mental Health Review Tribunal annual report 2015-16 which was tabled on 3 January 2017. Subsequent to the tabling of these reports, errors were identified in the reports. The reports have been amended to correct the errors as identified in the respective errata.

Tabled paper: Mental Health Court—Annual Report 2015-16: Erratum [275].

Tabled paper: Mental Health Review Tribunal—Annual Report 2015-16: Erratum [276].

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Domestic and Family Violence

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.38 am): I wish to again extend my sympathies to the family of Gold Coast mother Tara Brown. Yesterday her former partner was sentenced to life in prison for her brutal murder. Justice has been done but it will understandably be of little comfort to Tara's family and friends. The years ahead will be especially difficult for Tara's

little daughter, who, according to reports, still asks every day where her mother is. I applaud the strength and resolve of her grandmother Natalie Hinton, who, like too many women, has to care for a grandchild left without a mother via domestic violence.

I applaud the bravery of Leesa Kennedy, who was present on the scene of that awful attack. Having realised that Tara's former partner was not helping her but battering her as she lay trapped in the wreckage of her car, Leesa put herself in harm's way in an extraordinary act of courage. As a community, we must take Leesa Kennedy's lead to always speak up and never look away when domestic and family violence occurs.

To the women facing these threats and acts of violence themselves, I urge them to reach out for help and get themselves to safety. If they are in immediate danger, they should telephone the police on triple 0 or for help and advice call DVConnect Womensline 24 hours a day, seven days a week on 1800811811. My government stands determined to continue to implement Quentin Bryce's landmark report *Not now, not ever*.

Political Donations, Real-Time Disclosure

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.39 am): Mr Speaker, last Thursday I was pleased to join the Attorney-General and you to launch my government's and Australia's first real-time disclosure system for political donations. This system is the fruit of the first piece of legislation that my government passed after the 2015 election—a bill that honoured an election commitment by reducing the threshold for political donations to be disclosed from $12,800 to $1,000.

Until now, Queenslanders have had to wait two to three months to see a log of donations for the previous six-month period. That could mean a wait of over eight months after an election before finding out to whom the money had gone and from where it came. That is the case no more. From tomorrow, 1 March, all Queenslanders have instant online access to donations as recent as seven days prior. Queensland now has some of the most progressive, open and transparent political donation laws in the country.

My government is determined to ensure that integrity and accountability are cornerstones of our democratic process in this state. Now, when voters go to the ballot box they will be better informed about who is donating to which candidates and how much they are donating. Donations made in previous elections will be progressively uploaded by the Electoral Commission of Queensland. More importantly, in the lead-up to the next state election—whenever that may be—voters will be able to track donations, before and during the campaign. That regime will also apply to local government elections and by-elections.

I would like to be able to say that this regime applies to federal elections as well but I cannot. That is a matter for the Prime Minister, not me. However, I give notice to the House that I will be asking for the transparency of political donations to be an item on the agenda for COAG when COAG next meets in April. I encourage the Commonwealth and other states and territories to follow Queensland's lead in relation to this important issue.

Foster and Kinship Carers, Child Care

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.41 am): When I travel across Queensland and speak to our hardworking and generous foster and kinship carers, they tell me that their job is getting harder. The children they are opening their hearts and homes to are facing more complex needs. I was pleased that on Sunday, along with the Minister for Child Safety, Minister Shannon Fentiman, my government delivered for these families. For years, foster carers have been telling us that child care is too expensive. Carers told us that the cost of child care was a disincentive to becoming a carer, particularly if a family already had children of their own, because it locked them out of the workforce.

That is why I am proud to say that my government will cover the out-of-pocket expenses of child care for foster children aged zero to five years. This is the first time the Queensland government has committed to helping pay the out-of-pocket costs involved with child care for our children in foster and kinship care. This is a $15 million game changer for our foster care families in Queensland. It means that more families will be able to care for children and stay in the workforce. It has the backing of our carers, with Foster Care Queensland CEO Bryan Smith saying that this announcement will 'ease the pressure on our foster and kinship carers'. Mr Smith said this commitment from my government was something they had been seeking for 25 years. I am proud to say that my government has been able to deliver.

As we launch our $2.6 million campaign to recruit more foster carers over the next four years, this funding means that we are ensuring that our wonderful carers have the support they need to do their difficult job. In Queensland we have more than 5,000 foster and kinship carers but, of course, we always need more. We are determined to do everything that we can to attract more people to open their arms to some of our most vulnerable Queensland kids. That is why we have given carers the power to get children immunised and have covered the out-of-pocket expenses for kids in care to go to kindy. That is why we are delivering new training sessions for carers, including looking after children from homes where domestic violence was a problem. That is why we are giving child safety staff intensive training to make sure that foster carers are a valued partner and member of each child's care team. I know that this funding commitment will make the rewarding decision to become a foster carer an even easier one for people to make.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games; Gold Coast, Community Cabinet; Trade Mission

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.44 am): The Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games will be the biggest event to be held this decade and the biggest in Queensland's history. In exactly 400 days, on Wednesday, 4 April 2018, over 6,600 athletes and team officials from 70 nations and territories will converge on the Gold Coast for an 11-day sporting and cultural event that has the attention of the world. Those athletes will be joined by 15,000 carefully selected volunteers. So far, 70 per cent of applications for those positions have come from Queensland. Competition in 18 sports and seven parasports will be contested and broadcast to a cumulative television audience of 1.5 billion people. One hundred thousand visitors are expected to attend the Commonwealth Games, the first ever to be held in a regional city. The games will support 30,000 jobs and inject over $2 billion into the Queensland economy.

For those reasons and many more I have decided that, for the week of 3 to 7 April, marking one year to go until the Commonwealth Games, my government will govern from the Gold Coast. During that week, we will hold our cabinet meeting on the Gold Coast—

An opposition member: With all your local members?

Ms PALASZCZUK: We might even see David Crisafulli.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They are obviously so happy we are coming to the Gold Coast. During that week we will hold—

Ms Trad: Just like Jason Costigan followed you around in Whitsunday.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, he followed me around. I will also host a town hall meeting open to the community. Ministers and directors-general will meet with stakeholders and members of the community to discuss issues and opportunities within their portfolio responsibilities. My government will advertise for meeting requests to meet with ministers during the week.

The impending Commonwealth Games are a testament to the growing strength of the Gold Coast. Today, unemployment on the Gold Coast is 5.5 per cent and there are 11,700 more jobs on the coast than there were two years ago. My government is building for the future. We have committed $1 billion in new infrastructure investment on the Gold Coast this financial year, including $94.5 million for the $420 million expansion of the Gold Coast Light Rail from the Gold Coast University Hospital to Helensvale Railway Station.

To ensure that the Gold Coast can maximise this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, I will be travelling to London next week. Together with Gold Coast Mayor Tom Tate and other officials, I will attend trade meetings to ensure that the Gold Coast, and Queensland more broadly, can leverage every potential benefit from the Commonwealth Games, as well as other trade opportunities with our Commonwealth partners.

The continued importance of the Commonwealth to Queensland more broadly will be demonstrated through the other elements of this trade mission. In Singapore, I will open the state's new trade office covering South-East Asia and have discussions on further opportunities to grow export markets for Queensland agriculture. A growing group of regional mayors—Jenny Hill from Townsville, Margaret Strelow from Rockhampton, Greg Williamson from Mackay, Anne Baker from Isaac, Andrew Willcox from Whitsunday, Matt Burnett from Gladstone and Liz Schmidt from Charters Towers—will join me in India to discuss opportunities with Adani and other Indian companies. These opportunities will, of course, include the Carmichael mine but also, and very importantly, Adani's large-scale investment

in renewable energy sources and their plans for a solar power station near Moranbah, as well as other opportunities for Queensland farmers to sell their crops to markets in the world's second most populous nation.

Like my government, these leaders from across our state recognise how important it is to constantly identify and foster new sources of jobs for regional Queensland. Like me, they know that Queensland's future lies in being an outward looking, internationally competitive economy that is welcoming of tourists, trade partners and visitors from around the world.

Cross River Rail

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.48 am): Cross River Rail is this government's highest priority infrastructure project, presenting—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms TRAD: Perhaps if I had started with 'No. 1 William Street' they would be more excited. They like a good infrastructure project, as long as it is for them, not for Queenslanders. Cross River Rail is this government's highest priority infrastructure project, presenting a unique opportunity to transform South-East Queensland. In fact, Infrastructure Australia has just released its updated infrastructure priority list and reconfirmed that Cross River Rail is a high-priority initiative for the near future.

Cross River Rail will free up the transport network right across South-East Queensland by removing a bottleneck across the Brisbane River. It will get commuters home faster and create thousands of jobs.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I am being tolerant.

Ms TRAD: A second river rail crossing and four new stations, plus the upgrades to Exhibition and Dutton Park stations, will unlock capacity in the inner-city network benefiting all of South-East Queensland. Whether you drive or whether you catch public transport to travel around South-East Queensland, Cross River Rail will get you there faster. It will mean 14 minutes on the average commute from Cleveland to—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Ms TRAD: What is not a laughing matter is the fact that this project would be under construction if those opposite had not cancelled it. That is not a laughing matter. This project will make sure that Queenslanders can travel around the South-East Queensland corner faster: 14 minutes on the average commute from Cleveland to the southern CBD; nine minutes from the Sunshine Coast.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, if you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms TRAD: 15 minutes from Beenleigh—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under standing order 253A for your continuous interjections. It is disorderly. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms TRAD: Thank you. It is also a pathetic joke. The Coordinator-General is now assessing—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Ms TRAD: The Coordinator-General is now assessing the request for project change in relation to the environmental impact statement for Cross River Rail that was approved in 2012. We are now conducting public consultation on this change until 27 March. This change is required because technical investigations and community consultation since 2012 have identified ways to improve the design and the construction methods that will significantly reduce community impacts. Of course there will be some construction impacts, but the long-term, city-building benefits will greatly outweigh any short-term inconvenience. It will mean 18,500 less car trips every day by 2036, making it easier for people to live, work or run a business outside the inner city. It will mean that we can deliver turn-up-and-go services,

with a train leaving every six minutes on average during peak periods. It will mean the capacity for an extra 5,400 peak hour seats on the Sunshine Coast and Redcliffe Peninsula lines and 8,600 extra peak hour seats into the city on the Gold Coast and Beenleigh lines.

I want to conclude by giving a quick shout out to the Sunshine Coast Lightning who had their first home ground win on the weekend. The girls put in an absolutely stellar performance in their come-from-behind victory over the Melbourne Vixens. The Lightning have joined the Suncorp Super Netball competition and I am very excited to say I will be a patron of the Lightning this year after much encouragement from their number 1 fan, Sunshine Coast mayor, Mark Jamieson. Most importantly though, the Lightning are the first ever elite sports team to be based on the Sunshine Coast and if the sold-out crowd was anything to go by I am sure they will not be the last.

Jobs

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.52 am): From the start the Palaszczuk government's prime objective has been to create jobs. We have ensured that Queensland is open for investment. I am very proud to be Treasurer in a government that has talked up the prospects of our economy and that has worked with business to create jobs. The government's initiatives to attract investment to Queensland have already paid dividends. The $40 million Business Development Fund is part of the Palaszczuk government's $405 million Advance Queensland suite of programs designed to create knowledge-based jobs of the future.

Today I am proud to announce that the Palaszczuk government has made another investment in an innovative emerging business through the Business Development Fund. An investment of $1.05 million was made into the Miner Group on 10 February. The Miner Group is an emerging firm located in Hendra that has developed an online platform which enables customers to hire plant and equipment. Their system has been designed to connect governments, councils, large contractors and insurance companies. Their business model is based on collecting a small percentage fee of the transactions conducted through the platform. Launched in 2013, the Miner Group has grown from small beginnings to around 45 full-time staff. Within the next two years they hope to add a further 20 Queensland staff to manage the growing business. The investment provided by the Palaszczuk government through the Business Development Fund will assist the company's expansion into the subcontractor and possibly international markets.

The Business Development Fund has invested in eight innovative businesses with investments totalling $9.425 million—ideas that now have legs, ideas that have turned into commercial reality and businesses that can grow and hire. Today I am also pleased to report another milestone in the Herston Quarter project. On 23 February 2017, Australian Unity and Metro North Hospital and Health Service executed contractual documentation. Last year, after a competitive procurement and negotiation process led by Queensland Treasury working with Queensland Health, Australian Unity was appointed as the preferred master developer for the project. Australian Unity will transform the currently vacant site into a vibrant health related, mixed-use community. Australian Unity and Metro North Hospital and Health Service have now executed contractual documentation and works on site are expected to commence soon. The $1.1 billion project will support over 700 full-time-equivalent jobs annually over the 10-year construction period and hundreds of full-time jobs annually in operation.

This is all part of our successful Market-Led Proposals initiative—our partnership approach to delivering private sector investment and jobs. The five announced projects are valued at more than $700 million—that is $700 million of activity in addition to our $40 billion infrastructure program. These projects offer the potential to support more than 1,600 jobs during construction and generate more than $2 billion worth of economic activity in Queensland. The Business Development Fund, Market-Led Proposals and the Herston Quarter are more proof of the Palaszczuk government's determination to work with business to create more jobs for Queenslanders.

Mental Health Review Tribunal

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.55 am): In December 2016 I was advised that a former member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal, who was appointed as a legal member, was not fully qualified to serve in that role. I subsequently authorised the Department of Health to obtain legal advice from the Queensland Solicitor-General to determine the most appropriate course of action. The department received the advice on 19 January 2017 from the Solicitor-General and the department has been working since that date to develop a legislative response as recommended by the Solicitor-General.

The member was first appointed to the tribunal in 2002. The most recent re-appointment of the member occurred in 2014. The member has not sat on the tribunal since August 2016. The specific issue is that, although the member was awarded a law degree in the mid-1990s, the member had not been admitted to practice law by the Supreme Court of Queensland or equivalent. I am advised that, as a result, decisions made when the tribunal was constituted by that member may be subject to challenge. It is important to point out that the member never made decisions on their own. The individual was always a member of a two- or three-member panel and, accordingly, sat with other validly appointed members. I am advised that, in the member's time on the panel they had an involvement with eight per cent of matters during that period—around 11,000 decisions affecting approximately 5,600 individuals. I am advised that an analysis of those decisions by the Queensland Health Chief Psychiatrist shows no patterns which suggest any defect in decision-making by the tribunal in which the member was involved. Furthermore, around 98 per cent of decisions involved matters which were subsequently reviewed by a properly constituted tribunal or another responsible person under the Mental Health Act.

However, I am advised that the only way that we can ensure certainty is to introduce legislative amendments that retrospectively ensure the validity of those decisions. Later today I intend to introduce amendments to ensure the validity of decisions that involved the member in question during debate on the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. The amendments will also provide for a process to enable potentially affected individuals to seek a review of decisions by a special tribunal. The affected individuals will be contacted directly by Queensland Health. I hope to secure the support of all honourable members for these amendments to provide certainty to Queenslanders with mental illness, their families and their treating clinicians. I am disappointed that this problem has existed for a long period, over a number of state governments, and has not been addressed. We owe it to Queenslanders with a mental illness, their families and their treating clinicians to provide certainty, to protect their rights and to ensure that they are not disadvantaged.

Sugar Industry

Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development) (9.58 am): I rise to inform the House of the current status of the sugar industry in Queensland. The sugar industry is important to Queensland, as the majority of Australia's sugar, approximately 95 per cent worth, comes from this state. Over 80 per cent of Queensland's sugar is exported and is worth approximately $2 billion in export earnings annually. As the House is aware, there are negotiations currently occurring between QSL and Wilmar. The Palaszczuk government has been consistent in its approach that a negotiated commercial settlement is the best way forward for the industry, as rushed legislation presents a massive sovereign risk and an investment deterrence. It is appropriate that growers and industry negotiate outcomes themselves.

Until recently, the sugar industry has been mostly deregulated. Deregulation delivered substantial benefits and has seen a resurgence in the industry—a resurgence founded on foreign investment. This deregulation was accompanied by industry assistance packages totalling $444 million from the federal government and $85 million from the Queensland government, that is, more than half a billion dollars worth of taxpayers' money fed in to deregulate the industry.

Since 2006, there has been ongoing investment in Queensland, as mills have invested over $3 billion in infrastructure and enhanced operating capacity. After concern about the protracted negotiations in 2015, the Sugar Industry Act was reviewed by the Queensland Productivity Commission. Its report noted 'there was no evidence to support a case for market failure in the Queensland sugar industry that would indicate the need for additional Government intervention.'

The 2015 changes to the act created the need to change certain terms within the cane supplier agreements between growers and mills, and for mills to negotiate on-supply agreements with grower nominated sugar marketers. It is this on-supply agreement between Wilmar and QSL that is currently being negotiated. The Australian Sugar Milling Council—

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr BYRNE: You'll get your chance later on, Sport; don't worry about that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr BYRNE: Don't worry about that, Sunshine. I am looking forward to that.

Mr Nicholls: I don't need to read it, mate; I know.

Mr BYRNE: We will see whether you know it. You will be apologising for that, as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr BYRNE: It is the on-supply agreement between Wilmar and QSL that is currently being negotiated. The Australian Sugar Milling Council, the peak body for mills, has stated—

The two negotiating parties are multi-billion dollar companies, they have met 7 times in 6 weeks, and have made progress on each occasion by continuing to reduce the number of commercial terms still to be resolved.

It further stated—

New legislation will hinder resolution, not help it. The Queensland sugar industry cannot afford it.

To assist in the outcome, the Queensland government will fund the costs of an eminent mediator, the Hon. Richard Chesterman AO RFD, a retired judge of the Queensland Supreme Court and Queensland Court of Appeal, to mediate. The Queensland government will arrange any administrative support as required, but the government will not direct the course of the mediation. This is consistent with the commercial outcome. Yesterday, I was advised that there was in-principle agreement with QSL and Wilmar to participate in mediation. As of this morning, I am advised that QSL is still not completely ready to commit to mediation. It is the government's view that both parties should resolve their differences in a viable and sensible way, based on commercial principles.

Wotton and Ors v the State of Queensland and Anor

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (10.02 am): I would like to update the House about a matter of significant litigation: Wotton and Ors v the State of Queensland and Anor. The matter has been ongoing in the Federal Court since the application was first made in August 2013. Justice Mortimer brought down the decision on 5 December last year. On advice, the state lodged an appeal before the expiry of the appeal period. Having received a further considered legal advice about the state's prospects of success on appeal, the state is withdrawing the appeal to the full Federal Court. I note that there are continuing matters still being resolved by the trial judge and those matters will continue before the court.

Electoral Boundary Redistribution

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (10.03 am): The Queensland Redistribution Commission proposal for the redistribution of the state's electorate districts was to be gazetted on Friday, 24 February 2017 and published in advertisements in 45 newspapers around Queensland from Saturday, 25 February. The commission also had planned a media conference after the official gazetting of the report on Friday morning. On Thursday afternoon, the Queensland Redistribution Commission was alerted to an unauthorised release of the advertising material by a media outlet, the North West Star. The QRC advised that they sought to have the material withdrawn from the North West Star's website. That request was denied. My office was subsequently advised by the QRC of the breach. To avoid further confusion to elected members and the broader community, at 5.30 pm the QRC released online the full proposal for the redistribution.

This was an extraordinary leak that no doubt caused much distress among sitting members, particularly those contacted by the media for response. On Friday morning, I directed the Electoral Commissioner to provide a report by the end of the day on the circumstances surrounding the incident. I was subsequently advised that the breach arose from the Queensland Redistribution Commission placing print advertisements with local newspapers' advertising teams in advance, on a strictly confidential basis. The advertisements included maps and the new proposed boundaries and names, as required by section 48 of the Electoral Act 1992. On Friday, the QRC announced that they would be pursuing the source of the leak. The ECQ advises me that the editor of the paper that first published the leaked information, the North West Star, breached both the Fairfax Code of Conduct and the specific confidentiality agreement with the advertisers. The news item was subsequently removed when these breaches were pointed out.

I am advised that the QRC is now seeking legal advice about what actions to take as a result of the breach. The QRC will inform me of what further action may be taken in response to this breach. In addition, I will be requesting the ECQ to provide any submissions about what action can be taken in the future to avoid this occurring, including any changes to procedures for advertising and the method of advertising required under the Electoral Act.

The parliament and the public must have faith in our electoral system and the function of the Electoral Commission of Queensland, including the Queensland Redistribution Commission. This incident damages that confidence and it is important that the matter be fully investigated and that the public be informed of what action is taken as a consequence of the investigation. In the meantime, I remind all members and the public that objections and comments on the proposed electoral boundaries are open until 5 pm, 27 March.

Tourism Industry

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (10.06 am): Off the back of a record year in tourism in 2016 in Queensland, we are continuing our winning streak. Last week in Darwin, four of Queensland's leading regional tourism events and operators took out top honours at the Qantas Australian Tourism Awards. Our winners were the Toowoomba Carnival of Flowers, the Mount Isa Rotary Rodeo, the Fun Over 50 tours and ocean rafting in the Whitsundays. Queensland business leader and events guru Harvey Lister, chairman and CEO of AEG Ogden, took out the Australian tourism legend award. Anyone who knows Harvey will know that he really is a legend. This prestigious award acknowledges Harvey's lifelong dedication to growing the industry.

Last week, the Premier announced that international music icon Sir Elton John, another legend, will take his exclusive Once in a Lifetime tour to North Queensland. That is a massive coup for regional Queensland with Sir Elton John to open his Australian tour in Mackay and close the tour in Cairns in September. Tourism Events Queensland, in partnership with the Mackay and Cairns regional councils, secured those events. We expect to see crowds of 24,000, bringing both international and interstate visitors to the regions and injecting $7.5 million into the state's economy.

Last week, we also secured a new direct Tigerair service between Melbourne and Townsville. That flight means an extra $12.5 million into the local economy, delivering 28,000 more seats to the region. This is important because it is the first domestic service supported by the Palaszczuk government's Attracting Aviation Investment Fund. We changed the rules around this so that we could deliver jobs in regional Queensland. We are delivering on that. We look forward to welcoming more Victorians to North Queensland.

Finally, I am also pleased to announce that in early April Brisbane will host Australia's Davis Cup quarterfinal tie against the United States at the Queensland Tennis Centre. That major sporting event has only been secured here in Brisbane because of the investment that former Labor governments made in tennis and the Tennis Centre. We are determined to build on our success, to work with the industry to bring more visitors to this state and to create jobs in the vital tourism industry in all parts of Queensland.

Defence Industries

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (10.09 am): I am pleased to advise the House that Queensland is now in a two-state race for the largest defence capability acquisition project in the Australia Army's history. Last Friday global defence company Rheinmetall announced that Queensland is one of its two preferred states to deliver the next generation of Australian Army combat vehicles.

After investigating locations in every state, Rheinmetall Defence Australia has selected Queensland and Victoria for further consideration as its preferred choice to deliver its Boxer 8x8 combat reconnaissance vehicles. Rheinmetall is one of two companies chosen by the Department of Defence to bid for phase 2 of the LAND 400 project—a contract worth up to $5 billion and expected to deliver more than 250 highly skilled, long-term direct jobs as well as up to 2,350 indirect jobs in the supply chain.

Rheinmetall's selection of Queensland as one of its two preferred locations is an endorsement of our state's capabilities in land defence and heavy vehicle manufacturing and sustainment. My department will continue to work closely with Rheinmetall over the coming months with a view to being chosen as the preferred location for LAND 400. We are continuing to work with the second prime, BAE, who are still to shortlist their preferred locations. The Palaszczuk government stands ready and committed to supporting both proponents, to growing our state's defence industry capabilities and supporting long-term knowledge jobs for Queenslanders.

My department and I have been working behind the scenes to attract the Australian government's $20 billion LAND 400 project. Earlier this month I attended a major national defence gathering—the ADM Congress in Canberra—to further highlight Queensland's industry credentials in the land defence sector. My department has also been working hard to secure industry opportunities within defence and aerospace.

This week my department is hosting a Queensland contingent of businesses, with QUT and the Sunshine Coast Regional Council, at the Avalon 2017 trade show in Victoria. They are on a mission to win contracts and jobs, targeting senior aerospace and defence industry decision makers from around the world at the Asia-Pacific's most prestigious aerospace event. On land, at sea and in the air Queensland is Australia's front line for defence industries.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing Orders

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

That standing order 87(1) be suspended for the Liquor and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Report

Hon. L SPRINGBORG (Southern Downs—LNP) (10.12 am): In accordance with section 363(5) of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, I table the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner's report of the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. The report relates to the Parliamentary Commissioner's inspection of the CCC surveillance device warrant records from 28 April 2016 to 14 November 2016. Full details of the Parliamentary Commissioner's inspection and findings are set out in the report.

Tabled paper: Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner: Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, December 2016 [277].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Electricity Supply

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (10.13 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House condemns calls from GetUp! to close all of Queensland's coal- and gas-fired power stations.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Youth Jobs

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (10.13 am): Queensland is facing a lost generation of young people as Labor's youth jobs crisis continues. In the last 12 months across our regions thousands of young locals have given up looking for work because they have lost hope because of this do-nothing Labor government. They have lost hope that this government can deliver the jobs and the opportunities they want and need. They have lost hope because of the actions this government takes, exemplified in this place this morning.

We have seen the Deputy Premier with yet another iteration of the Cross River Rail project. It is almost like the Oscars last night. She pulls out the envelope and it has the wrong name in it. Where are they? They are living in la-la land. Even when they get the right envelope, what do they have? They only have moonlight. That is all they have—nothing else.

We are seeing the threat to investment and future jobs by a government that refuses to take action for the canegrowers and provide them with certainty for investment. Always do nothing and then always come late to the party; that is the story of this Labor government. It is no wonder that young people are not getting the jobs that they need, the jobs that they deserve, the jobs that support their local communities and it is no wonder that they are giving up hope and not even looking for those jobs throughout the regions of Queensland.

We have seen a massive cut to infrastructure. Some $3 billion has been just wiped out of the bottom line by the Treasurer over there—the man who claims that it is all about providing young people with jobs in his region where the youth unemployment rate is over 24½ per cent. That is the record of the Treasurer who says it is about major projects, but cannot even deliver the Aquis resort which was his No. 1 priority at the beginning of last year.

Labor turns a deaf ear, a blind eye and a cold shoulder to the plight of young people looking for jobs in this state. They are obsessed with their own political survival. They are obsessed with their own jobs. They are obsessed with the inner city because we know that the puppet master behind the throne from South Brisbane is obsessed with what the Greens will do to her in her own electorate.

That is the problem that we face. Unemployment is burgeoning. Our young people deserve a brighter future than this government is providing for them. This Labor government has lost its heart, it has lost its soul and it is losing young Queenslanders.

(Time expired)

Leader of the Opposition

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (10.16 am): The Leader of the Opposition wants to talk about Oscar-winning performances. Let us talk about Oscar-winning performances. We have seen some in Queensland of late. I am talking about the extraordinary performances we have seen from the member for Clayfield.

Let us run through some of these performances because I think some of them are indeed worthy of Oscar nomination. We have the dirt bike kid. The Leader of the Opposition is wanting desperately to be a revhead. I table a copy of that for the benefit of the House. He is wanting to be a revhead, but we know that he is far more comfortable in a Range Rover. Then there is 'Two-Faced Tim'. One minute he is saying he is pro trade—

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, you know it is not appropriate to have props.

Ms TRAD: I am tabling them. Then there is 'Two-Faced Tim'. One minute he is saying he is pro trade and the next minute he is saying he will re-regulate the sugar industry. Then there is 'Topless Tim'. I table a copy of that for the benefit of the House. It is like he is auditioning for a remake of *Blue Lagoon*. Then there is 'Titanic Tim'.

Mr SPEAKER: Table it.

Ms TRAD: I table a copy of that.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am having difficulty hearing.

Ms TRAD: I am happy to start again, Mr Speaker. Then there is 'Titanic Tim' showing just how much he loves to get out on Moreton Bay in his tinnie. Who could forget 'Tarantino Tim'—turning up to press conferences and swearing and trying to prove that he is not a blue blood from Ascot.

Tabled paper: A bundle of photographs of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Nicholls MP [278].

We saw last week that he was more like Warren Beatty—dazed and confused as he fronted up to a press conference and he said, 'Put One Nation last. No, actually put us first. Do something on the ballot paper.' Why is he doing all of these Oscar-winning performances? He is desperate to escape the peak performance of his career when he was Campbell Newman's treasurer.

So many Queenslanders were affected by that performance that he had to go out and apologise and say, 'I'm sorry. We got it wrong.' He must be living in la-la land if he believes that any Queenslander believes that he is sorry. Why would Queenslanders believe that he cares about jobs when he sacked

14,000 of them? Why would anyone believe that he cares about the vulnerable when he still will not apologise for closing the Barrett centre? Why would anyone believe that he cares about building public infrastructure when the only project he started was a great big tower to himself? This man cannot be believed when it comes to—

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.20 am): What have seen there? We have a Deputy Premier of this state and all she cares about is politics, not jobs. It is obvious that this Deputy Premier has an unhealthy obsession with the Leader of the Opposition—an absolute unhealthy obsession.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I know we are very jovial this morning.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: This from the Deputy Premier who does not even know what her job is. We had the Deputy Premier in her ministerial statement say that my—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. We will move on.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The Deputy Premier thought Boulia was Biloela the other day. After I interjected and said, 'Where is the funding?' the Deputy Premier called it a pathetic joke. This from the Deputy Premier who is in fairy land around Cross River Rail. She is naming Cross River Rail as her supposed No. 1 project but she has no funding. The Premier when she was the transport minister was obviously remarkably ill-informed or stretching the truth when back in 2013 she said that Cross River Rail was shovel ready. She obviously does not have a plan to fund it. She has not called for tenders and has no state environmental approvals.

Let's get the facts out there in relation to this ill-fated project. We have seen—and I can table—the Deputy Premier's own secret business case in relation to this.

Tabled paper: Executive Summary—Business Case Cross River Rail project [279].

What does this secret business case say in relation to the Deputy Premier's own time line? By now expressions of interest should have been released for construction. We have seen no procurement strategy and no value-sharing strategy, except for the Deputy Premier saying she is going to slug Queenslanders with five secret new taxes. We have had no funding strategy for it and there has been no market sounding for this project at all.

After two years of being in government, this do-nothing Labor government is not able to deliver on its No. 1 project. This is an ill-fated project that has completely been derailed by this Deputy Premier, who is too busy playing politics and misleading the people of Queensland. They have no plan to fund it. They have no funding. This is another iteration of another rail fail.

Fair Work Commission

Hon. G GRACE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.23 am): Last week's Fair Work Commission decision handed down in relation to Sunday penalty rates can only be described as devastating for the thousands of Queensland low-paid workers who will have a cut to their take-home pay. What we have seen is that the lowest paid workers in this state—cooks, cleaners, kitchen hands and retail assistants—face cuts of up to $6,000 a year in their take-home pay. They are facing cuts that will make it hard to make ends meet and make it hard to put food on the table.

The Deputy Premier forgot to mention 'Apologetic Leader of the Opposition'. What have we heard not only from the Leader of the Opposition but also from the member for Kawana in relation to this decision? Absolutely nothing. There are crickets out there that are louder than they are when it comes to sticking up for the lowest paid workers in this state.

The Palaszczuk government made it very clear. We submitted to the Fair Work Commission and to the Productivity Commission that we did not want to see cuts in penalty rates. The federal Labor opposition are doing something to prevent these cuts from occurring, and the Palaszczuk government stands behind them 100 per cent, because these cuts to low-paid workers could not come at a worse

possible time. We are seeing record low wage growth in this country. These workers rely the most on award entitlements and have little bargaining power. Yet at the same time we see massive increases in executive pays and we see massive profits occurring.

It is interesting that they talked about an independent decision. It did not appear that the Turnbull government had problems overturning the independent decision of the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal and then sacking them. They did not mind legislating to pre-empt the decision of the Fair Work Commission in relation to the Country Fire Authority.

These pay cuts are going to affect 700,000 Australian workers and many hardworking, low-paid Queensland workers. What should the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kawana apologise for? They should apologise for the 14,000 Queenslanders they sacked. They should apologise for the 16-month wage freeze they put on public servants. They should apologise for axing Skilling Queenslanders for Work.

Mr Bleijie: The bloke in front of you set the Fair Work Commission up. In 2009 Cameron Dick set the commission up.

Ms GRACE: We hear from the member for Kawana, who they locked away for six months of the last election campaign. They kept him quiet. They locked him in some box. They let him out after the election. They should apologise for cutting the workers comp entitlements to injured workers and their families. They are very silent on this important issue.

Mr SPEAKER: We might just take a breath for a moment. Member for Kawana, you were in full flight there.

Jobs

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (10.26 am): The desperation of this government has reached a new low, with it now accusing its own Treasury officials of incompetence. So desperate has it become to find a skerrick of good news that it has resorted to making job numbers up and, if Treasury does not agree with its claims, it brands Treasury as incompetent. Let us not forget that this is the government that slashed infrastructure spending by $3 billion, including in regional Queensland. Last week the Premier was claiming her Working Queensland policy would be a 'jobs bonanza' for regional Queensland and support 6,000 jobs. Apart from the fact that a $200 million policy does not come anywhere near making up for the $3 billion in cuts, a month earlier the government claimed that it would create just 600 jobs. In one month it is 600 jobs; a month later it is 6,000 jobs. I table the press releases.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 19 January 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad, titled '$200 million Works for Queensland program to create regional jobs now' [281].

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 21 February 2017, from the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad, titled 'Jobs Bonanza for Regional Queensland' [280].

What has changed? The policy was the same but in between we saw another terrible set of unemployment numbers for Queensland, with 28,000 full-time jobs lost in Queensland in January. When questioned by the media about this inflation of job numbers from 600 to 6,000, a tenfold increase in just a month, what did the Premier say? As ABC TV reported, the Premier said, 'That's interesting from Scott Emerson—it just shows he doesn't understand how the calculations are worked out.' The TV report then said, 'A government spokeswoman later confirmed that the 600 number was provided by Treasury—and they got it wrong.' So Treasury got it wrong.

The Premier claims Treasury is incompetent. Imagine the reaction to that statement among Treasury officials on the 39th floor of 1 William Street. Imagine how Under Treasurer Jim Murphy explained to staff that the economic wizard that is the Premier—the woman who could not even name the GST rates—knew better than them, that the Premier was trashing the well-established and accepted Treasury ratio of 3.1 jobs for every million dollars in capital investment and multiplying it by 1,000 per cent. Treasurer Curtis Pitt was not going to defend them. He was the one who reportedly launched a witch-hunt of Treasury staff after he made a 3,000 per cent mistake about the impact of his new property tax. We will always remember that.

The latest unemployment figures are devastating—28,000 full-time jobs lost in January, Townsville with the worst unemployment in that city's history and youth unemployment in outback Queensland at 34 per cent. This Premier is only interested in spin and, when she is caught out making the numbers up, she blames Treasury.

(Time expired)

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 11.28 am.

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mr NICHOLLS (10.28 am): My first question is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to today's report in the media that the member for Yeerongpilly used a private email server for official government business and has now deactivated the account. Will the Premier direct the member for Yeerongpilly to reactivate his Yahoo! account so that any official documents can be archived in accordance with the law?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I made it very clear to my cabinet—and every cabinet minister will attest to this—that I expect all work related calls and emails to be done through the official phone that is provided to them via MSB. That is my clear expectation. That is what I clearly told cabinet and that is what I expect. Goodness knows what happened when the LNP were in office. Goodness only knows what happened when they were in office—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I would ask you not to debate the matter.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The question was quite clear: will the Premier direct the member for Yeerongpilly to reactivate his Yahoo! account so that any official documents can be archived in accordance with the law? It is a very straightforward question that I would ask you to direct the Premier to answer.

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I expect all of my cabinet ministers and all of my members to abide by the law. That is a very clear expectation and I have told my cabinet that that is the case and that they should follow that. The people of Queensland expect integrity and accountability in this state. That is why we have introduced real-time disclosure of political donations. That is why we have reduced the electoral donations threshold from $12,800 to $1,000—

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With respect, the Premier is failing to answer the question. Will she direct the member to reactivate his account? She is going all around the world but not answering the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, do you have anything further to add to the question?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, I do, Mr Speaker. I expect the minister involved to abide by the law. If the law says that he must retrieve those emails, he must retrieve those emails—pure and simple.

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is to the Minister for Energy. In light of the Premier's answer that the minister is expected to make his records available, will the minister now reactivate his account and provide official records as he is required to do under the official records act?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for his question. Can I say in relation to this matter that I had my private email address for about 20 years. It was my first email address—well before my time as a minister. This means that many people from all walks of life have my email address in their email accounts and I have no control over who emails me, which was an issue that was raised.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Members, I am listening to the minister answer.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, you are warned under standing order 253A for your interjections. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Mr BAILEY: Regarding the issue which Mr Peter Simpson raised with me, I was not a decision-maker in that merger process and I made no representations whatsoever with anybody. The Premier has raised—

Mr Emerson: How do we know that?

Mr BAILEY: The member asked a question. Would he like an answer? The Premier raised—

Mrs Smith interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Just one moment, Minister. In my view, the minister's answer is relevant to the question. If the member for Mount Ommaney wishes to continue, she will be warned under standing order 253A or 252 depending upon the interjections.

Mr BAILEY: The Premier raised with ministers in cabinet, including me, the matter in regard to personal emails. Soon after, in response to that, to remove the possibility—because I do not have control over who emails me and there are a lot of people who have that address—I deleted that account so my only email account is my ministerial account. That is what I did. The only possibility that I have is to use my ministerial account. That is what I do. It is consistent with what the Premier advised.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The member clearly did not answer the question. Will he reactivate his account to allow the official records to be collected?

Mr SPEAKER: I think the minister has answered the question, even though members may not like the minister's answer to the question. Before I call the member for Pine Rivers, the member for Maryborough is warned under standing order 253A for his interjections. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility; National Water Infrastructure Development Fund

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier advise the House how much funding has been provided to Queensland from the federal government's Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility and the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. It is a very important question. Northern Queensland and Northern Australia are very important for growing jobs in this state. That is why around half of our capital works funding goes into regional infrastructure right across our state. A lot of that funding is for our roads and rail, but what I am really concerned about is the lack of movement by the federal government especially in regard to the Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility. It has been some 600 days since that facility was declared open. After 600 days, how much money has gone out the door? Would anyone like to make a guess as to how much? This much. After 600 days nothing has gone out. In fact, my government has stepped in with $15 million to fund feasibility studies for the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund including the Hells Gate Dam and the Atherton Tablelands irrigation project. Who is helping? We are helping.

If the federal government is serious—it has a board in place—it is time that we get this money out the door. $5 billion is sitting in a fund. Imagine how many jobs that could generate in Queensland. Imagine how many young people could be employed in regional Queensland. Do we see those opposite raising this issue federally? No, we do not. I have written to the federal government. It is about time that those opposite stood up for regional Queensland and said, 'We have got to get the money out the door.'

We will be continuing to fight for this money because we know there are projects out there that need funds to get on with the job of creating jobs in this state. It is a disgrace that after 600 days there has been not one single dollar—not one cent—out the door. I will also be raising this issue at COAG in April because it is not good enough. I know that this has an impact not just on the Northern Territory but also on Western Australia. We will continue to fight for Queensland. Those opposite might have given up, but we have not.

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. In light of the member for Yeerongpilly having been caught using private emails to conduct official business, will the Premier guarantee to the House that no more government members or staff are using private emails for official government business?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think part of the question contained an imputation, but I am happy to answer the substance of it. I thank the member for Nanango for the question. As I said very clearly, I have raised this issue with cabinet. My expectation and also the expectation of my government is clear. I hope it also would have applied under the former government.

In relation to the allegations that have been raised by both the Leader of the Opposition and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I am going to ask my director-general to review this issue with the department of ministerial services and I will come back to the House with the outcome of that investigation.

Regional Queensland, International Events

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on recent announcements of international events benefiting regional Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to thank the member for Mackay for that very important question, and I see the member for Mirani nodding in agreement. Just last week I went to Mackay bearing good news for regional Queensland—not just for Mackay but also for Cairns. As the Minister for Tourism said, we will see Sir Elton John playing only in regional Queensland in September, which is great news for the regions.

Mr Pitt: Not coming to Brisbane.

Ms PALASZCZUK: He is not coming to Brisbane; I take that interjection.

Ms Trad: Can you feel the love tonight?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Can you feel the love tonight? Not from Steve Dickson! This is very important for the regions because we know that they have been doing it tough. A lot of times the big acts come to Brisbane or the Gold Coast and regional Queensland misses out. I also want to especially thank the Minister for Tourism for her partnership that she has been able to undertake with the councils. The smile on both Mayor Greg Williamson and also the Mayor of Cairns—

Mr Costigan: Bob Manning in case you do not remember.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, I do know. I do know who he is, thank you very much, Bob Manning. Yes, I do know and he was smiling.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Premier, member for Whitsunday, you are warned under standing order 253A. You have had a good go this morning. If members persist I will take the appropriate action.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. In defence of the member, that was a pretty fair interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Resume your seat.

Mr SEENEY: I think all of us would agree that was a pretty fair interjection. The Premier could not remember the name of the Mayor of Cairns.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, if you—

Mr SEENEY: The Premier was in trouble and the member helped her out.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Callide.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do not believe he has helped. I never need his help.

Mr SPEAKER: We will get back to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We know that between 5,000 and 10,000 people will get to enjoy these concerts and they will bring $7.5 million in tourist dollars into these towns. The flow-on effects will be felt not just in those regions but also in the small businesses which will also benefit. I know that the member for Mirani said that his favourite song was *Candle in the Wind* due to his love and respect for the late Princess Diana, and others may remember *Crocodile Rock*. The member for Callide may remember *I'm Still Standing*.

Regarding the years when the LNP was in office, I think it would be a bit more apt if we went to the British band The Clash. That reminds me of some other songs from The Clash. Very clearly the member for Whitsunday reminds me of *Should I Stay or Should I Go?* Should he stay in the LNP or should he go? Regarding their federal colleague George Brandis, who is looking at a High Commission appointment to London, *London Calling* might be apt there. I cannot leave out—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So is the member for Surfers Paradise. Regarding the member for Kawana, I am quite sure The Clash song that is most apt is *I Fought the Law and the Law Won*. I think that sums it up for the member for Kawana.

In conclusion, this is great news for regional Queensland. It means jobs for regional Queensland. I am quite sure everyone is going to love seeing Sir Elton John.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Indooroopilly, I am informed that we have students and teachers from the Wavell State High School in the electorate of Nudgee observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Email Accounts

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. In light of the Premier, as the leader of the government and minister responsible for managing cabinet processes, failing to give the House a guarantee that no more government members or staff are using private email accounts, I table more emails from two ministerial advisers to the member for Springwood about official government business.

Tabled paper: Email correspondence, dated 9 December 2016, from the private email addresses of ministerial staffers [282].

I ask the Premier: how widespread is the use of personal emails to conduct official business in the Palaszczuk government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Indooroopilly. I am advised that there was nothing inappropriate about these emails. The staff members involved were counselled on the appropriate use of information technology. The two ministerial staff inadvertently used Gmail in December 2016 and when it was brought to the minister's attention it was immediately referred to the Integrity Commissioner. Once again, let me make it very clear. These are—

Mr EMERSON: I rise to a point of order. The question was very clear. Given the Premier said she was aware of these emails, how widespread is this in the government? That is the question.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. Points of order should not be abused as a chance to reiterate and repeat questions for the purposes of grandstanding. Mr Speaker, I would suggest you perhaps provide some counsel to the member for Indooroopilly.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier's answer is relevant. I call the Premier if she has anything further to add.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will now continue the answer I was giving before I was so rudely interrupted. Once again, let me reiterate. I have stated this very clearly to the cabinet. I have raised the issue again with my director-general. I will now write to my cabinet. I will also ensure that the director-general—

Mr Seeney: You will eyeball him.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member will wait. I am happy to eyeball him. As I said, I do expect these high standards. I also want to stress to the people of Queensland that I expect all the members of my government to live up to high standards as well, as the people of Queensland would expect.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Greenslopes, I am informed that we have more students from Sheldon College in the electorate of Redlands in our gallery observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Gold Coast Light Rail

Mr KELLY: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the success of stage 1 of the Gold Coast Light Rail project and the progress being made on Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Greenslopes for the question because, of course, he is a passionate advocate for public transport infrastructure in Queensland. Wherever Labor governments deliver them, whether it is in Brisbane, the Gold Coast, the Sunshine Coast or right throughout regional Queensland, I know that Labor is passionate about public transport infrastructure.

This is fantastic infrastructure, once-in-a-generation infrastructure, that will finally link the Gold Coast to Brisbane through light rail and heavy rail. This is a once-in-a-generation infrastructure project. Stage 1 has been hugely popular. Since it opened in 2014 some 18 million trips have been taken on Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 1. Seven of those trips were taken last week by the Leader of the Opposition and some of the LNP MPs from the Gold Coast, as per a tweet, and I table it for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 21 February 2017, from the Twitter profile of the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Tim Nicholls MP, regarding the G:Link on the Gold Coast [283].

Here we have a picture of the Leader of the Opposition—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection. I too would destroy all my pictures of the Leader of the Opposition if I were married to him for that long.

Last week the Leader of the Opposition took a trip on light rail with his merry band of LNP Gold Coast MPs, but I was very concerned to see that the LNP Leader of the Opposition was claiming credit for funding and delivering Gold Coast Light Rail. I was very interested to read that. The truth of the

matter is that it was a federal Labor government and a state Labor government that funded and built light rail. Those opposite may have turned up at the completion of the project to cut the ribbon soon after they were elected—because that is what they were good at—but it was Labor that delivered this project for the Gold Coast. It was the LNP that criticised and opposed stage 2 proceeding, but it is the Palaszczuk Labor government that lobbied the federal Turnbull government for money for stage 2. This project is going full steam ahead. It is so exciting that stage 2—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms TRAD: Maybe the Leader of the Opposition was a bit confused. Maybe someone handed him the wrong envelope when he was travelling on Gold Coast Light Rail and said, 'Remember, Tim, you did this. You did this, Timmy. Timmy from Ascot, you did this.' It is Labor governments that roll up their sleeves and deliver these projects while those opposite crow and tweet about it.

(Time expired)

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mr WALKER: My question is to the Minister for Energy. In the member's previous answer he said that he deleted his Yahoo! account following advice from the Premier. Did the Premier instruct the minister to delete his Yahoo! email account and any documents contained in that account?

Mr BAILEY: The answer is simply no. The Premier gave advice to all ministers. My response to that advice was to remove the possibility that it could be used at all in a way that was not related to my work duties. Given that I cannot control who emails me and that I have had that account for 20 years, I had no control over who would use it so I removed that possibility to ensure that I carry out my duties appropriately.

Job Creation

Ms LINARD: My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. Will the Treasurer please advise the House on the government's job-creating employment programs?

Mr PITT: I thank the member for Nudgee for her question. She takes an interest in jobs in her local area as well as right across the state.

I announced our two-year $100 million Back to Work program in the budget and, as today is 28 February, this is the last day for Youth Boost. We announced Youth Boost in December to encourage employers to take on employees aged between 15 and 24 to give them the opportunity to get into work for a year and stay employed for at least a year. We are very excited about that. I have been working closely with the Minister for Employment, Grace Grace, and over the course of this program I have managed to meet lots of people who are doing very exciting things in their businesses and hiring local young people.

I recently met with Jayden Widdows, who is a young diesel fitter up in Cairns who had been looking for work for six months. He was pounding the pavement and knocking on doors, but he could not take a trick. Then Youth Boost came along and Croft Auto Service in Cairns managed to put him on. He is fitting in well with the team and we also see that he is a happy young man. He is just one example of the many young people who are benefiting from this program, and that is why it is so galling to hear those opposite ask what we are doing about youth unemployment. We are very, very proud of Youth Boost and the broader Back to Work program, which is more than I can say for the programs that those opposite cut.

They axed programs like Skilling Queenslanders for Work. We saw a ballooning and structural unemployment problem, particularly in some parts of regional Queensland, as a result of their inaction when it came to our economy. We know that the economy has been in transition. They did nothing to get ahead of the curve and stop the transitioning economy from destroying parts of regional Queensland. That is what our government is doing. We are working hard with our programs and we continue to back these programs. We are not going to resile from these programs because we are getting the message out. Right now, in terms of the numbers we are very pleased with how it is going. As of yesterday, over 365 young people have found work because of the Back to Work Youth Boost and a further 455 applications are pending, so that is 820 young people in regional Queensland who are benefiting directly from our Youth Boost program. That is a fantastic outcome for a program that has only been in place since December.

Right across Queensland we still have the broader Back to Work program with payments of $10,000 to hire an unemployed person and $15,000 to hire a long-term unemployed person. It is not too late for people to get into Youth Boost. If they are watching today or if they hear the ads on TV we

want them to apply because the Back to Work Youth Boost is a great program that is helping young people in Queensland. We believe in supporting young people. We genuinely believe—we do not just say it in videos—in the dignity of work. This is very important for us and we are going to continue to back this program because it is working for Queenslanders.

Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Email Account

Mrs SMITH: My question is to the Minister for Energy. When deleting his accounts, what efforts did the minister make to comply with the Public Records Act 2002?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for her question. I carry out my duties to the best of my knowledge in conformity with all of my responsibilities as a minister. It was a private email account, I treated it as a private email account and I deleted it as a private email account. I am sure that all the members here and most people in everyday life have private email accounts.

Foster Carers

Mr WILLIAMS: My question is to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Will the minister outline to the House how the Palaszczuk government is better supporting Queensland foster carers?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for the question. On Sunday the Premier and I announced an historic package to support our foster and kinship carers: $15 million to cover out-of-pocket expenses for child care and kindergarten. This is a game changer for those wonderful families who open their hearts and homes to some of the most vulnerable children, and this really will help them cover the costs of child care and kindergarten. More than that, we are also hoping that this will attract more families to put up their hand and care for some of our vulnerable children.

As the Premier said, on the weekend Bryan Smith, a wonderful advocate for foster carers, said that he had been lobbying for this change for 25 years. Twenty-five years! While Bryan Smith has a long memory, it seems that the member for Mudgeeraba has quite a short one. In her comments on the weekend the member for Mudgeeraba claimed that the announcement of $15 million was money that the LNP had allocated back in 2014. The member for Mudgeeraba is wrong again and I am happy to correct the record. This wonderful package for our foster carers is new money being delivered by the Palaszczuk government. I know that the member for Mudgeeraba was not in cabinet very long and so she probably did not have much to do with the CBRC process, but let me tell members that the CBRC members on this side of the House are very proud of the new funding that is being delivered to support our foster and kinship carers.

On the weekend the member for Mudgeeraba also said that foster carers are leaving the system in droves. Let me say that she is wrong again. We have more foster carers than ever before and more foster carers are joining every year, but we always need more because our foster carers take some of the pressure off our front-line child safety officers. Again, I was very surprised to hear the member for Mudgeeraba talk about her newfound interest in supporting front-line workers.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I can hear you, member for Mudgeeraba, and I can also hear the minister. The minister is answering the question. I call the minister.

Ms FENTIMAN: The member for Mudgeeraba said that this money should not have gone to foster carers and that it should have gone to more staff. The member for Mudgeeraba was around the cabinet table when the member for Clayfield handed down the budget that ripped 225 child safety staff from the department.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, you have had a pretty good go.

Ms FENTIMAN: Since the member for Mudgeeraba became the opposition spokesperson she has put out 33 press releases but there is not one idea to keep kids safe—not one policy idea. I call on those opposite to—

(Time expired)

Premier and Minister for the Arts, Email

Mr MINNIKIN: My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have a private email account? Has she ever used it for official purposes?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes and no.

Schools, Federal Funding

Mr WHITING: My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the minister please update the House on negotiations with the federal government for a new education agreement for Queensland schools?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for his question. He, like all of us on this side of the House, is absolutely committed to not only delivering the best education system but also delivering more jobs in education. We know that with every dollar we invest in delivering good-quality education in Queensland we are creating jobs.

We are in uncharted waters when it comes to the agreement between the federal and state governments on schools funding. The current agreement expires in June this year and we have heard nothing—nothing at all—from the federal Liberal government in Canberra about what the new funding agreement will look like. In actual fact, the only thing we have heard is a cut of over a billion dollars to schools across Queensland—that is Catholic schools, state schools and independent schools. This will cost up to 10,000 teachers from our classrooms.

We have heard a lot of pretending that suddenly the LNP in Queensland cares about the underdog, that the LNP in Queensland cares about the little guy. Opposition members have been parading around Queensland pretending, after they sacked 14,000 people, that Queenslanders should believe that Campbell Newman's treasurer has a heart and gives a damn about the people of Queensland. Come on! We have heard it all before. If the LNP genuinely cared about the working-class people of Queensland it would stand up for state school funding. Those opposite have been deathly silent when it comes to the funding of schools in Queensland. All we have seen in scaredy cat Tim Nicholls, who is suddenly pretending he is a rough and tumble guy from Ascot, is someone who will not stand up for public schools in Queensland.

We have seen it all. Those opposite are deathly silent because they know what a fraud this is—what an absolute fake of a campaign they are running. There is only one party that can deliver stability in Queensland, and that is Labor in Queensland. There is only one party in Queensland that will stand up for all Queenslanders no matter what school they go to and no matter what part of Queensland they live in, and that is the great Australian Labor Party here in Queensland.

This One Nation-LNP government will never stand up for the values of my community. It will never stand up for the values of ordinary Queenslanders who believe in decency, multiculturalism and public education. Tim Nicholls is the biggest fraud in Queensland. This is a man who sacked 14,000 people—

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order—obviously.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, would you kindly refer to members by their appropriate names. Twice during your answer you have referred to the member for Clayfield by an inappropriate name.

Ms JONES: I withdraw. It was a really inappropriate—

Mr SPEAKER: On both occasions.

Ms JONES:—use of that language.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you.

Ms JONES: I table a gift from me to the member for Clayfield so that his transformation is complete. Here is a bottle of red hair dye. Then he can go around and legitimately claim that he is the leader of the One Nation-LNP government in Queensland.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister, I will not be receiving that as a tabled document. It is not appropriate. The minister's time has expired. Member for Albert, you are warned under standing order 253 for your interjections. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Weapons Licensing

Mr DICKSON: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier detail what consultation her government has undertaken with the affected primary producers before signing on to the Commonwealth government's National Firearms Agreement, particularly in relation to the category H licence, which currently allows farmers to utilise handguns to humanely put down livestock and feral pests.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to get back to the member with more details. When it comes to issues relating to gun law reform in this state, I can say that we stand by what John Howard brought in. That has been our view. I know that it may not be the view of the party the member represents. I know also that the minister has a firearms advisory council with which he meets regularly. I understand that some of the membership of that has been updated.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, that he has just updated.

Mr DICKSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Premier said that she would take the question on notice. Now she is going to talk about a whole lot of other things. I would like her to answer the question about how rural landholders will be affected by the changes to category H such that they cannot use those weapons on the land.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, that is not a point of order. You are making a statement. Premier, do you have anything you wish to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said, I am happy to take that question on notice. It is very important that we do not have the importation of weapons that will be detrimental if they get into the hands of the wrong people. I will take the question on notice. These issues are also raised at COAG and the Minister for Police is having regular updates from his firearms advisory council.

Manufacturing

Mr PEGG: My question is to the Minister for State Development. Will the minister update the House on the Palaszczuk government's plans to assist manufacturing businesses across the state?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Stretton for the question. I know that the member understands how important manufacturing is to jobs not only in his electorate but also right across this wonderful state of Queensland. That is why the Palaszczuk government has introduced the $20 million Made in Queensland program: to grow jobs and advance our state's manufacturing industry.

Today I am pleased to inform the House that registrations from businesses continue to pick up speed. Some 230 businesses have now registered to partner with the Palaszczuk government in this program. Made in Queensland offers matching grants of between $50,000 and $2.5 million to Queensland based manufacturers employing between five and 200 people. We have also seen a surge in interest from businesses from the north. As of last week we have had 20 registrations from North Queensland. It is not just businesses in North Queensland; businesses in and around the Stretton electorate are getting on board, with a total of 92 registrations from businesses across the south-east and an impressive 23 registrations from businesses on the Darling Downs and in the south-west. These figures represent a clear endorsement of our Made in Queensland initiative by manufacturing businesses across our state. Four businesses have already undertaken the benchmarking program and almost 50 are either booked in or scheduling their session.

Once again, I call on every manufacturing business in our great state to become part of the Made in Queensland initiative. I call on every member of this chamber to continue spreading the word in their electorates. I say to any manufacturing business that has considered Made in Queensland but is not sure if it would be of benefit to them: you should get your benchmark, get on to the website and let us help you identify opportunities specifically for your business to help your business grow. This program is designed for businesses in Queensland that may be looking at an overseas competitor. They want to be the best in the world. We will assist them to be the best in the world right here in Queensland.

This is so unlike those opposite, with not one pillar for manufacturing and not one pillar for advanced manufacturing. They purport to be the members standing up for small businesses and standing up for manufacturing, but there was three years of nothing—three years of nought! I look forward to updating the House in the coming weeks on the progress we are achieving with Made in Queensland—the businesses we helped, the productivity gains and, most importantly, the jobs for Queenslanders that are being created in a great manufacturing industry in this state.

Carrara Sports Precinct, CFMEU

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is directed to the Premier. Premier, last Friday Justice Reeves at the Federal Court ruled that the CFMEU's three weeks of rolling two-hour work stoppages at the Carrara Sports Precinct site were 'unlawful and illegitimate', and I table His Honour's judgement. Will the Premier now ban her ministers from consorting with the CFMEU?

Tabled paper: Judgement of the Federal Court, dated 24 February 2017, in the matter of Australian Building and Construction Commissioner v Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union [2017] FCA 157 [284].

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. There is an imputation in that question, Mr Speaker.

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order. Consorting is simply meeting with those alleged to have committed offences, not the actual individual.

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised by the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations that that matter is still being heard and there are some outstanding issues.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Premier. I understand this is a civil matter, not a criminal matter. Premier, do you have anything you would like to say?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes. I also want to comment on the Carrara Sports and Leisure Centre, because we know how important the Commonwealth Games are. I am advised that everything is going to be delivered on track, on time and on budget. That is what I am advised. Hopefully, we will see a bit of bipartisanship with those opposite because the Commonwealth Games are incredibly important not just for the Gold Coast but for our state and it is about time we started seeing some more positive reinforcement from those Gold Coast members. If they are not going to be positive about it, we are. That is why we are going down to the Gold Coast to mark that there is one year to go until the Commonwealth Games. We will be governing there for the state. We will be meeting with people. We will be listening, because it is a Labor government that has delivered for the Gold Coast in this state. The Gold Coast University Hospital was delivered by Labor.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. I think you have answered the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The convention centre was delivered by Labor.

Mr SPEAKER: I think you have answered the question. Thank you.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Speaker, but it is a Labor legacy on the Gold Coast built by Labor.

Political Donations

Mr POWER: My question is directed to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General advise the House of the latest steps taken to ensure transparency in political donations in Queensland?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Logan for his question because I know he is absolutely committed to transparency and accountability in government. Today we have heard a lot from the other side about transparency, but what they do not talk about is their legacy: the fact that it was an LNP government that was quick to change the thresholds on political donations to lift them to well over $12,000 and link them to CPI so every single year that amount just kept going up and up and up in terms of disclosure. It was an LNP government that stopped publishing crime statistics. It was the LNP government that sacked the Trauma Registry so we stopped collecting data in some of our emergency departments and our hospitals. It was an LNP government that changed the laws around the CCC and it was an LNP government that sacked the members of the parliamentary committee on crime and corruption because it did not like what it was hearing when it came to criticism of the government. It was an LNP government that gagged community organisations and CLCs in terms of speaking out against government policy.

When the LNP wants to ask questions about transparency, let us have some transparency in the LNP. Let us talk about its history. That is why I would love the opportunity to be able to talk about real-time disclosure. It is a Labor government—the Palaszczuk Labor government—that has brought in a nation first. We are ensuring that political donations from donors, from candidates, those received by political parties and by councils will all be disclosed within seven business days from tomorrow. From 1 March every donation made and every donation received, whether it is state or local government, will be disclosed. The community can search based on dates, by elections, by candidates, by electorate and by political parties. There will be transparency—more than any other jurisdiction in this country around political donations—and maybe, just maybe, we will see that $100,000 of donations that the LNP is still to disclose. Where is it? Who donated it? Where is it from? It is about time that those on the other side disclosed it. Instead of the member for Indooroopilly and shadow Treasurer last week coming out and supporting full transparency around political donations, what did he do? Complain about the last six days in an election not seeing the donations. Under those opposite we did not see the last six months of donations, and they have the nerve to be critical about six days! Get on board and back this initiative.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Surfers Paradise, I am informed that we have another group of students from Sheldon College in the electorate of Redlands in our gallery observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Carrara Sports Precinct, CFMEU

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is directed to the Premier. I table a sworn affidavit by the construction manager of the Carrara Sports Precinct redevelopment in relation to the unlawful and illegitimate behaviour of the CFMEU, and I ask: does the Premier support the CFMEU's actions that tarnish Queensland's reputation and had the potential to jeopardise the Commonwealth Games?

Tabled paper: Order of the Federal Court, dated 3 June 2016, in the matter of Director, Fair Work Building Industry Inspectorate v Construction, Forestry, Mining and Energy Union and Ors (QUD389/2016) and the affidavit of Mr Michael Remigio Vicenzino [285].

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Surfers Paradise for his question. I do not support any illegal activity full stop. That is the expectation that Queenslanders would have of me as their Premier, from members of my government, from members of my team and, of course, from members opposite. I want to update the House in that I have more information in relation to that ruling and I want to clarify it for the House. The Federal Court made its finding in relation to that matter as part of ongoing enterprise bargaining negotiations with the head contractor. On 24 February the Federal Court found that the meetings were unlawful and illegitimate and therefore contravened the Fair Work Act. The Federal Court proceedings noted that stability has returned to the site. The penalty hearing, about which I mentioned the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations was alluding to, will be held on 8 May 2017 with orders sought for the imposition of pecuniary penalties and any breaches of the federal legislation are a matter for the Australian Building and Construction Commission.

I wanted to clarify that for the House, but once again let me say that, as the Minister for the Commonwealth Games said, the Carrara Sports and Leisure Centre is on budget and it is on track. I am also further advised by the Minister for the Commonwealth Games that a very important tournament will be held. The Sudirman Cup will be held in May this year, which will inject close to $10 million into the Gold Coast economy. For those who are not familiar with the Sudirman Cup, it is indeed badminton. Let us get behind the Commonwealth Games. I want every member of this House to support the Commonwealth Games because it is going to be the best event that Queensland has seen for decades.

Public Hospitals, Emergency Departments

Mr RUSSO: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister please update the House on the performance of Queensland's emergency departments and outline the challenges presented by increasing demand for these services?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Sunnybank for his question and his strong support for the QEII Hospital, including the new emergency department built by federal and state Labor governments. I will inform the House of Queensland's newest emergency department, which will open at the Sunshine Coast University Hospital. I have just been advised that, earlier this morning, the Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Board has confirmed, following advice that it has received from the Clinical Readiness Advisory Group, that it will commence services at the new $1.8 billion Sunshine Coast University Hospital from 6 March in line with the indicative time frame that I announced in parliament during the last sitting week. I know that all members of this House, certainly government members, will welcome this important development for the delivery of health services on the Sunshine Coast—a vision that a Labor government had and a vision that this Labor government is delivering for the Sunshine Coast.

Emergency departments are a vital part of our hospital system. It is critical that Queenslanders know that, should they suffer a trauma or a life-threatening event, the system stands ready to assist them. I am pleased to advise the House that, according to a recent Report on Government Services, our performance in managing presentations within the clinically recommended time of four hours across our state's public health system was the second best in the country, only behind Western Australia, which is a smaller and more centralised state then Queensland. In the last financial year, 79 per cent of emergency presentations, as reported in the budget estimates process, were seen within four hours. That is one of the best performances ever recorded in Queensland. That is what Labor governments do.

All of this is at threat because of the dalliance and the commitment that we now see developing between the LNP and One Nation. The only difference between the LNP and the One Nation party is one letter, O—LNP, ONP. What have we heard in other late breaking news? The member for Dawson

has just resigned as the National Party whip in the federal parliament. We know that the next resignation that will be coming will be from the Liberal National Party. It has already lost Cory Bernardi. They are going to lose George Christensen. All of this, everything we are doing in health care—reducing the number of people on the waiting list, delivering a budget surplus across the health system, making sure that our hospitals are safe—will be put at jeopardy by this dalliance, by this coalition between the Liberal Party and One Nation.

They will not repudiate it. Why? Because we know that the deal is being done. We know that the preferences are being exchanged. The member for Clayfield, representing an inner-city, modern, progressive Liberal seat, will not stand up to One Nation, will not stand up for multicultural Queensland—

Ms Jones: No backbone.

Mr DICK: I take that interjection. No backbone. There is one party that will deliver for Queensland. There is one Premier—

(Time expired)

Member for Nudgee

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is to the Premier. Following the embarrassing and unprecedented situation late last year of the member for Nudgee starting a petition calling for the government she is a member of to fix Labor's rail fail, can the Premier advise what communication occurred between her office and the member for Nudgee or her staff that resulted in this image being edited to this image? I table those images for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Extract from the member for Nudgee, Mrs Leanne Linard MP's website, titled 'QR Timetable Fail—Petition' [286].

Tabled paper: Extract from the member for Nudgee, Mrs Leanne Linard MP's website, titled 'QR Timetable Petition—Nundah/Toombul' [287].

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am advised that my office had nothing to do with that.

Biosecurity

Mr STEWART: My question is to the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development. Will the minister advise the House of the current approach to biosecurity and any alternative approaches?

Mr BYRNE: I thank the member for Townsville for the question. When I saw that the member for Clayfield had stepped up to the confessional to atone for the sins of the past while he was the treasurer, I was looking forward to hearing what he had to say about biosecurity, particularly as it coincided with a watermelon eating competition. We know the issues that exist in that sector at the moment.

It is important for the House to be aware and reflect on the fact, that while those opposite were in government, they cut 26 per cent out of Biosecurity staffing in Queensland. That cut impacted deeply on the organisation—an organisation that Queenslanders rely on to address specific threats. Most of the people in Biosecurity Queensland who were disposed of were from rural and regional areas of Queensland.

When it comes to invasive species, noxious weeds, diseases that threaten entire industries and, just as importantly, the broader biodiversity within this state, Biosecurity Queensland is a front-line service and front-line agency. I am talking about tropical race 4 Panama disease in bananas and white spot disease in prawns and crustaceans. People know about the issue and what we are doing about it. Of course, there is always the dread of foot-and-mouth disease, an outbreak of which would see the destruction of the cattle industry and revenue losses of maybe $52 billion in Australia.

When the Palaszczuk government was elected, we set about repairing that damage. We commissioned an independent review with the aim of restoring Queensland's biosecurity preparedness to pre-Newman era levels. We have committed $30.2 million to implement the review recommendations. The highest priority key recommendations were the need to co-develop with stakeholders a biosecurity strategy, action plan and engagement process to outline the roles and responsibilities of all stakeholders within the biosecurity system. We also set out to establish a biosecurity preparedness and response unit; a process for prioritising biosecurity investments; the implementation of a marine pest preparedness process; increasing biosecurity capability in local government regions; implementing best proactive diagnostic systems for plant industries; and increasing capability within Biosecurity Queensland, including organisational redesign and skilling.

I ask members to compare the recognition of the issues about biosecurity by a Labor government and remember what the member for Clayfield as the treasurer did to Biosecurity Queensland. The people of Queensland, particularly regional Queensland, will never forget it.

(Time expired)

Mental Health Review Tribunal

Mr MANDER: My question is to the Premier. How can victims and families who have had loved ones murdered or harmed by a person being reviewed by the Mental Health Review Tribunal have confidence in the process when there are allegations of nepotism, bias, staff acting without qualifications and a general lack of distrust by the secret way in which the tribunal performs its functions?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Everton for his question. If he were listening to the Minister for Health, he would know that the minister spoke about this issue in detail this morning during ministerial statements. It has been brought to the minister's attention that an issue needs to be rectified. In fact, my understanding is that the minister did the right thing and spoke to his counterpart in the opposition, because the person in question was appointed not just by this government or the former Labor government but also by the LNP government.

We have a very clear situation where the minister got on top of this issue very quickly. He briefed cabinet on this issue and will introduce legislation to fix this up. That is the right thing to do. It is about time we started seeing some cooperation in this House.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, the person in question was also appointed under the former LNP government. My understanding is that the minister briefed the member about this issue in detail. This is in stark contrast to the—

Mr MANDER: I rise to a point of order. The question was very pointed. This is all about how can victims and families of loves ones who were murdered or harmed have confidence in the decisions made by the Mental Health Review Tribunal. The Premier is not addressing the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, do you have anything further that you wish to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I do think that what the member for Everton is saying is actually quite disgraceful because what we have seen is an issue that has arisen and the minister has taken the right and appropriate action through this parliament to fix it up, in stark contrast to those opposite who never even offered briefings to us when they were in office.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I think you are debating the question. Question time has now finished.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Further Answer to Question; Weapons Licensing

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (11.29 am): The member for Buderim asked me for specifics about firearms. I state for the record that I certainly appreciate that there are strong views from different sectors about different aspects of firearms regulation and licensing. As a government we need to ensure that any policies reflect the diverse needs and interests of key stakeholders such as sporting and recreational shooters, victims of crimes, weapons dealers and the agricultural sector. That is why the police minister determined that these stakeholders, including weapons dealers, should meet under one umbrella, the government's Firearms Advisory Forum.

Earlier this month the police minister met with members of the forum and listened to their views. By consulting and working together we are best placed to achieve sensible, workable solutions. I understand that he asked the forum members to get out and about and to consult with the community and industry on issues that are important to them. We remain committed to being a government of consultation and consensus. We want to ensure that all views are represented in policy debates.

With regard to category H weapons, I am informed that licence applications and renewals continue to be assessed taking into account the strict requirements of the Weapons Act and that is as it should be.

ABORTION LAW REFORM (WOMAN'S RIGHT TO CHOOSE) AMENDMENT BILL

HEALTH (ABORTION LAW REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

Order Discharged

Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (11.31 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That general business orders of the day Nos 1 and 2, the Abortion Law Reform (Woman's Right to Choose) Amendment Bill and the Health (Abortion Law Reform) Amendment Bill, be discharged from the *Notice Paper*.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Withdrawal

Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (11.31 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the bills be withdrawn.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SUGAR INDUSTRY (ARBITRATION FOR MILL OWNERS AND SUGAR MARKETING ENTITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.32 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Sugar Industry Act 1999 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Sugar Industry (Arbitration for Mill Owners and Sugar Marketing Entities) Amendment Bill 2017. [288]

Tabled paper: Sugar Industry (Arbitration for Mill Owners and Sugar Marketing Entities) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes [289].

What an extraordinary performance we have seen from the Minister for Agriculture this morning and what an absolutely appalling performance we have seen from this Palaszczuk Labor government and its Minister for Agriculture over the last two years. It has come to the stage where the LNP opposition is doing what this government should do, what this government is paid to do, what this government ought to do, but what this government is failing to do and that is to put Queenslanders first.

Two weeks ago in this place the Premier could not adequately explain in any way, shape or form the necessity for this legislation. She could not explain the details of the dispute that was going on. If ever there was a sign of a Premier who had her feet stuck in concrete in the south-east corner, who had not gone out to talk to Queenslanders, to Queensland farmers, about their needs and about the trouble they are facing, it was the example provided by this Premier when she failed two weeks ago to explain the genesis and the nature of the dispute between growers, marketers and millers. It has now taken two weeks for this lazy agriculture minister to stand up and barely be able to read a prepared statement detailing the issues. If ever there was a statement delivered with less understanding, less enthusiasm and less knowledge than the statement made by this minister, I am yet to see it in this House. He picked it up like a smelly old shoe—perhaps it was one of the rats he caught up in the roof—and held it out at a distance because he thinks it smells. Rather than grasping the nettle, rather than taking action, rather than visiting and talking to the canegrowers, he stays away, goes down into the bunker in Rocky, loads up the shotgun and says, 'Don't send the canegrowers near me. I don't want to speak to them. I don't want to know anything about it.'

There is a need for this legislation because there has been a long-running dispute between Wilmar Sugar and Queensland Sugar Ltd, a dispute that is affecting 1,500 Queensland canefarming families who need to get on with their life, get on with growing sugar cane, generating income, providing jobs for Queenslanders in regional Queensland and providing opportunities throughout this great state.

This lazy agriculture minister treats this industry with disdain. Our sugar industry is Queensland's third largest agricultural industry. It is absolutely vital to the social and economic wellbeing of huge areas of coastal Queensland, from Rocky Point—the minister knows where Rocky Point is because he

shot down there last week. He got notice that we were visiting the prawn farmers and he rang up and said, 'I hear the opposition leader is coming down. Do you mind if I shoot down for a meeting two hours beforehand?' He shot down there.

I think I am going to have to seek the assistance of the House. I am being stalked by the Deputy Premier, who wants to know where I am going and taking photos; the Treasurer is watching my YouTube video and now the Minister for Agriculture is shooting down for unannounced meetings with prawn farmers. They said, 'Tim, we don't need you to do any more for us. You have done everything you possibly can. We have finally got to see the minister after weeks of not being able to get to see him. He hears you are coming and he turns up down here.' He beetles down—he rings up from Rocky and says, 'I'd like to go to Rocky Point. Warm up the limo—the Caprice needs to get going. I'll get down there and have a chat with them.'

It was not all good news. He was going to have another review. What a surprise! I suppose the prawn farmers are a bit lucky. At least he went to see them. He has not been to see the canefarmers. From Rocky Point, between here and the Gold Coast, to Maryborough, to Bundaberg, to Mackay, to Proserpine, Ayr, Ingham, Tully, Innisfail, Mulgrave and Mareeba, our sugar industry is absolutely vital, not just for jobs, not just for the export industry, but for families and communities. As an industry it deserves the respect and support of this parliament and not the catcalls and the lazy work from those opposite, especially the lazy Minister for Agriculture who sits by and happily watches this industry fall to its knees.

Unlike those opposite, the LNP is determined to protect the interests of our canefarmers and their families and protect their rights to marketing choice and ensure that milling companies that hold regional monopolies are held to account when it comes to offering cane supply agreements with genuine choice in marketing. I want to place clearly on the record that the LNP believes commercial contracts should be negotiated by industry. Industry bodies and those involved need to reach a commercial resolution. But when those negotiations break down, when those companies fail for any reason not to act in their own commercial best interests, and when they fail to do so to the detriment of one of our most important agricultural industries and the thousands of families and regional communities it supports, then the time is right for the government to act.

Right from the start of this dispute, the LNP has taken the lead. We made it clear to all parties that we were more than willing to get involved to help sort out these issues. A bit of history is important to understand how we are arrived at where we are today, because there are a lot of Johnny-come-latelies on the scene—and I am not talking just about those opposite. There are a lot of Johnny-come-latelies. In 1996 the industry was deregulated under the Beattie-Bligh state government. In 1996 an assistance package was provided by the federal coalition government to help the industry deal with those adjustments. Commitments were given, foreign investors were welcomed and the marketing of Queensland sugar was undertaken by the industry owned Queensland Sugar Limited. Matters proceeded apace. In a number of regions there were disputes between growers and millers. We well remember them. However, they were commercial and they were resolved commercially on the ground by the people involved, because they showed a willingness to act with commercial sense. They showed a willingness to resolve matters and put commercial sense ahead of their egos and other drivers. Commitments were given and foreign investors were welcomed, as I have said.

In April 2014, Singaporean owned Wilmar Sugar announced that, from the 2017 season—meaning from the crush due to get underway in 16 to 17 weeks time—it would market all the sugar from the company's mills and not use the services of QSL. Therefore, a miller with a regional monopoly said, 'We will now take complete charge of the sale of the grower interest in sugar—in fact, all sugar'. That effectively created a regional monopoly. What choice was there? The Minister for Agriculture may well ask what choice there was for the growers to exercise their traditional grower economic interests to ensure a stable market and that they were not held to ransom by a multinational that holds a regional monopoly and effectively holds the whip hand, because the price that the growers receive is determined to an extent by the price that the marketer gets at the end of the day. The manipulation was able to be undertaken by the marketer on the price that the canegrower gets, to the detriment of the grower. I repeat: that was to the detriment of the grower. The 2014 announcement by Wilmar was quickly followed by Maryborough Sugar Factory, owned by Mitr Phol of Thailand, and Tully Sugar, owned by Cofco of China. For those who are interested, Cofco is a Chinese state owned food-processing organisation that is China's largest food processing manufacturer and trader. Does anyone think that they might not be in a position to exercise a substantial degree of market power? They all decided to pull out of the longstanding arrangements to use the industry owned QSL and from 2017 undertake not just the milling but also the marketing of sugar.

People might say, 'Well, hang on a second: that should be a reasonable outcome. It is fair enough. We can market products such as wheat and others that way.' However, there is a big and significant difference. Unlike other agricultural industries where farmers generally have ownership of their produce and choice in the processing and marketing of it, the sugar industry is different for this one fundamental factor: it is a perishable crop. Sugar has to be taken to the mills within 12 hours, otherwise its quality starts to deteriorate. As the quality deteriorates, the sugar contents gets less and the price that the grower receives decreases. You cannot store it somewhere for 24 or 48 hours and get the same price as you can by whacking it on a truck or a cane train and getting it straight to the miller and, because of its bulky nature, it needs to be milled locally. The transportation costs of taking it somewhere else have a significant impact on its viability. For that reason, district sugar mills hold a natural monopoly and growers have nowhere else to go. Therefore, cane has to be crushed and there is a natural monopoly.

It is no exaggeration to say that three years ago Wilmar's announcement to pull out of the existing agreements with QSL caused unprecedented concern across the industry. Canegrowers were concerned that their interests were set to be trammelled by large multinationals that not only held monopoly powers in crushing their cane but also were seeking to take similar powers with marketing, particularly with their grower economic interest, or the GEI, of sugar. That situation got worse when Wilmar was joined by MSF and Tully Sugar.

From April 2014, the LNP urged the industry to negotiate in good faith and provide cane supply agreements with growers. For those contracts to be in place, on-supply agreements also needed to be in place so that growers could continue to have their GEI sugar—that is, their economic interest in the milled sugar—sold through QSL if they chose to do so. John McVeigh, the then LNP agriculture minister, convened roundtable meetings and urged all parties to find common ground, but unfortunately that did not occur. Even back then, we made it clear that we would not stand by and do nothing and that the industry needed to resolve its differences. That stalemate continued.

In 2015, we did exactly what we said we would do. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, assisted by the member for Hinchinbrook, the member for Whitsunday, the member for Burdekin and the member for Burnett worked on bringing forward the first package of reforms that were passed through this House in December, despite the Minister for Agriculture and the Palaszczuk Labor government turning their backs on canefarmers and opposing it. We heard stories of big multinationals pulling out. We heard stories of $600 million worth of investment by MSF not proceeding. Has that money been invested? Has that announcement been made? Are we seeing that investment going ahead? Yes, it is still going ahead. Yet again, the chicken littles opposite who said that the sky would fall in have been proven wrong. Six of the seven growing areas are now covered by marketing choice arrangements, including MSF and Tully Sugar. I congratulate those organisations for coming to a sensible solution and understanding that they need to work with their canegrowers and not against their canegrowers. However, Wilmar and QSL have been unable to finalise an on-supply contract and there are a number of issues, including the terms of the contract and issues over testing and quality.

It has never been the intention of the LNP or, indeed, I believe of Katter's Australian Party, the Independent member for Cook or the Independent member for Cairns that this parliament acts as a judge on the items in dispute. That is not our role and it never should be. That is why the amendments of 2015, which were passed in December that year, focused on the cane supply contracts and provided for arbitration in the event of a breakdown. Throughout this ordeal, Wilmar Sugar has waged a relentless public relations campaign against the amendments, making all sorts of claims that the changes would destroy the industry, scare off investment and generally lead to the demise of the Queensland sugar industry. All have proven to be false. Wilmar has been assisted by the Australian Sugar Milling Council, cheered on by the minister opposite, cheered on by the Deputy Premier, cheered on by the Premier and cheered on through the statements made by their spokesperson, Dominic Nolan, in relation to this matter.

In stark contrast, the LNP continues to stand up for our canefarmers and our sugar industry. As the stalemate has dragged on, despite our urging to all involved, we have continued to liaise and to talk with the industry. My deputy, Deb Frecklington, the shadow agriculture minister, Dale Last, and the members who represent sugar growers—who actually represent their electorates and do the hard work for their constituents—Andrew Cripps from Hinchinbrook, Jason Costigan from Whitsunday, Dale Last from the Burdekin and Steve Bennett from the Burnett, have all met regularly with canefarmers and their key representatives. We have met regularly with the Australian Sugar Milling Council, QSL and Wilmar Sugar and had ongoing discussions. At every meeting we stress the need for the stalemate to be resolved for the good of the industry. On numerous trips to the sugar-growing regions, we have

heard firsthand of the absolute frustration felt by farmers, their families, local businesses and shire council mayors and councillors. On 16 December 2016, I personally wrote to Wilmar Sugar's chairman and CEO, Mr Kuok Khoon Hong. On 9 January 2017, my deputy, Deb Frecklington, also wrote to Mr Kuok. In those letters, we recognised the investment of Wilmar in Queensland and we respectfully asked that Mr Kuok travel to Queensland to help sort this mess out, to break the logjam that was occurring, which would have shown a genuine commitment on the part of Wilmar to resolve this matter. Unfortunately, Mr Kuok declined twice and his responses were less than conciliatory.

Ultimately, the LNP is not prepared to stand by and allow this situation to continue. At the last sitting of parliament on Tuesday, 14 February we again stated very clearly the next step in resolving the stalemate. It was the LNP and no others that took this action. We made it very clear. We gave both parties 48 hours to agree to resolve their long-running dispute by today and, if that was not forthcoming, we would at the next sitting—this day—bring amendments to parliament to provide arbitration for the on-supply agreements. The LNP is serious about protecting Queensland's sugar industry from any monopolistic and predatory marketing practices. We are absolutely serious about protecting growers and providing choice in marketing.

The Sugar Industry (Arbitration for Mill Owners and Sugar Marketing Entities) Amendment Bill 2017 will amend section 33A to provide for arbitration of disputed terms of intended supply contracts between millers and marketers. It will also amend section 33B regarding the terms of supply contracts about on-supply sugar, including the way economic interest sugar is to be worked out and also sale price exposure, and provide for a process for dispute resolution, including arbitration between mill owners and marketers.

The LNP has been as clear as possible with our intentions. Unlike Labor and unlike the mealy-mouthed words we heard from the Minister for Agriculture this morning, we have remained in constant contact with canegrowers and their representatives, millers and the Australian Sugar Milling Council and QSL. Indeed, we offered them twice in the last two weeks voluntary mediation. That was rejected twice in the past two weeks. The minister's announcement today is nothing more than a stale and last-minute attempt to try to salvage something out of a situation that he has totally failed to address.

We consulted on the amendments we brought to parliament in December 2015. Those amendments, which we then believed would ensure grower choice, have been sufficient to assist in providing growers who supply six of the seven milling companies. We now bring in these amendments to redress the stalemate between Wilmar and QSL which is denying proper contracts for 1,500 canefarmers.

Those 1,500 canefarmers, their families, their workers and their communities matter to the LNP, as does their investment of billions of dollars. We hear lots about the investment by foreign multinationals—and, as I say, that investment is welcomed—but we do not hear too much about the tens of billions of dollars invested by canegrowing families over generations. It is not just the money that gets invested; it is the families that get invested. It is the blood, it is the sweat and, increasingly and unfortunately, it is the tears of those canegrowers that is being invested. We will act to protect them.

I travelled to Ayr on Sunday, 19 February where I joined Deputy Prime Minister Barnaby Joyce, the member for Dawson George Christensen, LNP senator for Queensland Matt Canavan, federal member for Kennedy Bob Katter and KAP member for Dalrymple Shane Knuth and our own local member and the man who convened the meeting, shadow agriculture minister, Dale Last. We heard from millers about Wilmar's actions. We heard from industry leaders who made it clear that they were not attempting to improve their positions, they were simply trying to get a contract in the first place. They want to maintain choice for grower economic interest and they want to maintain control of their own farms.

Let us be very clear. The LNP is all for competition and we fully accept that Wilmar wishes to mill and market sugar in competition with Queensland Sugar Ltd, which has traditionally been the single desk marketer for sugar. However, there needs to be choice for growers who wish to remain with QSL. That choice needs to be real and needs to be accessible, and never more so than now at a time of low world prices.

The LNP will stand up for the canegrowers of Queensland. We will stand up for their families. We will stand up for their communities. We will put the values of the LNP up against the Labor Party and anyone else—the values around self-reliance, around personal sacrifice, around hard work, around backing oneself and around building business on and around families. We will put Queenslanders first. That is what this legislation does.

First Reading

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.54 am): 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.

Declared Urgent

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.54 am), by leave, with notice: I move—

That notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders:

1. the Sugar Industry (Arbitration for Mill Owners and Sugar Marketing Entities) Amendment Bill be declared an urgent bill and not stand referred to a portfolio committee and be set down on the *Notice Paper* for its second reading stage; and

2. having been declared urgent, debate shall take precedence this Wednesday evening to enable the bill to pass through all remaining stages on that day.

Mr DICKSON (Buderim—PHON) (11.55 am): I rise to speak to the motion. One Nation is very happy to support the bill that is being put forward today. I understand that the LNP is going to need four members to get this across the line.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The motion before the House relates to urgency. This is not an opportunity for anyone to debate the bill itself. We will get that opportunity on Wednesday night.

Mr DICKSON: As I was saying, it is an opportunity to speak to the matter of urgency.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Member for Buderim, take your seat. Member for Buderim, your statement needs to be relevant to the urgency motion and not to the bill itself.

Mr DICKSON: Absolutely. As I was saying before I was rudely interrupted, One Nation is very happy to support the urgency motion in relation to the bill put before the House today. We realise the impact of the issue on the people of Queensland. That is something that the crossbenchers will have to make a decision about today, because we need four votes from those at the back of the chamber to make sure the urgency motion gets up today. I am sure those on this side of the House understand that very clearly.

I am so grateful to people like Sam Cox and many others in North Queensland who have pushed this issue so hard. Regardless of which side of politics puts this bill forward, it is about the farmers. Let us not forget who this is about. It is not about the LNP or the ALP. It is about the urgency motion to make—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Buderim, we are debating the urgency motion. Have you anything further to say in relation to the urgency motion?

Mr DICKSON: Absolutely. It is about the urgency motion that I am speaking very clearly. We need to get this through so that the farmers in North Queensland can be looked after. This is a very urgent matter. That is what this motion being put forward today is all about. I am sure other crossbenchers may wish to talk about the urgency motion put forward. It will be urgent for at least four members up the back of the chamber to support this motion to support all Queensland farmers. That is what we believe in.

Hon. WS BYRNE (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development) (11.57 am): Unsurprisingly, I rise to oppose the motion moved by the Liberal National Party opposition. Why is this bill being considered urgently? What is the fundamental issue here? It is to meet a synthetic set of arrangements put forward by the Liberal National Party and created by the Liberal National Party. That is what this is all about. The only reason this is urgent is to deal with the political necessities of those opposite.

In 2015 they played around with this act and much of what we predicted has transpired. That is the truth of it. The urgency now is the urgency to take standing for the Liberal National Party. It is more to do with ultimatums that come from the federal government. We see George Christensen resign today

as whip. Who can forget the photo of George Christensen and his whip that was circulated? This about trying to shore up the National Party backbench, both federally and at the state level, with ultimatums being issued to Malcolm Turnbull and to, I would imagine, the Leader of the Opposition by some within his own group making a stand on this issue.

It has nothing to do with the good of the industry. It has nothing to do with relevant, thoughtful consideration of the issue. It is about picking sides and ultimatums—ultimatums issued by members of the backbench in this House in the opposition and by members of the backbench in the Liberal-National Party coalition government. What we are seeing here today is an urgency motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition to try to medicate his backbench and the forces that are in play in those sugar seats.

There is nothing sensible about this. If they were serious about this matter, they would be referring the bill to a committee. There would be a proper, thorough interrogation of this where proper, thorough interrogation and consideration of the issues are put forward—but no. Ultimatums have been issued by the backbench to the leadership of the Liberal National Party at a state level and a federal level and ultimatums then issued by the Leader of the Opposition to parties where clearly the sentiment of the opposition is one in favour of a particular view. The difference between that view and the government's view, which has been absolutely consistent—

Mr SEENEY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As sessional orders require, the time for the introduction of private members' bills is to expire at 12 o'clock. As it is now 12 o'clock, I move—

That the question be now put.

Division: Question put—That the question be now put.

AYES, 45:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Pyne.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Business and Industry

Mr NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.07 pm): At the outset can I say thank you to those who supported the motion that we just passed in this House to have this matter dealt with urgently. This is a matter of considerable urgency for the people of regional Queensland. It is needed to bring the long-running stalemate between Wilmar Sugar and QSL to an end.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition is now anticipating a debate that is before the House.

Mr Cripps: Not at all. He was reflecting on the urgency motion.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: We have just dealt with that. There is not another question to be dealt with. I suggest you give some guidance to the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Leader of the Opposition, as I am sure you are aware, you cannot anticipate debate on the sugar bill, so I ask you to make sure that you are—

Mr NICHOLLS: I will not be anticipating debate on the sugar bill. I was simply thanking people for supporting the urgency motion. Unlike my honourable friend over there, the member for Sandgate, I had an extra three years of tuition in this place, so I am very aware of the rules of procedure here in this House. I thank him for his attempt at guidance and I acknowledge that it was meant in my very own best interest, but let me carry on as to why it is important to thank people for the urgency that has been accorded to the bill—and I will not touch on the subject matter of the bill. I will reflect on what has occurred to farming families in Queensland over the last three years as a result of the bill not being put before the House. I will reflect on the families—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the Leader of the Opposition is now going to reflect upon the impacts of a bill not being in place in the state of Queensland then clearly he is debating the substance of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I am inclined to agree. I will caution you again. Do not anticipate debate on the bill that will be coming before the House.

Mr NICHOLLS: I will not be anticipating that debate. Given the sensitivities of the Leader of the House in relation to the inaction of his government to address the significant issues concerning Queenslanders in this debate, I will not address the substance of the bill which goes, of course, to the dispute between the millers and the marketers in relation to it.

Let me reflect on my week on the road listening to Queenslanders including my visit to the Burdekin and the canegrowers of Burdekin. Since we last met we have been travelling the state, as we said we would. We have been talking with and listening to Queenslanders about the issues that concern them. One thing that has come through loud and clear is that many believe this government is not listening to their concerns. They believe Queensland is stagnating and that the community is crying out for leadership at a time when we have a government firmly stuck in neutral. All Queenslanders are getting from this government is review after review, and inaction and instability as Labor ministers show they are more interested in their own jobs than they are in the jobs of Queenslanders. They are prepared to sell out their local communities to advance their own careers.

Last weekend I visited Chinchilla and I attended the melon festival. I am glad that I am being followed around the state by the Deputy Premier, who is posting those photos, because I can tell members one thing: there was no-one from the ALP in Chinchilla. They were nowhere to be seen. Another great agricultural industry, the melon industry, the home of which is Chinchilla, is being ignored by Labor. It was great to talk to Mayor Paul McVeigh about his ideas for expanding growth in Chinchilla. The Western Downs Regional Council are grasping the nettle. They are doing it themselves. They are not asking for handouts from the government. They are getting on with developing the melon festival and a number of other tourism initiatives including the potential for a museum. All they want is the government and government owned businesses to talk to them, but all they are getting is a brick wall. I want to particularly acknowledge the melon festival president, Doug McNally, for getting me in to the melon-eating competition. I want to thank him for the particularly good melon that he provided to me. On conclusion he said to me, 'Mate, that one was so bad, I wouldn't have eaten it.' There you go, but it was great fun and everyone had a wonderful weekend.

On the Gold Coast last week I had the pleasure to meet with Logan River prawn farmers impacted by white spot. I mentioned that in my contribution when I introduced the bill around sugar marketing. They included Noel Herbst from Gold Coast Marine Aquaculture; Ian and Geoff Rossman from GI Rural; Daniel and Simon Rossman from DS Farms; the Truloffs representing TPF; the Zipfs from Rocky Point Prawn Farms; and others. White spot is now in all seven farms along the river and more than $25 million worth of prawns have had to be destroyed since November. This industry is worth $88 million a year to the Queensland economy. More importantly, it represents the jobs and livelihoods of dozens of workers—almost 120 employees—who are being kept on by those employers at the moment, but for how much longer is the question. The farms need certainty. They need the minister to give them certainty about whether they can re-establish and the terms upon which they can re-establish. That is the first thing. Let them know whether they can re-establish their farms. They are still waiting for that. We call on the minister to make that decision and to give those farmers certainty because they need to know now in order to be able to plan, buy and commence restocking.

We welcome the suspension of the importation of green prawns into Australia and the fast-tracking of the Farm Household Allowance support for affected farmers. While those things are good, they do not go the whole way to helping resolve these issues. It is an important issue and we will await the results of the Senate inquiry to get to the bottom of what went wrong. We stand ready and willing to help those farmers re-establish themselves.

Another Gold Coast business that we visited was Dreamworld. Of course we remember the shocking events that occurred there in October last year, and we remember the four people who died there—Roozi Araghi, Cindy Low, Kate Goodchild and Luke Dorsett. As law-makers and parliamentarians, we should make sure we do everything in our power to ensure that that tragedy does not occur again. However, we also must recognise the importance of Dreamworld and the other theme parks to local tourism as they provide jobs and opportunities for so many Queenslanders.

Tourism is vital to the Gold Coast economy, providing thousands of jobs, but at a time when we have seen more than 4,000 jobs lost on the Gold Coast in the last year we should be providing whatever support we can to the tourism industry. That is why we announced our wi-fi for tourism policy—a policy that makes Queensland an absolute must-see for tourists around the world. We want to make Queensland a No. 1 tourism destination for Australia. To do that, we need a plan to enhance the tourism experience for interstate and international visitors. Our policy will provide up to 500 wi-fi hotspots in key tourism destinations around Queensland so we can capitalise on an amazing range of natural and man-made tourism settings unique to Queensland that set our state apart.

I also travelled to the Sunshine Coast last week, another area that relies heavily on tourism and that has been hit hard by Labor's economic mismanagement, with a thousand jobs disappearing from the region last month. Despite the efforts of the local council, we have seen almost 8,000 jobs disappear from the Sunshine Coast in just one year while another 10,600 people have given up looking for work as the participation rate plummets.

We heard how hard it is for young people looking to get a start in their first job and for businesses looking to employ new staff. In the last year, more than 5,000 young kids have disappeared from the Sunshine Coast and another 5,100 young people have given up looking for work. The youth unemployment rate has increased by more than two per cent. What is this government's answer to this problem? It is to implement a Back to Work program that businesses on the Sunshine Coast cannot access. It does not apply on the Sunshine Coast. Unlike Labor, which has forgotten young jobseekers on the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast and Ipswich, our $100 million plan to get Queensland working and create up to 20,000 jobs applies right across the state without fear or favour. Everyone can apply for it. Our plan will also reduce the cost of working for young apprentices and incentivise businesses to train and retain young Queenslanders. That is just one policy we have put forward to get Queensland moving and make a change that is important to Queenslanders.

Another chance I had to speak about policy was while visiting Noosa, and that was the LNP's container deposit scheme—another scheme being ripped off by the Labor Party. Where was it? It was languishing in the doldrums with a do-nothing minister. Perhaps he was looking for a fresh environment to move to—an environment where he could pronounce the name of his electorate. He was looking to plough new fields. Our policy will make a change and we outlined how that scheme would work while visiting the Noosa Council's Eumundi Road Resource and Recovery Centre. We have been way out in front of Labor on this issue. After two years of dragging the chain, including a 12-month—guess what?—feasibility investigation, the best Labor could do a couple of weeks ago was release—guess what?—another discussion paper about possible implementation options. That is a government that is getting on with the job: a 12-month feasibility investigation followed by a discussion paper about possible options! No wonder it took him so long to decide which seat he will run for. He cannot even implement a policy. He cannot make a decision and just say, 'We're going to do it.'

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Before I call the next speaker I want to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of students from the newly formed Wilsonton State High School in the electorate of Toowoomba North.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements

Hon. M FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (12.19 pm): The Palaszczuk government has made a commitment to represent all Queenslanders regardless of where they live. Our government has listened. Across the state we have listened to locals and to the councils that represent them. The Palaszczuk government is delivering funds for critical projects—critical projects identified by those who will benefit the most. There is no doubt we are boosting regional economies. Perhaps, most importantly, we are delivering jobs. We are delivering jobs where they are needed the most.

The 2016-17 Local Government Grants and Subsidies Program is the backbone of local infrastructure in our hugely decentralised state. In the 2016-17 funding year $30.65 million in grants is being delivered to councils for shovel-ready projects to build vital community infrastructure. In 2016-17

the Palaszczuk government is funding 99 projects for 44 councils via the Local Government Grants and Subsidies Program. These councils have told us that these 99 projects will not only support 673 construction jobs but, importantly, they will support almost 50 ongoing jobs. That is almost 50 families who are assured of a sustainable income because our government is spending money where it makes the most difference.

Queensland local governments are the backbone of our communities. Theirs is not an easy job. Their job is to maximise service delivery whilst keeping rates at a level that is affordable. With the help of the Palaszczuk Labor government that job is made easier. The Palaszczuk government's Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning manages many grants and subsidy programs all aimed at supporting our local government partners. It does not matter to whom I speak from local government—whether it be Mayor Tate on the Gold Coast City Council last week; Lord Mayor Quirk from Brisbane City Council; or Paul Antonio, the Mayor of Toowoomba Regional Council, last Saturday night they all tell me that they are satisfied and impressed with what we are doing as a government.

In the past two financial years Local Government Grants and Subsidies Program funding has delivered more than $55.64 million to councils for 165 vital community infrastructure projects. In Gladstone, as an example, a grant of more than $283,000 is going towards upgrading the water main at the Clinton Reservoir and will improve the quality of Gladstone's drinking water. I know the member for Gladstone is very happy along with the council at Gladstone that they are receiving this infrastructure and this support from the Palaszczuk Labor government, which is creating and supporting 15 jobs.

If we go to Mackay, the stunning Mackay Regional Botanic Gardens is benefiting from fast-tracking a grant of almost $750,000 to build a new nursery and operations centre. That project is supporting 13 jobs. I know the member for Mackay is very happy with the outcome from the Palaszczuk Labor government in supporting the Mackay Regional Council.

The Carpentaria Shire Council has recently started work on the expansion of the Les Wilson Barramundi Discovery Centre with the help of an almost $2.5 million grant while the Winton Shire Council is cracking on with creating a film production studio with a grant of $60,000. There are many more examples of these council priority projects underway right across Queensland.

The Palaszczuk government has not only eased the financial strain on councils but we are streamlining the application and evaluation process for funding. That is because this government is absolutely determined to do all it possibly can to get the money out the door, supporting our regions and supporting jobs. I am pleased to report today that the turnaround time for evaluating applications from councils has been reduced to just four weeks. The form required, which once required the filling-out of reams of paper, has now been reduced to just two pages. We have relieved the council of the difficult task of determining which funding program is most suitable for their community needs. Councils are now simply asked to list their priorities and the department does the rest.

We are delivering key community projects and creating jobs right across our wonderful state. That is what we do. That is what this Labor Palaszczuk government will continue to do.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12.24 pm): The speech that we have just heard from the minister shows how completely out of touch this do-nothing Palaszczuk government is in relation to rural and regional Queensland. This is the government that slashed the successful Royalties for the Regions program. They halved it, they narrowed it and then they only put one per cent of its budget allocation out the door. This year we see that this is a government that is so worried about the next election in rural and regional Queensland they are ramming through these projects to local councils but forgetting that they have halved and narrowed the successful Royalties for the Regions project.

Just before question time we heard from the opposition leader about the jobs crisis facing Queensland. We are seeing a concerning trend and this government is doing nothing in its approach to improve this situation. It does not take a genius to figure out why we are seeing so many jobs disappear from regional communities across the state. Labor has completely gutted the Infrastructure budget. The Premier has chopped the government's Capital Works Program and regional Queensland has borne the brunt of this rip and tear approach.

In 2014-15 the LNP delivered more than $10 billion in infrastructure spending. Last year Labor only delivered $8 billion in infrastructure spending. They gutted the Capital Works Program by $2 billion in their first year in office. Over the next four years the capital purchases have been slashed by almost

$3 billion. That means $3 billion less invested in projects and jobs right across Queensland but particularly in rural and regional Queensland. It is clear that regional Queensland is bearing the brunt of this do-nothing Labor government and its savage attacks on the Infrastructure budget. It is clear that the Deputy Premier is unable to fight for her patch and get the money spent on infrastructure.

Let us go through the figures region by region. Labor's own budget papers show a $180 million cut to infrastructure in Townsville this year, and that is on top of a $220 million cut in Townsville the year before. Since Labor's election, per capita infrastructure spending in Townsville has declined by $823—that is $823 less spent on infrastructure per person in Townsville. Is it any wonder why unemployment in Townsville has reached its highest level on record, at an unacceptable level of 11.4 per cent? This is a region that has seen more than 13,000 jobs disappear since Labor's last election and it is directly attributable to infrastructure cuts.

Cairns has not fared any better. Infrastructure cuts in the budget this year total $120 million on top of $150 million the year before. That is $545 per person in infrastructure cuts. The member for Mulgrave is failing to deliver for his own patch. Youth unemployment continues to skyrocket, with 2,200 young people losing their jobs on this do-nothing government's watch. No matter where we look, regional Queensland has been short-changed by a government that is simply only focused on Brisbane and its inner-city Greens preferences. Mackay has seen infrastructure spending dramatically cut by $80 million this year alone. This region has seen 3,400 jobs disappear since Labor's election. I would ask the people of Mackay to let their members know that those 3,400 people are not happy that their only response is an Elton John concert.

It is clear that this Palaszczuk government is doing nothing. It is clear that they are completely out of touch. The Deputy Premier has slashed $3 billion from the Infrastructure budget. If this do-nothing government were serious about delivering jobs for regional Queensland, if they were serious about boosting the economies of regional towns and cities, if they were serious about improving the liveability of regional communities, they have to be serious about infrastructure; they have to put the money into the regions so the local councils can continue to employ their road crews. It is that simple.

Fair Work Commission

Mr PEARCE (Mirani—ALP) (12.29 pm): I rise to speak on behalf of the youth of Central Queensland, particularly in the Mirani electorate, who will soon lose valued cash from their pay packets. The cuts to penalty rates target young men and women and older workers who turn up for work on Sundays in retail, hospitality and fast food outlets. I recently read that the Fair Work Commission said that cuts to Sunday penalty rates will provide 'hardship' to workers, so they recognised that before they made the decision. I understand the decision will mean—this is only one example, but I thought it was a pretty good one—that after working an eight-hour shift on Sunday a retail worker on $19.44 an hour will be $77 worse off in their week's pay.

The motivation behind the decision was that the Fair Work Commission deemed that 'Sundays are now less important to people than they used to be'. To me that is just an elitist justification of the action taken by the commission. If the commission truly believes that people who step up for work on a Sunday do so because they enjoy working on a Sunday and it is not an important day in their lives, well, I am sorry, but my reading is that most people step up to work on a Sunday simply because they need those dollars to make up the figure in their pay packet. For those thousands of low-income retail workers who will be $77 a week worse off it means fewer funds in the budget pool. Less money on the table means they will have to divide it up to suit their needs. It will take a greater effort to budget to ensure that weekly, monthly and quarterly payments are all made on time.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: I do not want those opposite interjecting, because if I get a chance to get to you I am going to give you a little bit of a lesson.

Mr Langbroek: It is your commission, you goose!

Mr PEARCE: I am deeply offended by that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! Would you withdraw that statement, please.

Mr LANGBROEK: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I found that word unparliamentary. Member for Mirani, please continue.

Mr PEARCE: It will mean there is possibly less food on the table and less socialising—they cannot go out as much—and less cash going into the local economy, which again affects more people. The decision of the Fair Work Commission to cut penalty rates will only add to the ever-declining cash flow across local economies, and I see it happening in Central Queensland all the time. Reducing the take-home pay of our most vulnerable is a shameful act—in fact, I would say it is a mongrel act—and will do nothing to encourage our youth to pursue and secure part-time or full-time work. Why should they want to work on a weekend when the take-home pay that they have been entitled to is going to be slashed?

As a hands-on worker for several decades I always had access to well-paid work. For today's 18- to 25-year-olds job security is an unknown comfort zone which many will not experience. Casual work means less job security and worse conditions, including fewer holidays and no sick leave, and will quickly make employees who want full-time work feel undervalued. That is not a good thing for young people, who struggle enough without feeling undervalued. All of these negatives directed toward our youth by employers can and will lead to financial stress and poor health. Even our most dedicated savers and financial planners will become victims of a low cash flow society brought on by a casualised, low-income workforce. Workers who are casuals cannot access loans for the betterment of their quality of life. This is wrong and the people behind it, the federal conservative government, have done the young people of this state and this nation—

(Time expired)

TransLink, Monthly Performance Snapshot

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (12.34 pm): It is official: the trains have not been this bad since the Premier, Annastacia Palaszczuk, was the transport minister and in control at Queensland Rail.

Opposition members: Toot! Toot!

Mr POWELL: I take that interjection from the members of the LNP. Commuters already suspected it and even the member for Nudgee knew it, as we learned this morning. Now we finally have the data to back it up. As much as this government professes to be open and transparent—albeit that we saw a rather cagey effort by the Minister for Energy this morning—it was the LNP that had to pry the truth out of the Premier's hands when it came to TransLink customer satisfaction. When did the people of South-East Queensland get this data? They got it late on a Friday afternoon. Talk about open and transparent: talk about a cover-up!

The November TransLink monthly performance snapshot shows that every customer satisfaction measure for trains has decreased and that, as a result, the performance of public transport across South-East Queensland is being dragged down by this incompetent Labor government's management of our Citytrain network. It is unsurprising, but now we have data to show just how much commuters have given up on this inexperienced Palaszczuk government.

Let me run through some of the stats. I would like to say that I will run through the good ones to start with, but there are none. Overall satisfaction with train usage in South-East Queensland is now at 66 points, which is four points lower than at the 2015 election. That is not a shock. Since this mob took office the Redcliffe line has been delayed, thousands of services have been cancelled and there has been a damning commission of inquiry. Who can blame commuters for not being happy?

The next rating is the clincher—and I bet the Deputy Premier likes this one—because the train reliability rating is the lowest since Premier Palaszczuk was transport minister back in 2011. During the member for Inala's tenure as the minister the reliability rating of our Citytrain network was atrocious. The rating in quarter 3 of 2010-11 was 62; in quarter 4 of 2010-11 it was 61; and in quarter 1 of 2011-12 it was 61. If you fast-forward to November 2016 when the then minister for transport is now the Premier of this state, we have a reliability rating of 63 points. Six years of the Premier's fingerprints are all over Queensland Rail failures. We will go through some of the other train KPI failures of this government from October to November 2016.

The graphs are quite telling when we look at them, because overall satisfaction is down four points and safety and security are down five points. As it tracks along there—it is the lighter coloured one—you see that it basically falls off a cliff in October 2016. Reliability is even worse. It was faring better than all modes and then buses but, as you can see, there is a cataclysmic drop off the cliff in October 2016 combining with Labor's rail fail—down seven points. Comfort is down five points, and again the same cliff is very evident in the graphs. Ease of use is down five points; proximity, down four points; efficiency, down five points; and information—this is hardly surprising at all—down nine points.

Clearly, commuters are fed up with the lack of information about what is going on on their rail network. The rating for accessibility is down five points, the rating for staff is down five points and the rating for affordability is down five points. As I said, there is simply no good news for the government in this monthly snapshot.

This is not the report card of a government that knows what it is doing. This is the mark of an inexperienced Labor government, out of its depth and beholden to the unions. The LNP's record is clear, and commuters know it: if you want trains to run on time every time, you need an LNP government.

Central Queensland, Infrastructure

Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (12.40 pm): I rise to speak about how the Palaszczuk government is committed to delivering infrastructure in Central Queensland because we know it means jobs for regions. That is why in this year's budget we have committed more than $1.25 billion of infrastructure investment in Central Queensland alone, supporting more than 4,000 jobs, particularly in my area.

As Assistant Minister for Transport and Infrastructure I see the effect of this vital funding to communities in Central Queensland. The impact of this government's funding is being felt right across the region. Particularly Mackay—I note the member for Mackay is present in the chamber—is benefiting from a number of important projects in the area. Replacement of the fire station in Mackay, at a cost of $7.5 million, will support 20 jobs in that local area. A Mackay adult step-up step-down facility worth $4 million will support 10 jobs, thanks to the Minister for Health. We also understand the importance of investing in tourism, with Mackay receiving a brand-new visitor information centre going forward.

This government is also investing in education, particularly in the Mackay and Mirani areas—Mackay State High School, Finch Hatton State School, Pioneer State High School and Dysart State School, just to name a few. All of these schools will receive upgrades to classrooms, air conditioning, pools and important refurbishments. This vital infrastructure will make our schools better environments for the children of Mackay to learn and will continue to support jobs in the local community.

In my own electorate of Gladstone this government has delivered a number of upgrades to our highways. We secured funding of $40 million for the Department of Transport and Main Roads to replace five timber bridges—on the Dawson Highway at Catfish Creek, Nine Mile Creek, Sheep Station Creek, Maxwelton Creek and Doubtful Creek. This vital infrastructure upgrade is just the thing agricultural businesses in the area need to get their product to the Gladstone port.

The upgrade of a number of schools in my electorate has been included in the Accelerated Works Program. These include Clinton, Kin Kora and Tannum Sands. I have been to all of those schools and I can say that they are extremely grateful for these wonderful infrastructure upgrades. This government has also committed $40 million to the revitalisation of the riverfront in Rockhampton and the Yeppoon foreshore. I note the presence in the chamber of the member for Keppel.

Just last week the Deputy Premier and I announced the fantastic Works for Queensland program, valued at $200 million, which will deliver much needed funding to local councils to kick-start job-creating programs in their communities. It was great to be in Bundaberg with the member for Bundaberg and the Mayor, Jack Dempsey, who said that the Bundaberg Municipal Band was playing because the money that was announced is absolutely fantastic.

Local councils in regional Queensland have made it clear that this program is a perfect opportunity for them to upgrade facilities, fix roads and at the same time employ local workers. The member for Nanango says that the state government is doing nothing for regional Queensland, but I suggest that she asks her local mayors in regional Queensland what they think. I have talked to every single one of them out in the regions and I can say that they are most impressed with the Palaszczuk government delivering this funding to regional Queensland local governments so they can get on with the much needed work that is being delivered in local communities right now. This program has been rolled out within four weeks. Money is going straight to councils for them to get into the work and advance the programs they cannot deliver out of their local budgets.

In Mackay, $11.49 million has been allocated to the Mackay Regional Council to deliver 36 projects, supporting 176 jobs in Mackay. Gladstone Regional Council has had $6 million awarded to it. I know that the Mayor of Gladstone, a good mate of mine, Mr Burnett, is more than happy. Some $3½ million goes into a new facility in Lions Park to provide for people with disabilities. Other approved projects include at Tom Jeffrey park at Agnes Water. The member for Burnett will be most impressed about that. There will be a new car park at Agnes Water beach, which we in our area all use, to make that a better place.

The Works for Queensland program is delivering for regional Queensland. As I said, the mayors and the people of these communities are more than impressed with what the Palaszczuk government is doing. The Deputy Premier of Queensland is getting this money out to these councils. The program is not part funded; it is fully funded. The councils are spending the money as we speak and creating jobs in regional Queensland right now.

Justice System, Parole Review

Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (12.45 pm): I rise to speak about the response to the parole review handed down during the last sittings of parliament. This review was needed. It was brought about by the tragic murder of Beth Kippin in Townsville. It is alleged that somebody who had been released on parole murdered a complete and utter stranger within six or seven hours of release. It was a case that shocked the whole state and the country and it led to this review, which we welcomed.

We have been concerned, and still are concerned, about the time taken to undertake this review and to table the report. There are a number of recommendations which lead us—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is a bill before the House arising from the parole review. I am concerned that the member may be anticipating the debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! I was listening. Member for Everton, you are well aware that there is a bill before the House.

Mr MANDER: Yes, I am, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I caution you to make sure you keep your comments well away from that. Continue.

Mr MANDER: I will. The report was brought down on 30 November, but we had to wait at least 10 weeks to see the government's response to it. When the response was brought down it became quite apparent why there was a wait. A number of the signature policies—

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is clearly anticipating the debate we will shortly have in this House. I think he is in breach of the rules of anticipation in talking about the government's response to the report.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I am happy while your comments refer to the review but not if they go anywhere towards anticipating debate.

Mr MANDER: Absolutely, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am very aware of that.

We had a delayed response to the report. We had to wait 10 weeks for it. We realised that it was because a number of the signature policies were policies the LNP had already announced. We announced the no-body no-parole policy at the end of December.

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is clearly what the member will continue to say in his speech when the legislation comes before the House. He is clearly anticipating the debate that is yet to come in this House.

Mr MANDER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am speaking about the review. It is quite obvious what I am speaking about.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, I am happy for you to talk about the review, not the government response nor the bill that is to come before the House. For the third time I will say: do not anticipate debate on this bill.

Mr MANDER: I am well aware of that and I am not anticipating the debate. I am talking about the review that was done and a number of the recommendations in the report. A number of those recommendations will lead to even more reviews.

Mr Cramp: That is perfect for Labor.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Gaven. This government is addicted to reviews. It has had over 150 reviews. A government that reviews is a government that does not act. In terms of this particular issue, it is very important we ensure public safety, to ensure people have confidence in the system.

This side of the House is concerned that this review is going to lead to more reviews and the words that we hear are 'explore options', 'evaluate', 'consider the purview'—these are the types of things that we are worried about hearing again—'consider the alternatives', 'evaluate', 'put an independent evaluation committee together'. These are the types of things that raise concerns in the

community and that say everything about this government. This government is about reviewing and is not about action, but it should come as no surprise whatsoever that these are the types of things that are happening. We have already seen 150 reviews from this government so far.

Mr Cramp interjected.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Gaven. What we want to see here is action. We want to see the community protected. We want to make sure that the recommendations of the review are implemented as quickly as possible so members of the public can have confidence that they are going to be safe and that people are not going to be released into the community when they are not ready to be released into the community. We need to err on the side of caution.

Mr POWER: I rise to a point of order. When referring to the substance of the bill before the House, the member talking about whether prisoners will be released at the correct time while on parole means that he is clearly anticipating debate of legislation before the House.

Mr MANDER: Third time lucky!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Member for Everton, I am inclined to agree with the member for Logan. I think you have stepped too far. You have 43 seconds left and this is the fourth time that I have told you in this five minutes.

Mr MANDER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. We are concerned that a review that has been presented to the government will simply lead to another review—not just one review but 13 reviews. Fifteen reviews or 20 reviews could happen. We believe that the recommendations need to be enacted quickly. We need to give assurance to the community that it will be safe and that anybody who is released from prison has been rehabilitated and that they have proven that they can be released back into the community.

Queensland Building Plan

Ms FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (12.51 pm): I do not imagine that a member of parliament in this House has not had at least one subcontractor sit across the desk from them in desperate circumstances because they have not been paid for a job. If they are lucky they will get paid eventually; if they are unlucky they will never, ever get paid. As a member of parliament I have sat and listened to those stories and felt completely anguished for those people and completely frustrated that there is nothing in law that I can do to help them. I hear those good, hardworking people from my electorate tell of recurring nightmares from the worry of mounting debts. I hear of the stress putting just too much strain on their marriages or, worse, of people taking their own lives because they just could not find their way clear of dealing with the financial ruin. We are talking about injustice—plain and simple.

The Palaszczuk government is about many things. We are about creating jobs, about restoring front-line services, about providing stability to Queenslanders, about listening and about many other things but also about righting wrongs. That is why I am so pleased about the Queensland Building Plan, which the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport has developed and is personally championing across the state because we need to fix what is happening to subcontractors. We need to make sure they get paid on time and in full, and that is what this plan proposes.

The plan is about many other things, too, and last Friday I was delighted to see so many people from my electorate and the electorates of the members for Greenslopes and Lytton—it was wonderful to see them both there as I know both of them have a personal commitment to addressing these issues—at the consultation on the new Queensland Building Plan which we were privileged to host at our local Colmslie Hotel. The plan proposes wideranging historic reforms to the building and construction industry in this state, and the consultation schedule that has been put in place by the minister—the minister is attending every single one of the consultation events—means that people in my local patch and across the state are both informed about what is being proposed and able to have a say, able to help us make sure we get things right.

I went out of my way to make sure that every single person I could think of received an invitation from me to this consultation—subcontractors, architects, designers, planners, builders, people interested in preserving the heritage and sustainability of our buildings, people concerned about our buildings reflecting appropriate support for people with disabilities, those interested in the future of our environment, home owners, mums and dads who are thinking of building. You name it and they were invited, and they came in their droves. That breadth of interest really tells the story of just how far reaching this plan is. It touches so many people.

It touches the people of Power Street in Norman Park and surrounds who one day late last year found—without warning—that two character houses in their neighbourhood had been demolished and consequently that the loopholes around certification in this state are big enough to drive a truck through. I thank the minister so much for meeting with Power Street residents as we work through the ways in which things like this can be prevented from ever happening again. The plan touches Wendy, who as an architect has a vital interest in the good and responsible design of our buildings but as a sufferer of multiple sclerosis has an equally vital interest in our buildings being accessible to and supportive of people with disabilities. I thank her for the many conversations we have had as she has educated me in the way governments should be thinking of these issues.

It touches David and Mary-Lou, who have a lifelong commitment to sustainability and whose work is based on providing businesses and consumers world-wide with the means to assess the sustainability of their products and make responsible decisions. It covers licensing, the Home Warranty Scheme, plumbing and drainage, the Queensland Housing Code, nonconforming building products and liveable housing design. The home page of the plan's website could not say it any better. It states—

Every day, tens of thousands of men and women across Queensland start and finish their day contributing to our State through their work in the building and construction industry.

They don't just build houses or apartments or office blocks, they build the communities in which we live and work ...

Queensland needs a plan that acknowledges that impact and sets the long-term strategic direction for building and construction in the State. A plan that guides changes to policy and legislation so we can have a safer, fairer, and more sustainable industry that creates job opportunities and economic growth.

We need a plan that will foster a confident and successful building sector where businesses benefit from better processes, are paid on time and take pride in their high quality work. And we need a plan that enhances consumer confidence in the industry, ensures the right person and materials for the job, and drives innovative, liveable and sustainable design.

That is what this is about and that is what this government is about. I congratulate the many people, including the hardworking public servants, who have been responsible for putting this plan together and most of all the minister, whose personal passion for driving this reform is remarkable.

Abortion Law Reform

Mr PYNE (Cairns—Ind) (12.56 pm): Today I was happy to secure a commitment from this government to reform abortion laws in the state of Queensland. This commitment is consistent with my belief that in 2017 there should be no place for this procedure in the Criminal Code and that it should be treated as a women's health issue. Yesterday the Leader of the Opposition basically reneged on his commitment to give LNP members a conscience vote. It became clear that a majority of MPs were not prepared to support my bills despite the weight of public opinion. I table an article from the *Courier-Mail* dated 21 February 2017 stating that over 80 per cent of Queenslanders favour removing this procedure from the Criminal Code.

T*abled paper:* Articles from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 21 February 2017, titled 'Most want abortion to be decriminalised, survey says' and 'Drag Queensland's abortion laws out of the 19th century' [290].

I say to Catholic MPs: Pope Francis has given all priests the power to forgive women who have had an abortion, saying that God's mercy could wipe it away for those with a repentant heart. This move marked the end of the Vatican's Holy Year of Mercy in 2016. Pope Francis said that we should focus on the personal situations that force some women to get abortions, saying that he was well aware of the pressures that led to this decision. Pope Francis has indefinitely extended priests' rights to grant forgiveness. This shows an understanding that each woman's situation is unique to her. I applaud this leadership from the Pope.

This is an emotive area and there has been considerable misinformation distributed as part of this debate. One misconception is that people who are pro choice are in some way pro abortion and seek to have more abortions performed. I have never met anyone who is pro abortion, least of all the medical specialists who perform this procedure. As part of their care, these medical professionals offer valuable advice on women's sexual health and provide sound advice on contraception. I am disappointed that misinformation has been circulated that decriminalisation would encourage terminations up to nine months. Such claims are unfounded, nonsensical and offensive. Indeed, the only medical intervention that occurs at nine months is to induce labour. The only other name for what happens at nine months is childbirth. Regarding late-term abortions, an estimated 1.3 per cent of abortions happen later than 21 weeks into pregnancy and sometimes obstetricians will induce labour

at 36 weeks due to anencephaly, where a major portion of the brain is missing and the baby cannot survive, but this procedure is not called an abortion. It is induced labour to deliver a baby that will not live.

That is tragic and for others to make politics with these sad cases is one of the lowest things I have ever heard. Queensland and New South Wales are the last two states to not update legislation to protect vulnerable women, and doctors who are risking prosecution to assist them. Removing the termination of pregnancy from the Criminal Code will place abortion where it should be: in the hands of women, their healthcare providers and support services. We must improve clarity for health professionals and patients in the area of medical termination of pregnancy. It is not acceptable that many medical practitioners perform their duties under the risk of criminal prosecution. Can members of this Legislative Assembly honestly say that, if abortion was not already in the Queensland Criminal Code, we would vote to have it included in the code as a crime? I sincerely doubt it.

Abortion in Australia had previously been regulated by colonial law—before the end of the 19th century. It is now time to change the law. The great tide of history is in favour of women's emancipation. In 1902 women were granted the right to vote. In 1922, the CWA was founded. In 1961, the pill became available. In 1962, women were given access to pubs. In 2010, the first female was elected as our Prime Minister. There is no better time than 2017 to guarantee a woman's right to choose. It is a better time than ever to end the uncertainty surrounding the medical termination of pregnancy to promote and advance the law for Queensland women. I look forward to the recommendations of the Queensland Law Reform Commission later this year and to a re-elected Labor government introducing legislation into this House in line with the commitment given today.

National Red Balloon Day; Maryborough Electorate; Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements

Mr SAUNDERS (Maryborough—ALP) (1.01 pm): Firstly, I would like to acknowledge all the firefighters on this National Red Balloon Day. I would like to congratulate them, because they are marvellous people in our communities. I would like to thank them for the great job they do in getting around in their red trucks to keep the residents of Queensland safe, including the fine residents of that great Queensland city of Maryborough.

I would like to talk about the achievements of the Palaszczuk government and what it has done for my electorate over the past two years. The member for Gladstone talked about mayors and councils. I really think the member for Nanango should come up and talk to the Fraser Coast Regional Council about the $12.5 million that is going to benefit the Fraser Coast Regional Council area, which includes Maryborough. That funding has created a lot of work and kept people in employment—a lot of job creation projects that would not have happened if they were not brought forward under a three-year plan.

One of those projects is the revitalisation of the Maryborough CBD. Over countless years, the Maryborough CBD was neglected. Through this money the footpaths will be brought up to standard, which will bring people and shops back to the CBD. Already people have been talking to shop owners about opening up shops in the CBD. Along with that revitalisation of the Maryborough CBD is the new pontoon that will be put in the Mary River. That pontoon will be used to facilitate tourist boats coming up the river which, in turn, will bring tourists to the Maryborough CBD.

The other big announcement for Maryborough was the $1.8 million upgrade to Queen's Park. It is the jewel in the crown in Wide Bay. It is a fantastic park but, over the years, owing to a lack of money it has been neglected. Who delivered the money to upgrade this park with better lighting, which will make the park family friendly? The Palaszczuk Labor government. In case the members opposite did not hear that, I will repeat that: the Palaszczuk Labor government. There is an allocation of $1.8 million for better lighting for Queen's Park, which will make the park better for families. On a hot night in Maryborough, parents will be able to go into the park with their children and have a great time because there will be lighting and better seating. That is all being delivered by a Palaszczuk Labor government.

Mr Pyne interjected.

Mr SAUNDERS: I take that interjection from the member for Cairns, who said that the local member has been the best one for years.

Mr Madden: That wasn't exactly what he said.

Mr SAUNDERS: I say to the member for Ipswich West that I heard it with my own ears. Another great thing that has happened in Maryborough is the reopening of TAFE. I see the minister sitting there. The other day in the main street I got a hug from a lady whose daughter is able to go back to TAFE in Maryborough. Otherwise, she would have had to leave the city. She is staying at home, living with her family.

Ms Pease: Spending money in Maryborough.

Mr SAUNDERS: I take that interjection from the member for Lytton. She is spending money in the community. That TAFE is a great benefit to my community. The restoration of TAFE is bringing education levels up to standard right across the state and I thank the minister for that.

After the devastating cuts that that hospital received from the three years of the LNP, the budget for my local hospital has been increased year after year by the Palaszczuk Labor government. The hospital has pathology services restored, which was a Palaszczuk Labor government initiative. Money has been spent on the hospital and services are improving daily.

Money has also been spent on the schools to lift educational standards. The maintenance that has been carried out on school buildings is phenomenal. Once again, who delivered it? The Palaszczuk Labor government. The members of the opposition say that this government is asleep at the wheel. I ask the members opposite: if this government is asleep at the wheel, what happened to their government for three years? The Palaszczuk Labor government is delivering. It is unbelievable what is happening in my electorate and in other electorates throughout Queensland. I talk to people throughout Queensland and they tell me that they are very happy with the Palaszczuk Labor government. From Longreach, to Mount Isa, to Townsville, to Yeppoon, people are telling me that they are very happy with this government and what a breath of fresh air it has brought to Queensland over the past two years and continues to do so.

In my electorate, the Burrum Heads-Pialba Road was a dangerous road. Who fixed this road? The Palaszczuk Labor government. I would like to thank the Minister for Main Roads, the member for Yeerongpilly, for his great work. The minister came up to my area and drove along the road with the engineers and saw the problems firsthand. He then delivered. He came back and said, 'This road has to be fixed, because it is a major feeder road in the Maryborough electorate.'

Queensland is on the move and it is moving in the right direction because of the Palaszczuk Labor government. We will continue to put Queensland on the right track.

Sitting suspended from 1.06 pm to 2.40 pm.

MENTAL HEALTH AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 30 November 2016 (see p. 4702).

Second Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.40 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I would like to thank the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee for its consideration of the bill and, in particular, acknowledge the member for Nudgee's leadership as the committee chair. I thank the government members who support the passage of the bill. I note the statement of reservations by opposition members of the committee.

As all honourable members know, the act will, for the first time, give the Magistrates Court the power to properly deal with people who are affected by mental illness who appear before them. This is a position that has been supported by both the government and the opposition through various iterations of the mental health bills presented in this House, including a bill introduced by the member for Southern Downs when he was minister for health. This is a significant change that will be supported by a revitalised Court Liaison Service, which will assist the Magistrates Court to assess mental health issues and for individuals to commence treatment where appropriate.

As with any major change, implementation issues will arise and the department has been working closely with the Chief Magistrate to prepare for these changes. The Chief Magistrate, working closely with other legal stakeholders, identified a particular concern whereby information provided to the Court

Liaison Service for the purpose of assessment could be incriminating if the individual is subsequently deemed to be of sound mind. The Chief Magistrate raised the issue with me in his letter dated 1 September 2016, which I table.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 1 September 2016, from the Chief Magistrate, Judge Orazio Rinaudo, to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services, Hon. Cameron Dick, regarding proposed amendment to the Mental Health Act 2016 [291].

I would encourage all members to review this letter. We need the cooperation of the Chief Magistrate, the magistracy and the broader legal community if we are to make a success of the new Mental Health Act, which was supported by this House, and we should consider their submissions carefully.

This bill is an opportunity for all members of this House to give effect to the bipartisan will of this parliament and to ensure that we have a Court Liaison Service that is trusted by those who come before it and, as a consequence, is used. The real risk is if the substantive bill is not passed the Court Liaison Service may not be used or may be avoided altogether.

I turn now to the specific issues raised by opposition members in their statement of reservations. Opposition members expressed concern about the time frames to examine a person under an examination authority if the person was brought to a public sector health service facility, especially in regional and remote areas. The requirement for a person only to be detained for six hours with the possibility of extension to 12 hours is, of course, a safeguard for the person. The same time periods apply for examination orders made by magistrates and emergency examination authorities made under the Public Health Act 2005.

The availability of suitable clinicians will not be an issue as a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner will be actioning the examination authority in the first place. An examination authority enables a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner to enter a place, such as a person's home, to examine a person without the person's consent. Police may assist in this process. Examination authorities are a last resort where there are serious concerns about a person's health and wellbeing and it has not been possible for the person to be examined with consent.

An authorised mental health service will be very much engaged in the process leading up to the making of an examination authority and in many cases will have made the application to the Mental Health Review Tribunal. As such, clinicians in the service will be involved in planning for the actioning of an examination authority. In many instances the examination will be completed straight away in the person's home. This may result in the person agreeing to voluntary treatment, a recommendation for assessment being made for the person or no further clinical action being taken. In some cases the doctor or authorised mental health practitioner may form the view that the examination of a person would be better undertaken in a public sector health service facility, for example, if the doctor or authorised mental health practitioner is unable to make a clinical decision at the time. The person will then be transported to a public sector health service facility. As a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner initiated the actioning of the examination authority in the first place, they will be available to make further examinations in the public sector health service facility.

The opposition also sought further information on the approach in other jurisdictions to the admissibility of reports by court liaison services. The approach to providing reports to magistrates varies greatly between jurisdictions. It is largely the case that court liaison services in other jurisdictions do not provide fit-for-trial and unsound mind reports. Their focus is on the provision of advice regarding immediate treatment needs and associated diversionary options. In some cases magistrates in other jurisdictions may request a psychiatric report on a case-by-case basis.

Queensland will be the only jurisdiction to have a comprehensive service for offering these reports for simple offences. So that full and frank discussions between an individual and a health practitioner can occur, it is important that individuals are confident that any self-incriminating statements made by them to a health practitioner cannot be used against them in criminal or civil proceedings. The enhanced role of the Court Liaison Service in undertaking mental health assessments for the purpose of assessing fitness for trial and unsoundness of mind is a new feature of the mental health legislative framework.

Further to my ministerial statement in the House this morning, I advise the House that I will be moving amendments during the consideration in detail of this bill to rectify issues arising from a former member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal being appointed as a lawyer member who was not fully qualified to serve in that role. These amendments have been circulated along with the explanatory notes. I am advised that the member was first appointed to the tribunal in 2002. The most recent

appointment of the member occurred in 2014 by the Newman government. The member has not sat on the tribunal since August 2016. The specific issue is that, although the member was awarded a law degree in the mid 1990s, the member had not been admitted to practise as a lawyer by the Supreme Court of Queensland or equivalent. This falls short of the legal requirements established by the Mental Health Act, which requires that a lawyer member is a legal practitioner of at least five years standing. I am advised that, as a result, decisions made when the tribunal was constituted by that member may be subject to challenge.

It is important to point out that the member never made decisions on their own. They were always a member of a two- or three-member panel with other validly appointed members. There are approximately 95 members of the tribunal who sit sessionally as part of a panel. I am advised that the only way that we can ensure certainty is to introduce legislative amendments that retrospectively ensure the validity of those decisions.

Despite the member's lack of qualifications as prescribed by the act, members can be confident that there are a number of safeguards that have acted to protect the interests of the community and individuals. Firstly, the tribunal member never made a decision acting alone. Decisions made by the member were always with at least one other validly appointed member—usually two other persons. Secondly, around 98 per cent of decisions made by the member involved matters which were subsequently reviewed by a properly constituted tribunal or another responsible person under the act. Thirdly, analysis of those decisions by the Queensland Health Chief Psychiatrist shows the pattern of decisions in tribunals involving the member were consistent with decisions made by other members. Fourthly, all decisions relevant to the treatment of an individual could be appealed to the Mental Health Court, which is made up of judges of the Supreme Court. Fifthly, the Attorney-General was represented at hearings in relation to forensic orders and could appeal decisions.

It is also important to understand the policy rationale that underlies the makeup of the tribunal. The tribunal is constituted of three types of members: psychiatrist member, legal member and community member. Those different types of members represent the different interests that should be considered in making decisions about involuntary treatment for individuals. The community interests should be considered through the community member: this would include concerns about safety. There should be appropriate clinical expertise through the psychiatrist member: this would include assessing the risk of poor outcomes if treatment is not continued. The rights of the individual should be considered principally through the legal member. In this instance, there has been a defect in the appointment of the legal member, so the interest that may not have been appropriately represented is that of the individual's rights. That is why the right of review is made principally to individuals subject to treatment, although in some cases it may involve others.

Lastly, as I have mentioned, we will establish a right of review with this amendment that will be available to victims in particular circumstances. That is because the right of review is available to persons subject to a decision. This will include applicants to the Mental Health Review Tribunal for forensic information orders. As members will be aware, the act provides for victims or another relevant person to apply to the Mental Health Review Tribunal to receive information about forensic patients. If a victim or other person was denied that forensic information order, they will also have access to a right of review under the amendment that I will be moving.

I wish to reiterate that important safeguards have applied, as I articulated earlier. The department has moved as quickly as possible to assess the impact and prepare a response to resolve the uncertainty surrounding this matter. I trust that the information I have put before the House will assist members in supporting the bill. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (2.51 pm): I rise to speak to the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. The Mental Health Act is due to commence on 5 March. With this bill, the opposition has expressed concern about the number of amendments to an act that was passed only relatively recently. We are very concerned that, in rushing to overshadow the previous LNP bill, Labor got it very wrong. In fact, they got it wrong 54 times, which is the number of amendments that we have seen prior to the amendments that the honourable minister mentioned he will bring in with very short notice today. The implementation committee that oversees the preparation for the new regime has, as I have said, proposed 54 amendments to the act before it has even commenced.

This bill presents us with some bolt-on fixes that do little to aid the function of the legislation. Forty-five per cent of Australians will be affected by a mental health disorder at some point in their lifetime. Twenty per cent of those people will experience mental health issues in a 12-month period. As such, it is integral that the government legislates to support people living with a mental illness, while ensuring that our courts are operating to meet community expectations.

Under Labor, what we have seen is a dysfunctional system. We have seen a cut-and-paste report being used by the Mental Health Review Tribunal that included inaccuracies. We have seen the Mental Health Review Tribunal allegedly under investigation for nepotism. As we have just heard from the minister, we have seen within the Mental Health Review Tribunal people who are apparently unqualified overseeing important cases. The list goes on.

I have been speaking with the families of victims who have been seriously assaulted or worse by people affected by mental health issues. It is disgraceful that hearings of this nature are held behind closed doors. It is not the same in New South Wales. Families of victims have expressed to me their concerns about the difference between what happens in similar tribunals in New South Wales compared to Queensland. Families who are locked out of hearings are encouraged to provide a written statement but receive little communication outside of that. The families that I have been speaking to tell me that, in their cases, murderers have been let out into the community once a week without supervision after six months of committing the offence and have been let out without supervision for seven days a week one year after committing the offence. Those families had no knowledge of what was happening at the tribunal, they were not advised and often privacy provisions are quoted to them when they seek more information.

There is a major discrepancy between community expectations and how our mental health courts are currently operating. The safety of our community is in jeopardy under the current system. Not only is the system itself flawed; the bill before us fails Queenslanders. Clauses 3, 4 and 8 of the bill prescribe a one-size-fits-all approach to both cities and rural and regional areas. Once again, we have seen this Brisbane-centric Labor government overlook people who reside in our rural and regional areas.

Clause 3 inserts maximum time frames for which a person may be detained for the purpose of an examination to decide whether the person should be further assessed. This proposed amendment would replace the current wording of 'the period reasonably necessary for the examination'. The proposed detention periods are up to six hours, with an extension of an additional six hours if required, in an AMHS, authorised mental health service, or a PSHSF, public sector health service facility, or up to one hour in any other place. Clause 4 imposes a similar obligation by providing a maximum time frame that would apply to persons being detained for a mental health assessment conducted in an AMHS or PSHSF. In this case, the bill applies a maximum 24-hour period. A six-hour maximum time frame is proposed for a person to be detained at an authorised mental health service or public sector health service facility for a treatment authority review.

The Queensland branch of the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists raised concerns about putting time limit on assessments. They stated that regional and remote health services will not be able to meet their legislative obligations, saying in their submission—

> The clause does not take into account the difficulties experienced in rural and remote areas of Queensland where there is restricted access to health services and authorised doctors or authorised mental health practitioners, due to the lack of resources in these areas.

It is my view that the existing wording is insufficient unless the government can offer some alternative option or additional resources for regional Queensland, to ensure that they can meet the legislative requirements. Unlike Labor, the LNP knows that the last thing people living in regional and rural areas need is to create a strain on resources that are imposed by a regime modelled around cities. From the advice provided to date from the government, I am not confident that this will not be compromised with the placing of upper limits.

Under the Mental Health Act 2017, if a person is charged with a simple offence and a Magistrates Court is reasonably satisfied that the person was of unsound mind at the time of the offence or is unfit to stand trial, the Magistrates Court may dismiss the charge or adjourn the hearing of the charge. The Magistrates Court will be supported by the Court Liaison Service in Queensland Health in making those determinations.

There are two instances in which a magistrate can seek an examination order. If a Magistrates Court has dismissed a charge due to a finding of unsound mind or unfitness for trial or adjourned a hearing because the person is temporarily unfit for trial, the magistrate may make an examination order in relation to the person. Alternatively, the magistrate may make an examination order on the basis that it would benefit the person, even without dismissing or adjourning the charge. Currently, the section that dictates this, section 180, states that examination reports are admissible in proceedings against the person in which the examination order is made or any future proceeding against the person to which the examination report is relevant. This provision was intended to ensure that the examining doctor

could provide the examination report to the Magistrates Court without breaching the confidentiality provisions detailed in the Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011. The report assists the Magistrates Court to decide whether to make another examination order or refer a matter to the Mental Health Court.

The bill before us proposes amendments to section 180 and 180A. The amendment states that any oral or written statements made by a person during an assessment regarding unsoundness of mind or fitness for trial are not admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding and that, during an examination conducted pursuant to a Magistrates Court examination order, are not admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding.

The proposed changes are said to have come about from legal stakeholders who claim that the section in its current form may allow statements by the person of the alleged offence to be introduced as evidence. There is a suggestion this may deter someone from being frank and forthright in the process and compromise the assessment. Under the previous mental health bill—introduced by the former shadow minister, the member for Caloundra, which we on this side of the House supported—the section contained no prescription as is being proposed in this change. Whilst I appreciate the statement from the minister that this was raised by the Chief Justice, it was not raised in either the 2014 consultation or in the rigorous consultation on both the LNP and Labor bills in 2015.

This may be what the lawyers think is best, but the question is: is this the right balance? This is particularly so when we consider that there is no uniformity on this issue across jurisdictions. Legislation in New South Wales and South Australia does not expressly limit the admissibility of statements made during a mental health assessment or examination in civil and criminal proceedings. Alternatively, these frameworks limit the decision-maker's ability to consider the statement. According to the explanatory notes, all other Australian states and territories have equivalent provisions which provide that statements made by a person during a mental health assessment or examination are not admissible in a way that is detrimental to the person's interests in relation to findings of criminal guilt.

This now brings me to the urgent amendments being rushed into parliament. It is my concern that the urgent amendments being rushed into the parliament—for all that we may have had some issues raised by committee members in their consideration of the bill—are now tainting the bill. As the amendments have not been subject to rigorous scrutiny and this issue has only arisen over the last week, we on this side of the House have major concerns with them being rushed through.

Most of the details I, like most other Queenslanders, read for the first time in Saturday's *Courier-Mail*. I do want to acknowledge that the minister rang me about this when I was in North Queensland on Friday. I express my concern that a briefing of five or 10 minutes about such a significant issue followed by a *Courier-Mail* story being printed on Saturday which failed to adequately explain all of the issues and the questions that have arisen from the announcements that we have had since Saturday and the rushed additional amendments to the bill mean that the LNP will not be supporting this bill.

Mr Dick: And you were briefed yesterday—say that.

Mr LANGBROEK: I am also prepared to acknowledge that I was briefed by departmental advisers about the content of the amendments, but it is this side of the House that has to make a judgement about amendments that are being brought to the House and whether they are ones that we are prepared to support.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr LANGBROEK: We had no call in August 2016 when this issue apparently first came to light. We had no call from the minister in December or when he apparently referred these matters for further investigation in late December just before Christmas. It strikes me that the minister actually called me on Friday when it was obvious that the *Courier-Mail* was going to do a story on this on Saturday. That is why I got the call on Friday. In the spirit of goodwill, there was only a briefing to try to head off the trouble before the story in the paper.

The reason I and members on this side feel so concerned about this is that I have spoken to victims and family members who have been affected by the decisions of this tribunal. I know that these victims and family members have to deal with the tribunal every six months. They already harbour distrust and have no confidence in the process. They were disappointed that the minister chose to speak to the media over speaking to them.

Let us take the tragic murder of Bianca Girven. Her mother, Sonia Anderson, many in the House would know is a tireless supporter of victims of domestic violence following her daughter's murder. What many people do not know is that Sonia's daughter's killer and ex-partner had a forensic order revoked by the Mental Health Review Tribunal shortly before he killed her daughter. It was a decision that found

he was of sound mind and free to go back unchecked into the community. It is families like this who have now had their lives thrown into disarray because of the issues that have been exposed over the last week.

The decision that was made at the tribunal at the time is believed to be one which Anne-Maree Roche is alleged to have sat on. Worse still is that after killing Bianca her ex-partner and killer was again found of unsound mind by the Mental Health Court and once again he was back before the Mental Health Review Tribunal every six months. He is back before the very same tribunal that let him walk free.

Sonia was horrified to have read in Saturday's paper the complete disaster in the tribunal. She, like many other families I have met, was left asking why the minister had chosen to brief the media instead of the people caught up in the process. What is worse still, as I am advised, is that the Queensland Health Victim Support Service, that supports the families of victims killed by people being reviewed by the tribunal, was only told yesterday of the legal bungle and only after families were contacting them wanting answers.

When I am briefed that there are no issues from the department and the minister's office or reassured that people will have a right to approach a special tribunal that I know is in this legislation, I am disappointed that families impacted by this have been ignored. Just this morning I received a letter from Sonia Anderson that outlines her concerns about the way this whole debacle has been handled. I will read some segments of the letter for the benefit of the parliament. The letter is dated today. It reads—

Since the violent and heinous murder of my daughter Bianca Faith Girven in 2010, I have had zero faith in the workings of the Mental Health Tribunal in Queensland with very good reason.

In August 2009 [the offender] had a Forensic Health Order revoked by the MHRT. [It was a hearing] of the MHRT where this order was revoked ... Not only was the FHO revoked by the Tribunal, but NO stipulations were placed on [him] to NOT use illicit drugs. It has been proven that [his] paranoid schizophrenia, and the likelihood of committing violent offences, were exacerbated by his ongoing use of illicit drugs, alcohol and his choice to not use prescribed medication.

The MHRT declared [him] to be of sound mind, free to be in our community with no orders in place to reduce his risk. 7 months later, my daughter was dead. The day after her murder [he was] assessed … and … he was of sound mind and was simply upset his girlfriend had died.

The MHRT exists under a veil of secrecy, and it would appear to be under the scrutiny of no-one. Case in point this new information that came to light in the Courier Mail on the weekend, Anne Maree Roche has sat on the Tribunal for many years and was involved in making these kinds of obviously unsound, unjust and in Bianca's case, death causing decisions.

In 2014, the Mental Health Court found [the perpetrator] to have been of unsound mind on 30th March 2010 (retrospectively). The Court made very strong statements about how dangerous [he] is, not only due to paranoid schizophrenia, but also his ... desire to kill people. Just 6 months later [he] is back before the MHRT, who are to make decisions to grant him LCT and allow him to enter back into our community; this is ongoing, every single 6 months. The strong decisions made by the Mental Health Court as to his dangerousness are no longer a factor. And here is the next veil of secrecy, I am not allowed to tell you any information I have on [his] Limited Community Treatment granted by the MHRT!!

She continues to speak about other offenders in the system who then found out about her other daughter through their contacts with the perpetrator and the frightening situation she then faced of other people who had been found to be of unsound mind and associates of the perpetrator then getting in contact with her other daughter. Sonia Anderson has through her very passionate letter expressed her concern that she has no faith in the current system.

She mentioned that she phoned the QHVSS, the victims support group, and they only knew of the issues as families had phoned them. They instructed her to write to the president with her concerns. She says that she does not accept any decisions being made by parliament with regard to Ms Roche's suitability to sit on the MHRT until her concerns have been addressed. That is a letter from the mother of a victim in a very tragic case.

This is a colossal legal mess. We are talking about more than 11,000 cases that need to be reviewed. I think it is important to review the time line of events to get this into some form of perspective. We are being asked to grandfather the invalid appointment of this member by the former Labor government in 2002 and the reappointment on at least three other occasions, including—I am prepared to acknowledge and unhappy to acknowledge—the reappointment in 2014 under the LNP government. What is most disturbing is that the president knew about this issue in October, raised it with the minister in December and we are only now hearing about it two months later with no consultation.

What is worse is that we know that the tribunal is in disarray. There are allegations of nepotism said to be being investigated. It is alleged that the wives of both the president and the CEO are employed. We know that when allegations levelled against this member came to light the minister did

not tell the House that those allegations also included bias that saw a large amount of work being given to this unauthorised member. Furthermore, there is the broader community distrust of the secretive way in which the tribunal conducts its business.

As I have mentioned already, in New South Wales it is a different situation where victims are encouraged to participate in tribunal proceedings. Victims and families of victims in Queensland are forced to fill in repetitious forms every six months and be kept in the dark for weeks after any decision. In one of the recent cases where I met family members, they had not been advised that the person who had killed their mother was actually facing the tribunal. They did not receive any notification. It was that person who was subsequently given one-day-a-week release to the community, yet they had not been advised that he was coming before the tribunal at all. There is nothing in the current process that could give a mother and a father whose daughter or son was murdered any confidence in the tribunal when the killer is released onto the streets under limited community treatment which can be done as soon as six months after the Mental Health Court makes a determination to have them locked in a secure facility.

We on this side of the House share the same reservation about the mental health process. We need a balance between community safety and consumer rights. It was the Premier who would accuse the LNP when in government of rushing things through. This is a critical error that should have gone to a committee and been properly examined. Furthermore, allow the community to have a say on this issue and express their views. If we have to better accept and understand mental illness, we need to have confidence in the system designed to protect us.

There are other recent circumstances that are still before the courts, and I know that there are many people who are wondering about the progress of those particular cases, including the recent murder of a bus driver where the offender was under a mental health order. More information should be provided for people to have confidence in the system. Will the review as to how the mental health system failed be made public? This can be said for many other cases.

I know the minister is hanging his hat on the amendments before the House being supported by the Chief Magistrate. As I understand, that letter that I saw was from September. That is an endorsement for one change that was obtained in September 2016. I wonder what the Chief Magistrate would say about the rushing through of amendments to validate unsound decisions of the tribunal. Would the Chief Magistrate support the retrospective validation of an unlawful appointment being made by an alleged dishonest person who failed to disclose the error of their appointment, as proposed by the urgent amendments we will be asked to vote on?

In conclusion, I can say that, aside from the urgent amendment from the floor today, the LNP cannot support this bill. It is a patchwork policy which attempts to fix an already dysfunctional system. The bill lets down those with a mental illness. It lets down people in rural and regional areas. It lets down the people of Queensland, who rightly expect to be safe in our community. What we heard this morning in the hollow explanation from the minister further reinforced what is wrong with the system. Not once did he mention victims or families who have been harmed by people released by the tribunal or who are regularly subjected to ongoing emotional harm at decisions of the tribunal. What is more is the fact that none of the questions raised have been adequately answered. For that reason the LNP will not be supporting the amendments before the House. I can flag now that we will not be supporting any rushed amendments that have not been properly investigated.

Ms LINARD (Nudgee—ALP) (3.13 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. As members are aware, the parliament last year passed the Mental Health Act 2016, which provides a regulatory framework for the respectful treatment of people who are unable to make decisions about their own treatment and care, and balances treatment needs with the needs of the community. The bill represented a modernising of the act and rectified a perceived deficiency in the previous mental health legal framework in Queensland by expressly enabling magistrates to discharge persons who appear to have been of unsound mind at the time of an alleged offence or who are unfit for trial. The act received royal assent on 4 March 2016 and is due to commence on 5 March 2017.

As the minister has outlined, since the bill was passed the Department of Health has been working closely with stakeholders in preparation for commencement of the new act, particularly in regard to the enhanced and broadened functions of the existing Court Liaison Service to support innovation in the Magistrates Court. During this process, the Chief Magistrate and other members of the Court Liaison Service Steering Committee, established to implement the act, identified an amendment that should be made before the new act commences to ensure that statements made by a defendant during mental health assessments and examinations are inadmissible in criminal and civil proceedings.

Under the act, to assist the court in determining the person's soundness of mind or fitness to stand trial, a mental health assessment may be conducted by the Court Liaison Service. If the court dismisses the charge or adjourns the hearing or otherwise believes it would benefit the person, the court may make an examination order. To make an examination order, the court must be satisfied the person has a mental illness or be unable to decide whether the person has a mental illness or another mental condition. An examination order allows the person to be temporarily detained for examination in a public sector health service facility or an authorised mental health service. A mental health examination is used to decide whether to make a treatment authority for the person, providing lawful authority to treat them if they lack the capacity to consent to treatment; make a recommendation for the person's treatment and care; or change the nature and extent of treatment and care provided to the person under an existing authority or order.

A mental health examination is intended to inform clinical decision-making about the person's mental health care and treatment, not to inform the court about criminal responsibility or fitness to stand trial. However, under section 180 of the act as it currently stands, the examination report, including details of the examination, would be admissible against the person in the criminal or civil proceeding for which the examination order was made and any future proceeding to which it is relevant. The valid concern raised is that, if this amendment is not made, defendants risk making statements during an assessment or examination that are admissible in criminal and civil proceedings against a defendant's interests in relation to findings of guilt. For this reason, they would likely be advised by their counsel not to engage in an assessment or examination, hence frustrating the Magistrates Court's ability to determine fitness for trial and soundness of mind. The proposed amendments seek to clarify this situation under the law so that oral or written statements made by a defendant during an assessment regarding unsoundness of mind or fitness for trial are not admissible in evidence against the defendant in any criminal or civil proceeding.

The bill also makes clarifying and technical amendments to improve the intended operation of the act upon its commencement on 5 March and makes clarifying commitments to the Public Health Act 2005 and Coroners Act 2003 to ensure the provisions of both acts operate as intended.

The committee's task was to consider the policy to be given effect by the bill and whether the bill has sufficient regard to fundamental legislative principles in the Legislative Standards Act 1992. Submitters were broadly supportive of the proposed amendments. One potential FLP issue was raised in regard to clause 6, removing the requirement for a treatment authority to contain information about treatment. The committee found, however, that on balance the bill has sufficient regard to the rights and liberties of patients, their support network and legal representative in relation to access to information about a patient's treatment and care. In reaching this view the committee noted that an authorised doctor will be required to discuss the proposed treatment and care with the patient and nominated support person and that patients may request access to their health records, including details of their treatment and care, at any time.

After considering the submitted evidence, government members of the committee supported the passage of the bill. However, the committee was unable to reach a majority decision on whether the bill should be passed. Opposition members of the committee raised two questions which the minister has responded to in detail regarding time frames under the bill to examine a person under an examination authority and the approach taken in other jurisdictions to the admissibility of reports by court liaison services. In this regard, I note the minister's comments during his second reading speech that the requirement for a person only to be detained for six hours, with the possibility of extension to 12 hours, is a safeguard for the person and is consistent with the time period for examination orders made by magistrates and emergency examination authorities under the Public Health Act 2005; further, the availability of suitable clinicians will not be an issue, as a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner will be actioning the examination authority in the first place; and, in regard to the admissibility of reports, yes, Queensland will differ from other jurisdictions because Queensland will be the only jurisdiction to have a comprehensive service for offering these mental health assessment reports for simple offences.

The minister has advised the House that he will also be moving amendments during consideration in detail to rectify issues arising from a former member of the Mental Health Review Tribunal being appointed as a lawyer member who is not fully qualified to serve in that role. I note the minister's statement earlier today that the proposed amendments will have the effect of retrospectively validating affected decisions of the tribunal. Without this amendment, affected Queenslanders do not have certainty and clinicians who acted in good faith relying on the decisions of the tribunal may be at risk of legal action.

I thank the minister for acting so swiftly once these issues were identified to provide certainty to Queenslanders with mental illness, their families and their treating clinicians. I would like to thank those individuals and organisations who lodged written submissions and appeared at the committee's public hearing, and the Department of Health for its assistance with the committee's bill inquiry. It is imperative that we protect vulnerable Queenslanders living with a mental health condition, and the Palaszczuk government is committed to that end. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr McARDLE (Caloundra—LNP) (3.20 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the bill before the House. Before I do so, I seek the House's indulgence. I note that the member for Cairns has today withdrawn his two bills in relation to abortion and that matter will be referred to the Queensland Law Reform Commission. I would like to extend my appreciation to all members of the health committee, both current and past. The work undertaken was extensive and lengthy and at times emotional and draining. I would also like to extend my thanks to all submitters and witnesses who appeared before the committee. Finally, I want to thank in particular Ms Sue Cawcutt, who was the research director for all inquiries—and there were indeed three. She had an enormous task and performed exceptionally well. We all know that emotions run high in regard to this topic, but Ms Cawcutt maintained a professional approach, and this needs to be well and truly acknowledged.

Turning to the current bill, I acknowledge my fellow committee members and the secretariat. I begin by commenting that this health minister, when the opposition introduced the Mental Health (Recovery Model) Bill 2015, attacked the bill for failing to deal with a number of important issues and he later introduced the Mental Health Bill 2015 some four months later. However, we find today an amendment bill to be debated before the act even commences in March of this year. This House is to consider some 54 amendments over some 33 pages. This shows clearly that the process to develop the original bill by this health minister was flawed and below the standard required of a minister.

The bill deals with a number of matters, but I will deal with only two. They are also raised in the non-government members' statement of reservations. The bill at clause 15 prevents statements made during a mental health assessment or examination and an examination report from being admitted as evidence against a person in a criminal or civil proceeding. The history as to how this amendment came about is exceedingly worrying. The explanatory notes outline its background and this goes to the very heart of the poor drafting that occurred in preparing the initial bill. This issue only comes to light after the bill is passed and involved those departments that I assume would have been consulted when the bill was first being prepared. If they were not so consulted or involved, that is even more disturbing. The provision at clause 15 in effect makes statements inadmissible in any civil or criminal proceeding if they are made by the person during an examination or to a health practitioner or when a magistrate is considering making a decision under sections 172 or 173.

The committee's report at appendix C gives a jurisdictional comparison across the nation. Western Australia, the Northern Territory and the ACT do not have any provisions covering this point. The jurisdictions of South Australia, Tasmania and New South Wales have acts that, in essence, mirror Queensland's proposals. The Victorian legislation is a combination of prohibition and an exception if the release is in the interests of justice.

The non-government members' statement of reservation asks the minister to explain what has been the benefit of such legislation in states where it operates and what have been the negative outcomes where it does not exist. I repeat that question here today. If a person is questioned by police, that record of interview is admitted in evidence at a subsequent hearing. If they make no statement at the record of interview, that is also admitted into evidence at the later hearing. Why should there be an exception in the cases outlined in the bill before the House? That question has not been properly answered. Why should one set of individuals in this state be covered by a rule that deals with statements not being able to be admitted into evidence because of self-incrimination but the general public are not given such a luxury?

The second issue deals with clause 3 of the bill and, in particular, limits on the period of time a person may be detained for an examination. The clause imposes time frames for which a person can be detained but the question arises particularly in regional and remote areas as to the number of qualified practitioners available. Both the AMAQ and the RANZCP raised questions on this point. The statement of reservations asked the minister to provide details of availability of such practitioners with a focus on regional and remote areas. If both the AMAQ and the RANZCP are concerned about this, I think the minister should enlarge upon his answer given in the chamber this afternoon.

Finally, I turn to the amendments to be moved in consideration in detail dealing with the actions of a person wrongfully appointed to the Mental Health Review Tribunal. The statement by the minister in the House today was clear that this person has sat on 11,000 cases involving 5,600 patients. This is

a very serious issue involving the lives of not just the patients themselves but also their families and, indeed, the wider community. The minister said that the person who is the subject of these amendments had never sat alone. However, on how many matters did they sit as part of a majority decision when by casting their vote differently the decision would have gone the other way? Amendments and the actions of the individual should be properly considered by a committee of this House. Rushing amendments into the House without fully understanding all the implications of doing so or not understanding other implications of the actions of the unqualified person is ridiculous and could be dangerous.

Over some 14 to 15 years the actions of the person would have covered many areas and questions, and this House needs to be fully and properly informed via the appropriate committee as to what are the full consequences of such a lengthy tenure by a person who is not qualified to hold the position. It is not only the immediate outcomes that are of concern. There are questions of what may have flowed from those immediate outcomes. Clearly this government is trying to ram these amendments through the House without any scrutiny or questioning. The amendments at what would be section 800B(2) make a person who would never have qualified to be appointed eligible for appointment. Further, the appointment of a person who would never have been appointed is then deemed to be valid and they are then endowed with all the powers the person could never have had.

It is important to remember that this is not a flawed appointment process concerning a person who in all other circumstances is qualified. The person would not even be able to be appointed in the first instance. It is not a flawed process of appointment; it is a flawed person being appointed to a position and now being ratified by this parliament, and this parliament should reject that out of hand. How can the public have faith in the system when the highest body harbours a person with no right to be there in the first place?

Ms DONALDSON (Bundaberg—ALP) (3.27 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. This bill amends the Mental Health Act, which is scheduled to commence on 5 March 2017, to clarify that oral and written statements made by a person during an assessment regarding unsoundness of mind or fitness for trial are not admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding and during an examination conducted pursuant to a court's examination order are not admissible in evidence against the person's interests in relation to findings of guilt. In addition, the bill also amends the Public Health Act 2005 and the Mental Health Act to make clarifying and technical amendments that were identified during preparation for implementation of the Mental Health Act by Queensland Health.

I will run through a summary of the key provisions of the bill, and I will do so briefly given there are 54 of them. Firstly, the bill clarifies the admissibility of statements made during assessment or examination. Under the Mental Health Act, if a person is charged with a simple offence as defined in the Justices Act 1886 and a Magistrates Court is reasonably satisfied that the person was of unsound mind at the time of the offence or is unfit to stand trial, the Magistrates Court may dismiss the charge or adjourn the hearing of the charge. Queensland Health, through the Court Liaison Service, supports the Magistrates Court in deciding issues relating to a person's state of mental health. The Court Liaison Service is made up of senior health practitioners who will assess the person's mental health and then provide an assessment report to the Magistrates Court.

What the amendments do make clear is that statements, oral and written, made by a person during an assessment will not be admissible in evidence, as I said earlier, against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding. If a charge has been dismissed by the Magistrates Court due to a finding of unsound mind or unfitness for trial, or a hearing has been adjourned because a person is temporarily unfit for trial, the magistrate may make an examination order in relation to that person. Alternatively, the magistrate may make an examination order on the basis that it would benefit the person even without dismissing or adjourning the charge. In making the order, the magistrate must be reasonably satisfied the person has a mental illness or must be unable to decide whether the person has a mental illness or condition.

It is clear in the amendments also that oral or written statements made by a person during an examination conducted pursuant to a court's examination order are not admissible in evidence against a person's interests in relation to findings of guilt. The examination reports by the Court Liaison Service may only be used to assist the Magistrates Court to decide whether to make another examination order or whether to refer a matter to the Mental Health Court. The amendments do not change the ability of health practitioners in clinical settings to disclose examination reports to other health practitioners so that appropriate treatment and care can be provided to a person.

The bill also makes a number of clarifying and technical amendments to the Mental Health Act and the Public Health Act, as I previously stated. Operational issues were identified during implementation preparation and these were made to ensure that the act operates as intended.

The bill proposes amendments to clarify and better reflect current process and strengthen an individual's rights. One such amendment is specifying the time limit of six hours that a person may be detained for examination with an extension of an additional six hours if required rather than the current reference to a 'period reasonably necessary'. This amendment also specifies that this time begins when the person arrives at an authorised mental health facility or public health facility because some people may not be admitted as patients. This then recognises people in that circumstance also.

The bill also specifies the maximum period of seclusion or restraint of a person in a 24-hour period. Furthermore, the extension to a period of seclusion is to be approved by a clinical director. This is very appropriate given the specific expertise those in this position have regarding the care of people with a mental illness and their treatment.

Further amendments to the operation of the Mental Health Review Tribunal proposed by the bill will make a number of improvements to its operation. I want to clarify also that, in recognition of its potential retrospective nature which could infringe upon the rights of patients, other measures have been considered to decide whether these measures can safeguard against any miscarriage of justice or any significant prejudice. Therefore, the right of review has been included in the legislation.

I would also like to thank the committee secretariat, committee members and particularly the member for Nudgee for her leadership in this inquiry. I would also like to thank the Minister for Health for bringing these important amendments to the House for the benefit of Queenslanders with mental health issues so that they and their loved ones can be confident that their needs are being met. I would also like to add that all stakeholders in the inquiry supported the bill. I would also like to thank organisations and people who made a submission to the inquiry.

The Mental Health Amendment Bill is just another example of how the Palaszczuk government is building a mental health system that supports Queenslanders when they are at their most vulnerable and they need support. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (3.33 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. Mental health is a vitally important issue for all Queenslanders in that those who live with mental health disorders should receive the quality of support they require. Mental health is an issue which will touch many of us, with 45 per cent of Australians being affected by a mental health disorder at some point in their lifetime. I have seen this firsthand in our local community in the Gaven electorate as well as some of the fantastic organisations that strive to make a difference to those living with mental health disorders.

I speak of organisations such as Let's Have a Chat Inc. founded by Janelle Reeves, who, as a result of living with mental illness herself, became motivated to help others in the same position. All members of the management committee of Let's Have a Chat are people living with mental health issues or carers of people with mental health issues. They regularly come together to chat about the impact of mental health issues. They discuss coping strategies as well as alternative and new therapies available. I commend the efforts of Janelle, Ian and the committee members of Let's Have a Chat for the selfless work they do in our community for people living with mental illness. That is why it is vitally important that we see this issue discussed in this chamber.

Last year in Gaven we lost a local husband and father who was battling with personal issues including mental health. The owners of the local dance group that this family associated with, Hy-Fidelity Dance Design, Sian and Stacy, wanted to do something to help raise funds for the little girls who lost their father and for their mum. They got together and organised a Somervell Masquerade Ball around lifting the stigma of mental illness. I met with Sian and Stacy and assisted them in the preparation of the event. I was so proud to see two of our young female community leaders getting behind such a good cause and an important issue such as mental health. Like many members in this chamber, I always want to do my bit to ensure that events such as this are a success. It was fantastic to see our community get behind Sian and Stacy and the team at Hy-Fidelity. An amount of $6,000 was raised on behalf of the Somervell family that evening. It was an absolute pleasure for my wife, Danielle, and me to be in attendance.

These are just some of the examples of the fantastic people living in Gaven looking out for one another especially in times of need. I have no doubt that issues such as those noted are repeated and reflected throughout many communities in Queensland. As I stated before, we in this chamber need to do what we can to assist in ensuring legislation and regulations are appropriate and effective in protecting and caring for those who live with, or care for those who live with, mental health issues and provide the support they need.

As a member of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my fellow committee members and our hardworking secretariat for the consistent care and diligence that is always shown even with a heavy workload, including with this bill before the House. I do note, however, that the committee could not recommend that the bill be passed. While the government members supported the government bill, opposition members submitted a statement of reservation as the committee noted some serious issues in the Mental Health Review Tribunal and a failure by the government to address numerous issues that will likely arise as an outcome of this bill being passed.

Clause 3 allows for the detention of a person in an authorised mental health service or public service facility for a period of not more than six hours. What happens to those in a regional or remote area of Queensland without access to a so-called authorised mental health facility? Is that person then held for more than six hours, or are they released back into the community? The government and the minister have failed to address this significant issue. The sheer lack of clarity in recognition of this bill for a significant portion of the state essentially not only fails the person in need of care; it fails the whole community. This should not come as a surprise to anybody as this Labor government has consistently failed rural and regional Queensland in all of its actions and deliberations. Labor has again shown that it is not a government for all Queenslanders but is a government only for the select few whom it deems worthy.

Further exacerbating this issue are the serious question marks over the role and function of the Mental Health Review Tribunal and the part it plays in the release of dangerous people back into the community after short stints in secure facilities. This is just another issue the incompetent health minister has failed to resolve. We now see reports that the Mental Health Review Tribunal is under investigation by the CCC due to its numerous failures.

Questions also arise about clause 15, which places limits on the circumstances in which an examination report is admissible at the time of trial of a person. This provision arose as a result of work undertaken by the Court Liaison Service, yet there has been a failure to give examples of similar legislation being implemented and, furthermore, being of benefit to the community. Then last week we saw that a legal officer appointed in 2002, as duly noted by our shadow health minister, did not have the required five years legal experience and since that time has continually been reappointed to their position.

The president of the tribunal is said to have known about this issue in August. He told the minister in December and we have only now been advised of this. True to form for this bumbling health minister and incompetent Labor government, nothing has been done about it. The only reason we are finding out about this now is that the government is seeking to rush through poor legislation. During the appointment process the person allegedly failed to disclose the truth concerning her lack of qualifications. If media reports are correct, this is under investigation by the CCC. This government is asking us to support this person's questionable decisions as well as its own, and this is something that we will not do.

The government fails to think of families who have been victims in all of this and provides them with no way of questioning the decisions that have been made. The fact that there was no consultation concerning the amendments outside of the department and tribunal screams volumes about this government and its need to cover up poor decision-making and significant dysfunction. The LNP cannot support a bill that would ultimately fail Queenslanders, particularly our most vulnerable.

Mr HARPER (Thuringowa—ALP) (3.40 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. The Palaszczuk government is committed to improving the mental health and wellbeing of all Queenslanders. We know that a significant body of work was completed last year by our government to deliver the Mental Health Act 2016. That bill was a huge undertaking by the government. The intent of the bill was to undertake the biggest change in mental health oversight in over a decade. I said then that mental health in Queensland is a very serious subject. It is imperative that politicians, practitioners and allied health staff from various agencies and communities support and advocate and put patient safety first and foremost. I believe it is our job as legislators to ensure there are safeguards around mental health policies and provisions. That is why I was very happy to be part of the Health and Ambulance Services Committee as it then was.

We have all worked hard and contributed in recent months to ensure that all bases are covered when it comes to the serious issue of mental health. In Queensland we know that an estimated 900,000 people have presented with some type of mental illness in their lifetime—one in four Queenslanders—

and that is why it is imperative that we get the basics right. The Court Liaison Service Steering Committee identified that amendments were needed to parts of the Mental Health Act to get better clarity around legal issues arising from that act. As stated in the explanatory notes to the bill—

The Bill amends the Mental Health Act to clarify that oral or written statements made by a person:

- during an assessment regarding unsoundness of mind or fitness for trial are not admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding; and
- during an examination conducted pursuant to a Magistrates Court's examination order are not admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding.

The Mental Health Act is scheduled to commence on 5 March this year. Amongst other things, it provides a framework that allows a court to direct a person from the legal system toward the receipt of appropriate treatment and care if they have a mental illness or condition. That is a longstanding principle which has been in place for several decades with bipartisan support.

The objectives of this amendment bill are to provide a framework for people undergoing mental health assessments and mental health examinations without the risk of self-incrimination and to make clarifying and technical amendments to improve the intended operation of the act upon its commencement on 5 March 2017. The bill also clarifies amendments to the Public Health Act 2005 to ensure that provisions of the act operate as intended and makes consequential amendments to the Coroner's Act. In his introductory speech the health minister stated that amendments proposed in this bill will 'strengthen protections for people living with a mental illness who find themselves caught up in the legal system'. As further stated in the explanatory notes—

Following the enactment of the Mental Health Act, implementation work has been proceeding in a range of forums including the Court Liaison Service (CLS) Steering Committee.

The CLS was established to implement the bill. The committee is made up of representatives from the Queensland Magistrates Court, Queensland Mental Health Commission, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, Legal Aid Queensland, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, Queensland Law Society, Queensland Bar Association, Police Prosecutions and Public Guardian. The explanatory notes continue—

As part of the implementation work, the CLS steering committee has raised concerns about the admissibility of statements made during mental health assessments and examinations, and has recommended amendments to the Mental Health Act. These proposed amendments were formally supported in a letter from the Chief Magistrate to the Minister dated 1 September 2016.

All of the agencies that now make up the CLS steering committee had an opportunity to comment on the Draft Bill which was publicly released by the Government. However, none of these agencies raised these concerns prior to its enactment. The Government has agreed to act on the recommendation of the CLS steering committee and make the proposed amendments. The Government has agreed to this in line with the written advice from the Chief Magistrate on behalf of the members of the CLS steering committee.

The need to make this critical amendment has presented an opportunity to make other operational improvements to the Mental Health Act by way of clarifying and technical amendments. The amendments make clear that oral and written statements made by a person during an assessment will not be admissible in evidence against the person in any criminal or civil proceeding. If a Magistrates Court has dismissed a charge due to a finding of unsound mind or unfitness for trial or adjourned a hearing because the person is temporarily unfit for trial, the magistrate may make an examination order in relation to the person. The amendments make clear that oral and written statements made by the person during an examination conducted pursuant to the court's examination order are not admissible as evidence against the person's interests in relation to a finding of guilt. Examination reports may only be used to assist the Magistrates Court to decide whether to make another examination order.

I do support this bill. If it is passed it will ensure that the Mental Health Act operates as intended by making, clarifying and technical amendments which: support the operation of court processes, including by clarifying the Mental Health Court's ability to make a treatment support order for a person subject to an existing order and by clarifying the circumstances in which the suspension of a criminal proceeding ends; clarify the maximum time periods that a relevant patient may be kept in seclusion or have a mechanical restraint applied; enhance Mental Health Review Tribunal processes, including inserting a head of power to enable the Mental Health Review Tribunal to dismiss frivolous or vexatious appeals, confirming the confidential nature of certain processes and decisions and clarifying the periods within which certain matters must be reviewed; and provide that only those temporarily unfit persons who have not been found fit for trial and whose criminal proceedings have not been discontinued are prevented from applying to transfer interstate. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (3.47 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. Once again we see this Labor government dropping the ball on mental health. We saw a new Mental Health Act introduced and passed through this parliament, only for this minister to come running back into the chamber a year later to introduce amendments. The bill we are debating today contains 50 proposed amendments to the act before it has even commenced because the implementation committee which was set up to prepare for the new regime noticed 50 issues that needed to be addressed. For a reform of this scale that is not good enough. This minister needs to explain how he allowed 50 oversights to occur under his watch on a significant piece of legislation. Why were these issues not addressed or even considered in the original bill? Why are we back in this chamber more than a year after the original bill was introduced fixing the problems created by this Labor government?

We know how important mental health is to Queensland. At some point in their lifetime almost half of Australians will be affected by a mental health disorder. One in five of these people will encounter a mental health issue in a 12-month period. We on this side of the House know how important this issue is, and that is why we put so much focus on mental health during our time in government. We have a strong history of investing in mental health issues and delivering for Queenslanders, with a $1.1 billion investment in services in 2014-15 alone. We on this side of the House also established the Mental Health Commission, because we wanted to see better coordination and advocacy for services and support.

As the shadow minister for the prevention of domestic and family violence, I know how important mental health is. Having spoken to so many victims of domestic violence in support services throughout this state, I know that mental health can play a significant role in domestic violence situations. This has also been noted by the Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board, which is responsible for the systemic review of domestic and family violence deaths that have occurred in Queensland.

The board recently conducted a meeting which reviewed seven suicides of male perpetrators of domestic and family violence and two homicides of female victims that occurred between 2013 and 2016. All of these deaths occurred in the midst of a relationship separation where there was an identifiable prior history of intimate partner violence. The board found that mental health was a key factor in these deaths which occurred in a domestic violence context. The board noted that there were significant similarities across the cases, including: all male perpetrators had a prior history of mental illness and problematic substance misuse concerns, either professionally diagnosed or in the opinion of family and friends; four perpetrators had recent contact with mental health professionals in relation to domestic and family violence or suicide attempts or threats; and in seven of the nine deaths the deceased had come to the attention of formal services in relation to either domestic and family violence or suicidal threats or attempts. This shows that mental health played a key role in domestic violence related deaths in Queensland in recent years. That means that when it comes to domestic violence we owe it to victims to have a robust mental health system which can provide support, especially to those with a prior history of mental illness.

Instead of introducing a bill that improves mental health services in Queensland, we have a bill that creates a number of contentious issues which put our mental health system at risk. We see issues relating to the Mental Health Review Tribunal still not addressed by this Labor government. Serious questions remain over the role and function of the Mental Health Review Tribunal and the part it plays in releasing dangerous people back into the community after short stints in secure facilities.

We have heard from the shadow minister that the tribunal is reported to be under investigation by the Crime and Corruption Commission over nepotism claims. Now we see this Labor government asking us to support a rushed amendment which would only serve to hide the dysfunction in the Mental Health Review Tribunal. I, too, have spoken directly with Sonia Anderson on the Mental Health Review Tribunal. Her bravery in the face of losing her daughter Bianca is nothing short of heroic. I want to reinforce the position put forward by the shadow minister and say that Sonia is not alone. Her case is one that raises serious questions about the conduct of the tribunal and the lack of confidence victims' families have in this process. Not only did Sonia lose her daughter through domestic violence; she was also let down by a mental health system that Labor is asking us to support. Where are the amendments to immediately advise family members when a patient escapes a secure facility? Where is the balance for community safety?

We have heard a lot from the minister about the clients but not a lot about victims. These amendments would only reinforce the secretive and one-sided nature of the tribunal in its current form. We cannot support legislation that does not address the underlying dysfunction and distrust of the

Mental Health Review Tribunal process. Instead of introducing these rushed, ill-considered amendments, this Labor government should be investing in mental health services and restoring confidence in the system like the LNP did.

Mr KELLY (Greenslopes—ALP) (3.52 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. With the indulgence of the House, I join with the member for Caloundra and note my thanks to the various members of the House who participated in the committees that considered the two bills related to abortion. It was a long and difficult process. Even though people had significantly different views in relation to that matter, the committee process was conducted in a manner which speaks well of this institution of parliament. I also note his thanks to research director Sue Cawcutt.

I thank the current health committee and the submitters for their work on this bill. The Mental Health Bill, passed just over a year ago, was a significant body of work. It set a framework for the least restrictive way. This is an objective which allows us to deliver mental health services in a way that maximises empowerment for people who are affected by mental health issues. At times there is a need to, for sound clinical reasons, restrict individuals' freedoms. That piece of legislation dealt with regulating some of those challenging areas of health care where we have to act in that way.

I am pleased to note that significant work has been done since the Mental Health Bill was passed. To me, the bill we are considering here today—the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016—represents the Palaszczuk government's willingness to listen and to work with key stakeholders. The Court Liaison Service Steering Committee has been consulted widely in relation to this and in fact raised its concerns, which the minister rightly responded to. The steering committee includes the Queensland Magistrates Court, Queensland Mental Health Commission, Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions, Legal Aid Queensland, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service, Queensland Law Society, Queensland Bar Association, Police Prosecutions and the Public Guardian.

The minister has listened to the concerns raised by this group in relation to the admissibility of statements made during mental health assessments and examinations. That is what we in the Palaszczuk Labor government do: we listen and we act with stakeholders. This bill ensures that the court processes which facilitate proper assessment of people who may have a mental illness occur. The amendments make it clear that oral or written statements made by a person during an examination conducted pursuant to a court's examination order are not admissible in evidence against a person's interests in relation to findings of guilt. What that means in practice is that we ensure that those people who have a mental health issue who come before a court receive proper and appropriate care and treatment and are not inappropriately handled in the criminal justice system.

There has been much discussion here today about the minister's and the parliament's need to act in relation to the Mental Health Review Tribunal. I think it is extremely commendable that swift and sensible action has been taken. We need to give legal certainty to the patients at the centre of this. We should never forget the patients at the centre of this. It is important that we give them legal certainty.

From the comments of the member for Everton during question time today and some of the other speakers here this afternoon, the opposition seems determined to try to transform a straightforward debate into ongoing hysteria about mental illness. We need to get some facts and balance established. The overwhelming majority of people with mental illness are not dangerous and pose no harm to people. I doubt there would be any members of this House who do not have a relative or a friend affected by mental illness. We know that people who are mentally ill are much more likely to be a victim of a crime than a perpetrator. On some very rare occasions there are very bad outcomes involving people with a mental illness, just as on occasions there are very bad outcomes involving people without a mental illness. We should be careful not to tar others with that brush. If we want to have care that is safe for the community, it needs to be funded properly. We know that the Queensland mental health system is still recovering from the damage done by the now opposition leader when he was treasurer. This bill demonstrates that the Palaszczuk government will listen to the community, take action and work with stakeholders. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (3.58 pm): I have been listening with interest to the debate as it has proceeded and the first thing that has to be said and acknowledged is the importance of mental health and the crucial nature of the House dealing with this properly given its importance to Queensland. It has been stated that 45 per cent of Australians will be affected with a mental health disorder at some time in their lifetime, and that is a pretty confronting figure. The member for Greenslopes rightly pointed out that most of us will have a friend or relative or have suffered some mental illness at some point in our own lives. That is not an unusual thing given the things we have just heard. Contrary to what the

member for Greenslopes said, the LNP does have a strong history of investing in mental health services and delivering in that area and in 2014-15 the former government invested some $1.1 billion in services across the state. It is therefore an area which our side of politics has had a strong commitment to.

The thing that came through to me after listening to the debate was the alarm bells that were being rung right throughout the course of the debate. Perhaps the phrase that stuck most in my mind was when the member for Bundaberg said that this bill was an example of how the Palaszczuk government is building mental health systems. If this is an example of how the Palaszczuk government is building mental health systems, we had better be a bit scared because the foundations are not too hot. The issues that came through particularly when the member for Surfers Paradise, the member for Caloundra and the member for Mudgeeraba were speaking concern me greatly—that is, since the initial bill was passed, this amendment bill brings forward 50 amendments for us to deal with today. That is the first thing that puts me on guard as to whether the bill should be supported, and it does so in a climate where society is particularly concerned at the moment about the actions of those who are released after courts or tribunals have given them a clear bill of health and unhappy—indeed, tragic—consequences happen.

I move away from the mental health area to the broader area within the community. In Townsville we have seen the tragic deaths of Elizabeth Kippen and Rosemary Russo, and in particular in Mrs Kippen's case by a person who had been released by an authority in our state and yet has gone on to allegedly commit this most terrible offence. Recently we saw the case of Teresa Bradford where someone had been released on bail and tragic consequences followed. I do not mean to put the mental health situation foursquare on the same footing, but I do say that the level of concern within the community about the testing of people before they are released back into the community is at a high level and that we proceed in this matter at our peril. We need to be very careful taking that concern into account. The 50 amendments that this bill brings and also the new amendments foreshadowed by the minister which we are to deal with in very short time concern me greatly.

It is not the position of the opposition to reject these sorts of things out of hand. Members may recall that early in the term of the government we had a situation where magistrates had not taken the proper oath and it was sought to get opposition cooperation to a bill which rectified that by declaring that it was as if the oaths had been taken, and we were happy to do that because that was clearly a matter of form in relation to the appointment of those magistrates, not a matter of substance. The circumstance we have before us in relation to the Mental Health Review Tribunal is a very different matter. It is a matter of substance as to whether the person was qualified ever to be a member of the tribunal, and it is not a small matter. As has been pointed out to the House, the particular error in question affects some 11,000 matters involving some 5,600 patients.

This is not a similar situation to that which we were happy to cooperate with in rectifying a matter of form—it does go to substance—and I do not think it is good enough for this House merely to gloss over it and pass a simple enabling piece of legislation to say that that which was wrong is now right when in fact so many questions are raised by a person, in this circumstance, sitting for such a long period of time in a very highly controversial circumstance and where so many patients were affected. My position is that the alarm bells being rung by the nature of this legislation and by the fact that everything seems to be being patchworked as we go through puts me on great guard. I will await the rest of the debate, but I certainly cannot embrace either the original bill or the proposed amendments with any enthusiasm at all.

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (4.04 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016. I note that the Minister for Health will be introducing various amendments to the bill relating to the Mental Health Review Tribunal and it is therefore important that this also be raised during debate. The Mental Health Review Tribunal is an independent statutory body established under the Mental Health Act 2000 whose primary purpose is to review the involuntary status of persons with mental illnesses. The tribunal consists of the president and other members including lawyers, psychiatrists and other persons with relevant qualifications and/or experience.

The tribunal protects the rights of people receiving involuntary treatment for mental illness. It provides an independent review and makes decisions about whether the treatment should be given in hospital or in the community. In making these decisions, the tribunal must balance the rights of the patient with the rights of others and the protection of the community. It automatically reviews involuntary treatment orders, forensic orders and fitness for trial and young persons with mental illnesses who are detained in high security for treatment. The tribunal also hears applications for involuntary patients to move out of Queensland and applications to appeal against a decision made at the mental health

service not to allow a person to visit a patient. In addition, if a person is not able to consent to treatment and needs electroconvulsive therapy, the psychiatrist must apply to the tribunal for approval for the ECT.

Three members usually sit on each tribunal panel, although sometimes it may be as many as five members. Urgent cases may be decided by fewer than three members if it is in the patient's interests to do so. The community member is an experienced mental health worker or someone with other skills and experience that are relevant to the decisions the tribunal must make. Members are appointed by the Governor in Council for a term of no longer than three years. Part-time members are appointed throughout Queensland to enable panels to be constituted in a number of different locations.

This bill amends two Health portfolio acts to address issues identified during the implementation planning for the Mental Health Act 2016. In particular, the bill amends the Mental Health Act to provide a framework for people undergoing mental health assessments and examinations to do so without the risk of self-incrimination and makes other clarifying and technical amendments to improve the intended operation of the Mental Health Act upon its commencement on 5 March 2017. The bill also amends the Mental Health Act 2016 to clarify that oral and written statements made by a person during an assessment regarding unsoundness of mind or fitness for trial are not admissible in evidence against that person in any criminal or civil proceedings and that an examination conducted pursuant to a court's examination order are not admissible in evidence against the person's interests in relation to findings of guilt. I commend the bill and any amendments proposed by the minister to the House.

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (4.08 pm): It is the cover-up that will get you, not just the substance of the original mistake. The excuses I have heard from the government sound like a cover-up. Those opposite have known for some time that there was a problem and now they are in a rush to fix it—not just because of a concern for patients and the public but to protect their own political hides! We have found out that the chair of the Mental Health Review Tribunal allegedly knew at least in August last year that one of the tribunal members was not properly qualified in accordance with the act to sit on the tribunal as they had not been admitted as a lawyer.

That person sat on the tribunal, considering 11,000 cases involving 5,600 patients. We have also found out that the health minister has supposedly known of the problem since at least December last year, but the public were notified a few days ago—apparently after a media inquiry. We now see these amendments tabled today to be tacked on to a Mental Health Amendment Bill, which was already before the House, and we are debating them. The implications of legally invalid decision-making do not go away with this quick-fix retrospective parliamentary bandaid with little prior notice to the House. Many questions have been raised as a result of this dodgy process and they have not been appropriately answered by this government. This is a dodgy process from the health minister. There has not been a good enough explanation as to why there was a delay for a fix once it was discovered and, also, whether that fix is appropriate. How many of these 11,000 cases that are subject to this amendment have been considered properly? What are the implications?

Dealing with mental illness in our community with appropriate services and a carefully considered legal process to support those services, the patient, their families and the public is a significant issue. Families need support and involvement in care but so, too, do people who have been victims of crimes committed by those with a mental illness. Those who are mentally ill need proper care, but sometimes the public and loved ones also need protection from people suffering from a mental illness. As my colleague the member for Surfers Paradise has outlined, there are serious concerns about where the mental health system interfaces with the criminal system and also some tragic failures. Those failures are people's lives. In the worst cases, those failures have resulted in some terrible situations.

I also acknowledge the contribution of the member for Mudgeeraba in regard to the impact of this bill on domestic violence victims. It is time that the secrecy in forensic cases was stripped away in favour of restoring confidence and integrity in the system, where families and victims are appropriately consulted and kept abreast and considered as well as the public.

The secrecy of this government and how it has mishandled the mental health system is endemic. Unfortunately, the amendments to the bill before the House embody that very problem. The minister knew—at least last year—about a problem with an inappropriately appointed member of the tribunal. Now, we see these rushed amendments being tacked on to this bill without full consideration. There is an issue with secrecy. Therefore, it leads to an issue of integrity that this mental health system needs to have appropriately addressed not only for the sake of patients but particularly for the public and all of those who are involved in the care of patients and all of those who are affected when there are issues at hand.

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.12 pm), in reply: I am delighted to close the debate on the Mental Health Amendment Bill. Of all the debates that I have listened to in the parliament, for me, the contributions by the LNP members rate as some of the most insubstantial and, frankly, dishonest contributions that I have heard in any debate in Queensland. Speaker after speaker, in particular the member for Surfers Paradise, the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Maroochydore, spoke about how the mental health system in Queensland was broken, how people were put at risk by this system. This is exactly the same system that they operated when they were in government. Not only did the members opposite operate the system, on two occasions—a single occasion in the life of the last parliament and on another occasion in this parliament—they brought a new bill into this parliament to continue the operation of that very system that they decry.

When the member for Southern Downs was the health minister, he brought a bill into the parliament. The executive processes of the state means that legislation introduced by the government is endorsed by the cabinet. That means that the member for Surfers Paradise as a cabinet minister, the member for Kawana as a cabinet minister, and the member for Mansfield as a cabinet minister all supported that process in relation to the Mental Health Review Tribunal—a process that they now call secretive, hurtful and destructive to people. Notwithstanding that, when the members opposite formed the opposition benches after the last election—for very good reason, it seems—the member for Caloundra brought in a private member's bill, presumably endorsed by the shadow cabinet, reflecting exactly the same system.

When the government introduced the Mental Health Amendment Bill, which will become the Mental Health Act 2017 on 5 March this year, it was substantively in the same terms, particularly in relation to the operation of the Mental Health Review Tribunal and the Mental Health Court. The members of the opposition supported that legislation at the second reading. They supported that legislation that they now decry. In the history of hypocritical speeches and actions in this parliament, of which there are many, and the hypocritical conduct of individuals, which are legion, the member for Surfers Paradise and his colleagues really take the cake.

Mr Crandon: Still waiting for an apology from you to the member for—

Mr DICK: I take that interjection from the member for Coomera. We are talking about mental health. The one apology that the people of Queensland are looking for is an apology from the member for Coomera and all of those other members opposite who formed government under Campbell Newman for the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Centre, against expert advice, which resulted in catastrophic consequences for individuals. The member for Coomera and all the other members opposite put the issue of the mental health system in the frame on this bill. That is the one apology that has never been forthcoming.

The only thing that the opposition has ever said about the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Centre, against expert advice, was the comment by the member for Surfers Paradise, who said that the commission of inquiry was a witch-hunt. I have met with the families affected by the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Centre and I can tell the parliament that they do not regard the inquiry as a witch-hunt. They regard it as a way to reframe mental health in Queensland, which is what we are trying to do through this legislation before the House and the amendments that I foreshadowed. It is to provide certainty for the families and the clinicians who are impacted by the conduct of the Mental Health Review Tribunal, including the conduct of the individual who was appointed without full qualification. We need to provide certainty to mental health patients, families, victims and clinicians.

I remind the parliament that the Mental Health Review Tribunal framework was introduced under the LNP in 2014 in its Mental Health Bill—exactly the same process that we are talking about here today. In 2015, the bill was again introduced by the member for Caloundra as a private member's bill and it was supported by the opposition in the second reading, when it formed part of the government's bill. It is not only nonsense to suggest that principle is at stake here; it is nonsense on stilts. The members opposite had consistently supported the Mental Health Review Tribunal framework. The LNP reappointed the member who was at issue and it reappointed the president of the Mental Health Review Tribunal. We have gone through a proper process.

In relation to the bill that the government introduced into the parliament, it was subjected to very extensive public consultation, including into the conduct and operation of the Mental Health Review Tribunal, which those members opposite now oppose. There was significant public engagement. We

put the bill on the Get involved website. It was subject to open public comment and contribution. An exposure draft was released and nearly 100 submissions were received by the government. The bill was subject to full parliamentary examination through the committee process. Yet, from those members opposite we have not good public policy, but rank opportunism.

I want to address the issue of why the government has acted with speed to provide certainty. As soon as I became aware of this issue, legal advice was commissioned from the second legal officer of the state, the Solicitor-General. Given the complexity of this situation we received that advice as quickly as possible. All honourable members who sensibly approach these reforms know how complex this matter is. We have tried to avoid adding or extending any issues that arise from the uncertainty. The longer the issue is left unresolved in respect of the Mental Health Review Tribunal, and known to be unresolved, the greater the impact will be on individuals, including individuals suffering from mental illness, the community and clinicians.

It was not my choice to make this matter public through the *Courier-Mail*. I received a media inquiry to my office. I responded by being honest and transparent about what we are doing and we have moved quickly to act to remove uncertainty because uncertainty is a problem, particularly for people living with mental illness. I took the opportunity to brief the member for Surfers Paradise after I had spoken to the *Courier-Mail*. I acted in good faith in briefing the member for Surfers Paradise. I explained it to him in words to the effect of, 'There could be blame that could be apportioned in this: to the Newman government that reappointed the tribunal member, to previous Labor governments that appointed her, but', I said to him, 'there could be responsibility that would be discharged by members of this House to address this problem.' For my courtesy I have been slapped in the face by the member for Surfers Paradise. It was only on my interjection that the member for Surfers Paradise was willing to disclose to the House that he was briefed on this bill. He would not have said that otherwise; he would have left the record incomplete.

On the substantive bill, particularly the admissibility of statements, this was an initiative that emerged from the legal profession and the Chief Magistrate. It was not an initiative of the government. The member for Mansfield, the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Surfers Paradise claimed that the bill was flawed, that there were 50 amendments that needed to come into the House. A plain and simple reading of the explanatory notes on the first page—not even taxing the members opposite to have to turn the page—makes clear the reason this came before the House in relation to the implementation process for a very complex and important piece of legislation. On the front page of the explanatory notes it states—

> All of the agencies that now make up the CLS steering committee had an opportunity to comment on the Draft Bill which was publicly released by the Government. However, none of these agencies raised these concerns prior to its enactment—

that is, concerns in relation to the amending bill prior to the enactment of the substantive bill. It continues—

> The Government has agreed to act on the recommendation of the CLS steering committee and make the proposed amendments. The Government has agreed to this in line with the written advice from the Chief Magistrate on behalf of the members of the CLS steering committee.

That is the source of the amendments that come before the parliament. Mental health works best when it is bipartisan. The actions of the opposition are unprincipled, opportunistic and irresponsible. The member for Surfers Paradise advised that the LNP does not intend to support this bill and I am greatly disappointed by this. For a moment can we dissect the politics behind the position of the LNP. The consequence of the LNP's decision not to support this bill or the amendments proposed to be moved in consideration in detail will mean the new Mental Health Act 2016 does not operate as intended and it will create legal uncertainty about the effect of the Mental Health Review Tribunal's decisions which has broad implications not just for the tribunal but for the clinicians who acted on the advice of the tribunal, for the patients and for those in the community affected by the tribunal's work.

The member for Surfers Paradise and those members opposite are attacking me and the Labor government, but sometimes, particularly when it comes to mental health, public interest and public benefit should trump political interest. I do take objection to the suggestion by those members opposite that families do not matter, that victims are not supported. We are very mindful of supporting patients, victims of crime and clinicians in this process. We are open to discussing the best way of delivering sensible and appropriate support to each of these groups. As I previously indicated, resolving issues around the Mental Health Review Tribunal is important to protect our clinicians. A decision to not support this amendment puts at risk our mental health doctors, our mental health nurses and other

clinicians. There is a balance that can be reached. This issue was not of my making, nor was it of the making of the former government, but as responsible legislators we have a duty to step up and provide appropriate responses to these important issues.

I have met Sonia Anderson. I have heard her speak passionately about domestic violence. I am happy to meet with her again to discuss any issues arising out of this bill if that is her will. We do support victims. We have a very robust process in place to support victims of individuals who act unlawfully because of mental illness. The Queensland Health Victim Support Service is a free statewide service. We provide specialised counselling, support and information to victims of crime through this service when the offender has been assessed as having a mental illness or intellectual disability. The Queensland Health Victim Support Service has offices in Brisbane and Townsville and provides outreach throughout Queensland. Services are delivered by experienced social workers and psychologists who can assist individuals to access entitlements and help support recovery. Assistance can be provided face-to-face, by telephone or by email. Early support for people who are victims of violent crimes helps individuals to more effectively cope with the offence and improves long-term wellbeing. Help is available at any stage after any offence and for as long as is needed, and that support will be provided to anyone who feels impacted by the decisions that are before the parliament for rectification in this bill and in the amendments I intend to move. I would encourage individuals to contact the Queensland Health Victim Support Service for any support and assistance they might need.

I will deal firstly with the technical and clarifying amendments to the Mental Health Act. The Mental Health Act will commence on 5 March 2017, whether the opposition supports that or not. What the members opposite are doing is knowingly accepting the consequences of having minor and technical issues not rectified before the bill commences next week. I turn to the amendments proposed to be moved in consideration in detail, where the consequences of the opposition's approach are even more serious. If the LNP is successful in blocking these amendments proposed, members opposite will be responsible for leaving the state government open to unknown liability by choosing not to support the urgent solution put forward today. That will have broad-reaching ramifications for those impacted.

The member for Surfers Paradise has suggested that there is a direct causal relationship between the decisions of the tribunal and the behaviour of patients in the community. This conclusion is simply wrong. I will repeat for the benefit of those members opposite, as I said in the parliament this morning during my ministerial statement, that 98 per cent of decisions were made consistently with decisions of the tribunal generally. It is not appropriate to start with the assumption that all decisions were flawed or even that decisions of the tribunal have led to adverse outcomes in the community. This framework was originally proposed, as I have said, by the LNP and introduced as a bill by this government. The opposition has consistently supported the framework contained in the Mental Health Act and to say that the system is broken is outrageous hypocrisy.

I want to address this issue of individuals being treated within time limits as set out in the substantive amending bill. The requirement for a person only to be detained for six hours in a health service facility with the possibility of extension to 12 hours is a safeguard for the person. I am reiterating what I said at the start of this debate because it appears to have been lost on all of those members opposite. The same time periods apply for examination orders made by magistrates and emergency examination authorities made under the Public Health Act 2005. The availability of suitable clinicians will not be an issue as a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner will be actioning the examination authority in the first place. An examination authority enables a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner to enter a place, such as a person's home, to examine a person without the person's consent. Police may assist in that process, as I have said. Examination authorities are a last resort where there are serious concerns about a person's health and wellbeing and it has not been possible for the person to be examined with consent. An authorised mental health service will be very much engaged in the process leading up to the making of an examination authority and in many cases will have made the application to the Mental Health Review Tribunal. As such, clinicians in the service will be involved in planning for the actioning of an examination authority.

In many instances, the examination will be completed straightaway in the person's home. This may result in the person agreeing to voluntary treatment, a recommendation for assessment being made for the person or no further clinical action being taken. In some cases, the doctor or authorised mental health practitioner may form the view that the examination of the person would be better undertaken in a public sector health service facility—for example, if the doctor or authorised mental health practitioner is unable to make a clinical decision at the time. The person will then be transported

to a public sector health service facility. As a doctor or authorised mental health practitioner initiated the action of the examination authority in the first place, they will be available to make further examinations in a public sector health service facility.

In conclusion, I note that a number of members opposite, including the member for Mansfield and the member for Mudgeeraba, said that the Palaszczuk Labor government should invest in mental health like the LNP government did. They said it without any reticence at all. They said it without thinking twice. They said it without any concern at all. However, the record shows that the Newman LNP government did not invest in mental health. Reports from the Productivity Commission show that, with the now opposition leader holding the purse strings as treasurer, Queensland's spending on mental health fell to the lowest amount in Australia on a per capita basis. The Productivity Commission has reported that Queensland's expenditure for 2013-14 was $209.62 per person, below the national average of $210.37 per person. In 2013-14, Queensland also had the lowest number of FTE staff employed in a specialist mental health service per 100,000 of population. Queensland's results of 107.3 full-time equivalent workers per 100,000 of population was again below the national average, but that was not the first time the LNP cut mental health.

The *Report on government services* released in 2015 showed that expenditure on mental health services fell by $45.4 million in 2012-13 in the Leader of the Opposition's first full year as treasurer. In nominal terms, the cut that was made was the single largest cut to mental health expenditure ever recorded by any state or territory government. It is also the first time that Queensland has ever recorded a reduction in expenditure on mental health services in both nominal and inflation adjusted terms. If the LNP want to be serious about a debate on mental health, they should start by taking account for their actions in government.

These are important reforms contained in a substantive amending bill and also in the amendments. It is important that they be passed by the parliament. I seek the support of all members of this House for the amending bill and for the amendments I foreshadow.

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

AYES, 45:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! I note that the minister's amendment No. 1 proposes to insert new clause 1A, which relates to proposed new clauses in other amendments. Therefore, consideration of the minister's amendment is postponed until after all other clauses and amendments have been considered.

New clause 1A postponed.

Clauses 2 to 50, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr DICK (4.39 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr DICK: I move the following amendment—

2 After clause 50

Page 26, after line 27—

insert—

50A Insertion of new ch 18A

After chapter 18—

insert—

Chapter 18A Validation of appointment to tribunal and related provisions

Part 1 Preliminary

800A Definitions for chapter

In this chapter—

relevant decision see section 800D(1).

repealed Act means the repealed *Mental Health Act 2000*.

special tribunal see section 800C(1).

Part 2 Validation

800B Validation provision for purported appointment of ineligible person

(1) This section applies in relation to the person—

(a) who was purportedly appointed as a member of the tribunal under the repealed Act on 28 February 2002 on the basis that the person was eligible for appointment because the person was a lawyer of at least 5 years standing under the repealed Act, section 440(4)(a); and

(b) whose purported appointment was continued on that basis even though the person was not eligible for appointment under the repealed Act, section 440(4)(a) during the relevant period.

(2) For the repealed Act, the person is taken—

(a) to have been eligible for appointment under the repealed Act, section 440(4)(a) during the relevant period; and

(b) to have been validly appointed on that basis as a member of the tribunal for the relevant period.

(3) Anything done or omitted to be done during the relevant period that would have been valid and lawful under the repealed Act had the person been validly appointed as a member is taken to be, and always to have been, valid and lawful.

(4) In this section—

relevant period means the period starting on 28 February 2002 and ending on 31 August 2016.

Part 3 Referral of particular decisions to special tribunal

800C Special tribunal

(1) The ***special tribunal*** is the tribunal constituted under subsection (2) for hearing a referral by the chief executive under section 800E.

(2) The special tribunal must be constituted by at least 3, but not more than 5, members of whom—

(a) at least 1 must be a lawyer; and

(b) at least 1 must be a psychiatrist or, if a psychiatrist is not readily available but another doctor is available, another doctor; and

(c) at least 1 person must be a person who is not a lawyer or doctor.

800D Request to refer relevant decision to the special tribunal

(1) This section applies in relation to a decision (a ***relevant decision***) made by the tribunal under the repealed Act as constituted by—

(a) the person mentioned in section 800B(1); or

(b) members who included the person mentioned in section 800B(1).

(2) The following persons may ask the chief executive to refer a relevant decision to the special tribunal for a decision under section 800F—

(a) the person who is or was the subject of the decision, or an interested person for the person;

(b) if the relevant decision was made under the repealed Act, section 318R in a proceeding for a forensic information order—the applicant in the proceeding.

(3) The request must be made to the chief executive within 6 months after the commencement.

800E When chief executive may refer relevant decision

The chief executive may refer a relevant decision to the special tribunal only if the chief executive considers the decision is likely to have been affected in a material way because, when the decision was made, the tribunal was constituted in a way mentioned in section 800D(1).

800F Decision by special tribunal on referral

(1) This section applies if, on considering a referral of a relevant decision, the special tribunal is satisfied the relevant decision is likely to have been affected in a material way because, when the decision was made, the tribunal was constituted in a way mentioned in section 800D(1).

(2) The special tribunal may—

(a) if the relevant decision is still in force—refer the matter to the tribunal for a new decision under section 800G; and

(b) make any other recommendation to the chief executive about the relevant decision the tribunal considers appropriate.

(3) However, if an appeal is or has been made against the relevant decision, the special tribunal must not make a decision under subsection (2) until the appeal is decided or withdrawn.

Part 4 Decisions by tribunal

800G Decision by tribunal on referral

(1) If the special tribunal refers the matter to the tribunal for a new decision, the tribunal must—

(a) hear and decide the matters the subject of the proceeding in which the relevant decision was made, by way of a fresh hearing on the merits; and

(b) set aside the relevant decision and substitute a new decision.

(2) The repealed Act applies in relation to a proceeding under this section as if it had not been repealed.

(3) For this Act and the repealed Act, the new decision substituted under subsection (1)(b)—

(a) is the tribunal's final decision in the proceeding; and

(b) for chapter 20, part 7—is taken to have been made on the same day as the relevant decision.

(4) To remove any doubt, it is declared that—

(a) the new decision by the tribunal may be consistent with the relevant decision; and

(b) the repealed Act, chapter 8 applies in relation to the new decision.

I tabled the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Mental Health Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Cameron Dick's amendments [292].

As I have explained in the debate on the second reading, these amendments go to rectifying the issue in relation to the Mental Health Review Tribunal appointment of a member who was not fully qualified to be a member. I addressed this in detail in my ministerial statement this morning, at the start of the second reading debate and in my concluding remarks. Hopefully for the members of the House, that is sufficient detail to explain the reason and purpose behind the amendments.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 51—

Mr DICK (4.38 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr DICK: I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 51 (Amendment of sch 3 (Dictionary))

Page 27, after line 14—

insert—

relevant decision, for chapter 18A, see section 800D(1).

repealed Act, for chapter 18A, see section 800A.

special tribunal, for chapter 18A, see section 800C(1).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 51, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 52 to 54, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: The House will now consider the minister's postponed amendment No. 1.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr DICK (4.41 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr DICK: I move the following amendment—

1 After clause 1

Page 6, after line 5—

insert—

1A Commencement

Section 50A, to the extent it inserts new chapter 18A, parts 3 and 4, commences on a day to be fixed by proclamation.

Amendment agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.42 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.42 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.

MOTION

Order of Business

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (4.42 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That government business order of the day No. 2 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (QUEENSLAND) BILL

Resumed from 13 September 2016 (see p. 3399).

Second Reading

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (4.43 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Let me thank the members of the Transportation and Utilities Committee for their detailed consideration and support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. I would also like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the committee's secretariat for the hard work and support they provided to members. I have considered the committee's report which was tabled on 25 October 2016.

The report contains one recommendation only. That is that the bill be passed. The development of this bill was a collaborative process involving many people. I thank the stakeholders involved in that process, including all those individuals who attended departmental briefings. Let me also acknowledge the contributions of the Association of Tourist Railways Queensland and the Australian Rail Track Corporation, both of whom lodged submissions to the committee. This bill is an important milestone for national rail safety reforms in Australia. It is the culmination of much effort from all those who understood and sought the benefits of the national rail safety reforms for Queensland.

The introductory speech on this bill explained that its provisions will remove inefficiencies resulting from the inconsistent application of regulations across the states and territories. I will explain what that looks like for industry. The Australian Rail Track Corporation, ARTC, once upon a time was required to become accredited in five different jurisdictions, including Queensland. The move towards a set of national rail safety laws and away from jurisdictional inconsistencies has enabled the ARTC to experience smoother and more seamless operations.

In supporting the harmonisation of rail safety law across Queensland, the ARTC explained how difficult it had been in the past to seek a variation to a network-wide standard. Previously, when ARTC wanted to introduce a new type of rolling stock it had to seek approval from five different regulators. Even if the new stock matched its operating purposes in scope and nature, the ARTC had to devote five lots of time, money and effort to compliance.

Those five different regulators applied their laws in five different ways, charged annual accreditation fees using five different methods and had five different sets of needs. Each jurisdiction had a different regulatory culture, ranging from a co-regulatory approach to a more prescriptive regime. Even though jurisdictions had laws that were very similar, there were very different approaches and cultures underpinning each regulator's decision-making.

Having a regulator for each jurisdiction created other difficulties. For example, representatives of rail operators were required to travel to five different jurisdictions to meet their various regulators. They incurred significant financial costs and, of course, lost valuable time as they sought to comply with the various administrative requirements. Upon commencement of this bill, a rail transport operator will make a single application to the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. There will be a set of consistent national requirements upon which the outcome of their applications will be based. The experience of ARTC demonstrates the benefits that operating under a single national regulator provide to industry, particularly to those rail transport operators that require accreditation in multiple jurisdictions.

Applying the Rail Safety National Law as a law of Queensland enables us to achieve the right balance—the right balance between having an independent national rail safety regulator whilst also retaining our ability to address any unique issues that may rise for us here in Queensland. While we believe in the big picture, long-term benefits of national harmonisation, we also think it is important that any Queensland specific issues are managed in a way that benefits our operators, our rail workers and, of course, our passengers.

The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator is an independent body. However, under the National Rail Safety Law, the Minister for Transport will retain certain powers. I will take just a few moments now to explain those powers in detail. The minister may give a written direction to the National Rail Safety Regulator to investigate or provide advice about any rail safety matter in Queensland. The minister will also retain the power to grant exemptions from the Rail Safety National Law for railway operations carried out in Queensland for up to three months. This three-month exemption could be used, for example, to enable an operator to conduct business while the National Rail Safety Regulator considered a long-term exemption. The minister may, in consultation with the national regulator, decide to grant a three-month exemption to the proponent of a major building project that requires a short-term, low-risk temporary railway to move cement pipes from one side of the site to another. This would enable the project to proceed without the delay.

As a member of the national Transport and Infrastructure Council, the minister will continue to play a role in appointing the regulator and non-executive members of the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. The Transport and Infrastructure Council is, of course, the national government body that approves codes of practice and the making of regulations under the Rail Safety National Law. As a member of that council, the Minister for Transport, on behalf of the Queensland government, will continue to ensure that Queensland specific concerns are addressed.

It is important to acknowledge that across this mighty great southern land of ours each jurisdiction does indeed have a set of unique characteristics. In some cases this requires slight deviations from the provisions of the national law. The Queensland specific fatigue provisions are a perfect example of this. This government has taken a strong position on fatigue management across our railways. We are determined to do everything possible to ensure safety remains paramount across Queensland's railways.

That is why made sure that our strong position on fatigue management was accommodated by the national laws. Prescribed minimum hours of work and rest for train drivers in Queensland will be contained in a schedule in the Rail Safety National Law regulations. This government makes no apologies for making that accommodation a condition of Queensland's ongoing participation in this

process. Last year in this place we made it very clear where we stood on this issue, just as we did back in 2013 when I was shadow transport minister. By enshrining prescribed minimum hours of work and rest for train drivers in legislation last year, we made it very clear where we stand on this issue. We have the strongest fatigue management provisions for rail operations in Australia, and these provisions will remain. We are very proud of them. On this side of the House, we are very proud of them.

It is important to provide honourable members with some broader context as they consider this bill. Both the Rail Safety National Law and the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 are based on the model national law. It is therefore not surprising that the laws are very similar in most regards. There are, however, important changes. Let me explain those changes.

The main differences are, first, the Rail Safety National Law provides that the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator must undertake a cost-benefit analysis if a decision is likely to result in significant costs or expenses to an operator. The cost-benefit analysis is a comprehensive assessment of a decision's appropriateness, efficiency and effectiveness. This will ensure that the national regulator does not impose expensive requirements on rail operators unless there is a sufficient safety imperative.

Second, mining railways that are currently excluded from the requirement will require accreditation under the Rail Safety National Law for their above-ground operations. We have transitional provisions in place that will provide those operators a period of three years during which they can take the necessary steps to gain accreditation.

Third, the Rail Safety National Law introduces a duty for persons who load or unload freight on rolling stock to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that such operations are carried out safely. This is important because the manner in which such operations are carried out can determine whether a railway worker goes home safely at the end of their shift or not. These are important tasks and for the most part they are done very well. The new laws emphasise the primacy of safety on our railways. They recognise that safety is a shared responsibility.

There is also a welcome strengthening of the drug and alcohol provisions. The Rail Safety National Law provides that it will be an offence for a rail safety worker to carry out, or attempt to carry out, rail safety work while there is alcohol present in their blood; or a prescribed drug is present in their oral fluid or blood; or they are so much under the influence of alcohol or a drug as to be incapable of effectively discharging a function or duty of a rail safety worker. Currently, while rail operators undertake extensive testing programs of their own, only train drivers are subject to an offence if they test positive. A rail safety worker who tests positive has only been dealt with through workplace procedures. These changes will mean that all rail safety workers become subject to an offence under the law. Drug and alcohol testing of our rail safety workers will be undertaken by authorised persons who are appointed by the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator.

A large number of proposed penalties in the Rail Safety National Law are significantly higher than those provided for in the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010—again, something this government is very comfortable with. The proposed penalty amounts in the Rail Safety National Law have been aligned to penalty amounts contained in work health and safety legislation. Due to variations in the value of a penalty unit across jurisdictions, penalties in the Rail Safety National Law have a designated monetary value. This ensures that the penalty is the same in each jurisdiction.

This legislation also brings about change to no-blame rail safety investigations. Currently, no-blame rail safety investigations in Queensland are undertaken by the Queensland regulator under the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010. The application of the national laws will change that. Once the bill commences, the Australian Transport Safety Bureau, or the ATSB, will undertake no-blame rail safety investigations in Queensland. The findings from these investigations are used to benefit the rail industry as a whole. Whilst no-blame investigations have traditionally been well conducted in Queensland, the time is right to separate the investigator more clearly from the government.

In Queensland we are very fortunate to have numerous wonderful tourist and heritage railways. Under the national rail safety laws, these operators would have been required to pay accreditation fees. These tourist and heritage rail operators are often very small organisations but they provide great services. We understand the challenges they face meeting their costs, and we recognise the contribution they make to Queensland's tourism industry and cultural heritage. That is why we have decided to pay those fees on their behalf. This is a good government decision, and we make it because on this side of the House we are always looking for ways to support jobs and small business.

As honourable members would understand, the integrity of the national rail safety laws will be best maintained by as much uniformity as possible. Notwithstanding our retention of the right to address Queensland-specific issues from time to time through the national process of the Transport

Infrastructure Council, we do as a government have to make decisions as to which objectives are best served by seeking a regulation and which are best served through policy and administrative arrangements. In this case, we have chosen to support our tourist and heritage rail operators through a policy decision, and the outcome, I believe, is a good one. It is good for the operators, it is good for their families, and it is good for their customers.

This is not the end of the journey for the national harmonisation of rail safety laws. Under this Labor government, Queensland will continue to play an active role in the ongoing work required to maintain and improve the Rail Safety National Law. This bill is a considerable achievement and the culmination of much hard work. It demonstrates this government's ability to get things done. It demonstrates this government's ability to work with industry, regulators and the public to ensure our railways are as safe as possible. It demonstrates this government's determination to ensure all our policies support jobs. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (4.55 pm): Colleagues, isn't it refreshing to be in the chamber talking about trains in a more positive light than we have certainly been able to over the last six months under this Palaszczuk Labor government and its constant rail fail? I am pleased to declare from the outset that the LNP will be supporting the Rail Safety National Law, because it does follow on from the preparatory work that the LNP undertook while in government, particularly around the COAG transport ministers' table. It also follows our passing of the Heavy Vehicle National Law and the implementation of that scheme in Queensland.

While Queensland currently only has a standard gauge interstate freight line from the New South Wales border into Acacia Ridge, this Rail Safety National Law will still benefit interstate rail operators and bring legislative consistency between the states. The bill will also allow the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator to become the rail safety regulator in Queensland, taking these functions from the Department of Transport and Main Roads.

Over a number of years Queensland rail safety laws have largely become homogeneous with the framework for the national law and laws in other states. The main difference is that we were not yet ready to sign up to the ONRSR when the scheme began in 2013. The other differences between the existing national law that we will be adopting today and the existing legislation include the requirement under the national law to conduct a cost-benefit analysis where a decision is likely to result in significant costs or expenses to a rail operator. While, yes, this could be seen as an extra bit of red tape to jump through, this also provides more rigour around the effects regulatory changes have on operators. The benefit of regulatory changes should outweigh the costs to operators and the regulators.

The national law will not allow for the ONRSR to have—sorry, it will allow for the ONRSR to have an exemption granted to low-risk railways.

Ms Trad: Got it!

Mr POWELL: I got it right. I thank the Deputy Premier for her interjection. These are railways that are not connected to or associated with the tracks of another railway or a rail or road crossing. The department told the committee during the hearings that there are approximately seven of these operators that this applies to and include some cane rail operators and tourist operators. I hope the minister can ensure that these small operators continue to not be disadvantaged as a result of the implementation of this national law. Some of the other safety measures introduced by the national law include a duty for people loading or unloading freight on rolling stock to ensure that such operations are carried out safely. This is a similar step to that taken with the chain of responsibility reforms recently debated and passed with regard to the National Heavy Vehicle Law.

This bill will also strengthen drug and alcohol requirements for rail safety workers. The current law allows for a BAC, or blood alcohol content, of .02. Under the national law, as the Deputy Premier previously outlined, this will be zero. Once the ONRSR becomes the regulator in Queensland, they will be undertaking random testing of workers. This is an important tightening of the rules. Rail accidents in particular can be catastrophic and these changes will hopefully save lives.

Because the national law harmonises the rules amongst the states, it also harmonises the penalties for breaking them and that is to be expected. Perhaps one harmonisation that is a little bit worrying, especially for smaller operators, is the change in fee structures to mirror the national law requirements. While I was not initially going to refer in detail to these, I think it is worth outlining what those fees might look like. There will, for instance, be an annual accreditation fee. Currently, only 16 out of the 67 accredited rail transport operators pay such a fee here in Queensland. Under the new system, every accredited operator will pay a fixed flat fee and a variable fee based on the kilometres of

track and kilometres travelled. Small operators and track managers are likely to pay more with high-frequency operators benefiting from a reduction in fees. I do note seven commercial operators will pay less, 21 will pay more and there will be little impact on the remaining 15 operators.

There will also be an annual registration fee for private sidings. The 20 rail infrastructure managers in Queensland will pay increased fees under the Rail Safety National Law, with increases ranging from between $145.45 and $382.15 annually.

There will also be an adjusted rail safety investigation fee. The existing rail accreditation fee calculation will be remodelled for Queensland to cost recover the Australian Transport Safety Bureau services. The fee will be aimed at high-frequency rail transport operators travelling the most rail kilometres because they have the highest risk of an incident.

The ONRSR is taking these fees for their operations. I would expect that they would be able to, on an ongoing basis, justify why operators will pay more. I would also ask that the minister keep an eye on these fees to ensure Queensland operators are being treated fairly. Perhaps the minister could assure operators that the ONRSR will be transparent in their costs and the fees that they are charging.

These reforms are meant to introduce efficiencies for both the regulator and operators by introducing consistency in laws and economies in scale for the task the regulator needs to undertake. As I stated at the beginning, this adoption of the Rail Safety National Law is a continuation of the work started under the previous LNP government. It benefits interstate operators and it strengthens the safety requirements. For that reason the LNP will be supporting the bill.

Mr KING (Kallangur—ALP) (5.02 pm): I rise this evening to make a contribution to this debate on the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. The purpose of this bill is to adopt national rail safety regulation and investigation reforms by applying the Rail Safety National Law as the law of Queensland. It will also establish the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator—ONRSR—as the rail safety regulator in Queensland. The bill proposes to apply the Rail Safety National Law, as modified by the bill, as a law of Queensland; repeal the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010; define a number of terms to aid in the interpretation of the Rail Safety National Law in the Queensland context; provide for drug and alcohol testing of rail safety workers using procedures that are consistent with the procedures used by the police under the transport operations act; and provide transitional arrangements.

The Rail Safety National Law was prepared and passed in South Australia in 2012 with South Australia being the host jurisdiction. There was always the intention that other states and territories would pass legislation to apply national law as the law of their own jurisdiction. This bill does not seek to incorporate the Rail Safety National Law within its provisions but instead applies the Rail Safety National Law, as modified by the bill, as the law of Queensland. This means that any future amendments made to the Rail Safety National Law will not need to be considered by the Queensland parliament. However, it does not mean we do not get to have a say in the future, as changes to the Rail Safety National Law can only be made by unanimous agreement at the Transport and Infrastructure Council before then progressing through the South Australian parliament.

The Department of Transport and Main Roads explained to the committee that if the Queensland government had a serious concern about the management of safety or the management of the national law in the future, it would still be able to effect changes to the legislation. They said—

> We will continue to work very closely with the National Rail Safety Regulator through a number of forums. We will be represented on the policy committee, so the Queensland government will still have a role in rail safety. The minister in fact will have a role to approve any change to the national legislation in his role on the transport and infrastructure committee.

> ... we will still be represented on the policy committees and we will still have contact with the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. In addition, there is a communication protocol that the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator has which ensures that the minister is advised of any major incidents that they become aware of. The National Rail Safety Regulator also produces an annual report in December each year to the minister specifically that outlines what has been happening in the state.

I will address the drug and alcohol testing component of the bill. Under the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 a rail transport operator must have and implement an alcohol and drug management program which identifies, assesses and manages the risks that may be caused by workers being under the influence of alcohol or impaired by a drug. Even though we are now moving to a new set of national rail safety laws, this requirement will remain. Rail safety in Queensland already has a strong culture in testing rail safety workers and complying with the drug and alcohol requirements. For example, during the 2014-15 financial year rail transport operators in Australia conducted over 21,000 drug tests and 170,000 alcohol tests. The percentage of positive results was only about .5 per cent for drugs and .05 per cent for alcohol tests. Queensland Rail, who publish their monthly drug and alcohol tests, undertook between 564 and 776 drug and alcohol tests each month during 2015-16. This equates to testing between 10 to 13 per cent of their workforce every month with an average of 0.39 per cent of tests having a positive result.

This culture of the industry testing its workers will not change on commencement of this bill. Rail transport operators will still be required to prepare and implement a drug and alcohol management program for rail safety workers. However, the Rail Safety National Law recognises that, while the rail industry has a strong safety culture, introducing regular drug and alcohol testing by the national regulator would complement the rail operator testing. It will do that by: acting as a deterrent, which will improve safety; monitoring compliance with the law; and monitoring the effectiveness of the rail transport operator's drug and alcohol management program. The Rail Safety National Law introduces a maximum penalty of $10,000 for a rail safety worker who commits any offences in that regard.

Under the Rail Safety National Law, all rail safety workers can be tested by the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. Rail safety workers are considered individuals who are doing rail safety work, and that includes workers involved in driving or dispatching rolling stock; workers involved in signalling; and workers involved in the maintaining, repairing and testing of rolling stock or rail infrastructure. It covers the people who could do some damage if they were impeded by drugs or alcohol.

Under the Rail Safety National Law, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator can appoint a person to be an authorised person to undertake the drug and alcohol testing program. The regulator's drug and alcohol testing program includes random testing, post-incident testing, and informed testing based on identified trends or information that the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator receives.

It was agreed nationally that the regulator's drug and alcohol testing process is to mirror the roadside testing process in each jurisdiction. In Queensland, the regulator's drug and alcohol testing process will largely mirror the testing process contained in the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995. The Queensland Police can already test train drivers. This will continue unchanged and police will still continue to test train drivers as they currently do.

In fairness and recognition of the important contribution tourist and heritage railways make to Queensland's tourism industry and the commitment many volunteers display in keeping these services running, the Department of Transport and Main Roads is going to fund the annual accreditation fees payable to the national regulator on behalf of—

Mr Rickuss: Are you just reading from the second reading speech now?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar): Member for Lockyer, I would like to hear the member. Please do not interrupt.

Mr KING: I will take that interjection. In answer to your question: no.

In fairness and recognition of the important contribution that tourist and heritage railways make to Queensland's tourism industry and the commitment many volunteers display in keeping these services running, the Department of Transport and Main Roads is going to fund the annual accreditation fees payable to the national regulator on behalf of tourist heritage operators as a community service. When Queensland applies the Rail Safety National Law, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator will be able to recover the cost of regulation from all accredited operators in Queensland, including tourist and heritage operators. This would have resulted in all tourist and heritage operators being required to pay fees, the majority of them for the first time. The national regulator charges an annual fixed flat fee that is based on the amount of track managed and the number of kilometres travelled.

The tourist and heritage rail sector is important to Queensland and there would be significant impacts if these railways were forced to close, with a loss of volunteer and paid jobs; reduced capacity to attract tourists and encourage longer stays, with flow-on impacts to local businesses; and the loss of important rail history in Queensland. Our government will support tourist and heritage rail operators to ensure these services continue to operate and bring enjoyment to Queenslanders. Many of these services are tourist attractions in our regional areas and provide a boost to the local economy.

This bill, while not at all contentious, is important to allow us to come into step with the rest of the nation with respect to rail safety. I would like to thank the members of the Public Works and Utilities Committee—formerly the Transportation and Utilities Committee—for their work on this bill. We did go through it in great depth and, member for Lockyer, that is why I thought it was valid to make a speech on it. I would like to thank Chris Whiting, the member for Murrumba; Linus Power, the member for Logan; Joan Pease, the member for Lytton who came on board at the end; Rob Molhoek, the member for Southport; Matt McEachan, the member for Redlands; Jason Costigan, the member for Whitsunday; and, as always, our hardworking secretariat staff Kate, Rachelle, Lynette and Mishelle. On behalf of the committee I would like to thank those organisations which lodged written submissions on the bill: the Technical Scrutiny of Legislation Secretariat, the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the National Rail Safety Regulator for their assistance. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MOLHOEK (Southport—LNP) (5.11 pm): As the chair of the committee has pointed out, this is not the most exciting piece of legislation but there are some important changes foreshadowed within these amendments and the committee did indeed go through this with a great deal of rigour. We did, however, only receive two submissions: one from the Australian Rail Track Corporation and a second from the Association of Tourist Railways.

It may interest the House to know that Queensland has one of the most extensive rail networks of any state in Australia. In fact, its current growth trajectory is for some 9,500 kilometres of operational track with 67 accredited rail operators operating over the last 150 years. The heavy rail system in Queensland provides the basis for a vital transport system, delivering connectivity to strategic areas of regional Queensland supporting agriculture, mining, manufacturing, retail and tourism industries and of course mass commuter transport services in South-East Queensland. It is recognised as an important mode of transport for moving bulk commodities like coal, minerals, agricultural products, livestock and large volumes of passengers across this geographically vast state. It is Australia's largest export coal rail network as well as having some of the country's most remote and iconic passenger trains including the *Spirit of the Outback*, the *Gulflander* and the *Savannahlander* services.

Mr Costigan: What about the *Inlander?*

Mr Rickuss: What about the *Bushlander*?

Mr McEachan: The *Quilpie Connection?*

Mr MOLHOEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, can you call the member for Lockyer to order?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call on the member for Lockyer to cease interjecting. I call on all in the chamber to listen to the member for Southport. The member for Southport has the call.

Mr MOLHOEK: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. Was it the *Quilpie Connection* that you were suggesting? Sorry, that was the member for Redlands.

There are also a number of registered private sidings owned by organisations that are not transport operators. Some belong to mining companies and some are used to load bulk commodities onto railway wagons.

The history of the legislation goes back as far as 1995. It was recognised that there was a need for a more collaborative approach between the states; hence in 2010 the Queensland government introduced the Transport (Rail Safety) Act and the Transport (Rail Safety) Regulation 2010, which were in fact at that time based on the National Transport Commission's Rail Safety Model Law. At that time the legislation included a range of strategies around fatigue management, emergency management plans and increasing the skill requirements for rail safety workers and drivers. I wonder if those on the other side of the House have perhaps considered the need to increase the number of available drivers on the current commuter networks in South-East Queensland, because that has been nothing but a debacle in recent months. Past regulation also covers accredited railway operators in Queensland including Queensland Rail, Aurizon, Pacific National, Airtrain and a range of tourist and heritage rail operators.

In terms of the amendments proposed, the bill also makes a number of minor and consequential amendments to some 10 other acts: Coal Mining Safety Health Act 1999; Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999; Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013; Work Health and Safety Act 2011; Coroners Act 2003; Queensland Competition Authority Act 1997; Right to Information Act 2009; Surat Basin Rail (Infrastructure Development and Management) Act 2012; Transport Infrastructure Act 1994; Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994; and Transport Planning and Coordination Act 1994.

There are a number of amendments that are brought about as a result of this legislation, but the two main benefits of this proposed amendment relate to better drug and alcohol management. The Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 states that a railway operator must ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that each rail safety worker who is on duty has a blood alcohol content of less than .02 in their blood or is not impaired by a defined drug. Currently, drug and alcohol testing of rail safety workers extends only to train drivers who may be tested by the police under the provisions of the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995.

It is proposed, however, that the current requirements be changed in order to increase safety standards in Queensland. The bill proposes that the Rail Safety National Law be applied so that it will be an offence for a rail safety worker—which includes a train driver—to carry out or attempt to carry out rail safety work while there is present in their blood more than the prescribed concentration of alcohol, which is now .00, or while a prescribed drug is present in their oral fluid or blood, or while they are so

much under the influence of alcohol or a drug as to be incapable of effectively discharging the function or duty of a rail safety worker. This policy will be supported by the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator, which proposes to undertake random, targeted and post-incident testing of rail safety workers.

The second significant benefit of this proposed legislation and the amendments relates to a shared responsibility to ensure the safety of railway operations and to ensure that those staff or persons engaged in the loading or unloading of rolling stock have a clear understanding of their obligations and responsibilities in respect of these activities. As stated in the explanatory notes to the bill—

The Rail Safety National Law introduces a duty for persons who load or unload freight on rolling stock to ensure, so far as is reasonably practicable, that such operations are carried out safely. This change is expected to increase rail safety standards in Queensland.

There are a couple of other points to note. The proposed law will come into effect from June 2017, in just a few months. It is interesting to note that these changes have been adopted in every state of Australia bar Queensland. These amendments simply bring us into line with other states. As the Rail Safety National Law and the Queensland laws were both passed on a national framework, there is a lot of consistency between our current legislation and the national law. That is why today we are dealing with only a fairly small number of changes.

Significantly, existing laws do not require a cost-benefit analysis to be conducted around costs, expenses or the work of transport operators. The new law requires a cost-benefit analysis to be conducted so that the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator is held accountable and so that there is absolute transparency in decision-making processes. Rather than simply imposing requirements on rail transport operators with little regard to cost, there will be a requirement for the regulator to be accountable to those operators. It will need to justify whether there is a discernible safety benefit or an improvement of a meaningful nature.

I have touched on the drug and alcohol issue. I mention the provision within the legislation with respect to application fees. Currently, only 16 out of 67 accredited rail transport operators pay accreditation fees. Under the new system, every accredited operator will pay a fixed, flat fee. This brings us into line with what is happening at the national level. There are also assurances that historical rail groups and operators of non-main infrastructure—cane tracks and so on—will be exempt from these provisions.

I am happy to stand in the House and support the legislation as presented. As the chair of the committee has rightly done, I thank the committee for its work. While there were only two submissions received, many hours were spent by the committee in trying to get our minds around the devil in the detail. We certainly had a lot of questions for the representatives of the Australian Rail Track Corporation. We grilled them at length about the financial implications of this legislation. We were relatively relaxed with the fact that it would not mean a significant cost impost on operators but rather it would hopefully deliver some significant efficiencies across the scheme and better safety outcomes. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr WHITING (Murrumba—ALP) (5.23 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. I would like to characterise this legislation as part of the great project to build consistent laws and regulations across Australia. In a lot of ways, that project has been going on since Federation. In the case of this bill, we will apply the Rail Safety National Law as a law of Queensland. Across Australia we will see greater national consistency in rail safety regulation. In Queensland, the National Rail Safety Regulator becomes the rail safety regulator. This and other changes we have heard about already are small but they are necessary and substantive. Our rail system is already strong, and so are the safety processes surrounding it. That is built on 150 years of rail development in Queensland. I note that the total number of rail kilometres travelled has increased over the past five years but the total number of serious rail incidents on operations has decreased in that time. We have a good record in safety, but these changes are welcome.

As we have already heard, under this bill a person who loads or unloads freight on rolling stock will have an obligation to ensure it happens safely. Under this bill, there will be improvements to the drug and alcohol testing regime. Drug and alcohol testing is already an important part of the culture and operations in Queensland. In 2014-15 rail transport operators conducted over 21,000 drug tests and 170,000 alcohol tests. I am informed that Queensland Rail undertakes the equivalent of testing 10 to 13 per cent of their workforce every month.

I believe that adopting the rail safety bill will also help us address the fatigue management issue. I know that the Rail Tram & Bus Union is very concerned about this. This is one of the most important issues for rail workers and rail passengers, who will be protected by this bill. We have already done a

lot of hard work in Queensland to help mitigate the dangers posed by worker fatigue. In July last year we amended the 2010 regulation to introduce work-hours and rest-hours provisions in Queensland. These provisions will now be included in the national regulations. These include maximum shift length of 12 hours for a two-driver operation or nine hours for a one-driver operation; a break of eight to 12 continuous hours between each shift, depending on where the driver finishes their shift; and no more than 12 shifts in a 14-day period. I believe that these provisions are there for very good reason. A scientific study from Monash University obtained by the RTBU reveals a strong link between fatigue and injury. It points to a 30.4 per cent increased risk of occupational accidents during the night shift and an even bigger risk beyond the eighth or ninth hour of a shift. It reveals that forcing a worker to drive while fatigued is akin to forcing them to drive under the influence of alcohol. Being awake for 17 hours has a similar effect on performance as having a blood alcohol content of .05.

Addressing issues like fatigue is about the culture of workplace health and safety that we are building and have built within Queensland Rail workplaces and in Queensland generally. We in the Labor Party want to build a strong, healthy, inclusive safety culture that permeates every workplace, big or small, in the 9,500-kilometre Queensland rail system and, indeed, in all Queensland workplaces. I believe that the desire for a better workplace health and safety culture reflects the values that animate many of the Labor members in this parliament.

Firstly, we believe that everyone has the right to come home alive and safe at the end of every day. That is a basic expectation that has been at the heart of many Labor people who have come through this place. That expectation and desire to walk in your own front door each night is very real to many of us in this House as well. Many of us in this House perhaps have family stories of risks taken by workers that could have had disastrous consequences. There may be stories of family members who actually did not make it to the dinner table that night. For my mother that was a real fear. We have memories of my father working at a brake parts company in Mackay, with row upon row of brake parts on the shelves behind the counter generating dust. For my mother there was a very real fear of mesothelioma.

Secondly, we believe that safety in the workplace is everyone's responsibility. It is not just up to the union official who travels between sites riding everyone when a breach is detected. It is not just something for the boss to be responsible for implementing. It is something that every person in the workplace has a role in—knowing what needs to be done, keeping an eye out when risk appears and taking action to fix it. That is what we in Labor believe. These are our values. That is why we support reforms like this that build a safer and better workplace in Queensland Rail and in Queensland generally. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr McEACHAN (Redlands—LNP) (5.29 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. I begin by thanking my fellow committee members, the committee secretariat and those who made submissions during the reporting process. This bill proposes that Queensland adopt national rail safety regulation and investigation reforms. It also proposes to establish the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator here in Queensland. It should be noted that Rail Safety National Law has commenced in all other Australian states and territories. These reforms were supported and progressed by the former LNP government.

Queensland has an extensive rail network. In fact, it is one of the most extensive in Australia with thousands of kilometres of operational track. Not only is rail transport a vital connection for industry in Queensland, but it also serves as a significant tourism operator in the state. We have several iconic rail journeys and many smaller tourism operators using rail transport. Indeed, I have an enduring personal interest in rail in Queensland as my great-great-grandfather drove the first train on the Cleveland line on 1 November 1889. Indeed, my grandfather was also the station master at Wallumbilla and at Baddow station. I have also engaged in significant train travel myself as a young fellow when I was heading to Western Queensland to go kangaroo skinning. I would get on the Maryborough rattler and travel 8½ hours to Brisbane, stay overnight in Brisbane and then get on the *Westlander* to go to Charleville—all day, all night—and arrive the next morning. At lunchtime I would then get on the Quilpie connection and get to Quilpie just as the sun was going down. It was quite an adventure. I digress, so back to the bill at hand.

Rail safety regulations are intended to provide a higher degree of regulatory cohesion across state and territory rail networks. The Australian Transport Council was created in 2009, allowing a single national regulatory framework for rail safety with the establishment of the National Rail Safety Regulator and the commencement of the Rail Safety National Law. The introduction of this bill today meets the objectives of the Intergovernmental Agreement on Rail Safety Regulation and Investigation Reform

signed by the Council of Australian Governments in 2011. This bill will apply the Rail Safety National Law as a law of Queensland and will repeal the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010. It will provide interpretation for the Rail Safety National Law in a Queensland context.

The bill further provides for drug and alcohol testing of rail safety workers using procedures consistent with those used by police under the Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995. I note the submission provided by the Association of Tourist Railways Queensland that raised some concern about the burden placed upon volunteer rail safety workers in the application of drug and alcohol testing. Its submission to the committee states—

Some concern was initially raised with regard to the requirement for zero blood alcohol levels (and the accompanying testing regime) on volunteer workers performing peripheral 'rail safety work' as the definition of that work in the National Law is exceptionally broad. This concern has been allayed by the issue of a Draft Guideline for identifying rail safety work.

This bill proposes that current drug and alcohol requirements be changed to increase safety standards in Queensland. It provides that the Rail Safety National Law be applied so that it will be an offence for all rail safety workers to carry out, or attempt to carry out, rail safety work if under the influence of alcohol more than the prescribed concentration of .00. It will also be an offence if a prescribed drug is present either in a worker's oral fluid or blood. This policy is intended to be undertaken at random and post incident for rail safety workers. I note that the committee addressed the concerns raised by the Association of Tourist Railways Queensland with guidelines which will identify rail safety work subject to this testing.

Under this bill, a number of penalties stemming from the Rail Safety National Law are significantly higher than those currently in existing Queensland laws. There will be an impact from the change to the annual accreditation fees as well. Currently, 16 of the 67 accredited rail transport operators pay annual accreditation fees. The new structure proposed in this bill will see operators paying a fixed flat fee and a variable fee based on the kilometres of track and kilometres travelled. It should be noted that high-frequency operators will benefit from a reduction in fees under this new structure. Finally, the adjusted rail safety investigation fee will be remodelled under the new structure and is aimed at higher frequency operators—those who travel the most kilometres and are therefore at higher risk of incident. In a state with a diverse range of industries all relying on our rail transport system, it is vital that we support this bill. I commend this bill to the House.

Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (5.34 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. Queensland has one of the most extensive rail networks of any state in Australia, growing to more than 9,500 kilometres of operational track and 67 accredited rail operators over the last 150 years. Our rail network provides the basis for a vital transport system delivering connectivity to strategic areas in regional Queensland; supports agriculture, mining, manufacturing, retail and tourism industries; and mass commuter transport services in South-East Queensland. This bill will deliver a consistent approach to policy and regulation across Australia and remove most inconsistencies between states to adopt national rail safety regulations and investigation reforms by applying the Rail Safety National Law as the law of Queensland and establishing the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator as the rail safety regulator in Queensland.

The Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 was introduced and referred to the then Transportation and Utilities Committee in September 2016. The committee sought advice from the Department of Transport and Main Roads and stakeholders and subscribers were invited to lodge written submissions to its inquiry. The committee received two submissions as well as written advice from DTMR on the bill. The written advice included responses to matters raised in the submissions. Further, a public departmental briefing on the bill was held in Brisbane on 12 October with DTMR and the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. Whilst I was not on the committee at the time of this review, I want to acknowledge the work of the committee and the secretariat and congratulate them for the work they undertook, in particular the chair, Mr Shane King, the member for Kallangur.

As I stated earlier, Queensland has one of the most extensive rail networks of any state in Australia, growing to more than 9,500 kilometres of operational track with 67 accredited rail operators. It provides the basis for a vital transport system delivering, as I have said, connectivity to strategic areas in regional Queensland; supports agriculture, mining, manufacturing and tourism industries; and mass commuter transport in South-East Queensland. It is recognised as an efficient mode of transport for moving bulk commodities such as coal, minerals, agricultural products, livestock and large volumes of passengers across a geographically vast state. Queensland has Australia's largest export coal rail network, as well as having some of the country's most remote and iconic passenger trains including the *Spirit of the Outback*, the *Gulflander* and the *Savannahlander* services.

The state's rail transport industry is made up of a very diverse group of organisations, with rail transport operators ranging from major corporations operating thousands of kilometres of freight, coal or passenger services to the enthusiastic volunteers who operate small historic and tourist railways. There is a strong safety culture among the 65 accredited rail operators in Queensland. The Department of Transport and Main Roads as Queensland's rail safety regulator has provided a strong focus on informing the railway industry about the appropriate safety standards, helping them to comply with legislation, undertaking investigations and checking that safety standards are maintained.

Queensland already has a strong record in rail safety, with ongoing downward trends in safety occurrences and a robust co-regulatory environment. Encouragingly, even with the substantial increase in total rail kilometres travelled over the last five years, the total number of serious rail safety incidents directly resulting from rail operations has decreased. In 2015-16, for instance, there was not a single rail safety related fatality in Queensland. Further, 2015-16 also saw the lowest number of serious safety occurrences in five years. Similarly, while still a continuing concern, near misses between trains and road vehicles at level crossings has decreased every year since 2011-12.

Queensland's rail network transitions to the national regulator with this strong safety performance and this is expected to be further reinforced by implementing the national rail safety reforms in Queensland. The Queensland government will continue to work towards ensuring the safety of Queensland's travelling public by safeguarding the integrity of the rail network through relevant state policies and investment priorities that include enhancing rail safety and rail infrastructure safety.

As I have said, Queensland Rail continues to undergo significant growth. The increasingly competitive environment has raised some concerns about train driver fatigue and excessive shift lengths. Rail safety is dependent on human performance and is, therefore, vulnerable to human factor issues, such as fatigue. To address those concerns, on 8 July 2016 the Queensland government made an amendment to the Transport (Rail Safety) Regulation 2010 to include additional fatigue provisions that require a rail transport operator's fatigue management program to state the standard or alternative work hours and rest periods applying to the operator's train drivers. The fatigue provisions will complement existing fatigue management requirements and will provide a safety net for those rail transport operators with a less mature approach to fatigue risk management whilst allowing rail transport operators to operate using alternate hours if they can demonstrate that they have adequate fatigue management processes in place to mitigate the risk of operating outside the standard hours.

To provide sufficient time for operators to comply with the additional fatigue requirements, the additional fatigue provisions will not commence until 1 July 2017. To ensure that these fatigue requirements continue to apply to rail transport operators in Queensland following the commencement of the Rail Safety National Law, the members of the Transport and Infrastructure Council agreed unanimously to the policy position to include Queensland's train driver fatigue provisions in the Rail Safety National Law National Regulations 2012.

Therefore, Queensland Rail transport operators will need to comply with the Queensland-specific standard work hours and rest periods following the commencement of the Rail Safety National Law. This is similar to the approach taken by New South Wales, with their fatigue management requirement in relation to train drivers within New South Wales, which is also contained as a schedule to the Rail Safety National Law National Regulation 2012. That means that Queensland will continue to maintain its high standard of safety.

Currently, the standard work hours and rest periods are for a two-driver operation, a maximum shift length of 12 hours; for a one-driver operation, a maximum shift length of nine hours; for suburban passenger rail operations, a maximum shift length of nine hours, but no more than eight hours can be spent driving trains; a break of at least 12 continuous hours between each shift where the driver's shift ends at the driver's home depot; a break of at least eight continuous hours between each shift where the driver's shift ends at an away depot; and no more than 12 shifts in any 14-day period and a maximum of 132 hours to be worked in any 14-day period.

The length of a shift is all time between the signing on and signing off of a shift. However, the shift can be up to 16 hours in cases where the train driver, after completing their driving tasks, is provided transport as a passenger to the home depot, or away depot, by the rail transport operator. The Queensland government will continue to work towards ensuring the safety of Queensland's travelling public by safeguarding the integrity of the rail network through relevant state policies and investment priorities that include enhancing rail infrastructure safety. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.43 pm): I, too, rise in the House to speak to the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. As a member of the Transportation and Utilities Committee, nowadays known as the Public Works and Utilities Committee, I commend the bill to the House.

There is no doubt that, in this debate, members on both sides of this House have spoken very candidly about the importance of safety in the rail industry. Whether it is in terms of passengers or freight, we have to take rail safety seriously—and we do. There is no doubt that the purpose of this bill is at the forefront of the minds of those members who have spoken in this debate and that is to adopt the national rail safety regulation and investigation reforms and to set up the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator—the ONRSR—as the rail safety regulator here in the state of Queensland.

No doubt, a lot of railways families I know in Central North, Far North and Western Queensland will be following what is happening in the parliament tonight because they hold the railways dear to their heart. They are very proud of their history of working in the railways. On a night like tonight, I think of those railway workers at Pring, Coppabella and Jilalan across the Mackay-Whitsunday region who contribute to rail safety, whether they are drivers, navvies, permanent weigh inspectors and so forth. In fact, I recall when I was a kid in Sarina I spent some time on the Goonyella line which, of course, is so critical to the economy of Queensland. As I recall, construction started in 1969 and it opened in 1971.

It would not have been possible for all of that black gold to come down the Connors Range over the past 4½ decades to the port of Hay Point without those people who have contributed to rail safety—people like long-serving permanent weigh inspector Alf Abdullah in Sarina, the man they call 'King Crocodile'. He is proud of his Indigenous heritage, he is proud of his contribution to making our state a better place. In fact, I recall being out on the line near Waitara with the navvies on one particular week in late 1988 and seeing how it all happened—seeing the hard work of the navvies under the hot Central Queensland sun, doing their jobs to make sure those coal trains got to the port safely. I particularly recall one Stephen Walkabout Hazel, who spent some time at Wynnum Manly in the BRL. He said to me, 'Costo, this will sort you out' and it certainly did.

Mr Millar interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear the laughter of the member for Gregory. I will come to his electorate in a moment. It is hard work and you need a big engine to get out there and work in the railways. When I was a kid, I wanted to drive the *Sunlander*. I heard my committee colleague the member for Murrumba talk about fatigue management. He is not the only member who spoke on that topic. It is a serious issue, whether it is fatigue management in relation to driving on our roads, flying aircraft or driving trains. When I was a kid, I really had the dream that I wanted to drive the *Sunlander*. I wanted to come town to Roma Street and go toot toot.

Ms Trad: We dream that you do, too.

Mr COSTIGAN: I do not dream about the Deputy Premier; I tell members that much.

Ms Trad: Thank God.

Mr COSTIGAN: Absolutely. I would like to thank the Big Fellow for that. He has been very kind to me in many ways. I wanted to drive the *Sunlander* from Roma Street through to Cairns. Of course, it then dawned on me that you cannot drive the whole section; you have to change at Maryborough—or at Baddow, as it used to be—or at Rockhampton because of fatigue management. So much for that ambition!

I fondly remember many old mates in the railway. My second dad, as I call him, drove for QR in the glory days, with steam, diesel and electric across Central, North and Far North Queensland—St Lawrence, out in the coalfields, Hughenden and Gladstone when Gladstone was a very small place. He is no longer with us. There are many people who have contributed to rail safety across our state.

Over the years, the history of the railways has not all been good news. I draw the attention of members to some terrible tragedies that have happened in this state. I think of what happened at Bogantungan many years ago in 1960—360 kilometres west of Rockhampton—when the *Midlander* crashed. Seven people lost their lives and 40-odd people were injured. Old-timers in Central Queensland at the bottom of the Drummond Range—in fact, both sides of the Drummond Range—will still talk about—

Mr Millar: It is the anniversary today.

Mr COSTIGAN: There we go. I take that interjection from the member for Gregory. I dare say that I speak for the member for Gregory and the people he represents when I say that our thoughts are with those families who remember the stories and those who remember what happened on that fateful day in February 1960 at the bottom of the Drummond Range involving the ill-fated *Midlander* passenger train. In more recent times—

Mr Harper: Cardwell.

Mr COSTIGAN: We had the terrible tragedy involving the tilt train at Cardwell—and I hear the interjection from the member for Thuringowa—in 2008.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: There have been a number of incidents. It is no doubt that the community look to politicians and parliaments to enhance and tighten rail safety laws—to do everything possible—to make sure that we are doing the right thing. Having five different regulators for rolling stock from coast to coast is hardly ideal. I go back to the early days of pre Federation when we had the different gauges. I think it is pretty well documented how railways have played an important role in the development of our nation. Tonight, we have heard stories of the tourist trains in regional Queensland. I acknowledge the contribution of the Association of Tourist Railways and the Australian Rail Track Corporation. They were the only two entities that provided submissions to the committee in relation to these matters.

The *Savannahlander,* the *Gulflander,* the Kuranda tourist train and the *Spirit of the Outback* are great services. There is a bit of the trainspotter in me. I love the trains, as members can probably gather. I have been from Spencer Street Station in Melbourne all the way through to Cairns. In fact, my first trip out of Queensland was via the *Inlander* to Mount Isa. I remember it well, sitting back in the club car coming through Charters Towers, Julia Creek and Cloncurry.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I hear the interjections from the outgoing member for Pine Rivers. I am not sure when the next train back to Pine Rivers is. I love the trains. On my first trip to the Northern Territory the line terminated in the Isa and then I had to catch the bus on to the territory via the Threeways. There is no doubt that trains have played an incredible role in the development of our state. Heartache, blood, sweat and tears have gone into constructing these lines and bridges. The north coast railway, all the way from Brisbane to Cairns—which will resonate with you, Mr Deputy Speaker—was completed in 1924. We take it for granted today, but in those days there were no aeroplanes. There were steamships bringing those who came before us in this House to Brisbane to the parliament. Going back to the days of George Elphinstone Dalrymple, having the railway was a great achievement in its day. The line between Brisbane and Townsville was finally completed right in the heart of my electorate of Whitsunday, the spiritual home of the late Ron Camm, around Bloomsbury in 1923. Every now and then when I go along the Bruce Highway in my travels in the discharge of my duties I often think back to those pioneers who got in there with the snakes and the heat and the sandflies and built Queensland. We would be a poorer state without those people.

Ms Leahy: With picks and shovels.

Mr COSTIGAN: They were on the pick and shovel. It is not everyone's cup of tea. I will be the first to admit I was not cut out for it, but I salute all those people who have made an enormous contribution to rail safety across our state over many, many years—in fact, decades, going back to when that north coast railway construction work commenced back in 1864.

On a night like tonight I think of the permanent weigh inspectors and those who go out and check the line, in particular in my part of the world with the Goonyella system and the Newland system which was connected after the missing link was finally completed in 2010-11. There was talk about joining up those two rail systems when I was starting my career in Bowen in the late 1980s. It is great for our economy. We would not have all that black gold going around the world if it was not for the people who built the railway and kept those trains running safely and making sure those drivers came back to places like Bluff and Pring outside Bowen, Coppabella and Jilalan and Blackwater as well and it goes on and on. They do a marvellous job and long may it continue. I acknowledge those people. No matter which company or department they are from they play a huge role and we are very, very grateful for their contribution.

In conclusion, more work always needs to be done. Last year I had the good fortune of travelling out to Mount Isa—not on the *Inlander* as I did 30 years ago this September as a young boy going out to the top end to the Tiwi Islands at the invitation of the Catholic Church. Last year I drove out to Mount Isa in my role as the shadow assistant minister for North Queensland. You can see all that work going on with the navvies rebuilding a huge section of the Mount Isa line—the much maligned Mount Isa line which has been so important in building the wealth of our state going back to the glory days of MIM, well before the Bowen Basin kicked off. We take the Bowen Basin for granted. Do not forget about the North West Minerals Provence and how Mount Isa helped transform the economic fortunes of the great

state of Queensland. Last year the line was a hive of activity given some of the big derailments that have been well documented. All key stakeholders need to be aware of that. We can never slacken off when it comes to rail safety. Whether it is rail safety, road safety or safety with our planes, we do not take it for granted and we salute those people who make an enormous contribution to rail safety. I commend the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 to the House.

Hon. M FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (5.53 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill. The bill will apply a national law that provides for a national system of rail safety, repeal the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 and amend that act, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, the Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013 and the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. Before proceeding I acknowledge the excellent work of the then minister for transport, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, for his commitment and hard work in this portfolio and the proposal initiated in this bill for rail safety and delivery of regulatory harmonisation across the Australian states and territories contained in this bill. Equally, I acknowledge the experience and commitment the Deputy Premier shall bestow on the portfolio to ensure the delivery of transport needs for all Queenslanders.

Our government recognises the significance of rail. This is echoed in the following three rail infrastructure projects: the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, which will open in time for the Commonwealth Games in 2018; the Redcliffe peninsula line from Petrie to Kippa-Ring, which has provided affordable and efficient transport links to Brisbane's north; and the duplication of the Gold Coast line between Helensvale and Coomera. Queensland needs a safe, efficient and reliable rail network. Rail transport operators in Queensland must be accredited in accordance with the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010. The act specifically requires operators to demonstrate that they have the competence and capacity to operate rail, that they have appropriate funding, effective management and control of their operations and a safety management system in place.

From 2010 Queensland has recorded a continued trend of improvement in rail safety. Previous speakers have identified those particular areas in their contributions. The safe, efficient and seamless operation of rail transport networks will be further reinforced by the Queensland government's decision to adopt the national reforms. Queenslanders can be confident that our high safety standards will be retained following commencement of the bill. This move to a single national law will result in substantial efficiency and productivity developments for commercial rail organisations operating in more than one state. It shall build on the substantial progress in rail safety achieved in Queensland since 2010. This bill will also benefit workers, including contractors who, by choice or by contract, will be working in different states and territories. These workers will better understand their responsibilities under the law and they might find the transition easier.

I acknowledge the excellent work in the report of the Transportation and Utilities Committee's examination of the bill and the continued commitment of the members of the committee, particularly Chair Shane King. After receiving submissions and holding a public departmental briefing on the bill in Brisbane on 12 October 2016, the members recommended the passing of the bill. As the report identifies, Queensland is the only jurisdiction that has not mirrored or applied the Rail Safety National Law. This bill will bring our state in line with every other jurisdiction. The Department of Transport and Main Roads informed the committee Queensland was the last jurisdiction to apply the Rail Safety National Law and that Queensland's application of the law means that we would be again moving closer to a truly national rail safety regulation scheme. This has also enabled us to learn more from the experience of other jurisdictions and we believe that this will be a smooth transition for Queensland and all the stakeholders who are involved in the process. This bill will bring rail safety in Queensland into a national, harmonised and safe situation that will stand for more than 150 years into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (5.58 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to this bill. I pay tribute to the member for Whitsunday. What a passion he has for the rail network across Queensland! His knowledge and commitment to understanding how important the railway industry has been in Queensland is absolutely amazing, whether it is for the tourism sector all the way up to the Cairns but, most importantly from where I come from, for the Bowen Basin and the infrastructure that has been put in place for our coal industry. I will talk about that a little bit later tonight. I thank all the people who work in the rail industry. They are absolute champions. They keep Queensland moving. They play a significant role in making sure that we have a sophisticated export industry.

Debate, on motion of Mr Millar, adjourned.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Portfolio Committee, Referral of Auditor-General's Report

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.59 pm): I seek to advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 194B, that the Auditor-General's report to parliament No. 11 of 2016-17 titled *Audit of Aurukun school partnership agreement* be referred to the Education, Tourism, Innovation and Small Business Committee.

MOTION

Electricity Supply

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House condemns calls from GetUp! to close all of Queensland's coal- and gas-fired power stations.

If someone were to go to the GetUp! website, they would see its clean energy policy. For the benefit of members I can say that that that policy calls to lock in a commitment to legislate a renewable energy target, to accelerate the uptake of renewable energy—in fact, they want 100 per cent renewable energy—and to plan for the orderly closure of Queensland's coal- and gas-fired power stations. I table that for the benefit of members.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'GetUp!: Queensland's clean energy future' [293].

While all members of the House are now aware of what is on the GetUp! website, one member of the House was well aware of it a lot earlier, that is, the member for Yeerongpilly. I know that the member for Yeerongpilly was aware of the position of GetUp! because on 1 October he used his personal email account to communicate that position to his ministerial advisers. I table a copy of an email that was obtained by the Queensland opposition under a right-to-information request that we made late last year.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 12 October 2016, from Tam van Alphen to the Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding GetUp! [294].

We know what the minister said to his ministerial advisers, but we do not know what the response was from the ministerial department. The email that I just tabled is blank at the bottom. It has a stamp that says that this RTI was refused under schedule 3(2)(1)(b) because of cabinet in confidence. There we have it: the member for Yeerongpilly and Minister for Energy has been using his private email address for cabinet business.

One has to ask: what did the Palaszczuk cabinet discuss around the position of GetUp!? Does the Palaszczuk government support legislating for a 50 per cent renewable target? Does the Palaszczuk government support closing down all of our coal-fired and gas-fired power stations? It would be nice to hear the minister discuss whether they do intend to legislate for a 50 per cent renewable energy target and if they do support closing down all of the coal-fired and gas-fired generators in this state.

Numerous times we have heard from businesses. I table a report by the Australian Industry Group titled *Energy shock: no gas, no power, no future?* That is exactly the issue that we are facing if we go down the path that GetUp! wants to take us and the path that the government wants to take us to achieve 50 per cent renewable energy.

Tabled paper: Document, dated February 2017, from the Australian Industry Group titled 'Energy Shock—No Gas, No Power, No Future?' [295].

There is no doubt in my mind that if GetUp! has its way and we close the coal-fired power stations, the Premier will not need to go to Mackay or Cairns to listen to Elton John sing *Candle in the Wind* because, in fact, all that the people of Queensland will have left will be a candle and it will be blowing in the wind. They will be trying to cook their dinner and light their houses with a candle. During the last sitting week when they went off to see Bruce Springsteen, maybe he sang *When the Lights Go Out*, as they have been singing in South Australia lately because of the renewable energy target they have down there. In fact, they are looking to—

(Time expired)

Hon. MC BAILEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (6.05 pm): I move—

That all words after 'House' be deleted and the following words inserted:

'does not support calls to close all of Queensland's coal- and gas-fired power stations, and notes that traditional baseload generation will continue to play an important role in Queensland's energy mix as our state transitions to a clean energy future, as outlined by the Palaszczuk government's renewable energy task force.'

I move this amendment because the opposition is obsessed with targeting one group—that is, the one stakeholder who is contributing to this debate—when they know what our policy position is. Our policy position is 50 per cent by 2030. That is well known. Queensland has a diverse mix of generation complemented by renewables, with solar PV effectively making up the second largest power station in Queensland. We are less reliant than other jurisdictions on interconnector flows from other states. This diversity means that our power system is robust and well placed to manage the transition to a higher integration of renewable generation, without compromising the security of our supply. The Palaszczuk government recognises the importance of our traditional energy sectors and their role in both our regional and national economies. However, the reality is that energy is undergoing a transformational change in the way it is generated, transported and used, which is something that the LNP does not like to hear. The LNP would rather stick its head in the sand than build a solar PV farm on that desert. I think that says it all.

We are delivering on our commitment to grow the renewable energy sector, to create regional jobs and to act on climate change. The traditional energy sector will continue to play an important role as we transition to a clean energy future. The renewable energy expert panel's draft report shows three credible pathways to reaching that target. It was prepared by an independent team of business, energy and environmental experts, chaired by Colin Mugglestone, a very well respected investment banker and former head of energy and utilities at Macquarie Group. It shows that it is an achievable, cost-effective and sustainable approach in our commitment to reduce carbon emissions and act on climate change. It found that the renewable energy target will have a cost-neutral impact on Queensland's electricity consumers, and electricity security and reliability will be maintained over the next 13 years. It is a sustainable, gradual and responsible approach, because competition from new renewable generators is anticipated to place downward pressure on wholesale electricity prices. It found that coal- and gas-fired generation are expected to play a significant role in Queensland over the next 13 years, as we transition.

Queensland continues to benefit from one of the youngest and least emissions-intensive fleets of traditional generators in the nation. In fact, four of our eight generators are supercritical in technology. The state has a significant number of gas-fired power plants supplying about 20 per cent of the state's total energy mix. Gas will continue to be used when there is a peak in demand, as of course gas plants vary their output quickly.

Gas peaking plants can help smooth the variable output of renewable energy during periods of high intermittency and also have significant lower emissions compared to coal-fired generation. We know that industry cannot function properly without an integrated and credible energy and climate policy. That is why in the absence of real action or a relevant plan by the Turnbull government—a government on 45 per cent popularity—Queensland remains committed to our target.

We have to get the politics out of energy policy. That is what has to happen in this country. This motion that I seek to amend is another case of the LNP playing politics with energy at a time when other countries have much better practice and are way ahead of us in terms of integration and way ahead of us in a lot of realms. That is why the Finkel review is currently looking at best practice right across a range of jurisdictions such as the European Union.

I was in Kidston recently for the sod turning for the solar farm. The member for Mount Isa was there as well. That is part of our Solar 150 program. We need a diverse range of energy production in this state. We are diversifying when not a single large-scale renewable project was started under Tim Nicholls and the LNP. We will continue the investment flow and the jobs that come with it.

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise tonight to support my good friend and colleague the member for Burleigh. I am going to drop the 'C' word—coal. In Queensland coal is king. We on this side of the House are proud to support the coal industry because where would we be economically, socially and culturally without coal? It has transformed our state ever since the opening up of the Bowen Basin in 1971, with the birth of towns like Moranbah, Dysart in 1973 and the opening up of the port of Hay Point and the Goonyella rail line. Queensland would be a poorer state without it.

I have a message for GetUp!. We have some young Queenslanders in the gallery tonight. I wonder what they think of GetUp!? I have been giving the riding instructions that it is not a lot. There are people in Queensland—I call them the silent majority—who understand that coal will always be in our energy mix. We have people like the member for Burdekin, the member for Hinchinbrook and me beating the drum to fire up the Collinsville coal-fired power station because we know the importance of delivering energy security for the people of North Queensland.

The people on the other side of the House just do not get it. Having a renewable energy target of 50 per cent is absolutely absurd. What is going to happen? I know that there are a lot of people wondering. Do we go up to Eungella and go into a cave and get out the candles that the member for Burleigh has alluded to, hold hands and sing *Kumbaya*? Do not worry about cheap wine and three-day growth, we will have no wine and we will have one century's growth. They will go up there and find new species of Grizzly Adams because we will go into the Dark Ages. We have seen what has happened in South Australia. They are the laughing-stock of the nation.

What is this government going to say? What are they going to say to all the energy workers at places like Stanwell? Maybe the Palaszczuk Labor government can come up on the tilt train with me to Rockhampton at the end of the sitting week. I am sure the member for Gregory would love to come along for this. We will go to the head office to see the shirts and the suits in downtown Rocky in Fitzroy Street. Then we will go and see the real workers out at Stanwell. They can tell them, 'We do not believe in the coal industry.'

On this side of the House we will stand up for coal. We know it will always be in our energy mix. We all know that. Even working-class Queenslanders, the blue-collar workers—whether they vote LNP or Labor—know that. The Labor people that I talk to have lost faith in the Palaszczuk Labor government and the previous Labor governments.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth. They will not stand up for the worker anymore. Where are the train drivers? Where are the workers? They have all got letters after their names and they are all party hacks. Where are the real people in the red army?

I have said it before and I will say it again: coal is king. In Central Queensland and North Queensland it is not a dirty word. Organisations like Townsville Enterprise, the Greater Whitsunday Alliance, the Bowen Collinsville Enterprise and the Bowen Chamber of Commerce understand the importance of coal. It will always be in the energy mix.

There is no doubt that these extreme green groups, including GetUp! are off their heads. They should be sent to the Mater or the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital to get a CAT scan because they are off their heads. The real people in real parts of Queensland, even Labor Party people, cannot believe the oxygen and media coverage these clowns at GetUp! get. My message to GetUp! is that they can get nicked. They are holding back Queensland. We live in a democracy where everyone should have a say. That is what a democracy is all about. We all know that.

At the end of the day, people in my electorate and Central and North Queensland understand that we need to keep the lights on and baseload power is important. Coal and gas will always, touch wood, be in the energy mix in this state. There is a place for renewables, but to have a target of 50 is—

Mr Minnikin: Madness.

Mr COSTIGAN: It is madness. I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth. These people need to have more than a cold shower.

I love Eungella, but I do not want to go up there in a cave and have candlelit dinners for the rest of my life. I support the motion put forward by my good friend the shadow minister, the member for Burleigh. At the end of the day, I am proud to support the coal industry in this state.

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (6.15 pm): How the mighty have fallen. Once the Liberal Party stood on the national stage. Once they were kings of the national scene. Menzies stood on the national stage. 'Black Jack' McEwen, leading the National Party, had strong ideas about building industry. They fought the Labor Party tooth and nail across our national landscape. Fundamentally, it was the Labor Party creating a scene, but Menzies and 'Black Jack' McEwen were fighting them at every corner.

Now we see the Liberal Party and National Party have taken on a new enemy—not those that will create the nation, but getup.org. That is their enemy. We see the member for Whitsunday and the member for Burleigh taking on the great enemy change.org, such are their arguments. If we were to rely on the member for Whitsunday and the member for Burleigh to run our energy then God help Queensland.

We on this side of the House recognise the importance of our traditional energy sectors that contribute so much to the Queensland and the national economies and provide energy security. We saw the official policy of the LNP put forward by the member for Whitsunday that coal is king. Energy is king. Energy is what we need to drive our state forward.

We in Queensland are an energy powerhouse. While Queenslanders sweated through an unprecedented heatwave, Queensland's power system rose to the challenge. On Sunday, 12 February at 5 pm Queensland had reached a new demand record for electricity consumption of 9,000—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock! If I cannot hear the member speaking, I am certain Hansard cannot.

Mr POWER: We are an energy powerhouse. We reached a new record demand for electricity consumption of 9,369 megawatts. This is a significant event given that weekends typically have a lower demand than weekdays as a result of less commercial and industrial load. This breaks the previous record set on 18 January 2017. However, even when Queensland hit the maximum demand level, Queensland still had 548 megawatts in reserve capacity. The Queensland electricity sector has shown it is well placed to deliver Queensland's electricity demands even in periods of extremely high power demand. That is because Queensland has a diverse mix of generation, including baseload coal-fired generation, complemented by renewables and gas and is less reliant on other jurisdictions, on interconnector flows from other states. This diversity means that Queensland's power system continues to meet the electricity demand needs of Queenslanders, even during our heatwaves, and that we are well placed to manage the transition to a higher integration of renewable energy generation without compromising security of supply.

Queensland has a substantial baseload generation capacity, and there is no doubt that the sector will continue to play an important role. We have some of the youngest and least emissions-intensive coal-fired generators in Australia, along with a considerable stock of highly flexible and efficient gas-fired generation capacity. The efficiency of coal-fired generation has improved over time as knowledge of the various processes has developed. Improved materials and technology achieve higher pressures, higher temperatures and higher efficiencies. Higher pressures are essential. I want to assure the member for Burleigh that pressure inside the power station is not measured in 'hectacres'. In Queensland, the technologies used are subcritical and supercritical generators, with supercritical generators being the most efficient coal-fired generators in Australia.

Four of our eight generators are supercritical, being Callide C, Kogan Creek, Millmerran and Tarong North. Also, these supercritical generators were built relatively recently: Callide C in 2001, Millmerran in 2002, Tarong North in 2003 and Kogan Creek, which was opened as Australia's largest single turbine—

Mr King: Eight hundred megawatts.

Mr POWER: Eight hundred milliwatts, I am told.

Mr King: Megawatts.

Mr POWER: Megawatts. It was opened in 2007 and it complements Stanwell, which opened in 1996. It is clear that maintaining the state's existing traditional baseload generation fleet—

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, will you desist from making continuous interjections?

Mr POWER: It is clear that maintaining the state's existing traditional baseload generation fleet while adding more renewable energy to the mix is the right way forward for Queensland when it comes to stabilising prices and transitioning to a lower emissions economy.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (6.21 pm): Mr Speaker—

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will just wait a moment. Thank you, Treasurer. You will have an opportunity soon.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: What a load of 'milliwatts' that was! They are so against the coal-fired and gas-fired generation industry that they bring out the big guns. They do not bring out the megawatts; they bring out 'Mr Milliwatts', the member for Logan.

We all know that it is only this side of the House that supports rural and regional Queensland, and there is no greater example of that than what we are arguing here today. We have a minister over there who is prepared to put the entire workforce of Stanwell in particular in jeopardy. We have evidence of this. Apart from the fact that this government has got rid of the corporate offices and moved them to Brisbane—they have taken them from their Rockhampton and Kingaroy bases and moved them to Brisbane, trying to justify that their community affairs office and head office staff, who should be based at Kingaroy and Rocky—guess where they are based? That is right—down here at Stanwell's head office. What an embarrassment and what a disgrace from this government.

This all comes from the fact that the reliability of their jobs is at risk because this government is so intent on closing our good generating coal-fired power stations. It is so intent at aiming towards a 50 per cent renewable target that is completely and utterly unachievable. We heard earlier the 'milliwatt' member—sorry, the member for Logan talk about the fact that—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Thank you, Ministers.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I hear the murmur of interjections degrading people, saying that they should not want to live in Kingaroy, that they should prefer their jobs to be down here. That is what is wrong with them over there. They do not understand that people should be able to choose where they want to live. If it is the case that Kingaroy can prosper because we have a coal-fired power station, good on us.

Dr Lynham: And a coalmine.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Also, we have a coalmine. We are very proud of our coalmine. I take that interjection. Meandu coalmine supports—and this is something that those over there do not get. They do not understand that the Meandu coalmine feeds the Stanwell Power Station. It is not some little start-up company that is scaring mum-and-dad investors that the minister over there is trying to—

Mr Seeney: As a lot of families do.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: A lot of families need that support but not from this minister over there. He does not support the Meandu coalmine supporting the power station. He refuses to support the over 600 workers that are based in the South Burnett. He certainly does not support all of the contractors who also—

Mr Cripps: He pulled the rug out from underneath them.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I digress.

Mr Cripps: Are you going to get them all jobs on the windmill?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. It is those over there who genuinely believe that they can shut down—

Mr Seeney: Shut down coalmines.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON:—the coalmine that supports the power station. There you have it. They are going to shut down the coalmine. They are going to shut down the power station—over 650 direct jobs for the South Burnett. What are they going to replace it with? Ten jobs that support a couple of windmills! Guess what else they are going to be supporting? A fair few batteries and generators to kickstart the power for all of the businesspeople—all of the mums and dads—who are not going to have any power. According to the 'milliwatt' member for Logan, he wants us to go down the track of South Australia where, like the member for Whitsunday said, it is lights out—let's light the candle.

More than that, those people will only be able to afford to light a candle because they will not be able to afford to turn on their electricity. There will be no electricity for them because there will be no jobs when they shut this power station down. There is no greater example of their lack of support for rural and regional Queensland than their scaremongering around shutting down the power stations. There is no greater community that deserves its coalmine and power station than Kingaroy.

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (6.26 pm): I certainly rise to express my support for the diversified energy sector which is reliable, cost-effective and creates jobs. It feels like deja vu. It feels like we had this debate only last sitting week. I think we did. The debate was led by the member for Burleigh and he has come up with 'hectacres' of great arguments right off the bat. It was followed by the member for Whitsunday doing his best Rupert McCall impersonation—again talking about nothing.

I looked down the list and I thought the member for Nanango had dropped off—but, no, there she is at the end. That means that the member for Callide dropped off. That is a shame. It would have been really good to have the member for Callide make a contribution. Why? Try as hard as he could, he could not get the Carmichael Mine off the ground. It took a Labor government to get that happening and get it to the stage that we have. He could not get a coalmine open, yet here he is arguing against making sure coal-fired power stations are not closed.

Let's not forget the member for Nanango. She comes in, bringing up the tail for the opposition. Of course, this is the member who does not even want a coalmine in her own backyard. If we are so against coal-fired power stations on this side of the House, why did we campaign so hard to keep Stanwell in public hands? We fought so hard to keep it in public hands because we believe in baseload power and coal-fired power stations. It is absurd to come in here and attack us.

Who was the last government to close a coal-fired power station in Queensland? Was it our Labor government? No. It was the LNP—the former Newman-Nicholls government. They closed the last one down in 2012. When we look at where Stanwell's office is going to be, why do they care about where Stanwell's office is going to be? They did not know where it was going to be when they sold Stanwell off as part of their electricity sell-off. With all of the arguments they are putting forward, the rug, as the member for Hinchinbrook kindly brought up, has been pulled out from underneath them by their own members speaking.

In Queensland we know that the state energy market is secure. We went through this last sitting. It is secure with a very strong mix of baseload coal-fired power and hydro-generated power as well, complemented by renewables such as solar. We have a very diverse mix of energy in our state—a very reliable energy source for all Queenslanders.

This month, as we all are aware, we have experienced some extreme weather patterns here in Queensland. That is something that all of us should be concerned about. Without the diverse mix of power that we have we could have seen some very different outcomes. We have a very reliable system and it is because of that diverse mix. Our robust system in Queensland remains exactly that: robust and ready to meet Queenslanders' expectations on energy demands, even during extreme heatwaves like we experienced.

The amendments moved by the Minister for Energy, again, show that the Palaszczuk government is committed to continuing to support our traditional baseload generation, but we are very cognisant of the fact that we have to move to more of a clean energy future. We understand that Queensland has to play our part in tackling global warming. It is something that some of those opposite still do not get, although some of them do and I applaud them for that. However, we know that the LNP's broad and very narrow focus on coal-fired power stations only jeopardises our secure energy supply and puts energy jobs in the renewable sector at risk.

The Prime Minister, Malcolm Turnbull, may go on about outdated coal-fired approaches to electricity generation, but the fact is our diversity is what makes our system so strong—

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr PITT:—and it is very disappointing that the shadow energy minister cannot acknowledge that fact. The LNP does not want to listen to independent reviews because it does not suit their political agenda. We know that they did not want to hear from the COAG Energy Council's Finkel review that their federal colleagues actually initiated. We are committed to the Finkel review process. That review makes it clear that it is not if we integrate renewables but how we get that up to speed with other countries that are making that transition that is a key point.

Those opposite are stuck in the Dark Ages yet again. They are bereft of ideas when it comes to motions in the House. This week we are having a repeat of the last sitting. What is it going to be next week? Are they going to change three letters in the motion and then have the same debate yet again? What we hear is echoing silence from the people of Queensland when it comes to those opposite. We know that on the same day that the member for Clayfield attacked Queenslanders' support of a renewable energy sector his mates in Canberra were caught out withholding advice on the blackouts in South Australia. They withheld that advice. The member for Clayfield said we should be falling into line with the federal government and then Mr Turnbull himself received advice that the South Australian blackout was not caused by renewables. I think Malcolm Turnbull should be less worried about what is happening in that space. He should be more worried about this tweet—

7 News Political Editor Mark Riley has been told the Queensland Nationals are considering a split from the Liberals.

They are smart. I table that tweet.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, of a 7 News Brisbane Facebook link to an online article regarding the Queensland Nationals considering a split from the Liberals [296].

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

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 43:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Mr SPEAKER: For any future divisions on this matter the bells will be rung for one minute.

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

AYES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 41:

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

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House does not support calls to close all of Queensland's coal- and gas-fired power stations, and notes that traditional baseload generation will continue to play an important role in Queensland's energy mix as our state transitions to a clean energy future, as outlined by the Palaszczuk government's renewable energy task force.

Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.40 pm.

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (QUEENSLAND) BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 334, on motion of Ms Trad—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (7.40 pm), continuing: This bill is necessary in order for Queensland to join national rail safety regulation and investigation reforms and to establish the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator as the rail safety regulator in Queensland. I would also like to pick up where the member for Whitsunday left off with regard to rail history across Queensland. It would be remiss of me not to mention that last Sunday marked the 56th anniversary of the Bogantungan railway accident, which was one of the worst rail disasters in this state. On Friday, 26 February 1960, while on its way to Rockhampton the *Midlander* had an accident at Medway Creek just west of Bogantungan, killing seven and injuring 43. The night before the accident an uprooted gum tree weighing 12 tonnes impacted and damaged the pylons under the railway bridge. As the train crossed the bridge just after 2 am the bridge collapsed, causing the first engine to derail on the other side and the C-class second engine and three sleeping cars to fall 7.6 metres into the creek. Peter Henderson was four at that time and travelling with his mum, thankfully seated in one of the back carriages. As quoted in the *CQ News*, he said—

I don't remember a great deal ... I can remember giving my clothes from my suitcase away to other children.

I can remember the carriage and the water and the people.

It must have been an extraordinarily frightening time for those people, and I pay my respects to and remember those people. It is a disaster that everybody in regional and Central Queensland knows and has heard about, and it is time to remember those people who lost their lives and those who were impacted by it.

I welcome the cost-benefit analysis provisions in this bill, which will ensure proper consideration of the changes which may be imposed under the national reforms. These are intended to prevent the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator from introducing changes that may impose significant costs on a rail operator with little benefit in terms of operational safety. If only we could wind back the clock and have the Aurizon contracts for western rail freight properly considered as well. This is important, because Queensland Rail and rail freight out to western Queensland is very important to the electorates of Gregory, Mount Isa and Warrego, who are hugely impacted by this. When the Labor government privatised Queensland Rail, it is pretty clear that absolutely no thought was given to ensuring that western rail freight services were maintained. These services are key to the ability of people in the west to earn a living, and they are key to our quality of life in the west.

Mr Power: So help us bring them back.

Mr MILLAR: I take that interjection from the member for Logan. It was the Bligh Labor government that sold Queensland Rail to Aurizon, and this is why we are having these problems. In the first instance, bulky goods and dangerous freight deliveries that were once reliably provided by rail are now sparse and unreliable.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr MILLAR: Mate, they are unreliable. You got out there once: that's great! This has a direct impact on all of the small businesses in the seat of Gregory who should be able to stock those goods and the consumers who wish to purchase and use those goods.

In the second instance I am talking about the ability to shift livestock out of the west by rail. This is a key product of Western Queensland, and transport access to these markets is fundamental if we are to be productive and competitive. The loss of these services is absolutely devastating to Western Queensland. People out in Western Queensland in the seats of Gregory and Warrego know that Aurizon plays games while paying lip-service to these issues. Meanwhile, on the ground Aurizon provides a service so poor that it is not competitive, not reliable, not frequent and not up to the freight tasks required. It is a Clayton's service—the service you provide when you are not providing a service—and this is why the Labor government is doing nothing at the moment. They both faffed about so much that the government then felt the tender period would need adjustment. In essence, the Labor government rewarded Aurizon's performance by extending their contract until December 2017. This shows a complete lack of proper oversight. The west has been left unserviced and uncertain for two years. The new contract will not commence until January 2018. Tenders for the contract closed in October 2016.

Only last week I was talking to Peter Ballard, who has been a freight carrier in Longreach for over 30 years. He relies on good, reliable rail services. He told me that his business has been devastated by the Aurizon contract, and every time he hears the government talk about getting freight off the road and onto rail it is a mockery given that they do not see rail services out there. Given this woeful record on the oversight of rail services, it is a good thing that the Labor government will no longer be overseeing rail safety and that that important responsibility will be vested federally.

I also welcome the improvements the bill will make in terms of worker safety so that it will be an offence for rail safety workers—including train drivers—to work with a blood alcohol level above zero. While this may sound tough, we must remember that rail disasters can be large in scale and have a widespread impact on victims and their families. This reduction in blood alcohol from .02 to zero recognises this fact. I commend this bill to the House.

Mr PEGG (Stretton—ALP) (7.46 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution on the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. This bill delivers on the Palaszczuk government's commitment to rail safety and delivers regulatory harmonisation across Australian states and territories. The bill will repeal the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 and amend the Coal Mining Safety Health Act 1999, Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999 and Work Health and Safety Act 2011. It will also establish the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator as the rail safety regulator in this state. Currently the Rail Safety National Law applies in all Australian states and territories other than Queensland. This bill is introduced to align with the rail safety laws of the rest of the nation and ensure the consistency of rail safety regulation and investigation.

In 2009 the Council of Australian Governments agreed that the Australian Transport Council would create a single national regulatory framework for rail safety with the establishment of a National Rail Safety Regulator and the commencement of the Rail Safety National Law. The implementation of the bill will achieve the outcomes of the intergovernmental agreement by improving consistent national requirements and decreasing the regulatory burden on industry. It is necessary to move to a single national law and one set of processes and procedures to ensure efficiency, consistency and safety across Queensland rail networks. It will result in significant productivity improvements for commercial rail organisations operating in more than one state. It will also benefit workers who will be working in different states and territories.

The bill seeks to achieve the objectives of the Rail Safety National Law, including: to provide for the effective management of safety risks associated with railway operations; to provide for the safe carrying out of railway operations; and to promote public confidence and ensure effective consultation and cooperation with relevant stakeholders.

As the Rail Safety National Law and the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 were both based on the model law, there are only a small number of policy changes for Queensland when moving from the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 to the Rail Safety National Law. I will go through some of the major differences. The first relates to an independent single national rail safety regulator, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator commenced operations in South Australia, New South Wales, Tasmania and the Northern Territory in January 2013, Victoria in May 2014, the Australian Capital Territory in November 2014 and Western Australia in November 2015. Therefore, this bill supports greater national consistency in rail safety regulation for all Australian rail transport operations.

Other differences are that persons who load or unload freight on rolling stock will have an obligation to ensure such operations are carried out safely to recognise that there is a shared responsibility to ensure the safety of railway operations; and that some penalties are significantly higher than the penalties contained in the current act.

As part of the national rail safety reforms, the Australian Transport Safety Bureau will commence conducting necessary no-blame rail safety investigations in Queensland. These no-blame rail safety investigations are currently undertaken by the rail safety regulation unit in the Department of Transport and Main Roads under the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010.

The consistency and safety of the Queensland rail network are imperative, as it is a vital and efficient mode of transport for moving bulk commodities, coal, minerals, agricultural products, livestock and large volumes of passengers across our geographically vast state. Therefore, this bill is vital as it will bring rail safety in Queensland into a nationally harmonised and safe environment which will ensure consistency and efficiency. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (7.51 pm): The passing of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 will achieve the outcomes sought by the intergovernmental agreement from 2011 relating to the harmonisation of rail safety regulation and investigation. The Rail Safety National Law currently applies in all states and territories and in Queensland.

The bill will repeal the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 and amend numerous other Queensland acts, including the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and the Work Health and Safety Act 2011, to guarantee that the Rail Safety National Law prevails over those acts to the extent that both may apply. The Queensland Rail Transit Authority Act 2013 will also need to be amended to clarify the operation of the Rail Safety National Law to Queensland Rail Limited and the Queensland Rail Transit Authority.

A range of benefits will come from this harmonisation. Rail safety in Queensland will no longer be regulated by the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Going forward, the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator, ONRSR, will manage rail safety. The objectives of the ONRSR include the facilitation of safe operations of rail transport; to exhibit independence, rigour and excellence in carrying out their regulatory functions; and the promotion of safety improvements in the management of rail transport throughout Queensland. An office will be established in Queensland. There will be challenges to address various administrative hurdles in rail safety regulations, and it is hoped that they will be swiftly overcome.

As part of the national rail safety investigation reforms project, in 2013 the Australian Transport Safety Bureau became the national no-blame safety investigator. In the future, all no-blame rail safety investigations on intrastate tracks will be conducted by the ATSB. It will also have a role in selectively investigating some accidents where the outcome of those investigations might enhance rail safety.

Currently, Queensland police officers may drug and alcohol test train drivers. The bill will expand drug and alcohol testing to all rail safety workers including train drivers. The law will demand the highest standards, with any person exhibiting any alcohol reading committing an offence. Now it will be not just Queensland police officers testing rail safety workers. Testing will randomly also be undertaken by the ONRSR, thereby providing a second line of defence to assist in the safeguarding of Queenslanders.

Benefits will also accrue from the ONRSR being obliged to undertake a cost-benefit analysis if a decision is likely to result in significant costs or expenses to rail transport operators. The best public policy is always built on strong analysis. Let us hope that it bears out in practice.

Rail transport operators have the primary safety responsibility for the loading or unloading of rolling stock under existing regulation. There are no particular obligations imposed on parties engaged in the loading or unloading of rolling stock. The bill recognises that there is now a shared responsibility for safety, and a new duty with an associated penalty framework will be brought into effect for any parties loading or unloading rail freight.

These rail safety harmonisation laws will benefit all rail transport operators by introducing consistent national requirements while diminishing the overarching regulatory burden. I support the bill before the House.

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (7.54 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016. As stated by the former minister for transport and the Commonwealth Games in his introductory speech on 13 September 2016, this is a bill for an act to apply a national law that provides for a national system of rail safety. This bill supports the Palaszczuk government's commitment to rail safety and delivers regulatory harmonisation across Australian states and territories.

In 1996 the Australian government signed the intergovernmental agreement in relation to national rail safety, which provided the framework for development of a uniform national rail safety standard as the basis for rail safety accreditation. In 2006 the National Transport Commission developed the rail safety model law, based on best practice rail safety law. The main purpose of the rail safety model laws was to provide for rail safety legislation that formed part of a system of nationally consistent rail safety laws; however, each jurisdiction was able to modify the law to reflect different drafting preferences, local legal and enforcement regimes and local operational differences.

As we all know, Queensland has the most extensive rail network of any state in Australia, growing to more than 9,500 kilometres of operational track and 65 accredited rail operators over the last 150 years. Our rail network provides the basis for a vital transport system that connects strategic areas in regional Queensland supporting the agriculture, mining, manufacturing, retail and tourism industries as well as mass commuter transport services in South-East Queensland. It is an efficient and effective mode of transport for moving bulk commodities, coal, minerals, agricultural products, livestock and large volumes of passengers across our geographically vast state.

To meet the challenges and capitalise on the opportunities presented by our size and population growth and diverse economic base, Queensland needs a safe, efficient and reliable rail network. Rail transport operators in Queensland must be accredited in accordance with the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010. In 2009 the Council of Australian Governments agreed that the Australian Transport Council should create a single national regulatory framework for rail safety with the establishment of a National Rail Safety Regulator and the commencement of a Rail Safety National Law by January 2013. As the then minister stated in his introductory speech, across Australia there has been significant work in relation to national harmonisation of rail safety regulation and investigation from as far back as 2009, when the Council of Australian Governments agreed to the establishment of the National Rail Safety Regulator, the development of a single Rail Safety National Law and the expansion of the role of the Australian Transport Safety Bureau as the national safety investigator.

The Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016, to which I am speaking in support, reflects many years of work, both in Queensland and nationally, to ensure a more consistent approach to policy and regulation across jurisdictions and to remove inefficiencies resulting from various inconsistencies between states and territories.

The main purpose of the bill is to apply the Rail Safety National Law as the law of Queensland. There is a strong safety culture amongst the 65 accredited rail operators in Queensland. The Department of Transport and Main Roads, as Queensland's rail safety regulator, has provided a strong focus on informing the rail industry about the appropriate safety standards, helping them to comply with legislation, undertaking investigations and checking safety standards are maintained.

Queensland already has a strong record in rail safety, with ongoing downward trends in safety occurrences with a robust co-regulatory environment. Even with the substantial increase in total kilometres travelled by rolling stock over the last five years, the total number of serious rail safety incidents directly resulting from rail operations has decreased. In 2015-16, just as an example, there was not a single rail safety related fatality in Queensland. 2015-16 also had the lowest number of serious safety occurrences in the previous five years. Similarly, while still a continuing concern, near misses between trains and road vehicles at level crossings has decreased every year since 2011-12. The Queensland rail network transitions to the national regulator with this strong safety performance, and this is expected to be further reinforced by implementing the national rail safety reforms in Queensland.

The Queensland government will continue to work towards ensuring the safety of Queensland's travelling public by safeguarding the integrity of the rail network through the relevant state policies and investment priorities that include enhancing rail infrastructure safety. The national rail safety reforms were established to deliver a more consistent approach to policy and regulation across jurisdictions and remove inconsistencies in the rail regulatory regimes between states and territories. The implementation of the bill will achieve the outcomes of the intergovernmental agreement by improving consistent national requirements and decreasing the regulatory burden on industry. The Rail Safety National Law was developed in consultation with all Australian states and territories and also the rail industry, unions and other representative groups. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (8.01 pm): I rise to speak briefly on the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill. The Gympie region has a great affinity with the railways with it being a reliable provider of freight transport, for commuters and the iconic tourist and heritage railway of the Mary Valley Rattler, which builds on the Gympie region's historical reputation and is situated within close reach of the tourists of the Sunshine Coast. This bill has two purposes. The first is for Queensland to adopt national rail safety regulation and investigative reforms. The second is to establish the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator as the rail safety regulator in Queensland. These changes will bring Queensland into line with the rest of Australia and take effect on 30 June.

The Rail Safety National Law has already commenced application in South Australia, Tasmania, the Northern Territory and New South Wales in January 2013, in Victoria in May 2014, in the Australian Capital Territory in November 2014, and in Western Australia in November 2015. The previous LNP government had already supported and progressed Queensland's implementation of the reforms. The government only introduced this bill to the parliament in September last year even though there was not much to change because the Rail Safety National Law and our current laws were both based on a national framework. It makes you wonder if this bill is yet another example of policy delay and paralysis because of this government's dithering. Fortunately, there are only a small number of policy changes to be made.

The differences between the Rail Safety National Law and the existing laws are a requirement to undertake a cost-benefit analysis, exemption for low-risk railways, freight loading duties, drug and alcohol management, the level of fees and penalties, and compliance and enforcement measures. I am a firm advocate of being prudent with money and making common-sense decisions based on the best analysis of the true costs involved. It is only with these changes that a cost-benefit analysis will be required if a particular decision is likely to result in significant costs or expenses to the rail transport operator. In effect, that means that previous decisions would have been made without any cost-benefit analysis. The expectation is that an analysis will introduce additional rigor into a national regulator's decision-making process. It will also reduce the likelihood of the regulator imposing requirements on rail transport operators that may involve a high cost of compliance with little or no resulting safety benefit. How often before have we seen policymakers imposing measures which have negligible benefits? I estimate that many of the complaints in my office are the result of unnecessary and expensive regulation which ends in having little positive effect.

There is a special category of railways which are a legacy of our rich heritage, reflect our agricultural base or are used in tourist facilities. Low-risk railways are those that are not connected to or associated with railway tracks of any other rail infrastructure, another railway or connected or associated with a rail or public road crossing. They can be given an exemption from needing accreditation. Currently, there are approximately seven operators excluded on the basis that they do not connect with the public railway system. They will continue to be excluded. These include cane rail, some very small tourist and heritage operators and theme park operators which fall under the mandate of workplace health and safety.

In my electorate of Gympie we have a small tourist and heritage railway which needs revitalisation. The previous LNP government had budgeted $2 million for track and line restoration work, with another $600,000 to upgrade rolling stock of the Mary Valley Rattler which travelled through the fertile and picturesque Mary Valley. Earlier this month we heard that the state government has announced another $4.7 million to help support the restoration of the railway. However, of course that much touted announcement is conditional. For the last two years the state government has found ways to continually defer any announcement of support for the railway and let us hope that it does not find an excuse to back out.

I always welcome the use of common sense when addressing safety measures. While you cannot prevent someone from being stupid, you can make it safer for others. The bill will introduce a requirement that those who load or unload freight on rolling stock have a duty to ensure, so far as reasonably practicable, that such operations are carried out safely.

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr PERRETT: I take that interjection from the member for Gladstone, because I would like to hear that it has gone unconditional. I am waiting for the announcement from the Deputy Premier that that $4.7 million has gone unconditional.

Ms Trad: It's in their bank account as of last Friday.

Mr PERRETT: That is a great announcement by the Deputy Premier, and something that I have supported and something that will make a great change.

There is also the change from the current practice where a railway operator must ensure that the blood alcohol content of each rail safety worker on duty is less than .02 in their blood or breath or that the worker is not impaired by a defined drug. Now it will be an offence for a rail safety worker, which includes a train driver, to carry out rail safety work with a blood alcohol content above .00. This policy will be supported by the national regulator undertaking random, targeted and post-incident testing of rail safety workers. The testing of train drivers will continue to be conducted by the Queensland Police Service. By making the reforms in this bill align with those in other states, we are applying good, practical common sense to policymaking. This is why I urge this House to support the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Before I call the member for Bulimba, I acknowledge in the gallery community leaders of the Pacific Islands Council of Queensland, hosted by the member for Sunnybank.

Ms FARMER (Bulimba—ALP) (8.07 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill. The main purpose of the bill is to adopt national rail safety regulation and investigation reforms by applying the Rail Safety National Law as a law in Queensland and establishing the Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator as the rail safety regulator in Queensland. The purpose of the national law reforms is to deliver a more consistent approach to policy and regulation across jurisdictions and to remove inconsistencies in the rail regulatory regimes between states and territories.

This debate obviously follows a significant body of work from a number of years ago, including the signing by Australian governments in 1996 of the Intergovernmental Agreement in relation to National Rail Safety 1996 which provided the framework for the development of a uniform national rail safety standard as the basis for rail safety accreditation; the development by the National Transport Commission in 2006 of the rail safety model law based on best practice rail safety law; and agreement by COAG in 2009 for the Australian Transport Council to create a single national regulatory framework for rail safety with the establishment of a National Rail Safety Regulator and commencement of a Rail Safety National Law by January 2013. Over the years the Rail Safety National Law as applied commenced in—and I know a number of members have talked about this—South Australia, Tasmania, the Northern Territory and New South Wales in 2013, in Victoria and the ACT in 2014 and Western Australia in 2015.

Owing to our size, our population growth and our decentralisation, rail is incredibly iconic in Queensland. The previous minister's explanatory speech and the committee report reminded us of how iconic rail is in our state, with Queensland having the most extensive rail network of any state in Australia, with more than 9½ thousand kilometres, and those wonderful iconic passenger trains that we all knew about when we were kids—certainly for me, growing up in Central Queensland—the *Spirit of the Outback,* the *Gulflander* and the *Savannahlander.*

Today, in this House the Premier reminded us of the significant commitment of the Palaszczuk Labor government to rail infrastructure. The Premier talked about Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, which will be opened for the Commonwealth Games in 2018. Who can forget all of the members representing the north side of Brisbane celebrating the Redcliffe peninsula line from Petrie to Kippa Ring. The Deputy Premier also talks often about the duplication of the Gold Coast line between Helensvale and Coomera.

As the then minister said, it is because of all of this that it is so important that Queensland has a safe, efficient and reliable rail network. As Queensland is the only state or territory that is not part of the national framework, and with that significant investment in rail in mind, it surely is our turn. It is time for us to link in with those national reforms. In terms of national consistency, although we are playing on the team, we are still able to meet our jurisdictional obligations across the state.

The public expect us to make practical decisions. They hate us inserting or sustaining bureaucracy that creates extra work. When we look at the history of having separate regimes for rail across the Australian states and territories and what an imposition that was with different rail operators, we know very clearly that this is the sort of bill that the public really want us to put in place. The public like us to get on with things, they like us to do things that are simple and practical and they want us to just make sense. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (8.11 pm), in reply: I would like to start by thanking all of those members who made a contribution to this debate in support of this bill. I am very pleased that, on this occasion, all speakers commended the bill and will be supporting it. The Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 is very important. I would like to also thank the former transport minister, Hon. Stirling Hinchliffe, for his work in bringing these laws into this parliament.

At the outset, I want to address some comments that have been made that have contextualised this bill in relation to the former LNP government's commitment to this issue. Let me be abundantly clear: Labor has always proposed to join the national approach to harmonisation around rail safety. We have been consistent on this matter and we have held firm on things that are unique and dear to Queensland, such as fatigue management and our heritage railways. For those opposite to say that they had started this reform process I think is somewhat disingenuous.

Mr Powell: We didn't say we started it.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Glass House. I am pretty sure the members opposite made some claim that, in fact, the LNP government had started the reform process around the Rail Safety National Law and certainly Queensland's adoption of the harmonisation approach. Let me be clear: those opposite decided that they would have mirror laws to the Rail Safety National Law but that Queensland would still go it alone, which is not consistent with a harmonised approach. Let me be clear: it is Labor that has always taken a very strong view that we need to be harmonised in terms of our rail safety approach with that national law for all of the reasons than I outlined in my second reading speech, but in the last term of government those opposite decided to go it alone, because they decided that a Queensland-only approach was best. Nonetheless, I thank the opposition for supporting the bill and I particularly want to thank the Labor members for their insightful contributions.

This debate has highlighted how important rail transport is in Queensland. In fact, the member for Bulimba referred to how iconic rail transport is in Queensland. In particular, this debate has highlighted how crucial rail safety is to Queenslanders. During the 2015-16 financial year there were no rail safety related fatalities reported on the rail network in Queensland. This was the first fatality-free financial year since at least 1995-96. I think that excellent safety record is due to the hard work and commitment shown by both the rail industry and the rail safety regulation unit in the Department of Transport and Main Roads. Tonight I acknowledge their efforts.

I also acknowledge the work of the rail safety regulation unit. This unit is a team of hardworking and dedicated people who during this national reform process—which, if we are to be honest, at times has been a little uncertain for them—have remained positive and committed right throughout. We might not see the faces of the workers behind the rail safety regulation team, but every day we experience the difference that this team makes to rail safety in our state. They are an excellent example of the success of co-regulation.

I would also like to talk about the importance of rail in Queensland. Today, we have heard members talk about the importance of rail across our state and how important rail is to so many aspects of Queensland life—from agriculture and mining to tourism and heritage appreciation through to the mass commuter transport services in South-East Queensland. In 2015, Queensland celebrated the 150th anniversary of the first heavy rail service between Ipswich and Grandchester, which was approximately 40 kilometres of track. One hundred and fifty years later, in Queensland there is over 9,000 kilometres of operational railway, managed and regulated under the act. We have a diverse and expansive rail network in our state.

However, the value placed on safety is the consistent feature of these railways. I acknowledge the support of the member for Glass House for the requirement for the national regulator to undertake a cost-benefit analysis before imposing a costly requirement on a rail operator. As I said in my speech, this strikes the right balance between ensuring rigour in the regulator's decision and not imposing unnecessary burdens on operators with no safety benefits.

I also acknowledge the contributions of the members for Whitsunday and Gregory in which they reminded us of the anniversary of one of Queensland's worst rail tragedies. It is a timely reminder of the potential disaster that can occur if railway safety is not maintained to the highest standard. Seven people were killed and 43 were injured in the Bogantungan disaster. The area had experienced heavy rainfall and flooded waterways. Medway Creek, lined with old gum trees, flowed under a rail bridge just west of Bogantungan. At 2.30 am, a 12-tonne tree had demolished the bridge just as the Rockhampton bound *Midlander* train, carrying 120 passengers, was about to cross. The impact was disastrous and train carriages piled on top of each other, some forced 7.6 metres into the creek below. We can be grateful that these types of incidents are now very rare. Queensland has a very safe railway and a strong safety culture among rail operators.

We will transition to the national regulator with the safest railways that we have ever had and we expect this to continue under the national reforms. The Queensland government will maintain a keen interest in rail safety matters and will have oversight of the Rail Safety National Law through our involvement in the Transport and Infrastructure Council, which must approve any amendments to the law, all significant policy decisions and the fee model.

I am pleased to see support for the introduction of regulator drug and alcohol testing. This allows the national regulator to undertake random, targeted and post-incident testing. Firstly, I acknowledge the extensive testing that occurs in the rail industry, which has a strong culture of drug and alcohol testing. This strong culture of the industry testing its workers will continue after the commencement of this bill. The regulator drug and alcohol testing is complementary to industry testing. The regulator testing is about improving safety by acting as a deterrent, monitoring compliance with the law and monitoring the effectiveness of an operator's drug and alcohol management program.

Section 269 of the Transport (Rail Safety) Act 2010 prohibits me from disclosing information that the Department of Transport and Main Roads has obtained about an accredited operator in the course of administering the act. However, I can speak in general terms about how the differences in cost-recovery methodologies will affect rail operators.

There is no increase in the overall cost of regulation in Queensland under the national reforms. There is redistribution of the fees to make the model more equitable and reduce the level of cross-subsidisation. Currently, only 13 of the 66 accredited rail transport operators pay annual accreditation fees. Under the national model all accredited operators will pay fees. The rail industry in Queensland will pay less overall in regulation and investigation fees than they do under the current cost-recovery model. I am advised by the department that no rail operator who pays both the annual accreditation fee and the rail safety investigation fee will pay more overall than they currently do. In fact, they will all pay less than they currently do. There will, however, be around 14 accredited operators who will pay higher accreditation fees than they currently do—the majority a very modest increase. The majority of these operators are also very large multinational companies.

During consultation, the Department of Transport and Main Roads made detailed modelling available to rail operators so they know what to expect post transition. I can again say that we as a government are extremely proud to be paying the annual accreditation fees of tourist and heritage operators on their behalf in acknowledging the ongoing support of the historic and cultural significance they have in Queensland. We also continue to find ways to support jobs, tourism and small business. I note the member for Gympie's comments in relation to the *Rattler*, and I am very pleased and proud of the fact that the Palaszczuk Labor government provided more than $4 million to this project that will see some 50-plus jobs for this project in the Gympie region. In fact, I can advise the House that the Gympie Regional Council Mayor, Mick Curran, was ecstatic about this contribution from the Palaszczuk Labor government. For the benefit of parliament I would like to read into *Hansard* his specific comments when he heard about this announcement. He said—

It's great to see the government supporting regional Queensland. This will be a significant boost for our region. We would like to thank minister Jackie Trad and the state government for their support of our region.

Mr Power interjected.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Logan. Thank you. The Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator is currently progressing the proposed variable fees that will apply to Queensland for the 2017-18 period. The ONRSR's fees are calculated based on an agreed cost of

regulation for Queensland. It is about recovering the amount that it will cost the national regulator to regulate rail safety in Queensland and that amount only. Once the Transport and Infrastructure Council agrees with the proposed fees they will be included in the national regulations so operators can see what fees apply to them. This will not just happen this once; it will happen every time it is proposed that the national regulations or national law be amended. Changes need to receive unanimous support from the Transport and Infrastructure Council, so Queensland will always be involved in changes that may affect our operators.

The department and the national regulator have consulted widely on the fee structure and worked with industry. As we work towards transition, the department and the national regulator will work closely with industry ensuring that they continue to remain informed and understand the changes as they apply to their circumstances. After transition, the national regulator will continue the comprehensive engagement with industry. That is an important aspect of the national regulator's daily work across other states and territories.

I would like to again thank the members of the Transportation and Utilities Committee and their staff for their work in considering the bill in detail. We appreciate the committee's recommendation that the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 be passed. Again I would like to take this opportunity to thank those stakeholders who attended the industry sessions, responded to discussion papers and provided feedback to the Transportation and Utilities Committee. I would also like to acknowledge staff from the Department of Transport and Main Roads, in particular my acting director-general, Mike Stapleton, the acting deputy director-general, Geoff Magoffin, Kirrim Corley, Anita Eenink and Elizabeth Robinson for all of their work in relation to the bill before us. They have worked collaboratively to help achieve this milestone and their continued commitment to ensuring a smooth transition to the national rail safety reforms is appreciated by this government.

I would also like to thank staff from my office, in particular Peter Procopis, who has recently joined my staff. This is his first bill through the House.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Ms TRAD: Hear, hear! I welcome Peter to my staff and also to his first bill before the House. Passing the Rail Safety National Law (Queensland) Bill 2016 today is a very important milestone that will ensure that Queensland's rail transport operations benefit from the efficiencies of the national rail safety reforms. I commend the bill to the House.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 145, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (8.25 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. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (8.26 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.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (8.26 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Keogh, Supt J; Loggie, Mr S

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (8.26 pm): In state electorates across Queensland our police officers, our school principals and teachers work hard to provide safe communities and quality education on a daily basis. I often say how proud I am to represent a community as caring and connected as Currumbin. I have done so as the local member of parliament for the past 13 years and hope to do so for many more.

Tonight I pay tribute to two individuals who have contributed significantly to the wellbeing and safety of those who live in this amazing electorate. First I speak of police officer Superintendent Jim Keogh. His imminent retirement has saddened countless people who admire and respect his brave, fearless determination to rid our Gold Coast community of criminal activity and in particular drive outlaw motorcycle criminal gangs out of the state. Jim Keogh has been a serving Queensland police officer for 37 years rising to the rank of inspector then superintendent on the Gold Coast. Jim became regional duty officer in 2000 before heading to Burleigh as a detective inspector and first waged war on bikies in 2004 when the Finks had control of Surfers. He often presided over schoolies celebrations and Indy and V8 events.

In 2010 Jim was awarded an Australian Police Medal for distinguished service and was appointed by Deputy Commissioner Brett Pointing in 2013 to lead Taskforce Takeback and then the much larger Rapid Action and Patrols Group—RAP. In the first six months of Taskforce Takeback there were 791 arrests, 2,726 traffic infringement notices issued, 137 liquor infringement notices issued, 16,728 random breath tests conducted and 2,100 intelligence reports generated. Unfortunately, in what has been widely labelled a political move by Labor, Jim was transferred back to Brisbane in 2015 when RAP was absorbed back into the Gold Coast police district under the Palaszczuk government. Jim received the Meritorious Service Medal and the Exemplary Conduct Medal from Commissioner Ian Stewart earlier this month in recognition of the successful bikie crackdown.

News that popular Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School principal Stephen Loggie was heading to an international posting in coming months came as a surprise to many. Stephen has been a principal for over 23 years across nine different primary and secondary schools in rural, regional and urban locations in Queensland. He started as executive principal of Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School in 2009. He wasted no time in applying for Palm Beach-Currumbin State High School to become an Independent Public School in 2013. He formed the PBC Alliance the same year. It has formed the foundation for our students to embrace employment and training opportunities.

I feel very privileged to have worked closely with these two gentlemen for many years and I thank them for their outstanding service to our community. I would like to note also that Stephen is a progressive principal dedicated to excellence and getting the most from staff and students, helping them to realise their potential.

Fair Work Commission, Penalty Rates

Mr BROWN (Capalaba—ALP) (8.29 pm): Unfortunately, tonight I rise to discuss an issue that is going to hurt hardworking families in my electorate of Capalaba which will sadly flow on to our local businesses. It is the decision handed down by the Fair Work Commission last week to cut Sunday and public holiday rates by 25 per cent in the retail, fast-food and hospitality industries. That will affect 700,000 of the lowest paid workers across Australia and approximately 6,000 workers in Redlands, who will lose up to $70 per Sunday shift or up to $6,000 per year. It will affect those in our society who can least afford it. My first job was working in the bars at the Alexandra Hills Hotel. Surprise, surprise: the vast majority of my shifts occurred on a weekend, which allowed me to study during the week and to pay my way through university. It also gave me a small amount of disposable income and it will come as no surprise where it went: I invested in good times at the local watering holes at university and around Brisbane.

If those rates were good enough for me when I worked in the industry, they are good enough for the workers I now represent. That is why I went in to bat for workers at the Capalaba Sports Club when they cut weekend and public holiday penalty rates last year. I was proud of the community campaign

that I led and we were able to overturn those cuts. I am pleased that the effects of that campaign continue to deliver for the workers, as the Capalaba Sports Club committed to not cutting the penalty rates after the decision was made. That decision was followed by the East Carina leagues club.

Mr Minnikin: A great club.

Mr BROWN: It is a great club. It has done the right thing by its workers. Some might say that the decision does not affect club workers, but at page 222 the decision leaves the door wide open for those workers to be included, laying out two options that could affect them. In the latest edition of the Clubs Queensland magazine, I was disappointed to read an article by CEO Doug Flockhart in which he likened acts of domestic violence to the actions of club union members who stood up for their weekend rates. In relation to United Voice he stated—

... a picture comes to mind when thinking of the UV and their activity. A caveman (seeking a mate) hits a woman on the head with a BIG bone and he drags her into his cave. The caption from the cave woman reads—"have you not heard of Tinder?"

When it comes to caveman views I suggest Mr Flockhart look in the mirror. I implore him to look towards the progressive big clubs on the east side, such as Capalaba and East Carina, when it comes to weekend penalty rates. Those clubs know the importance of keeping and attracting a dedicated and happy workforce that delivers profits for the clubs which flow through to our local communities.

Sunshine Coast, Health Services

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (8.32 pm): There are 10,000 reasons to celebrate our new Sunshine Coast university public hospital and it is time to celebrate. Our new tertiary-level hospital opens on the Sunshine Coast in a few weeks. Each year it will save 10,000 patient trips to Brisbane to access services.

What is so special about a new $1.8 billion hospital? When fully opened over the next few months it will mean that, for the first time, the Sunshine Coast will have child and adolescent mental health in-patient services; neonatal services to care for lower birth weight newborn babies; tertiary rehabilitation services for patients with spinal cord injuries, brain injuries or other major trauma; and radiation oncology. We already have public access to radiation oncology through private sector contracts, which is something I have fought for over the years. I am pleased that I could contribute to the provision of those services, never knowing that my own family would have to access them. For the first time, radiation oncology will be delivered directly through our public hospital. Other services that will be provided include nuclear medicine services, CT angiography and enhanced trauma services. This is a wonderful expansion of services, but it also means that an expanded workforce will bring flow-on benefits to an expanding and deepening economy as higher level specialties deliver services to people closer to home.

Also flagged is the expansion of Dove Cottage at Caloundra Hospital from 10 to 20 beds, which I strongly support. On the Sunshine Coast we have amazing health workers. In particular, I send a shout-out to the palliative specialist team. The Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Service's Specialist Palliative Care Service is a multidisciplinary team that provides specialist support for people who have a life-limiting illness, their families and carers. The best advice I have received from some of my palliative-nursing friends is that if you or a loved one is facing a terminal illness, do not hesitate to reach out to specialist services. Ask the GP for a referral and find out what is available. Many amazing, caring and very skilled people deliver those services and, most importantly, they can coordinate and link in with at-home help and sometimes, when it is needed, in-hospital help and, in a case such as I just mentioned, in-hospice help such as is available through Dove Cottage. It surprises me that many good GPs do not always realise how early they can get people into such services and have them appropriately assessed. At the end of the day, from the cradle through to end of life, everyone needs to know that they can access the best care. We advocate to ensure that they get that care.

Community Legal Centres

Ms BOYD (Pine Rivers—ALP) (8.35 pm): Community legal centres perform a vital role for the most vulnerable, marginalised and at-risk in our community, but on 1 July this year the Turnbull government is going to cut 30 per cent of the funding out of that program. Once again, it proves that through the austerity measures of bad federal and state Liberal and National parties the hardest hit is the little guy.

There is no denying that community legal centres have had their fair share of challenges. They face growing demands each year. The Pine Rivers Community Legal Centre has seen a vast spike in the number of clients, with over 3,000 cases in just the last six months. They deal with complex issues,

often of a deeply personal nature, such as issues involving family separations, consumer problems, debt, tenancy disputes, employment issues and, increasingly, domestic and family violence cases with duty lawyers at the Pine Rivers Magistrates Court. In my community there is a four-week wait just to access an appointment. That demand illustrates the need for more funding to the service, not less.

We know that early intervention and support can be the best thing for people resolving and dealing with legal issues. The Pine Rivers Community Legal Centre has been an institution for 33 years and some of the volunteer solicitors are foundation members, with a small core team of five mostly part-time workers and over 38 volunteer solicitors. After much work, our local service increased its office space to keep up with demand, particularly through the Thursday walk-in service, which has lines that run out of the door.

A substantial funding cut would result in the service being less accessible, in more ways than one. Insecurity in funding has already led to experienced staff departing, less legal advice available in group sessions and fewer legal services for youth. That is happening while people are stressed, anxious and have highly confidential issues that need to be addressed. Ripping $34 million out of those services for three years will only create a false economy, while vulnerable and marginalised locals with pressing legal issues are left without help. It is poor policy, it is flawed policy and it is policy that no-one entrusted into leadership should ever support.

I call on those opposite to send a message to the Turnbull government. The message is clear: our communities need more community legal funding, not less; reverse these cuts and support the most at need in our community.

Moore, Father D

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (8.38 pm): It is with great sadness that I rise to pay tribute to Father Daniel Mary Moore, who recently passed away at Killowen House, Castlejordan in County Offaly, Ireland, surrounded by family and friends and in the constant and loving prayers of Central Queenslanders. Father Dan, as we called him, was one of the most outstanding men I have ever met. He was a rock of the Catholic faith and the soul of community spirit and service.

Father Dan was born in 1937 in Ireland, the fourth of nine children born to Paddy and Biddy Moore. Together with his brothers and sisters, Father Dan was raised on the family's 100-acre farm in Killowen, County Offaly. They grew small crops and the children enjoyed a close acquaintance with chickens, ducks, dogs and cattle. He undertook his primary schooling at the village school, but his secondary schooling was spent as a boarder and he suffered badly from homesickness.

After being ordained in 1962, he boarded a ship for Australia, having signed up to work for the bishop of the Catholic Diocese of Rockhampton. Think for a moment of that fair skinned, red-headed young Irish priest arriving into the full force of a Central Queensland summer. Father Dan became one of the most beloved priests—not just beloved by his own flock but also loved by everybody in Central Queensland.

Father Dan served in North Mackay and South Mackay before moving to Aramac and Muttaburra in the 1970s. This was followed by eight years in the new mining towns of Moranbah and Dysart. The 1980s saw him working on the north side of Rockhampton before being appointed to minister to the parishes of Emerald, Springsure, Rolleston, Anakie and Blackwater on the Central Highlands. He christened my eldest daughter, Lucy. He had a lot of territory to cover and each parish came with its unique challenges which Father Dan addressed enthusiastically.

I do not have time to list all the events and achievements of Father Dan's time on the Central Highlands, but by the time he left in 2004 he was awarded Emerald's Citizen of the Year. He returned home to Ireland when he retired the following year. His death has been greatly mourned by all who knew him in Central Queensland. His loving and gentle character, his infectious enthusiasm and engaging sense of humour are warmly remembered and missed to this day. His enduring faith in a loving God inspired many who continue to hold him in their prayers.

It was quite fitting that we had a memorial service at St Patrick's Catholic Church Emerald on Saturday. Hundreds of people turned up to pay their respects to Father Dan Moore. He was a man who was loved and will always be missed. It was fitting that we all went down to the Irish Village pub in the main street of Emerald to remember Father Dan with a Guinness. I am not a fan of Guinness, but I had a couple of Guinnesses in remembrance of Father Dan, who was a fantastic man and well loved in Central Queensland. May he rest in peace. May we all have a Guinness to remember him in the future.

Townsville Central State School, Pedestrian Crossing

Mr STEWART (Townsville—ALP) (8.41 pm): I rise tonight to speak of the improvements to the Townsville Central State School pedestrian crossing. In October last year two parents from Townsville Central State School, Sonia Hore and Kylie Ringuet, met with me in my office to discuss their concerns about drivers not stopping at the signalled crossing at the front of the school, thereby putting students' lives at risk.

Having known this school for many years, I visited the location and saw for myself the concerns of parents and brought them to the attention of the Minister for Road Safety, Hon. Mark Bailey, and invited him to visit the school crossing when next in Townsville. True to his word, the minister visited the school and met with the two parents and principal Craig Holmer, who described countless instances of near misses between children crossing and vehicles not stopping at those particular lights.

I can say from firsthand experience that the crossing at the front of the school was dangerous as I, too, was nearly skittled on the first day of the school year as two drivers ignored the red signal and drove through the crossing while I was crossing. We nearly had a by-election for the seat of Townsville! I can see those opposite champing at the bit for that. Thankfully, I had organised a police officer to be in attendance on that particular day at the crossing. Needless to say, he did his job with the offending drivers.

The two parents had also organised a petition from concerned parents and locals in the area which, I am proud to say, I presented to the parliament on the first day of sitting this year. There were over 600 signatures recorded. It shows how important this was not only for those at the school but also for the Townsville community.

I can report that work on improved safety at a signalised crossing outside the Townsville Central State School has begun. Minister Bailey awarded $150,000 in safety improvements to improve visibility of the crossing. This included replacing faded signage, adding a new set of overhead traffic lights and installing flashing lights to warn motorists who are approaching the red signal and, believe it or not, moving the stop line further back.

This upgrade complemented recent signal changes that delayed green lights for vehicles, giving pedestrians more time to cross the road. This work has been completed 31 days ahead of schedule. I take this opportunity to thank Minister Bailey for the funding to complete the work, but, more importantly, I would like to acknowledge the work of parents Sonia Hore and Kylie Ringuet and principal Craig Holmer for their sustained campaigning on this issue. As we all know, children's safety is the most important thing.

Rochedale, Housing Estates

Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (8.44 pm): I want to speak about one of the fastest growing areas in my electorate: the suburb of Rochedale. This is an area that has only fairly recently become a residential area but which is growing very quickly. There are a number of estates in Rochedale. The first is Rochedale Estates, the second is Arise at Rochedale and the third is Rochedale Grand, which is just selling now. The estates are growing very rapidly. The communities forming there are impressive communities. People live, work and play together in the best sense of community.

The Rochedale Estates particularly has a wonderful community centre based around a swimming pool, gym and theatre. I was there last year to watch the State of Origin in glorious technicolour. It is a great place for people to congregate.

All of those communities are growing quickly. That means that things are changing in the Rochedale area. As the estates grow we are getting to the point where people who used to know all of their neighbours now do not necessarily recognise those who are coming in and going out of the estates. While it has been an area of very low crime, I have been keen to look at establishing a Neighbourhood Watch group. As we know from our respective electorates, Neighbourhood Watch groups not only keep an eye on crime and keep crime down to a minimal level but also act to bring communities together and foster a spirit of community.

A couple of weeks ago I letterbox dropped the area and we had a Coffee with a Cop morning at the Flying Pepper cafe at the Rochedale Estates. For those members who have not had Coffee with a Cop sessions, they are a great way to bring the community together to meet their local police over a cup of coffee, to talk about local issues, to hear from the local police and to understand how the local police are looking after the area and how they can contribute to their own safety.

I particularly want to thank Sergeant Chris Hebblethwaite and Constable Sandy Geary from the Upper Mount Gravatt Police Station who came along to Coffee with a Cop and inspired the 30 or 40 people to form a small steering group to look at forming a Neighbourhood Watch group amongst the Rochedale estate communities. Last night about a dozen of us met. Chris and Sandy came along again. They talked to the locals. We decided to set up a small steering group which we will try to operate for six months or so to see whether there is sufficient interest to officially approach Neighbourhood Watch Queensland and have an official Neighbourhood Watch group set up.

I encourage other honourable members to look at doing similar things in their communities, particularly in their new communities. I thank the Queensland Police Service for their support of this initiative and Neighbourhood Watch Queensland.

Cruise Ships

Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (8.47 pm): The bayside was abuzz last Wednesday with the arrival of Royal Caribbean's *Ovation of the Seas* as this majestic cruise ship docked at the port of Brisbane for a stopover on its maiden voyage. What a magnificent sight it was. The Royal Caribbean flagship vessel could be seen from the Qandamooka Jetty in Wynnum and certainly had the locals talking. The local ladies at the ARAD cent auction were very enthralled by the sight.

Mr Furner: I am sure they were.

Ms PEASE: They were. Thank you for that interjection. It was great to have the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business, Leeanne Enoch, welcome Captain Loy and his crew to the port of Brisbane.

The cruise industry is key to tourism in Queensland. We have seen double-digit growth in the number of cruise ships calling into Queensland destinations over the past eight years. *Ovation of the Seas* is the fourth largest cruise ship in the world, spanning the length of three football fields, with 18 decks and accommodating 4,905 guests and 1,500 staff. It was great to welcome guests and staff to Queensland. There is no better city in the world than Brisbane. I would go even further and say that there is no better place in the world than Wynnum Manly to visit. In fact, last Wednesday we saw two cruise ships in the port in Brisbane—the *Ovation of the Seas* and P&O's *Arcadia*.

The cruise industry is a major player in the state's booming $23 billion tourism industry, with 320 cruise ships visiting Queensland last year—and these numbers continue to grow. Last week alone we welcomed five ships to South-East Queensland. This means that in one week over 12,000 passengers were exposed to the world-class experiences on offer in Brisbane and on the bayside.

The Queensland government welcomes cruise ships and the contribution they make to our state. The cruise sector already supports more than 2,700 jobs in Queensland, and the state is well placed to expand its position in the Oceania cruise marketplace. This means more jobs in the region including the bayside, more support for local businesses and all the benefits that passengers and visitors bring to our regions.

It is great that more cruise liners are basing their ships in Brisbane, delivering cruises around Australia and across New Zealand, the South Pacific and Papua New Guinea. We Wynnum Manly locals were all very excited to see the majestic *Ovation of the Seas* and look forward to again welcoming her and other cruise ships just like her to our region.

Toowoomba Royal Show

Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (8.50 pm): The show season in the Darling Downs subchamber of agricultural societies is well and truly underway across southern Queensland. Damon Phillips, the CEO of the Royal Agricultural Society of Queensland, and his team of hardworking volunteers are readying the Toowoomba showgrounds for the Toowoomba Royal Show to be held later next month. The Toowoomba Royal Show is the oldest event in Queensland and the Royal Agricultural Society of Queensland is the oldest show society dating back to 1860.

Show societies are the largest volunteer movement in Queensland, with almost 14,000 volunteers across Queensland's 130 shows. A recent study showed that show committees across Australia contributed more than 1.2 million hours of volunteer time per year and are supported by judges, stewards, grounds staff, gatekeepers and other volunteers. My childhood was steeped in the show movement, especially the Oakey show where I watched my father organise the stud beef cattle, and today he traverses southern Queensland in his role as president of the Darling Downs and region subchamber.

Showgrounds across Queensland offer vital social and economic benefits to the regions they serve, and the Toowoomba showgrounds are no different. Our showgrounds host over 450 events, attracting nearly 180,000 visitors. The total economic benefit to the Toowoomba region from events held at the showgrounds tops nearly $57 million per annum. The RASQ provides local community groups in excess of $150,000 worth of rental and hire rebates and payments for services annually.

The popular perception of shows are that they are all about show bags, dagwood dogs, animals and fairy floss.

Mr Power: What are they about, then?

Mr JANETZKI: We all know that they are about competition, member for Logan. It is all about the competition for better animal breeds, for the best cake and for the best artwork. That competition requires volunteers. I want to pay tribute to RASQ CEO Damon, President Shane Charles, Vice Presidents Mark Freeman and Kent Bligh, Treasurer George Fox and a whole range of committee members who serve on the RASQ committee.

I also want to acknowledge that this year there is a shadow cast over the Toowoomba Royal Show with the untimely death of a former vice-president Bill Hedger late last year. Bill was responsible for organising eight sections—eight sections—at the Toowoomba Royal Show and he has done that for the best part of 20 years. His untimely death leaves an enormous hole in the RASQ arrangements, and he will be very sorely missed. This year in his honour there will be the inaugural Bill Hedger Memorial Trophy for the best painting on display at the Toowoomba Royal Show. He will be sorely missed not just by the show movement but by the entire Toowoomba business community. I pay tribute to him.

Logan Electorate

Mr POWER (Logan—ALP) (8.53 pm): I know that we hear in this place good news about Logan and I am here to deliver more good news to the House about roads and schools—good news from the Palaszczuk government delivering for our area. Firstly, schools are so vital to the young families of Logan, made up of aspiring people who want to make their world better and especially for their kids to achieve more.

Recently I took the Minister for Education, the member for Ashgrove, Kate Jones, to Logan Village to see the six new classrooms that are providing for growth in the area. As you might know, Mr Speaker, Logan Village is right next to the community of Yarrabilba. Last year the Premier and the Minister for Education came to Yarrabilba to talk about the opening of the school in 2019. Principal Alan Bunce and I spoke to the minister, saying that we needed to look at opening the school earlier than planned because of the great pressure from growing families in the local area. At the last sitting I was really pleased to announce that the Yarrabilba school will be opened a year earlier, in 2018, which is fantastic news for the area. Locals were very pleased but they also said to me, 'Keep pushing, Linus. Keep fighting. We want a high school.' I will continue to do that and I will continue to fight for my area.

Mr Pearce: And you'll deliver.

Mr POWER: It will be a tough job, but we have the support of the Premier and we have the support of the Minister for Education, so I know they are listening and that is what is important.

I wanted to talk about roads in our local area. We all know that I have spoken before about the safety review of the Mount Lindesay Highway, which is vital for my area and I am fighting for it. That is in addition to the $40 million we have spent on making the Waterford-Tamborine Road safer. Some $5 million came out of the safety review for lights at the intersection of Camp Cable Road and the Mount Lindesay Highway north of Jimboomba. This has made that intersection safer, after a very sad death there.

Probably the biggest thing happening in Logan is the motorway improvements. The member for Woodridge, the member for Algester, the member for Stretton and I fought and got the backing of the minister to see these improvement projects happen. I am glad to see that those members are all here tonight, working late into the night for Logan. As part of those improvements we are going to see the duplication of the Wembley Road overpass that will connect the two parts of Logan without the delays that hold people up. We are also going to see huge improvements to the Mount Lindesay Highway and Logan Motorway interchange which will include a flyover so that you never need to join the Logan Motorway when getting on to the Gateway.

Vitally—and the member for Algester knows how hard we fought for this—the right-hand turn across the highway will now go under the highway, meaning that drivers can go straight through on the road north and it will be much safer for all. I thank the two ministers—the Minister for Roads and the Minister for Education. They are fighting for Logan, just as I am.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 8.56 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