



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

Wednesday, 9 August 2017

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S RULINGS	2067
Same Question Rule	2067
Answers to Questions on Notice	2068
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence relating to matters of privilege regarding ministerial responses to questions on notice raised by the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP and the member for Everton, Mr Tim Mander MP	2068
PRIVILEGE	2069
Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee	2069
PETITIONS	2070
TABLED PAPERS	2071
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2071
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Gold Coast	2071
Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements, Category D	2072
Buy Queensland	2073
Waste Management	2073
Ipswich, Waste	2073
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Company Profile Cleanaway Waste Management Limited and associated documents.	2073
Cross River Rail	2074
Queensland Economy	2075
Commonwealth Bank, Jobs	2075
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 8 August 2017, from the Treasurer, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the CEO of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, Mr Ian Narev, regarding Commonwealth Bank job redundancies.	2075
Gold Coast, Development	2076
Gold Coast, TAFE	2076

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 9 August 2017

Gold Coast, Jobs	2077
Procurement Strategy	2077
MOTION	2078
Amendments to Sessional Orders	2078
MOTION	2078
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	2078
PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE.....	2078
Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner, Report.....	2078
<i>Tabled paper:</i> 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, June 2017.....	2078
NOTICE OF MOTION	2079
Palaszczuk Labor Government, CFMEU	2079
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....	2079
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	2079
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Labor Show Bag of Horrors.....	2079
Liberal National Party, Performance	2079
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance; Cross River Rail	2080
Liberal National Party, Performance	2080
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	2081
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2082
Drug Court	2082
Crime Statistics	2082
Women on Boards.....	2083
TAFE.....	2083
Exports.....	2084
Crime and Corruption Commission, Funding.....	2084
Cross River Rail.....	2085
ID Scanners	2085
Powering Queensland Plan	2086
Jobs Queensland	2086
Health System, Federal Funding	2087
Prostitution Licensing Authority	2088
Catholic Education Week.....	2089
Budget.....	2090
Procurement Strategy	2091
State Schools, Religious Instruction.....	2091
Neighbourhood Centres, Funding.....	2092
Prickly Acacia	2092
CHILD PROTECTION REFORM AMENDMENT BILL	2092
Introduction	2092
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Protection Reform Amendment Bill 2017	2093
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Protection Reform Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes.....	2093
First Reading	2095
Referral to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.....	2095
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date	2095
CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL.....	2095
Second Reading	2095
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	2112
Documents Tabled by the Member for Cairns	2112
MOTION	2112
Palaszczuk Labor Government, CFMEU	2112
<i>Tabled paper:</i> A4 photograph depicting the Premier with CFMEU official	2115
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	2119
Resolved in the negative.....	2119
SUSTAINABLE QUEENSLAND DAIRY PRODUCTION (FAIR MILK PRICE LOGOS) BILL	2119
Second Reading	2119
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 33, 55th Parliament— Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016, government response.....	2121
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time	2136
Resolved in the negative.....	2136
CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL.....	2137
Second Reading	2137
PRIVILEGE.....	2142
Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i> and Apology	2142
ADJOURNMENT	2142
Harms, Mr O.....	2142
Kallangur Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government.....	2143
Callide Electorate, Roads.....	2144

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 9 August 2017

Suicide Prevention	2144
Pacific Motorway, Exit 41	2145
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of photographs depicting Pacific Motorway exits.....	2145
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 21 July 2017, from Mr Andrew Wheeler, Department of Transport and Main Roads, regarding traffic signals at Exit 41, Pacific Motorway.....	2145
Greenslopes Electorate, Scouts and Girl Guides	2146
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'The Scout promise'.....	2146
Mount Ommaney Electorate	2146
Queensland Multicultural Awards	2147
Yarraman and Nanango, Men's Shed	2147
Mount Lindesay Highway	2148
ATTENDANCE	2148

WEDNESDAY, 9 AUGUST 2017



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

SPEAKER'S RULINGS

Same Question Rule



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have reviewed the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill introduced by the Attorney-General on 23 May 2017 and a defeated amendment to the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which was moved by the member for Everton on 23 May 2017 to determine whether the same question rule is enlivened.

I have circulated a ruling on this matter. I am satisfied that the wording contained in the defeated amendment was capable of broader interpretation and application than the wording of the bill which is now before the House. The specific provisions of the bill operate to create a sufficient divergence from the substance of the defeated amendment and the same question rule is not enlivened. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling circulated in my name.

Leave granted.

Honourable Members, on 23 May 2017, the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills, Hon. D'Ath, introduced the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill. Later that day, the Member for Everton moved an amendment outside the long title of the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which was defeated.

The issue arises as to whether the same question rule is enlivened in respect of the Bill introduced by the Attorney-General, as certain of its provisions appear to relate to matters already dealt with by the House in the Member for Everton's defeated amendment.

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.

As previous Speakers and I have noted, the matters do not have to be identical, merely the same in substance as the previous matter. In other words, it is a question of substance, not form.

The defeated amendment sought to amend s193 of the Corrective Services Act 2006 by providing that if a 'prisoner is serving a period of imprisonment for an offence of murder or an offence of manslaughter, the parole board must refuse to grant the application unless the board is satisfied the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated with the investigation of the offence.'

Clause 4 of the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill seeks to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 by inserting a new s193A in relation to the matters that must be considered by a parole board in deciding a parole application by a prisoner serving a sentence for a homicide offence and where the body or remains of the victim have not been located. The granting of parole would be dependent on the prisoner's cooperation in disclosing the whereabouts of the victim's remains, thus introducing a 'no body, no parole' policy in Queensland.

There are similarities between the provisions contained in the defeated amendment to s193 of the Corrective Services Act 2006 and the provisions of the new s193A proposed in the bill. Both impose an obligation on a parole board to refuse to grant an application unless it is satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily when assessed against stated criteria. The criteria set out in the amendment are substantially the same as those in the bill. However, the Member for Everton's amendment is broader in nature in that it requires satisfactory cooperation in relation to 'the investigation of the offence' whereas the proposed s193A(6)(b) of the bill specifically relates the cooperation to 'locating the victim's remains'.

Whilst the assessment criteria are substantially similar in form, the narrowing of the envisaged cooperation contained in the proposed s193A(6)(b) imposes a different standard of cooperation on a prisoner in order to meet the 'satisfactory cooperation' test.

I consider it to be sufficiently different in substance from the defeated amendment proposed by the shadow Minister. Accordingly, I am satisfied that the same question rule is not enlivened by the bill introduced by the Attorney-General.

In considering this matter I noted my previous ruling of 12 November 2015 regarding the Electoral (Improving Representation) and Another Act Amendment Bill where a genuinely alternative proposition was held not to infringe the rule.

Answers to Questions on Notice



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, further to my recent rulings, I have received additional items of correspondence from the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Everton regarding answers to questions on notice. In summary, I have ruled as follows: regarding question on notice 515, which was submitted to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, I find that the minister appears to have made a genuine and reasonable attempt to provide a response by re-scoping the question. I therefore find the question has been answered.

Regarding question on notice 647, which was submitted to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, while the minister has provided a response to the question and has understandably been unable to provide some data, the minister has referred the member to a report that was not yet released for the 2016-17 data and has made no reference to the 2015-16 data or other requested data. Therefore, in accordance with my rulings of 22 March 2017 and 23 May 2017, I ask that the minister provide further information to parts (b) and (c) of the question.

Regarding questions on notice 2288 of 2016 and 1010 of 2017 to the Minister for Corrective Services, I find that question on notice 2288 has been answered. I find that the minister has also made a reasonable and best effort to answer question 1010 and the question has been answered.

I table the correspondence in relation to these matters. I seek leave to incorporate the ruling circulated in my name.

Tabled paper: Correspondence relating to matters of privilege regarding ministerial responses to questions on notice raised by the member for Mudgeeraba, Ms Ros Bates MP and the member for Everton, Mr Tim Mander MP [\[1275\]](#).

Leave granted.

Further to my recent rulings, I have received additional items of correspondence from the Member for Mudgeeraba and the Member for Everton regarding answers to questions on notice.

The Member for Mudgeeraba has written to me regarding Question on Notice 515 and 647, which were submitted to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence.

In Question on Notice 515, submitted on 9 May 2017, the Member for Mudgeeraba requested a breakdown of the number of notification investigations that took longer than 60 days to finalise but were originally listed as shorter investigations, and the number of investigations that took longer than 60 days to finalise that were listed as sexual, physical and emotional abuse and neglect, reported by abuse type.

The Minister responded by advising that the breakdown of information requested does not form part of standard corporate reporting and would require an extraction of data, which would divert officers from supporting frontline work. The Minister then referred the Member for Mudgeeraba to the relevant website to access the measures that are reported and available on the website, and gave examples of reasons why an investigation can take longer to complete, as well as information on the use of regular safety assessments to determine whether the child is at risk during the investigation.

The Member for Mudgeeraba submitted that the Minister did not address any of the specific questions in the Question on Notice and instead referred her to the department's webpage. The Member for Mudgeeraba also argued that the Minister had previously answered Question on Notice 411, asked on 22 March 2017, by providing a detailed response to a similar question including a breakdown of notification investigations not responded to within timeframes for the year ending 30 September 2016. The Member for Mudgeeraba contends the Minister's response to Question on Notice 515 is misleading and the Minister has not even attempted to answer the question.

In her response to my correspondence, the Minister advised that the Department's Integrated Client Management System has limitations on its ability to collate state-wide reporting, and that this limitation was previously explained in the response to Question on Notice 411 when the substantive element of the question, harm type comparisons, could not be provided. Hence, the Minister states that when the Member for Mudgeeraba sought the same information for the next quarter, she repeated the advice that 'The breakdown of type of harm for the data requested does not form part of standard reporting'.

In Question on Notice 411, the Member for Mudgeeraba asked how many of the 24 hour, five day and 10 day notification investigations were subsequently recorded as substantiated abuse, by abuse type. I note that the Member for Mudgeeraba included the number of cases for each time period in her question. In Question on Notice 515, the Member for Mudgeeraba asked a different question, which was in relation to the number of investigations that were initially allocated a shorter time period for investigation, but subsequently took longer than 60 days to investigate, with the response to include the number of cases by abuse type.

While the Member for Mudgeeraba argues that the questions are very similar, they are each asking for different data, except for requesting that the breakdown be provided by abuse type, which was not provided in either answer. The Minister had previously advised in her response to Question on Notice 411 that a breakdown by abuse type does not form part of standard reporting, and therefore the responses provided by the Minister are not necessarily comparable.

On balance, and taking the Minister's advice on face value, I find that the Minister has provided a reasonable explanation as to why she hasn't provided the requested information, that is, that the information does not form part of standard corporate data compilation or reporting. The Minister also appears to have made a genuine and reasonable attempt to provide a response, by re-scoping the question to address the reasons why an investigation may take longer than originally categorised and the focus on the safety of the child during the investigation. I therefore find the question has been answered.

In Question on Notice 647, submitted by the Member for Gympie, Mr Tony Perrett MP on 23 May 2017, the Minister was asked to advise how many children in care were reported missing to the department via the department website since the function went live, how many children in care were reported missing in 2015-16 and 2016-17 year to date, and how many children were missing for more than five days.

The Minister responded by advising that the department's website provides information and advice for carers and carer agency staff when a child in out-of-home care is missing from where they live, but there is no function for reporting children missing on the department's website. The Minister also advised that the 2016-17 data on children missing from out-of-home care will be provided in the department's Annual Report, and provided information, including the budget and timeframe, on the development of an ICT system designed to enable greater information sharing between agencies.

The Member for Mudgeeraba submitted that the Minister's response is a clear attempt to avoid answering a simple question. In her response to my correspondence, the Minister advised that the question was asked about a website function for reporting missing children, which does not exist, and that the question was based on an incorrect understanding about how reports about missing children are made. The Minister contended that the correct information, including links to the department's website, was provided in her answer.

While the Minister has provided a response to the question, and has understandably been unable to report on the number of children reported missing via the department's website, I note the Minister has referred the Member for Gympie to a report that was not yet released for the 2016-17 data, and has made no reference to the 2015-16 data or the number of children missing for more than five days.

My ruling of 23 May 2017 stated that reference in an answer to a website, annual report or budget estimates document that does not, at the time of the question and/or answer, contain the information is not an answer to the question and is irrelevant to the question. Furthermore, I note that the Minister's response to my correspondence does not indicate that the data isn't available or compiled.

Therefore, in accordance with my rulings of 22 March 2017 and 23 March 2017, I ask that the Minister provide further information to parts (b) and (c) of the question.

The Member for Everton has written to me regarding Questions on Notice Nos 2130 and 2288 of 2016 and 1010 of 2017. On 9 November 2016, the Member for Everton submitted Question on Notice 2130 requesting information on the total number of 'inmates on correctional officer' assaults between January and June 2015, reported separately by month and year.

The then Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Bill Byrne MP, provided a response which included an outline of measures to deliver a safe environment for those in the custodial, probation and parole environments and a breakdown of the number of assaults as requested.

On 30 November 2016, the Member for Southern Downs asked the same question of the current Minister for Corrective Services, Hon. Mark Ryan MP. In his response, the Minister advised that Queensland Corrective Services had spent a considerable amount of time and resources compiling the information in response to Questions on Notice 2128-2132, and that as this information is not collated in a reportable format, the information the Member for Southern Downs was seeking would require another significant diversion of resources which was not considered justifiable at that time. The Minister also advised that information on Queensland Corrective Services staff assaults is reported in the Queensland Department of Justice and Attorney-General Annual Report.

The Member for Everton contends that the Minister's response appears to be a deliberate attempt to hide information that should be made available to the public, and that he has potentially breached the Standing Orders.

In his response to Question on Notice 2288, the Minister made reference to the answers given to Questions on Notice 2128-2132, which includes Question on Notice 2130 which is identical to Question on Notice 2288. The answer to Question on Notice 2130, provided by the then-Minister Hon. Bill Byrne MP, appears to be a reasonable and best endeavour to answer the question. Hence, as the Minister has referred the Member for Southern Downs to the response to the same question previously asked by the Member for Everton, I find that Question on Notice 2288 has been answered.

The Member for Everton has also written to me regarding the response from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services to Question on Notice 1010, asked by the Member for Chatsworth on 16 June 2017. The question requested the number of lockdowns in Queensland correctional facilities for 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17 as at 1 June 2017, per year and broken down by facility.

The Minister's response provided reasons for lockdowns and advised that such data is stored locally in centre log books and is not collected centrally by Queensland Corrective Services, and therefore to answer the Member's question 'extensive manual extraction and collation would need to be undertaken at each correctional centre which would be disruptive to centre operations and not in the interests of correctional centre safety and security'.

The Member for Everton asserts that he believes Question on Notice 1010 would not stretch the resources within the Minister's Department. However, in the absence of any substantive evidence to contradict the Minister's reason for not providing the figures, I am reliant on the Minister's explanation regarding the statistics currently collected and the difficulty associated in trying to obtain those statistics. Therefore, I find that on the evidence available to me, the Minister has made a reasonable and best effort to answer the question, and the question has been answered.

PRIVILEGE

Speaker's Ruling, Referral to Ethics Committee



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, on 15 June 2017 the Leader of the House and member for Sandgate wrote to me alleging that the Leader of the Opposition and shadow minister for arts and major events and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and shadow minister for infrastructure, state development, trade and investment deliberately misled the House during three questions without notice to the Premier on 13 June 2017.

The questions relate to the member for Pumicestone and rates and water charges. In each case, statements made in the question are not supported by other information and are arguably factually incorrect and/or misleading. Both members were provided an opportunity to respond to the allegations, and I am not satisfied with either member's explanation regarding their questions. I have therefore decided to refer these matters to the Ethics Committee.

In doing so, I wish to emphasise that I have formed no view as to whether there has been a breach of privilege but, rather, that there are sufficient issues in play to warrant the further consideration of the House via the Ethics Committee. I remind members that standing order 271 now applies, and members should not refer to these matters in the House.

PETITIONS

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

Caloundra Hospital, Urgent Care Centre

Mr McArdle, from 3,580 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the Urgent Care Centre at the Caloundra Hospital be open and operational 24 hours a day, seven days a week [\[1258\]](#).

Mount Crosby and Warrego Highway Interchange, Upgrade

Mr Madden, from 86 petitioners, requesting the House to expedite the completion of the upgrade of the Mount Crosby and Warrego Highway interchange [\[1259\]](#).

Coomera, Hospital

Mr Crandon, from 301 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure planning and construction of a hospital in the medical precinct adjacent to the Coomera Railway Station and the "under construction" Coomera Town Centre [\[1260\]](#).

Coomera Railway Station, Car Park

Mr Crandon, from 134 petitioners, requesting the House to increase the car park size at the Coomera Railway Station [\[1261\]](#).

Ormeau Railway Station, Car Park

Mr Crandon, from 160 petitioners, requesting the House to increase the car park size at the Ormeau Railway Station [\[1262\]](#).

M1 Motorway, Exit 41, Upgrade

Mr Crandon, from 329 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake improvements to upgrade Exit 41 [\[1263\]](#).

Ormeau Railway Station and Coomera Railway Station, Bus Service

Mr Crandon, from 231 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade bus services between Ormeau Railway Station and Coomera Railway Station [\[1264\]](#).

M1 Motorway, Exit 45, Upgrade

Mr Crandon, from 396 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake improvements to Exit 45 [\[1265\]](#).

Ormeau, Police Station

Mr Crandon, from 104 petitioners, requesting the House to plan and construct a police station at Ormeau and provide an additional 50 police officers [\[1266\]](#).

M1 Motorway, Exit 49, Upgrade

Mr Crandon, from 14 petitioners, requesting the House to undertake improvements to Exit 49 [\[1267\]](#).

Pimpama State Primary College, Parking Facilities, Bus Service and Access

Mr Crandon, from 7 petitioners, requesting the House to upgrade school parking facilities; the school bus service; and road access to and from the Pimpama State Primary College [\[1268\]](#).

Pimpama, Yawalpah Road, Upgrade

Mr Crandon, from 7 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the City of Gold Coast undertakes the necessary roadworks to turn Yawalpah Road into two lanes, for 250 metres, leading to the roundabout at Exit 49 [\[1269\]](#).

Rededge Convenience Centre, Australia Post Box

Mr Crandon, from 6 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure an Australia Post post box is provided at the Rededge Convenience Centre, corner of Finnegan and Celestial Ways Coomera [\[1270\]](#).

The Clerk presented the following e-petitions, sponsored by the honourable members indicated—

Parkwood Light Rail Station, Pedestrian Bridge

Mr Molhoek, from 13 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a pedestrian only overbridge from the Parkwood light rail station to a suitable access point within the Molendinar industrial estate crossing over Smith Street [\[1271\]](#).

Smith Street Motorway, Connectivity

Mr Molhoek, from 125 petitioners, requesting the House to open up connectivity of Edmund Rice Drive through Everest Drive and Griffith Way into Olsen Avenue and into the Smith Street Motorway via left in only and left out only turning lanes [[1272](#)].

Law and Order

Ms Bates, from 454 petitioners, requesting the House to consider changes to legislation which make it an offence for any person, who is a witness to the commission of a serious indictable offence, to fail to report the commission of the offence and/or to fail to do anything within their power to stop the offence from being committed or continuing [[1273](#)].

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

Parliament, Broadcasting, Captioning

From 144 petitioners, requesting the House to respect the right of Queenslanders who are hearing impaired, hard of hearing or deaf the opportunity to listen (via sight) to our elected representatives with all broadcasts of Parliament, particularly live-streaming, with captioning [[1274](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MEMBER'S PAPERS

The following member's papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Cairns (Mr Pyne)—

[1255](#) Document (with redactions), dated August 2017, titled 'Call for Cook Shire Council to be placed into administration'

[1256](#) Letter (with redactions), dated 17 February 2017, from Queensland Ombudsman to an unknown recipient in relation to a complaint made against Ipswich City Council

[1257](#) Document (with redactions), dated August 2017, titled 'The Claytons 'Independent' candidates'

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Gold Coast

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.10 pm): My government governs for all of Queensland and each and every Queenslanders. We are building infrastructure and supporting jobs and economic growth across the state. We do this because we listen to Queenslanders. That is why it was my great pleasure, and the great pleasure of my cabinet, to spend last week governing from the Gold Coast. In just 239 days, the Commonwealth Games will open as the biggest event in Queensland's history and the biggest sporting event in Australia in a decade.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier is not saying anything provocative and it is not appropriate for interjections at this stage.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am pleased to report that the games are on track and will be delivered on time and within budget. The final 600 jobs for Commonwealth Games staff were advertised on Monday. We also saw the 'golden weld', marking completion of stage 2 of the Gold Coast Light Rail, and announced \$5 million towards a feasibility study for stage 3A. While on the Gold Coast, we also made the decision to terminate the proposed ASF development on The Spit and announced the process for developing a master plan with a commitment that future development will occur within the existing three-storey height limit.

Ms Jones interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. I would like to make special mention of Lyn Wright, who presented me with a trove of historical archives about The Spit and its importance to the Gold Coast community. This included a letter written 34 years ago from the then governor, Sir James Ramsay, to the then premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen. The letter is the start of the process to name the area of The Spit on the ocean side of Sea World 'Phillip Park', following the Duke of Edinburgh's visit to the Gold Coast in October 1982. I believe it would be fitting for the Prince of Wales to visit the public park named in his father's honour when he is on the coast for the Commonwealth Games next year. I am sure he will understand why it is so important that the amenity of this area is preserved.

Next year's Commonwealth Games will highlight the best of the Gold Coast and Queensland. The ongoing tourism benefits from the television exposure the games will provide to 1.5 billion people around the world are vast. The Gold Coast is surfing the wave of an investment pipeline of almost \$3 billion worth of new hotels, resorts and attractions that will drive jobs well into the future. The world-class sporting facilities that will host games events—some of which we inspected last week—will continue to be valuable assets long after the closing ceremony. Already, several of them have been booked as training venues for international teams ahead of the Tokyo Olympics.

The Commonwealth Games presents a unique opportunity to further diversify the Gold Coast economy, providing protection from the cyclical nature of its traditional strengths in tourism and construction. One of the biggest and most exciting legacy investments is the Gold Coast Health and Knowledge Precinct, which will support an additional 26,000 full-time jobs. I have repeatedly made clear my government's commitment to putting Queenslanders first, the sentiment that underpins our Buy Queensland procurement strategy. That sentiment is already being reflected on the Gold Coast, where almost 90 per cent of contracts awarded by Goldoc have gone to Gold Coast and Queensland businesses—more than \$260 million in contracts, securing thousands of jobs along the broader supply chain.

Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements, Category D

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.13 pm): Severe Tropical Cyclone Debbie caused havoc and damage across large parts of Queensland for thousands of Queenslanders. During Debbie's onslaught and the immediate response, agencies of my government worked with local councils, local businesses and communities, the Bureau of Meteorology and the Australian Defence Force. The Queensland Reconstruction Authority has worked closely with local councils to plan and implement the long-term recovery for these communities. I thank the Deputy Premier for that work.

As part of that long-term response, my government worked with local councils to develop a \$220 million Natural Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements category D application for key projects. Projects included: \$60 million for resilient infrastructure; a \$40 million economic package; a \$10 million environmental recovery package; and a \$135 million local councils package for the South Rockhampton Flood Levee, the reconstruction of Shute Harbour, the Whitsundays-Proserpine airport, the revitalisation of the Airlie Beach Foreshore, and Bluewater Trail and Queens Park redevelopment.

My government committed to pay half of those costs—\$110 million—with the federal government to match it. Despite having the application for two months, the Prime Minister wrote to me last month to say—

Unfortunately, the remaining projects proposed are not suitable for funding as they fall outside of the scope of the NDRRA or because there has not been enough evidence provided to establish the need for the measure.

Shamefully, when the Prime Minister was asked about his decision, he accused Queensland—represented by my government and councils throughout Queensland—of using the NDRRA program as a slush fund. Prime Minister, the damage from Debbie was real, the need is real and your response was unbelievable. I again urge Malcolm Turnbull to reconsider his cold-hearted decision. Malcolm Turnbull is due in North Queensland next week. I urge him to visit the communities devastated by Debbie and see firsthand the need for extra category D assistance. My government's commitment of \$110 million stands. We stand with Queenslanders through the immediate response, the long-term recovery and reconstruction. The Prime Minister can find \$122 million for a postal vote on same-sex marriage, but he cannot find \$110 million for Queensland communities devastated by Tropical Cyclone Debbie.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not need your encouragement, member for Chatsworth.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Same-sex marriage could be decided by a free vote in the federal parliament, just as our parliament voted to restore civil partnership ceremonies. Same-sex marriage can be decided in parliament, but the recovery from Tropical Cyclone Debbie can only be done in the affected communities.

Buy Queensland

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.16 pm): I make no apologies for standing up for Queensland jobs and Queensland businesses. That is my job. Since the last election, 77,300 new jobs have been created in Queensland. Yesterday, the National Australia Bank business confidence survey found business had the most confidence in Queensland of all the mainland states in employment and business conditions.

My government's Buy Queensland procurement policy is about supporting Queensland businesses and supporting Queensland jobs. Despite being from Queensland, the federal trade minister, Steve Ciobo, does not support Buy Queensland. He is ignoring Queensland businesses who overwhelmingly support our policy. The LNP in this place remain silent—on the policy and on Mr Ciobo's attacks on it. Shamefully, Mr Ciobo has stirred up the New Zealand trade minister, Todd McClay, to criticise the Buy Queensland policy.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have not heard their views on it. When Mr McClay was asked about Buy Queensland on ABC Radio last week, he conceded that he had not read it. I am happy for Mr McClay to be briefed on the policy when he visits Australia this week. I was happy for DFAT to be briefed on Monday, but unfortunately DFAT cancelled the meeting. Let me be very clear: I will always put Rockhampton ahead of Rotorua. I am the Premier of Queensland and I will always work for the people of this great state. Just as my government wants to support Queenslanders into work, Mr McClay supports New Zealanders. On 21 October, Suncorp Stadium will host the third and final clash in the Bledisloe Cup series. I will be barracking for the Wallabies. I can only assume Mr Ciobo—like the New Zealand trade minister—will be cheering for the All Blacks.

The federal LNP member for Brisbane, Trevor Evans, has also moved a motion in the House of Representatives condemning our Buy Queensland policy. It is time that Mr Evans, whom I note was born in Tweed Heads on the other side of the border, stood up for Queenslanders when he is in Canberra.

Waste Management

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.19 pm): My government has made historic reforms to address the management of waste in Queensland. We are introducing a container refund scheme and a single-use plastic bag ban. We are investing in biofuel projects to support waste-to-energy projects, and I have visited such a plant in the US on my recent trade mission. We have led operations, including heavy vehicle searches and a special pollution hotline, to allow the public to report illegal dumping to the department. The hotline number is 1300130372.

As I have said, the revelation this week that the New South Wales government is not enforcing its own laws is alarming. I repeat: the New South Wales government needs to enforce its laws. I can confirm there will be a crackdown on bulk waste transport activities from as early as tomorrow to ensure that operators are strictly complying with all necessary regulatory requirements. These border inspections by the Department of Transport and Main Roads will focus on the movement of hazardous waste such as asbestos to ensure that Queenslanders are kept safe. The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection will also step up regular compliance checks at key waste landfill sites to ensure that they are operating within their environmental authority conditions. Next week I will convene a meeting of waste and recycling industry representatives, our agencies and the Local Government Association of Queensland to discuss other long-term strategies to manage waste coming across our border. The issue needs to be addressed with the cooperation of the states. That is why the new cross-border agreement between New South Wales and Queensland included cooperation on waste management. I reached that agreement with former premier Mike Baird. I am looking forward to continuing that cooperation with the current Premier of New South Wales.

Ipswich, Waste

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.21 pm): Yesterday in response to a question from the member for Ipswich West I advised the House that I had asked the environment department to investigate claims made by the ABC's *Four Corners* program about practices at a landfill site at New Chum. They were to report back to me by the end of yesterday. I table that report.

Tabled paper: Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, Company Profile Cleanaway Waste Management Limited and associated documents [[1276](#)].

I would also like to set the record straight about this site. EHP advises that the facility at New Chum is a well-engineered facility. Sometimes using the void of a disused mine is a good option for landfill provided it is sealed, which the New Chum facility is.

The fire on 2 July did not occur as a result of spontaneous coal combustion, and the Queensland fire service attended the site when they were alerted, quickly putting the fire out and leaving the site before midday. EHP is investigating whether there was any noncompliant waste management at the site, but it is worth noting that Cleanaway is required to submit both quarterly exception reporting and an annual monitoring report to EHP detailing the outcomes of their monitoring. This includes all data on groundwater, surface water, landfill gas flare emissions and waste composition. No noncompliances warranting enforcement action have been identified as a result of this data. EHP officers inspected the Cleanaway facility on 3 July 2017 and a further proactive inspection is scheduled for September 2017.

We are also deploying Operation Tora, the waste compliance task force that the Palaszczuk government set up in 2015, to inspect all Ipswich landfill sites. Operation Tora has been working across the state to stamp out rogue operators and has so far carried out 207 investigations leading to 69 enforcement actions. As the Premier said, I have also directed EHP to work with TMR on heavy vehicle inspections at the border and in the Ipswich area. This is one of many actions the government has taken on waste. We have cracked down on illegal storage, transport and disposal of waste. We have introduced a bill to ban single-use plastic bags and introduced a container refund scheme that will drive more recycling and keep rubbish out of our environment. We have thrown our support behind biofuels projects like the Northern Oil Advanced Biofuels Pilot Plant in Yarwun, which can convert just about any kind of waste into various fuels. We are reregulating certain waste operations after the Newman-Nicholls government scrapped the need for these licences, inviting rogue operators into the industry and leading to waste stockpiling such as dangerous tyre stockpiles. In Ipswich we are working on reducing odours caused by waste management facilities by limiting the kinds of waste they can accept.

Like I said yesterday, the waste industry in Queensland is a big industry and in most cases does the right thing and employs many Queenslanders. The good operators want to see bad elements in their industry stamped out as much as we do and that is why they have been working with us. The industry round table the Premier announced today will be another opportunity for them to engage with us.

Just a fortnight ago I was very pleased to represent the Premier at the waste recycling industry dinner. It was a shame nobody from the state LNP cared enough about this important industry to be there. It was the 10th anniversary of their industry body WRIQ and they celebrated with 29 nominees from the industry who are doing excellent work. Over 100 people there that night had been employed in the industry for more than 25 years. It was my great pleasure that night to present the outstanding industry individual award to Rob Skyring from JJ Richards who has over 41 years in the industry. In those 41 years Rob has never missed a collection. He has maintained an impeccable driving record. He has not taken a sick day in the last 11 years and has never received a customer complaint. Rob is respected and admired by management, staff and customers. He is one of the thousands of Queenslanders who work for the waste industry who does a very important job for the rest of us. If the Newman-Nicholls government had more respect for this industry they would not have rolled out the red carpet for the crooks and cowboys exposed by *Four Corners*.

Cross River Rail

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.26 pm): Cross River Rail has today hit another milestone, with companies invited to tender for the demolition of the Goprint site at Woolloongabba. This is an opportunity to be involved in a project that will fundamentally transform South-East Queensland from the Gold Coast to the Sunshine Coast and out to Ipswich. I am pleased to advise the House that the first tender associated with this project will be released today and will be open to eligible businesses registered for Queensland government building and construction work. I want to see local contractors involved in this milestone that marks the start of on-site works for the historic Cross River Rail project. There will be plenty more opportunities ahead for Queensland businesses and Queensland workers to benefit from our investment in Cross River Rail.

Last week I joined the Premier to watch as crews welded the final piece of the track at Helensvale for the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2 project. This symbolic final rail weld represents the connection of the 7.3 kilometre dual track from Helensvale station to stage 1 of light rail at Gold Coast University Hospital. For the first time since the Bjelke-Petersen government ripped up the rail line to the Gold Coast decades ago Brisbane and the heart of the Gold Coast are once again connected by rail. We

have a 20-kilometre stretch of light rail track connecting the world-famous beaches of the Gold Coast with the heavy rail line of Brisbane. Work on the \$420 million light rail extension began in July 2016, with heavy machinery completing the earthworks necessary and preparing the corridor for track laying.

In recognition of the success of light rail on the Gold Coast, the Premier also took the opportunity to announce an additional \$5 million allocated in the 2017-18 state budget for a detailed business case to inform a future investment decision for light rail stage 3A, Broadbeach south to Burleigh Heads. With the amazing success of light rail and the expected population growth on the Gold Coast, the time is right to start planning for a third light rail extension that will further connect the Gold Coast. Only the Palaszczuk government will deliver infrastructure for the Gold Coast like the critical extension of the light rail network.

Queensland Economy

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.28 pm): The Palaszczuk government's clear economic plan is delivering stronger growth, lower unemployment and lower debt for the Queensland economy. We are encouraging business operators to invest in innovative products or services, tap new markets here or abroad and create more jobs. Just yesterday we saw some of the positive results—strong growth figures in the Queensland State Accounts and the latest NAB Monthly Business Survey again putting us ahead of all states on business confidence. As honourable members heard the Premier mention earlier, NAB's July survey showed Queensland's trend business confidence was still the highest among all Australian states at plus 13 points. It means we have had the highest or second-highest confidence rating for 29 out of the last 31 months. We know that having a strong, vibrant private sector is critical to the continued success of Queensland's \$320 billion-plus economy, which is why under our economic plan Queensland is absolutely open for business.

We are proud to see that quarterly economic growth is the best it has been in five years. It is a sign that business is growing and strengthening, which is why we have seen 77,300 net new jobs created in Queensland since we came to office. It is because we have given Queensland businesses the confidence to hire. That confidence can especially be seen on the Gold Coast, where investment in big projects is reflecting the confidence which is surging across the state. Construction projects which are near or commenced construction on the Gold Coast include: the \$850m Star casino and hotel redevelopment; the \$500 million Coomera Town Centre; the \$1 billion Ruby residential towers in Surfers Paradise; the \$1 billion Empire Estate, Yatala; the \$1.2 billion Spirit Tower; and the \$800 million Queen Street Village.

During our recent week of governing from the Gold Coast we also had the opportunity to see innovative businesses that are helping fuel our state's growth and deliver jobs. At Varsity College I announced a \$1 million government investment in the Gold Coast based Intrepica company to help it take its online LiteracyPlanet platform for school students into more markets around the world. That investment, matched by private investors, comes from our \$40 million Business Development Fund and is one of 13 investments totalling more than \$14.9 million made so far. I also visited Gold Coast companies that have been assisted by Trade & Investment Queensland to tap new export markets—companies such as Morlife at Arundel, which currently exports around 20 per cent of its health food products to the US, New Zealand, China, Hong Kong, Singapore, the Middle East, Thailand and Malaysia. Morlife's exports are up 40 per cent on last year. It has added two new production jobs in the past 12 months and expects to create more over the next year. It is these type of companies and more that will benefit from our \$35 million Trade and Investment Strategy which forms a key part of our economic plan.

Commonwealth Bank, Jobs

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.31 pm): Members of the House may be aware that the Commonwealth Bank has announced plans to sack 150 staff in Brisbane, with their Sydney and Perth teams to absorb the resultant workload. I have written to the CEO, Ian Narev, to express my sincere disappointment and urge him to reconsider this action—especially after the CBA this morning posted a record \$9.9 billion profit. This is the eighth consecutive annual profit for Australia's largest bank. This flies in the face of Queensland Labor's positive jobs agenda and, frankly, has the potential to damage the bank's relationship with the government, as I stated in writing to Mr Narev and the Commonwealth Bank. I table a copy of that letter for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 8 August 2017, from the Treasurer, Hon. Curtis Pitt, to the CEO of the Commonwealth Bank of Australia, Mr Ian Narev, regarding Commonwealth Bank job redundancies [[1277](#)].

Labor's economic plan has seen three state budgets in surplus and more to come. It has resulted in 77,300 net new jobs created since the election; debt paid down year on year; resurgent confidence in Queensland after the LNP was voted out; exports up; growth up; and our domestic economy turning around. The Commonwealth Bank should be investing in this positive story and investing in our regions from Cairns to the Gold Coast, with Labor restoring our state as the nation's economic leader.

Gold Coast, Development

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (2.32 pm): Confidence in our tourism economy is growing, and nowhere more so than on the Gold Coast. Right now we have close to \$3 billion in new hotels, resorts and attractions in the pipeline on the Gold Coast, and through our Investment Attraction Unit we are working hard to position the Gold Coast and Queensland as a leading destination for tourism, investment and infrastructure. These projects support thousands of jobs, inject billions into our economy and ultimately make the Gold Coast an even more attractive destination for tourists. Upgrades to the Gold Coast airport and new luxury tourism products will ensure the Gold Coast is positioned for growth long after the Commonwealth Games. As the Treasurer said, there are a number of projects including: the \$1 billion Jewel hotel and residential tower in Surfers Paradise; the new \$600 million Songcheng theme park at Carrara; the Spirit Hotel; and the Star group's \$850 million Jupiters six-star hotel redevelopment, which had its topping out for the roof last week.

I am pleased to announce that, as a result of this investment, Star will employ an additional 300 workers in the lead-up to the Commonwealth Games. These new jobs are in addition to the more than 600 jobs created during construction. I was only talking to the honourable Rob Borbidge the other day and we were saying that as soon as we announced the Commonwealth Games, the Star group—

Ms Palaszczuk: He is a lovely man.

Ms JONES: He is a lovely man. I take that interjection from the Premier. The Star group, which was their former name, announced a major \$850 million investment on the Gold Coast which will create real jobs for Gold Coasters. This is a great example of private sector investment being injected into the Gold Coast economy off the back of growing confidence in the tourism sector.

Gold Coast, TAFE

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.34 pm): Last week I had the opportunity to experience a number of the ways that TAFE Queensland is leading the way in providing opportunity and training to Queenslanders as part of governing from the Gold Coast. On Monday I was pleased to speak at the ceremony marking the commencement of a Higher Level Skills apprenticeship pilot at the Gold Coast Hospital, where TAFE is the training provider and delivering new and innovative ways to look at apprenticeships amongst 60 non-clinical staff.

On Tuesday I visited the students of the Queensland Hotel and Hospitality School. This school was established by TAFE Queensland in conjunction with the hospitality and hotel industry to provide the industry with a pipeline of workers for the five- and six-star projects that are coming online. These students are going to be the backbone of this sector in the future, and again it is TAFE Queensland that is delivering this training along with the real-world experiences of working in the industry. We will have five- and six-star hospitality students for the tourism boom now and into the future.

As we are all well aware, the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games will be held next year, and on Wednesday I met with staff at the volunteer selection centre. TAFE Queensland is the training partner in the mammoth task of training 15,000 volunteers. This is a wonderful opportunity to show the world not only how great the event will be but how well TAFE Queensland can deliver on these opportunities. I have to say that seeing those people lining up, getting their lanyards and waiting to go through the process and be interviewed to see if they can finally be selected as volunteers for what will be a once-in-a-lifetime experience was so exciting. I had the opportunity to talk to them and tell them that I worked at Expo 88, and it is one of those things that you remember forever. I will not say how old I was.

Government members interjected.

Mrs D'ATH: It was actually the festhouse. Finally, on Friday I was fortunate to attend the open day at Ashmore TAFE and I even had a go at some of the trades. It was an open day for school students to come to try various trades across so many different fields to see which pathway they may take. Events like this are a great way for TAFE Queensland to show what it can offer and allow prospective

students to get a taste of the TAFE Queensland experience. I want to thank the staff of TAFE Queensland Gold Coast for showing me a wide range of activities and how they are working with industry to provide not just training but career paths for Queenslanders.

Gold Coast, Jobs

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.37 pm): As the Gold Coast gears up for the 2018 Commonwealth Games there is a real sense of optimism amongst local business owners and employers about the economic opportunities this international major event will provide. While governing from the Gold Coast last week, I met with employers who are excited at the prospect of growing their businesses in the lead-up to the games. They are keen to take advantage of our positive job support policies, in particular the recently expanded \$177.5 million Back to Work jobs package which now includes the Gold Coast area. Employers in regional Queensland are backing this exceptional program, and since it kicked off in July last year they have given 6,257 new jobseekers a job.

The Gold Coast is next, with employers already hiring workers within days of the south-east applications opening. There are now more than 30 jobseekers back at work in the south-east thanks to this program, including pending applications. There have been a further 350 expressions of interest from south-east employers in the program. The additional \$27.5 million for Back to Work SEQ will support up to 1,500 new jobs, and the business owners I met with at Currumbin's Elephant Rock Cafe are ready and raring to go. Some have already considered hiring new workers, putting themselves in line for support payments of up to \$20,000 with Youth Boost. The Gold Coast Chamber of Commerce is also excited about the jobs and economic opportunities that Back to Work is bringing to the Gold Coast. I sat next to the Gold Coast chamber representative Martin Brady at the business breakfast, and I will soon be back on the Gold Coast with the chamber promoting the program to local businesses.

Employers in regional Queensland have already received more than \$33 million in support payments under this scheme with a total of \$92 million committed, which will boost local economies. It is about giving employers the extra boost they need to hire another worker to grow their business and their local economy.

The expanded Back to Work program also includes an extra \$50 million in 2017-18 to support the continuation of the Back to Work regional program. This additional \$50 million will support up to 3,400 new jobs outside the south-east. These extra funds are in addition to the \$100 million already allocated to the Back to Work regional program. I have seen firsthand the exceptional results this great program is producing throughout regional Queensland. I have heard the stories of those whose lives have been transformed. I encourage the Gold Coast and all south-east employers to join their regional counterparts and get on board with this great program.

Procurement Strategy

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (2.40 pm): The new Queensland procurement strategy is all about backing Queensland jobs, especially in the regions. As the Premier said earlier, we are unashamedly tilting the balance back towards local jobs and local businesses. A big part of this strategy is making it easier for business, especially small business, to tender for government work. For instance, we are exempting contractors from the prequalification system for building contracts under \$1 million. We are allowing agencies to procure outside of whole-of-government supply arrangements for regional and remote locations. We are also reducing complexity and providing government resources to help industry prepare for government tenders.

Our new Buy Queensland policy opens government work up to businesses in the regions in a way that has not been seen for generations. We are determined to make sure that regional businesses, especially small businesses, make the most of their opportunity to get involved. That is why, as part of the strategy, we will be appointing a regional procurement champion to advocate on behalf of businesses in regional Queensland. This champion will provide a high-level voice for the regions across all procurement categories. They will be a person from a region who really understands what it is like to run a business in regional Queensland. I am advised that my department will commence the recruitment of the regional procurement champion in coming days.

I am also pleased to inform the House that my department will commence a comprehensive regional engagement program with business right across the state. These sessions will provide people with all of the information they need to get involved in Buy Queensland, including how to submit tenders. These sessions will be held across the state, including in places like Bundaberg, Maryborough,

Rockhampton, Gladstone, Mackay, Townsville, Cairns, Toowoomba, the Gold Coast and the Sunshine Coast. Officers from my department are also engaging with government purchasing officers from across departments throughout those regions to ensure everyone is across the new strategy and policy.

The Palaszczuk government is 100 per cent committed to regional jobs and supporting our regional centres. As I said yesterday, it is such a shame that the Nationals will not stand up for regional Queensland. Regional Queenslanders can rest assured that they have strong advocates like the members for Bundaberg, Maryborough, Keppel, Rockhampton and Mirani in their corner.

MOTION

Amendments to Sessional Orders

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.42 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the amendments to sessional orders circulated in my name be agreed to.

Amendments to Sessional Orders

1. **Sessional Order 1 (d)** on each day (Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday) after 'Petitions'—

insert—

Citizen's Right of Reply

2. **Sessional Order 1 (i)** after 'Petitions'—

insert—

Citizen's Right of Reply

After **Sessional Order 2A**—

insert—

Consideration of Ethics Committee Reports in regard to Citizen's Right of Reply

- 2B** When the Ethics Committee reports to the House regarding a Citizen's Right of Reply in accordance with Standing Order 283, the committee's recommendation will be considered by the House on the next sitting day following the tabling of the committee's report and at the time in the Order of Business as specified in Sessional Order 1.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.43 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders—

- the debate of petitions and debate of committee reports be postponed for this week's sitting; and
- the 30-minute private member's motion for this Thursday will commence at 5 pm.

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) (2.43 pm): In accordance with section 363(5) of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, I table the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner's report titled *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, June 2017*.

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, June 2017 [[1278](#)].

The report relates to the parliamentary commissioner's inspection of the Crime and Corruption Commission surveillance device warrants records from 15 November 2016 to 31 May 2017. Full details of the inspection and findings are set out in the report.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Palaszczuk Labor Government, CFMEU

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (2.44 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House notes that over \$10 million worth of fines have been levied against the CFMEU and condemns the Palaszczuk Labor government for failing to disaffiliate from these lawless thugs.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (2.45 pm): When I got the newspaper this morning I was very excited to find the annual Ekka guide and show bag list. The member for Indooroopilly I hear has his favourite: the Bertie Beetle bag. The Leader of the Opposition has a soft spot for the Cadbury bag, I am told. There is one show bag no-one will be lining up for this year—that is, the Labor Show Bag of Horrors. That is the—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think you have anticipated that I was going to complain about the use of props.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you know the rules.

Mr BLEIJIE: Whilst most show bags will set you back less than \$20, Labor's Show Bag of Horrors will cost Queenslanders \$81.1 billion. That is a pretty hefty price tag, but the twisted sales spiel by the Treasurer would make most carnies blush. For a bloke dolled up in a three-piece suit, he is not the ringmaster; he is mostly magician, with his disappearing public servant superannuation trick.

I had a look at the bag earlier to see what it contains. First up there is a voucher to Yahoo! UK for a free Yahoo! email account. I hear 'mangocube7' is available at the moment. There is also a get-out-of-jail-free card. It has been graced over to the CFMEU. We have a Mark Bailey troll doll. It has especially frizzy hair this year. It must have had a power bill shock. There is a pass for the 'Slick Rick' tow truck ride. Entry is free—just do not count on getting your car back. There is a token for the Rockhampton shooting range—rats and mice stuff. There is also a dictionary for the agriculture minister, but it looks like the 'F' section has been ripped out of that one.

There is a Coralee compass, which never points north; a complimentary go card for when the trains do not go; some tickets to the Commonwealth Games, I see, for the minister, Kate Jones; and a hospital car park token for the health minister for his daily commute from Greenslopes. There is a map to the produce stand so that you can pick up some greens for Jackie. There is also thrown in a limited edition backstabber—never used, I am told, but sitting there just in case. There is also a selection from the preserves tent. We have jam from Bundamba, but it is quite bitter at the moment. We have a cricket bat for big Mick. A bit of batting practice would not go astray. I thought I saw something in there for Leanne Donaldson from Bundaberg, but it does not look like she rates much of a mention. Last up, there is Anastacia's blindfold and earmuffs for the see-nothing, hear-nothing, do-nothing Premier leading a circus tent government. For the benefit of all Queenslanders, I table Labor's Show Bag of Horrors.

Tabled paper: Queensland Labor Show Bag of Horrors [[1282](#)].

What a horror it is. Sort the mess out and get the LNP in government—a competent government for the state of Queensland, for once.

Liberal National Party, Performance

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.48 pm): As all honourable members know, Queensland is the home of the big events. We have had the Horn-Pacquiao superfight, we have had the filming of *Thor: Ragnarok* and *Aquaman* and, of course, we will have the 21st Commonwealth Games next year. Tonight we welcome to Queensland the greatest comedian in the world—Jerry Seinfeld, who hits the big stage in Queensland. That got me thinking: what would Jerry Seinfeld make of the Queensland LNP? Would he form the view, like every

Queenslander I talk to, that it is really a show about nothing? We have seen the attempted makeover of the member for Clayfield—the stubbies and thongs, the sipping of the shandies in the front bar, the devil-may-care theme park wild rides. However, no makeover will erase the memories of what he did when he was the treasurer when he revelled in the cut, sack and sell mantra. The only thing that was missing from him was the urban sombrero. What did he do? What did he say in that very first budget? What did he say to Queenslanders? 'No jobs for you, no jobs for you, cuts to health, cuts to education, cuts to families.' Nothing was off limits.

Unlike *Seinfeld*, there are no Jerrys, there are no Elaines and there are no Kramers to save him—except the member for Whitsunday, who looks a bit like Kramer! When they see him on the street, when they see him on the TV, when they see him in the paper, there is only thing that comes to mind and there is only one thing they want to say: 'Hello, Newman!' What did he say about the Newman government policies? He did not apologise. He did not say he was wrong. He just said, 'We got the messaging wrong. We could've communicated better.' What Bizarro World does the Leader of the Opposition live in? He needs to be up-front and honest: will he rule out a preference deal with One Nation? He says that he does not want to enter a coalition, but he says, 'Well, we might enter into a deal with One Nation, of course on a seat-by-seat basis.' The bottom line for Queensland is this: is the Leader of the Opposition the master of his own domain or is he in the thrall of Pauline Hanson? Let me leave the final quote to George—not George Costanza, who of course said, 'It's not a lie if you believe it.' Let me leave it to George—George Brandis, who said that the Leader of the Opposition and this opposition led by him are very, very mediocre. Welcome to Queensland, Jerry Seinfeld, and welcome to the Queensland LNP, because you could not script this.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance; Cross River Rail

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.52 pm): Talk about a show about nothing! The words 'rail fail' have become synonymous with this Palaszczuk Labor government. In the true Labor tradition of gravy trains, trains without seats, trains too big for tunnels, 15 per cent on 15 per cent public transport fares and under the Palaszczuk government tunnels without trains, trains without drivers and 1,800 services cut a month, Labor's rail fail knows no bounds.

After lauding and citing Infrastructure Australia—an independent authority, let us not forget, set up by Labor—the member for South Brisbane was quick to react when it said, 'Sorry, Jackie, but Cross River Rail doesn't stack up.' Infrastructure Australia had independently assessed Labor's only infrastructure priority and said that the costs of the project are likely to exceed the benefits. That means that taxpayers lose money by building the project. Put simply, for every dollar put in there is less than \$1 of benefit for this project. When the project costs \$15 billion, that is bad news for Queenslanders. IA went on to say that rail patronage growth projections and the estimation of project benefits are unrealistically high.

This is what the LNP has questioned all along. There is no evidence that rail patronage will triple, yet Labor has used this as a key assumption in the secret Cross River Rail business case. There is no evidence that the Merivale Bridge will reach capacity in 2026. In fact, if we were to believe the previous projections, the Merivale Bridge would be at capacity right now and it is not. At \$15 billion it is too expensive for taxpayers all across Queensland to get it wrong. The LNP has always supported and recognised the future need of a second heavy rail crossing across the Brisbane River, but this is too important to rush. The LNP has rightly questioned \$15 billion from the start and now some crossbenchers have come to the party late and in fact supported the creation of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority and voted in favour of last year's budget that set up the seed funding for this project. You cannot reallocate \$5.4 billion of funding that is not in the budget. On the back of media reports where we see billboards being erected in the 'People's Republic of South Brisbane', the truth about this project has been exposed. The only purpose of this project is to get the member for South Brisbane re-elected. The only priority is Jackie. The backbenchers know it. All of their electorates know it. This is a project to save her seat.

Liberal National Party, Performance

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (2.55 pm): Like the member for Kawana, I love the Ekka. I have gone to the Ekka every single year since I was born. It is a tradition in my family that I go with my mum and nanna. Do members know what? I am really looking forward to going to the Ekka this year. In actual fact—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection: I did get a show bag. I got the Jarrod Bleijie show bag, but I was very disappointed because there was only one thing in it—this mirror! One thing and I thought, 'That's all I got in the Jarrod Bleijie show bag!'

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. Like the member for Kawana, you know the rules about props.

Ms JONES: I thought that I would at least get a can of hairspray! But nothing, and that is what you get whether it is an LNP show bag or the LNP sideshow that is sitting opposite today.

A government member: A kerchief?

Ms JONES: A kerchief? Yes, a kerchief. No, I am moving on; I am getting on to the real issues of the day. Those opposite come in here and they joke and they laugh, yet Queenslanders know that there is no real alternative for them when it comes to government in Queensland. They said one thing before the last election and they did another thing when they were elected. What did George say? If you say it enough you believe it is true. Was that what this contract was? The member for Clayfield said, 'We're going to lower household electricity prices,' but then what did the member for Clayfield deliver? A 43 per cent increase in household electricity prices! The member for Clayfield said in his contract with Queenslanders that he would cut electricity prices for Queensland households; he increased them by 43 per cent.

This is the same member for Clayfield who said, 'I'm not doing a deal with One Nation. No, I'm not doing a deal with One Nation—except on a seat-by-seat basis.' What else is he dealing with her about if he is not doing a deal about seats? A deal is a deal and the member for Clayfield knows it. I remember when the member for Clayfield used to have a backbone and stood up against One Nation and One Nation's policies. That member for Clayfield is gone, because this is a man who is willing to get in bed with One Nation just to get his own job back and it is shameful. Those opposite talk about the economic risk. The biggest economic risk to the tourism industry in Queensland is One Nation and we have a Liberal leader who is happy to cosy up to One Nation on a seat-by-seat basis. I again call on the member for Clayfield to come clean and walk away from his dodgy deal with One Nation. I know it makes him uncomfortable, and he should be, because it is shameful that the member for Clayfield is willing to cosy up to One Nation. Remember when he denied that his chief of staff had even met with them? He denied that and then he had to come skulking back in here and apologise because he was already having private negotiations with One Nation.

Mr Dick: Caught out!

Ms JONES: He has been caught out. He should have a look in the member for Kawana's mirror.

(Time expired)

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.58 pm): Talk about more 'yadda yadda yadda' from Labor. There we have the cast of *Seinfeld*: we have Elaine and right next to her is Kramer—always sticking his head in—and the member for Mulgrave is George, who can never quite get it right. No-one pays any attention to him and no-one recognises his true value.

Talk about 'yadda yadda yadda'. While there is no serious discussion going on over there, Queensland is suffering. All we have is a Premier who seems to adopt the tactic of clinging to the Maroons victory over New South Wales as her single excuse of how to deal with things. Without the continued success of Cameron Smith and his Maroons warriors, we would be struggling to notch up any wins in the ongoing rivalry between Queensland and New South Wales, let alone between Australia and New Zealand in the Bledisloe Cup.

The Premier appears to have adopted the tactic of waving away every serious issue pressing down on her government with a glib, meaningless reference to the State of Origin competition. Let me bring some real force to the analogy. When it comes to the economic state of origin, New South Wales is in a different league from the Labor way of doing things in Queensland. In New South Wales, unemployment is lower, debt is lower, forecast growth is higher and infrastructure is being built. Under Labor, business conditions in Queensland are lower than they are in New South Wales.

Queensland is losing market share to other states in the vital area of tourism. In terms of organised crime, our laws are weaker, making us a prime target for interstate gangs to come back to Queensland. Industrial lawlessness has flourished and the CFMEU is back at the helm. When one of her own team stuffs up, the Premier gets angry. When the issue is too hot to handle, she disappears entirely. Only the LNP can deliver the better government that Queensland needs.

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at two minutes past four.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Drug Court



Mr NICHOLLS (3.02 pm): My first question without notice is to the Premier.

Ms Palaszczuk: Is this about Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: I urge all members to allow the questioner to ask the question in silence.

Mr NICHOLLS: My example made clear just then. How can Queenslanders take the Premier seriously about law and order issues when her Attorney-General has spent about \$1.2 million and almost three years trying to establish a Drug Court that is still yet to hear a single case?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Who was the treasurer who abolished the Drug Court in this state? Who abolished the Drug Court, the Murri Court and the Special Circumstances Court? We are bringing them back. In fact, tomorrow, the Attorney-General will bring legislation into this House that will re-establish the Drug Court, which was abolished by the former government.

The member for Kawana—remember him? The worst Attorney-General the country has ever seen—abolished all of those courts. There was no consultation. He did not talk to Queenslanders. He did not talk to the legal profession. He did not talk to the Bar Association. He did not talk to the Law Society. He came in here and abolished all of those courts. We are bringing them back. We have also introduced a specialist court to deal with domestic and family violence. We are rolling them out in this state.

I refer to the private member's statement of the Leader of the Opposition. I have never heard a worst private member's statement by a Leader of the Opposition in my life. He talked down Queensland. I will always stand up for this state. We do not hear what the other side wants to do. It is about time the Leader of the Opposition got behind Queensland, got behind Queensland jobs, got behind our Buy Queensland policy, got behind Queenslanders and the courts that were there to deal with people who have issues around domestic and family violence, people who have an intellectual disability and who need to go to a special circumstances court, or people who have drug and alcohol addiction. I have been out there listening to Queenslanders on issues such as ice. They want this court established.

The former government took it away. Clearly, the LNP does not listen. It has no capacity to listen. It has never listened. It is not listening now, and it never will. We will continue to stand up for this state. How dare the Leader of the Opposition come in here and criticise me for standing up for Queensland! How dare he do that!

Crime Statistics

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question without notice is also to the Premier. Given that it was an election commitment to establish an independent crime statistics body and that it has taken this inept Attorney-General now over 2½ years to come up with a model for the body, which she has now buck-passed to Treasury, will the Premier confirm that this is another example of a do-nothing government that cannot even implement its own election policies?

Ms PALASZCZUK: On this side of the House we honour our election commitments and we deliver on our election commitments. We said that we would stop the sale of assets. We did that. We said that we would restore front-line services in this state. That is what we are doing, with more teachers, more teacher aides, more doctors and more nurses. We are yet to hear what they are going to do about that.

Ms Trad: Right-size the Public Service.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection. They have said that they want to right-size the Public Service. We know what they said before the last election—that public servants had nothing to fear. What did the member for Clayfield do in his first budget? He axed 14,000 jobs—14,000 families who still feel the hurt and still feel the pain.

In 2½ years, more than 80 per cent of our election commitments have been completed and delivered. The member talks about crime statistics. The former government abolished the independent body that used to collect the crime statistics in this state. How dare the Leader of the Opposition come in here and criticise something that he abolished in the first place! We only have to look at the documents before Campbell Newman and Tim Nicholls won that election. They put a contract to Queensland about reducing the cost of living. They misrepresented themselves to the people of Queensland and increased electricity prices by more than 43 per cent. I will stand by my commitments. We believe that we must honour the trust that the Queensland people put in us. That is what we will do. The people of Queensland have put their trust in us and we will return that trust.

Women on Boards

Ms PEASE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier please update the House on the progress of the Queensland government's Women on Boards initiative?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Lytton very much for that question. She is a proud woman in the government. Whenever I travel overseas and speak to investors and representatives from other governments they absolutely applaud the number of women that we have in our cabinet and the number of women that we have in our caucus. We have been consistently promoting equality in this state. I am proud to say that my government's Women on Boards initiative is already making an impact. We understand the importance of tackling gender inequality and ensuring that we have equal representation when it comes to things like boards.

When we came to government in 2015 women comprised just 31 per cent of Queensland government board membership. We are making great progress towards women accounting for 50 per cent of all new government board appointees. Our initiative to reach 50 per cent female representation on government bodies by 2020 is indeed working. I thank the minister for women who is driving that initiative.

At the end of June this year, I can report to the House, 47 per cent of new board appointments in this state were women. Women now hold 43 per cent of all Queensland government board positions. This is a positive step. It is a great initiative that will inspire younger women who are coming through. However, during the recent estimates hearing I am quite sure everyone was somewhat alarmed when the member for Everton chose a rare moment in the limelight to criticise the diversity on the Parole Board. He said there were too many females. Women make up 68 per cent of the Parole Board. They were selected on merit. Who would have thought we would see criticism on that side of the House when it comes to gender diversity.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. International Women's Day at Tatts. At the same time the member for Everton was making those comments, the Prime Minister was writing to me about his government's commitment to set a target of women holding 50 per cent of Commonwealth government board positions overall. Perhaps the member for Everton would like to speak to the Prime Minister about making sure that they encourage more women to take up positions. Let us not be criticising when we get to a position where women are selected on merit and there is more than 50 per cent. That is something that we should celebrate as a state.

TAFE

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. Given the Attorney-General refuses to do so, will the Premier commit to publicly releasing Labor's secret review into TAFE assets across Queensland before the next state election?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Nanango for the question. I am looking forward to coming out to Kingaroy very shortly and meeting the community members out there. It is like those opposite are erasing history. It is like they have a blackboard and they are erasing everything that they did. I can remember speaking at rallies because those opposite wanted to close TAFE colleges in this state. In fact, I can remember personally speaking to TAFE teachers who loved working in TAFE and who had lost their job.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, you have had a pretty good go. If you persist you will be named. That applies to other members as well who are trying to talk over the top of the person who is either asking the question or answering the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am very pleased that on this side of the House we have honoured our election commitment to save TAFE. We firmly believe in skilling young people and giving people the opportunity to gain skills to enter the workforce. In fact, in the budget that was just handed down we allocated \$10 million to help those people, especially those in regional communities who are doing it tough and have lost their jobs during the downturn of the mining boom, to apply to get TAFE vouchers so that they can learn new skills to get a job. I find it incredibly hypocritical that members on that side of the House would dare ask a question about the value of TAFE when they smashed TAFE. They ripped the guts out of TAFE. They sacked people who worked in TAFE. They cut Skilling Queenslanders for Work. We are more than happy to go through all the cuts that those opposite made.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you have had a pretty good go. You are on notice. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Mr Speaker, we will always stand up for TAFE in this state. We value the skills—

Mr SPEAKER: Time has expired. We will move on.

(Time expired)

Exports

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the trade of Queensland agricultural produce and any current issues impacting on farm exports?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mackay for that very important question. There are some issues that are impacting on our farm exports that I think this House needs to be updated on. Under my government Queensland exports, as we heard yesterday in this House, are at record levels. Over the last 12 months Queensland exports rose to \$65.9 billion. I had the opportunity today to meet with the CEO of NAB and the former New South Wales premier Mike Baird. They came in and talked to me about how well they see Queensland going. It was very comforting to hear that from a former New South Wales premier.

In all seriousness, exports are now 48 per cent higher than they were when we came to office in 2015. By working with exporters by leading trade missions overseas and delivering infrastructure at home, we are helping to grow exports and, of course, create jobs. Agricultural exports are vitally important to farming families and rural communities. Despite the prolonged drought, Queensland farm exports increased by 6.7 per cent to \$9.7 billion over the last 12 months. We are determined to strengthen these overseas markets. To do that we encourage the federal government to ensure bilateral and multilateral negotiations on market access.

Today I have written to the federal trade minister, Steve Ciobo—maybe not a such great friend of Queensland, but he did welcome our announcement on The Spit—about China's temporary ban on beef imports from a number of Australian meatworks. I acknowledge that China had agreed to accept meat imports dispatched before the ban was issued. However, the ban and its impact on the beef industry remains. Impacted meatworks are Beef City near Toowoomba and Kilcoy. They process about 1,800 cattle every day. That is almost 20 per cent of Queensland's daily beef processing.

Mr Ciobo had indicated that he was willing to travel to China to resolve this issue. The Minister for Tourism will be seeing Mr Ciobo in China shortly. I will ask the minister to seek a meeting about this very important issue and maybe meet with some government officials while she is there about this issue because it is so important to the agricultural industry in this state. Minister Ciobo has been trying to stir up the New Zealanders on the government's Buy Queensland procurement policy. My job is to keep and help create Queensland jobs through exports and our own procurement. I urge Minister Ciobo to do his job and help restore market access for Queensland beef.

Crime and Corruption Commission, Funding

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the evidence given by Chairperson Alan MacSporran QC that the CCC budget has been reduced this year and a request for more resources was denied by the Palaszczuk Labor government. How can the Premier still claim to be committed to accountability and transparency, when she is actively cutting funding to the Crime and Corruption Commission?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to look further into that issue. I watched some of the estimates committee hearing and I will go back—

Mrs D'Ath: They said that they had sufficient funds to do the job.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the Attorney-General. The CCC comes under her portfolio. The Attorney-General has just advised the House that the CCC has the funds that they need to do the job, as was reported. They said in the estimates hearing that they have sufficient funds to do their job.

Cross River Rail

Mr KING: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on Cross River Rail and advise whether she is aware of any alternative positions?

Ms TRAD: Unlike those opposite, the member for Kallangur does not trash talk Cross River Rail. He did not trash talk the Townsville stadium like those opposite. He did not trash talk light rail on the Gold Coast like those opposite. He certainly does not trash talk Cross River Rail like those opposite, because he understands that, fundamentally, Cross River Rail will reform the way that public transport operates for more than three million people in the South-East Queensland region. The people who will benefit the most are those in the outer suburban regions such as Moreton Bay, who will save almost 20 minutes a day in travel to the CBD. Fundamentally, Cross River Rail will deliver turn-up-and-go, reliable and frequent services for the people of Queensland.

Today I was excited to announce that we have invited Queensland companies to tender for the demolition of the Goprint site. That is the first big step in the commencement of construction for this very important project. It is the No. 1 critical infrastructure project for the south-east Queensland corner. We have to get on and build this infrastructure, because, quite frankly, Queenslanders are sick and tired of waiting for a crisis before we build the infrastructure that we need. Paul Turner from the RACQ stood beside me and said, 'Wouldn't it be nice to build the infrastructure before we actually got to a crisis?' I wholeheartedly agree with the RACQ, which agrees with the Palaszczuk Labor government, that we need this project to bust congestion.

Unfortunately, there is another body that seems to be singing from the same song sheet as the LNP and that is Malcolm Turnbull's Infrastructure Australia. Infrastructure Australia, which has been so politically compromised by the Turnbull government, sees fit to fund major projects in New South Wales that do not have final EISs; that do not know where tunnels are going; that do not know where dive points or exit points are; that do not know where ventilation stacks are going. Those projects get the tick of approval from Infrastructure Australia, but not Cross River Rail. Soon after their shoddy assessment of Cross River Rail, Infrastructure Australia provided a report that says that if we want money from the federal government we should look at privatising Queensland Rail and using the proceeds to fund Cross River Rail. It is the same song sheet.

ID Scanners

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Is the Premier's announcement of a review into the implementation of ID scanners just days after they were introduced confirmation of yet another mishap presided over by the Attorney-General?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The answer is no. However, I am glad that I have had a question from the member for Kawana. When I was just asked about CCC funding, it brought back memories of estimates hearings in the past. I can confirm that, when the member for Kawana was the Attorney-General, some 25 positions were axed. It is a pity that he did not ask me that question.

Both the Attorney-General and I have had the opportunity to use ID scanners and have seen them working in practice. Since 1 July, 61 contraventions have been detected. That is the number of times people with banning orders have tried to enter licensed venues and been stopped. In the past, those people would have been allowed into the venues. The Leader of the Opposition and the member for Kawana might want to dance with such people, but I certainly do not and I do not think anyone on this side of the House would want to, either. People have banning orders because of violence, drugs, assaults, resisting or obstructing police and public nuisance offences. The idea of having a scanner is about creating—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This is a serious issue and those opposite are laughing about it.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are getting pretty close to the end of the line.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I repeat: people have banning orders because of violence, drugs, assaults, resisting or obstructing police and public nuisance offences. If the scanners were not in place, those people would not have been picked up and would have been able to enter the licensed venues. These laws are about keeping Queenslanders safe. They are about tackling alcohol fuelled violence. They are about reducing the number of hospitalisations that we have seen in the past.

(Time expired)

Powering Queensland Plan

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer advise the House on the views of the federal government towards the Queensland government's Powering Queensland Plan and any alternative policies?

Mr PITT: I thank the member for Barron River for his question. He is a great advocate for people in our area of Far North Queensland on renewable energy and the future of lower electricity prices in Queensland. Before I go to the heart of the question, I note that the federal energy minister, Josh Frydenberg, appeared to claim that pressure from the Turnbull government is the reason the Queensland government has acted to stabilise electricity prices. Nothing could be further from the truth. Because our electricity assets are in public hands, we have been able to announce a suite of initiatives, including our \$1.16 billion Powering Queensland Plan that has put downward pressure on wholesale electricity prices, directing Stanwell to alter its bidding strategies and, of course, returning Swanbank E to service. We made those decisions, not the federal government.

In contrast, we know that, when it comes to energy policy, the LNP, both at a state and federal level, are all at sea. The majority of experts in the energy space know that renewable energy is the cheapest form of new energy infrastructure to be built and it is definitely cheaper than a new coal-fired power station. We know that the Finkel review showed that the capital cost of a new ultra-supercritical coal-fired power station is around 34 per cent more than an equivalent solar farm. Renewable costs continue to fall and costs for coal-fired power stations will remain constantly high into the future.

When we start talking about the proposals put forward by the LNP for a new coal-fired power station—a power station that has no proponent, has no site and would not be built for another seven to 10 years—even the federal Treasurer cannot bring himself to support it. He said in the *Australian Financial Review* on 28 July—

But let's be real about it. These new HELE plants would produce energy at an estimated two and half times the costs of our existing coal-fired power stations. They would also take up to around seven years to set up.

On Radio National on 12 July, federal energy minister, Josh Frydenberg, said of the need for a new coal-fired power station—

Well we don't have any plan on the table to build a new coal-fired power station because today we're getting more than 60% of our electricity from that source ...

Tony Wood from the Grattan Institute said—

As for the idea that the Government should directly finance new coal plants, well, that would not restore low prices, but could create white elephants.

The Deputy Prime Minister, Barnaby Joyce, must have missed the memo because in today's electricity summit he has reportedly launched a call to build a HELE coal-fired power station but, of course, power chiefs gave it the big thumbs down.

When it comes to coal-fired power stations we know that Queensland has the youngest and most efficient fleet in Australia. We have eight of them and we do not need a ninth. That is why our efforts are focused on our Powering Queensland Plan. It is why we are focusing on where the investment is coming in, building on the momentum being created by the 17 renewable projects in this state—\$2.3 billion worth—creating jobs and creating the energy of the future.

Jobs Queensland

Ms DAVIS: My question without notice is to the Premier. The government's flagship advisory board Jobs Queensland has failed to roll out any more than \$4 million of its \$20 million budget for the first two years. How does the Premier defend yet another program overseen by the Attorney-General that has fallen well short of expectations and once again let down unemployed Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to take a question about jobs from that side of the House any day of the week when we look at their track record. Under your watch in Child Safety over 220 people lost their jobs. There was no apology. That is your record. We will not let Queenslanders forget your record and your cruel cuts. We had to come in here and fix your mess. We are fixing your mess.

Ms Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock! Member for Aspley and Premier, I would urge you both to speak through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have the Minister for Communities and Child Safety restoring front-line workers in this state and making sure the Triple P has the funding it needs to do its job.

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. It is the first time the Triple P parenting program has been free in Queensland. We are tackling those issues and making sure that we put Queensland families first.

In relation to Jobs Queensland, I have had the opportunity to speak with both the Attorney-General, as the Minister for Training, and Rachel Hunter, the chair of that board, about the work they are doing. One of the first things I decided was that Jobs Queensland needed to be located in Ipswich—in a regional area. We want to try to see if we can get more people to work in regional centres outside of Brisbane.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, I warn you under standing order 253A. You have had a pretty good go. If you continue I will take further action.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a trigger for interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Jobs Queensland has delivered a number of critical projects over the past year, providing invaluable input into the training and skills system in Queensland. The work program has included delivering the Queensland Tourism Workforce Plan, a key component of our Advancing Tourism strategy, to ensure Queensland has the skilled workforce it needs to support the growing and thriving tourism industry. Given the number of tourists coming to our state, we need to get a handle on the training that people need into the future.

Ms Jones: Two thousand more jobs.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We also know too with the Queen's Wharf development and developments on the Gold Coast that we need a higher standard of skills. We are making sure that the training is there for them.

Jobs Queensland has also been delivering advice on the implementation of the \$4 million Training in Emerging and Innovative Industries Fund to support industries impacted by digital disruption to upskill existing workers. It has also implemented a pilot of a place based skills project in the Fraser Coast region in partnership with TAFE Queensland and the CSIRO.

They are providing advice on the Queensland aviation industry. We know how important the aviation industry is for Queensland. Jobs Queensland is backing Queensland, just like our procurement strategy is backing Queensland.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: While we build they cut.

(Time expired)

Health System, Federal Funding

Ms DONALDSON: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on the status of the Commonwealth government's funding responsibilities to the Queensland health system?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Bundaberg for her question and also for her ongoing support in the fight against the Turnbull government to ensure the Queensland health system and our public hospitals in particular get their fair share of funding from the federal government. Last Friday I attended the COAG Health Council. I regret to advise the House that it was yet another case of another day, another cut from the Commonwealth government.

The funding arrangement between the Commonwealth and the states, reiterated in the COAG agreement signed by Malcolm Turnbull in April 2016, specifies that the Commonwealth will pay the states 45 per cent of efficient growth of activity delivered above purchase levels. I can inform the House that the Turnbull LNP government is now looking at withholding money that is due and owing to Queensland.

The federal Minister for Health, Greg Hunt, intends to issue a directive to the Independent Hospital Pricing Authority. I am advised that what this means for Queensland is that \$240 million—almost a quarter of a billion dollars—in funding owed to us for work already performed in public hospitals in 2015-16 is at risk. This move by the Commonwealth minister found no support from any state or territory. Not one state or territory, including states governed by coalition parties, would support this mechanism.

For two years we have been waiting and now we learn that we may not get the money that is owed to us—independently ratified by an independent administrator—for work already undertaken. It is like mowing someone's lawn for \$50, that person hanging on to it for two years and then telling you that they are not going to pay you until they check the edging.

It shows that, when it comes to health and healthcare funding, the LNP simply cannot be trusted. When is a deal not a deal? When you do a deal with the LNP. We saw it when the Abbott government cut \$10 billion, supported by Malcolm Turnbull, from public hospitals when they decided to unilaterally abandoned the National Health Reform Agreement.

What did the Leader of the Opposition say about that? Nothing. What did he say when the Turnbull and Abbott governments cut \$10.4 million from mental health in Queensland? Nothing. What did he say when they cut over \$200 million from aged care over four years? The Leader of the Opposition said nothing. What about when they cut \$56.7 million from dental funding for 2017-18? The Leader of the Opposition said nothing.

The Leader of the Opposition made the point recently that he does not take his riding instructions from Canberra. You do not need riding instructions when you will not even get on the horse! I will say this for Queensland: the Palaszczuk Labor government will stand up for Queensland and we will fight every day to get our fair share of funding for our Queensland health system.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Mansfield, I ask all members to reflect on their behaviour this afternoon. I think some of the comments that have been made are unparliamentary and not of the standard that we expect of members.

Prostitution Licensing Authority

Mr WALKER: My question without notice is to the Premier. In addition to the other six examples of portfolio failures by the Attorney-General highlighted by the opposition today, the Prostitution Licensing Authority has also been out of action without a permanent or acting chair and has not met since March. How does the Premier still have confidence in the Attorney-General?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have every confidence in this Attorney-General. Unlike the former attorney-general, she is out doing her job every day of the week as opposed to the protection program that was put in place by the former attorney-general where he was hidden away from public gaze for six months.

Let us talk about when we first came to office. What did we do? We brought in integrity and accountability in terms of political donations. The Attorney-General drove that.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I am having difficulty hearing the Premier. If I can cannot hear, Hansard certainly cannot.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. Where in the past political donations of under \$12,500 did not have to be disclosed, we brought that down to \$1,000.

Mr Perrett interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gympie, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you continue I will take the appropriate action. There are some other members who are about to follow suit if they continue.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Not only that, we introduced on this side of the House real-time political disclosure. We are leading the country when it comes to integrity and accountability. We are moving 17-year-olds out of adult prisons—something that was not supported on that side of the House. We are bringing back courts, as we heard earlier, that were cut under the former LNP government—the Special Circumstances Court, the Drug Court, the Murri Court.

This Attorney-General is travelling around the state. Let us talk about her interaction with the legal profession as well. She is a highly respected Attorney-General. There is no criticism of court appointments by this Attorney-General because she consults and she listens.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: In relation to the shadow minister's question about the Prostitution Licensing Authority, it is in the process of being transferred to police.

Mr Walker interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Perhaps that question should be redirected to the Minister for Police.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Mansfield, you are now warned under standing order 253A. I find your interjections were designed to try to talk over the top of the Premier, who was answering the member for Mansfield's question. If you continue, I will take further action.

Catholic Education Week

Ms FARMER: My question is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister provide the House with an update of the recent Catholic Education Week?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for Bulimba for the question. I know what a passionate advocate she is for all schools in her electorate. I have had the privilege of going to Lourdes Hill, a Catholic girls' school in her electorate, a couple of times.

Ms Trad: My alma mater.

Ms JONES: Yes, your alma mater. I also know that she was at Nudgee College for the P&F's dinner during Catholic Education Week when I had the great privilege of being at St Andrew's Catholic College in the electorate of Barron River. The Archbishop of Brisbane, Mark Coleridge, and I and many others went to the very first celebration of Catholic Education Week in regional Queensland ever—in Cairns of all cities, of course. It was wonderful to be there to see the wonderful level of education that is being provided through Catholic education across all parts of Queensland. This is because, as we celebrate Catholic Education Week, we recognise that it is a wonderful system of education. They operate as a system because they believe that every child deserves good quality Catholic based education no matter where they live in Queensland and, indeed, no matter where they live in this country.

We are a very proud government when it comes to supporting all schools' and parents' choice when it comes to the education of their child, including providing more than \$400 million to support Catholic education in Queensland. I want to acknowledge and thank all of the great workers in our Catholic schools—our teachers, our teacher aides, the leadership and the P&Fs. That is why we will stand firm with them in rejecting the unfair offer from the federal government that discriminates against Catholic schools in this country. In actual fact, as has been widely reported, the system rips \$1.1 billion off Catholic schools in our country. This is not good enough.

We also know that Gonski 2.0 locks in an unfair funding path for state schools. I spoke openly about this in estimates. We will not sign up to a deal that rips off state schools, rips off Catholic schools and walks away from the fundamental principles of Gonski, which is about being sector blind. Instead, Simon Birmingham said that he was not going to do side deals. That is the exact opposite to what he did. He has walked away from that commitment and he is off doing side deals with Tasmania and whoever, with One Nation in the dead of night, changing the legislation overnight. We know that the LNP will deal with One Nation—'whatever it takes'. We know that they will only be able to form government with a One Nation hung parliament.

I am calling on those opposite to stand with me and stand up for Catholic schools in Queensland. We are committed to ensuring that all schools in Queensland—Catholic, independent and state schools—get the best deal out of the federal government when it comes to funding. We do not want to go back to the bad old days of division in our country because of which school you go to.

(Time expired)

Budget

Mr DICKSON: My question is to the Treasurer. It has come to my attention that the Leader of the Opposition and the previous treasurer of Queensland believes that Queensland doctors, nurses, front-line staff and public servants would not be paid if the Appropriation Bill were not passed. The Clerk of the Parliament has stated in today's *Sunshine Coast Daily* that an amount of \$25.42 billion was available to pay public servants irrespective of whether the Appropriation Bill was passed. Who is right?

Mr PITT: If the member for Buderim, who has been here for quite some time, is looking to seek advice about what the impacts are of a vote in the parliament, he need only see the Table Office staff inside or outside of sitting hours. If he wants to ask a question about the budget itself and the appropriation bills and why they are so important to Queensland, I would be very happy to answer his question.

I am very disappointed with the One Nation stance on voting against the budget that we handed down because the budget this year has been a very good budget for Queensland, particularly for regional Queensland—some of those areas which the member purports to represent more faithfully than we do.

Mr DICKSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have asked a direct question: who is right—the Leader of the Opposition or the Clerk of the Parliament?

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer.

Mr PITT: Mr Speaker, I seek your guidance in answering the question. As far as I read this, the member has asked a question that should not be directed to me anyhow. If he wants to ask a question about the budget, I am very happy to give him an answer.

Mr DICKSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Isn't the Treasurer in charge of the Appropriation Bill for Queensland? Would he not understand that?

Mr SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. Treasurer, do you have anything further to add?

Mr PITT: The Appropriation Bill is what allows us to give supply to the government to deliver on all of the matters that are important to the people of Queensland. The fact that the member for Buderim voted against this budget speaks volumes because it shows reckless abandon when it comes to what is important to Queenslanders when it comes down to it.

One Nation have a very big case to answer. It is fine to throw out all sorts of things about what they like and what they do not like, but when it comes to matters of economic policy they will be found wanting every day of the week. Let me run through a few things in this budget for the member. We have had a record budget in terms of health, education and training. This is a budget which is going to support 40,000 jobs in 2017-18 and a Capital Works Program of more than \$42 billion which directly supports 29,000 jobs in 2017-18 alone.

I find it really interesting that this is the question the member has decided to save up when he could be asking questions about how our budget compares to the previous government of which he was a member. We are very proud of our budgets because we have built the economy. We have driven down debt. We have achieved jobs growth. The member should know better than to waste question time on a matter like this. This is a frivolous question. This is a question that he knows the answer to himself because he decided to vote against it.

Mr DICKSON: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The Treasurer may think I know the answer, but I am interested to know whether he knows the answer.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Do you have anything further, Treasurer?

Mr PITT: The member is asking a question which really should be a matter for the Clerk. I am responsible for the appropriation of the state, but in terms of the way that it is appropriated through the parliamentary process that is where you get parliamentary advice, member for Buderim. I will reiterate: this is a government which is delivering jobs. We are a government that has delivered 77,300 net new jobs, more than 2½ times what the last government—the government that you were a member of—did.

Ms Palaszczuk: Minister!

Mr PITT: You will have to excuse me if I do not take seriously the question. He was a minister of that government. He should know better.

(Time expired)

Procurement Strategy

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport. Will the minister inform the House about the implementation of a new Queensland procurement strategy, how it compares with previous procurement arrangements and how it will support regional jobs?

Mr de BRENNI: I thank the member for Maryborough for the question. I want to acknowledge in particular his continued advocacy for regional jobs and, particularly, businesses in Maryborough. This new procurement strategy is all about protecting Queensland jobs. It is a significant improvement on the previous approach because the choice is simple: do we want to see Queensland government contracts go to Queensland businesses and support Queensland workers, or should our taxpayer dollars go to jobs overseas? It is a simple question. When this government spends taxpayers' funds, we want to see Queenslanders get that work. It is very simple. Queensland businesses have the skills, the capacity and the workforce. We now have the policy to back them in.

The member for Maryborough has asked for a comparison between previous approaches. We can contrast the new Queensland procurement strategy with the Newman-Nicholls cut-price approach to procurement in this state. When the Queensland Audit Office says that they got procurement wrong, that is pretty damning. In September 2016 the Queensland Audit Office released its report into strategic procurement based on the framework established by the LNP. The LNP's Procurement Transformation Program, or PTP as they called it, was claimed to achieve up to \$1.3 billion in procurement benefits. That is what they claimed it would achieve.

The PTP was supposed to deliver a procurement benefit of \$417 million in its first two financial years, but it missed the mark entirely. It was a lofty goal and the Audit Office savaged them for not coming anywhere near it. It was a shemozzle that had no impact on Queensland communities and no impact on Queensland jobs. It is yet another example of how the previous government overpromised and fundamentally failed.

We are not just making up for their miserable record. We are doing what we were elected to do. We are supporting Queenslanders and we are supporting Queensland jobs. This government's policy to support jobs for regional Queensland is for Queensland's benefit. This policy gives businesses which employ Queenslanders an improved opportunity of competing and winning contracts from the government. If an overseas company wants to sell goods and services to the Queensland government, they are still welcome to have a go, but now they can increase their chances by employing people in Queensland by setting up and establishing their business in Queensland and investing in this state.

Unlike the previous government, we understand that procurement is about more than just dollars and cents. That is why our approach is an improvement. It is about a strong social, economic and environmental outcome—

(Time expired)

State Schools, Religious Instruction

Ms SIMPSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Education. With regard to the minister's letter to me of 3 July and the religious instruction review recommendations adopted by the government, will the minister give a guarantee that children, whatever their faith, will be allowed to talk about their faith in the playground and children will not be banned from exchanging Christmas cards at school?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question and for her genuine interest in this. I can absolutely give her that absolute guarantee. As I have been saying publicly for more than a fortnight, I can look her in the eye and give her an absolute rolled-gold guarantee—from me to you. I will absolutely do that. The member would have seen the public statements I have made in this regard. My position is the same as what Labor's position has always been, and that is that we support religious instruction in state schools and we will continue to do so. To answer the honourable member's question, absolutely, yes, I can give her that guarantee.

Neighbourhood Centres, Funding

Ms BOYD: 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 please advise the House of any feedback received from neighbourhood centres regarding the Palaszczuk government's funding initiatives?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Pine Rivers for her question. I know what a tremendous advocate she is for our neighbourhood centres. I have had the pleasure of meeting with representatives from the Pine Rivers Neighbourhood Centre. Our neighbourhood centres do so much good work supporting vulnerable Queenslanders. Whilst governing from the Gold Coast last week, I had the pleasure of visiting one of our hardest working neighbourhood centres, the Nerang Neighbourhood Centre, which does so much supporting vulnerable families on the Gold Coast. The Nerang Neighbourhood Centre recently received additional funding of \$125,000 for a new Community Connect worker. That worker is already in place. It was wonderful to meet with the centre and the staff to hear about the work the Community Connect worker is doing, particularly with families who have experienced domestic and family violence.

The coordinator at the Nerang Neighbourhood Centre, Vicki, told me just how different this government's approach was to neighbourhood centres compared with the previous government. The Nerang Neighbourhood Centre lost \$21,000 in what was already a very tight budget and neighbourhood centres across-the-board were slashed by \$1.8 million. Not only that, they also lost funding for their peak body. The member for Clayfield was the architect behind the fiscal repair that really did slash and burn our wonderful neighbourhood centres.

They were very grateful for our additional funding and I do wonder whether or not the local member, the member for Gaven, has had an opportunity to visit the Nerang Neighbourhood Centre. The coordinator said that they had not heard much from the local member for Gaven. Perhaps the local member for Gaven's problem with neighbours extends to neighbourhood centres. We know that the poor old member for Gaven was recently hauled up to Spring Hill in Brisbane to meet with the senior hierarchy of the LNP to talk about an alleged dispute with his neighbours.

It is understood that the selection committee had to view a video of this alleged unseemly incident with the member for Gaven's neighbours. I wonder if the member for Clayfield has seen this video. I wonder if he will release this video so that the voters in Gaven can see the kind of representative they have as their local MP. We know that he is the only member on that side of the House yet to be endorsed. Are they worried because of what they have seen in this alleged video, or is it because they are so worried he is going to join One Nation? We know he has been flirting with One Nation. It is time for Tim Nicholls to release that video.

(Time expired)

Prickly Acacia

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Premier. Premier, at estimates it was revealed that neither the agriculture minister nor the environment minister has a plan to stop the spread of prickly acacia when drought-breaking floods occur. Will the Premier now direct ministers Byrne and Miles to develop a comprehensive plan to stop the spread of this insidious weed to protect western graziers and the environment of our iconic Channel Country?

Mr SPEAKER: I call the Premier for two minutes.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This comes under the Minister for Agriculture and I am quite sure he would have been willing to answer this question in relation to prickly acacia. We know it is an issue out there and I know that the department of agriculture are making sure they address this issue. I am quite sure the minister would be more than happy to provide you with a briefing on this.

CHILD PROTECTION REFORM AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.01 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection Act 1999 and the Director of Child Protection Litigation

Act 2016 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Child Protection Reform Amendment Bill 2017 [[1279](#)].

Tabled paper: Child Protection Reform Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes [[1280](#)].

As Minister for Child Safety, I have met some incredible, resilient young people and amazing carers dedicating their lives to providing children with the care and stability they need. I have met parents and families who are doing their very best to care for their children, sometimes under extremely challenging circumstances. I have had the privilege of speaking with many of our dedicated child safety officers who day in and day out devote themselves to protecting Queensland's most vulnerable children and young people. I have listened to their stories and we have responded, with the Palaszczuk government supporting them in more ways than ever before.

The Palaszczuk government is providing the biggest funding injection in over a decade to boost front-line Child Safety jobs. An additional \$200 million investment will fund an extra 421 new Child Safety staff over three years—bringing down caseloads, improving practice and supporting children, parents and carers. The Palaszczuk government is backing our state's foster and kinship carer families by not only investing in a \$2.6 million campaign to recruit 1,000 more but ensuring they can exercise guardianship decision-making for routine medical checks and vaccinations when it is conferred on the chief executive, and with over \$15 million we are supporting carers' access to child care when it is needed.

The Palaszczuk government is also helping Queensland's parents with a network of new family support services from universal parenting advice to residential drug rehabilitation facilities. We must do everything we can to ensure Queensland families, including our kinship and foster carer families, are supported to look after Queensland's most precious and vulnerable citizens—our children.

While our reforms in Child Safety funding, policy and practice are significant, they need to be reinforced and embedded by contemporary legislation. That is what this bill is all about. I thank all of those who have worked with us in reviewing the Child Protection Act and shared their personal experiences and provided input so that we continue to improve the legislation. This has been a comprehensive process involving significant engagement with Queenslanders, including children and families, the services that support them and our key stakeholders.

This bill proposes priority amendments that will make significant improvements in how we can respond to the needs of children and young people in out-of-home care today. One of the keys to supporting the needs of children and young people in out-of-home care today is providing greater options for permanency and stability. For a child in out-of-home care, knowing where and with whom they are going to live and what relationships and cultural connections they can continue to have makes a world of difference. Permanency for a child in out-of-home care is not just about legal arrangements for the child. For the child themselves, it is about providing certainty and stability about a child's ongoing relationships with significant people in their lives, their living arrangements and connections to community. It is also about being clear from the very beginning about the goals of the department's intervention with their family and contingency planning so that, if reunification is not possible or appropriate, arrangements to meet the children's long-term needs are put in place.

This bill proposes a permanency framework to focus on achieving timely, long-term outcomes for children and young people involved in the child protection system. The bill amends the paramount principle in the act to refer to the safety, wellbeing and best interests of a child, both through childhood and for the rest of the child's life. This places front and centre the need to consider the long-term impacts for a child, as well as immediate safety and wellbeing issues when determining what is in the best interests of a child.

The bill also proposes to amend the act to include a preferred hierarchy of intervention options for achieving permanency for a child involved in the system. During the review of the act, we listened to children and young people who told us they would like the opportunity for a more permanent type of child protection order to provide for their long-term care needs when returning home to their parents is not possible. If they need to be in long-term out-of-home care, children want the opportunity to feel like they are truly part of a permanent family arrangement, without severing the relationships they might have with their siblings or their extended family members.

The bill proposes a new type of child protection order—a permanent care order—to provide a child with a more stable and secure family arrangement and greater certainty so they can get on with their lives knowing that their permanent guardian has the authority to make decisions about their care.

Under this type of order, a child can live with their guardian in a more secure and stable family arrangement knowing that unnecessary departmental intrusion into their family life is limited and that an order can only be subject to reconsideration by a court in very limited circumstances. A permanent care order will not sever a child's relationships with their siblings and extended family members, which is often very important throughout a young person's life.

For those involved in Queensland's child protection system over a number of years, people will know that this is not a brand-new idea. Back in 2006, the department released a discussion paper that asked about the need for a permanent care order. In 2013 the Queensland Child Protection Commission of Inquiry discussion paper asked the same question. Both discussion papers went nowhere and were left in the too-hard basket by former governments. I am extremely proud that it is the Palaszczuk government that is finally introducing into the Queensland parliament the changes called for by children and young people themselves so they can have the stability and permanency they need and absolutely deserve.

Another important area of reform this bill addresses is the safe care and connection of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children in care with their families, communities and cultures. In May this year, Minister Furner and I were proud to release the Queensland government strategy *Our way: a generational strategy for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and families* and its first three-year action plan *Changing Tracks*.

The bill embeds the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child placement principle, requiring explicit application of the five elements of the child placement principle—prevention, partnership, placement, participation and connection—when decisions are made about an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander child. These changes recognise the significant and long-term effect of decisions on a child, their family and community and acknowledge the role of family and community as the department's source of cultural knowledge. For the first time in Queensland's child protection legislation, we will recognise the rights of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people to self-determination by inserting a new principle for the administration of the act. This is supported by an amendment that enables the chief executive to delegate functions and powers in relation to a specific child to the chief executive officer of an appropriate Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander entity. Amendments will provide greater flexibility in how cultural advice about a child and their family is obtained and considered and how they can be better supported to participate in decision-making.

A contemporary and simplified information-sharing regime is critical to the child protection system in Queensland. The bill also clarifies the sharing of information between key government and non-government entities. Information-sharing provisions in the Child Protection Act were originally developed when the department had the central role of receiving information about child safety concerns and referring children and families to appropriate services. The reformed child protection system involves supporting families earlier, and this is increasingly coordinated and delivered by a range of non-government organisations.

The bill amends the information-sharing provisions to reflect the role played by specialist child and family support services. It enhances the ability of our funded family support services to meet the needs of children and families by enabling them to share relevant information with each other for particular purposes while providing safeguards to prevent the inappropriate sharing of personal information. The bill makes it clear that information can be shared for the purposes of supporting families to prevent a child becoming in need of protection or meeting the care and protection needs of a child who is in need of protection. Importantly, the bill clarifies that the preferred way of sharing information is with consent. The bill adds a new principle that consent should be sought where it is 'safe, possible and practicable', but it also makes clear that the safety, wellbeing and best interests of a child are paramount and take precedence over protecting privacy.

During the review we heard that front-line service providers often find the current provisions confusing and difficult to apply. The bill simplifies existing provisions and clarifies which entities can share information, and for what purpose, while maintaining current information sharing and appropriate safeguards. The bill requires the chief executive of the department to publish an information-sharing guideline. The guideline will provide simple, practical advice to front-line child safety officers and other government and non-government service providers about the sharing of information under the act.

During the review of the act, young people and adults who have had out-of-home care experiences told us it was extremely important to them to be able to access information held by the department as a way of strengthening the connection to their history, sense of self and identity. The bill

clarifies that records can be provided to an individual who is, or was, a child in out-of-home care. This includes information about both the individual and someone else, such as a sibling or carer. Information will be provided subject to appropriate safeguards and with the support of Child Safety staff.

Supporting young people to transition to adulthood is a critical time for any family. The bill strengthens the Queensland government's commitment to supporting young people approaching adulthood by inserting new requirements for transition to independence planning. This critical planning will commence when a young person turns 15 and provides that the chief executive can assist people now up until the age of 25. This bill is an important step in continuing the significant progress that has already been made in reforming Queensland's child protection system. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.14 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

Question put—That the bill be now read a first time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee

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

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date

Hon. SM FENTIMAN (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.14 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That under the provisions of standing order 136 the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee report to the House on the Child Protection Reform Amendment Bill by 28 September 2017.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 23 May (see p. 1246).

Second Reading

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (4.15 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

It is my pleasure to stand up, debate and hopefully pass my 26th bill as Attorney-General in this term of parliament. The Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 was introduced on 23 May 2017 and referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I thank the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill. I would also like to thank the organisations and particularly the individuals who took time to make submissions on, and attend the public hearing for, the bill.

In particular I would like to again acknowledge the determination of Mrs Fiona Splitt in tirelessly advocating for this reform in Queensland under the most tragic of circumstances. I hope that this bill will go some way towards providing comfort to Mrs Splitt and other families and loved ones who have found themselves in the same agonising predicament. I also want to acknowledge other representatives here today. I know the Pullen family are in the gallery today. I want to acknowledge all of those family members who have come down to listen to this debate and to watch this bill be passed through this parliament in what I hope is a bipartisan manner.

I am pleased to inform the House that on 24 July 2017 the committee tabled report No. 58 and made one recommendation: that the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 be passed. I thank the chair and members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for their timely consideration of the bill.

The bill before the House implements the recommendation made by the now President of the Court of Appeal, Mr Walter Sofronoff QC, in his report titled *Queensland parole system review*, which was tabled in parliament by the Premier and Minister for the Arts on 16 February 2017. As was indicated in the government's response to the report, this government committed to introducing legislation in 2017 to give effect to a no-body no-parole policy which prevents a murderer from being granted parole where he or she has not revealed where the victim's body is located. This legislation delivers on the government's commitment. I would like to foreshadow at this time that I will be moving two amendments to the bill during the consideration in detail stage of the debate. The amendments will ensure that the no-body no-parole framework in the bill operates as intended by making a clarifying amendment to the definition of homicide offence.

Firstly, the bill provides that the Parole Board Queensland must refuse an application for parole for a prisoner serving a period of imprisonment for a homicide offence and the body or remains of the victim have not been located, or because of an act or omission of the prisoner or another person part of the body or remains of the victim have not been located, unless the board is satisfied the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily with the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location.

Clause 4 of the bill defines a homicide offence to mean the Criminal Code offences of murder, manslaughter, accessory after the fact to murder or conspiring to murder or an offence of counselling or procuring the commission of, or conspiring the commission of, any of these offences. It is proposed to amend section 193A, 'Deciding particular applications where victim's body or remains have not been located', as inserted into the Corrective Services Act under clause 4 of the bill to capture the offence of accessory after the fact to manslaughter.

I want to thank the Pullens, who met with me today and conveyed their personal feelings about this issue and their desire to see this bill extended to include the charge of accessory after the fact to manslaughter. I thank them for their advocacy on this issue. I also want to acknowledge the opposition, who have also put in an amendment to achieve the same thing. This means that on both sides of this parliament we understand how important such an amendment is to all families. We will ensure that this bill truly addresses what it seeks to achieve, which is to, as far as possible, identify the body or remains of a victim and give closure to families where we can.

Secondly, the current drafting of the bill limits the application of the no-body no-parole framework to parole applications from relevant prisoners who were convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment for a prescribed homicide offence in Queensland. This approach does not capture those prisoners who have been convicted and sentenced to a term of imprisonment for a corresponding homicide offence in another jurisdiction but who have been transferred to a Queensland prison under the Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act 1982. It is therefore proposed to move an additional amendment to section 193A—'Deciding particular applications where a victim's body or remains have not been located'—as inserted by clause 4 of the bill. The amendment will ensure that a prisoner who is serving a term of imprisonment for a corresponding homicide offence from another state or territory who has been transferred to a Queensland prison under the Prisoners (Interstate Transfer) Act 1982 will be captured by the no-body no-parole framework in the bill. These amendments are consistent with the core objective of the bill, which is to actively encourage the cooperation of all those prisoners who have been convicted of a homicide offence to assist in finding and recovering the remains of a victim.

This legislation represents significant reform in this area. I have to say that the amendment which has been proposed by both sides is a first for this nation, because in relation to a no-body no-parole framework no other jurisdiction actually extends it to the offence we have identified today, which is accessory after the fact to manslaughter. It is an important amendment and I am proud that we are leading the way. This bill provides a comprehensive framework to effectively address the ongoing, unspeakable pain that families can face for decades. This legislation is far reaching and delivers the most effective pathway to allow the families and friends of victims to finally find some closure. The legislation is deliberately targeted to the nexus between the granting of parole and genuine cooperation in finding a body. It covers appropriate offences, and it specifically includes the discovery of parts of a body, because in circumstances that are all too cruel there are cases where that is a very important element.

There have been many who have contributed to get to where we are today. I want to thank the advocates who have had to deal with the extra burden of working so hard for change on top of their personal grief and loss. I would like to mention those in the gallery today: Fiona Splitt, her daughter Lisa and sister-in-law Tania, and Leanne and Gary Pullen. Thank you on behalf of the parliament and the people of Queensland. I thank Justice Sofronoff for his insight and extensive research in delivering his report into the parole system including, of course, the recommendation for no-body no-parole reform. I thank the departmental officers who worked so hard to deliver this comprehensive package, ensuring that Queenslanders have the most robust system in the nation.

This policy area is not an easy one to discuss, as it necessarily deals with the worst cases in the system, often with the most gruesome details and always with the greatest emotional pain for families. I am proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government which is again delivering important legislative reforms for Queensland. I hope this is one of those reforms that is supported by all sides of parliament. This bill is consistent with this government's ongoing commitment to support the victims of crime and their families, and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (4.24 pm): This is an important day: we are finally here debating a very significant reform that provides the families of homicide victims in Queensland with the opportunity for some closure following significant personal tragedy with the sudden loss of a loved one. No-body no-parole reforms, as they have been dubbed, first started with legislation in the South Australian parliament in 2015. In Queensland, talk of reform started with a parliamentary e-petition that was led by Fiona Splitt of Cooktown. I also acknowledge, as did the Attorney-General, the Splitt and Pullen families who are in the gallery tonight.

Fiona lost her husband Bruce Schuler in July 2012 when he was murdered near Palmerville in Far North Queensland by a husband and wife who have since been convicted of that murder. Unfortunately for Fiona and her family, Bruce's body has never been recovered. We need these laws to be passed so there is an opportunity for those people to have some closure with regard to what happened to Bruce and the location of his final resting place. All they want is the opportunity for a final goodbye. Fiona's parliamentary petition was tabled on 16 February last year with the support of 6,259 petitioners. It called for an amendment to the Corrective Services Act 2006 to provide that an application for parole may not be processed where a prisoner has been sentenced for murder and no remains of the victim have been found. Under the rule, murderers who refuse to assist police with information regarding the remains of their victim will be denied parole. These are otherwise known as no-body no-parole laws.

Similarly, the parents and loved ones of Timothy Pullen want the same opportunity. In 2012 Timothy was brutally murdered in North Mackay and Timothy's parents Leanne and Gary Pullen and their family want the opportunity to find out what happened to Timothy and where he is buried. Surely we owe them that at the very least. All they want to do is say goodbye to their son and give him a proper burial. In Timothy's case, six people were convicted under the lesser charge of manslaughter or accessory after the fact. Those offenders have started to become eligible for parole and one offender was recently released. We understand that another two convicted offenders are set to be released, one in November this year and the other early next year. With this law in place there may be an opportunity for Leanne and Gary to say their final goodbyes to their son, Timothy. No parent deserves to have their child die before them. Many of us would appreciate—not just as community leaders but also as parents—that the absolute anguish these families have gone through would be unbearable to anyone and would have long-lasting effects not only on the people themselves, of course, but on relationships and all that comes from such tragedy.

This bill is fundamentally about rebalancing the scales of justice in favour of the families of victims of crime in Queensland. It is thanks to the likes of Fiona Splitt and Leanne and Gary Pullen that we are here today debating—and I hope passing—these important reforms after a long public campaign. It is well and truly time that we got on and passed these reforms into law. In late 2016 the LNP announced our policy to not only support but introduce no-body no-parole laws in Queensland following on from examples in other states and territories. Since that time Victoria has passed reforms and Western Australia have introduced theirs, and those are currently before the Western Australian upper house. In Queensland the Palaszczuk Labor government followed suit approximately three months later after the LNP's announcement in February this year and following the recommendations of the Sofronoff review into parole, which was commissioned after the horrific murder of Townsville grandmother Elizabeth Kippin. Following that public statement in February sadly there has been delay, including a voting down of a measure introduced by the LNP which would have seen these laws passed in May this year. Time means everything, particularly for this law and how it applies to cases like Bruce Schuler's and Timothy Pullen's.

In debating these reforms here today I specifically note recommendation 87 of the Sofronoff report, which states—

The Queensland Government should introduce legislation, similar to that in South Australia, which requires the Parole Board to consider the cooperation of an offender convicted of murder or manslaughter and not release the prisoner on parole unless the Board is satisfied that the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of the offence, including, when relevant, by assisting in locating the remains of the victim of the offence.

The Sofronoff report noted two different approaches to the no-body no-parole laws. These were each enacted in South Australia and the Northern Territory—different approaches to the same subject matter. As I mentioned earlier, since that time legislation has also passed in Victoria, and in Western Australia the Legislative Council is set to consider changes which would introduce a no-body no-parole regime in that state as well. It is important to note that, while the spirit of the laws is the same, they do differ slightly in how they are applied and legislated because of the varying criminal laws and definitions which are already in place in the relevant jurisdictions.

I do note the concerns raised by the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland in their submissions to the parliamentary committee which reviewed this bill. However, we believe that there is sufficient flexibility in the drafting of the provisions that allows the laws to be practically applied by the Parole Board, with sufficient regard for the differences in each case that may be caught under these laws.

We are, however, seeking to improve the operation of the bill by proposing amendments to increase the scope of its operation. We note that the government has done the same, and we will carefully consider the amendments the government has foreshadowed it will introduce. We trust that it will do the same with ours. The offences we want to add are unlawful striking causing death, interfering with a corpse and accessory after the fact to manslaughter. That is an offence we promised the Pullen family we would try to include. We hope that the government recognises the importance of all of these amendments and the impact they have on the families and loved ones of victims. We call on the government to support these amendments.

The amendments I will later seek to move expand the definition of a homicide offence in clause 4 of the bill. We think it is important that we capture all possible relevant offences where someone could be convicted of an offence in which someone was killed and no body has been retrieved. The whole purpose of debating and hopefully passing these laws today is to give the opportunity to the families of victims of such crimes to say goodbye to their loved ones and to give them a proper burial.

The three offences we are seeking to add are all relevant to these situations and include unlawful striking causing death—the offence we introduced in 2014 and which sits between murder and manslaughter in the hierarchy of offences. One might think unlawful striking causing death, or the ‘one punch can kill’ offence, is much more likely to happen in a crowded nightclub precinct and the lack of a body is not likely to be an issue. In fact, that is not the case. During the week I was speaking to a lawyer who is dealing with a case where an incident occurred within the privacy of a home and the charge proffered against the person is unlawful striking causing death. It is in some cases an easier offence for the prosecution to prove, because intent is not required to be proved, and therefore it may be used in circumstances other than those that were originally thought—nightclub precincts and so on. It is possible that a person charged with that offence could have also disposed of the body and therefore should be potentially subject to this regime.

We also want to apply the no-body no-parole laws to the offence of misconduct with regard to a corpse, or interfering with a corpse. The reason is that it is often a less substantial offence with which people are charged, but those people have been involved in the disposal of a body and we think they also should be caught by these provisions.

Thirdly, we wish to broaden the inclusion of accessory after the fact offences to all of those I have mentioned and also to the offence of manslaughter. That is particularly relevant in the case involving Timothy Pullen, as I explained. I am glad that we can put that provision forward in our amendments today in response to the submissions made by the Pullen family, so rightly I believe, to include that measure. We believe that all three offences to be added improve and obviously expand the definition, and we would encourage members to support the amendments I will move during consideration in detail of the bill.

As outlined in the explanatory notes to the bill, the no-body no-parole policy is predicated on the notion that, by making parole release for particular prisoners contingent on their satisfactorily cooperating in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim’s location, it will encourage and provide incentive for these prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of the victim. This will in turn, I hope, offer some comfort and certainty to the families of the victims.

The establishment of the no-body no-parole policy in Queensland was considered as part of the Queensland Parole System Review, which was undertaken by Mr Walter Sofronoff QC, as he then was. The Queensland Parole System Review report was delivered to the government on 1 December 2016 and made 91 recommendations for the complete reform of Queensland's parole system, including the introduction of no-body no-parole as recommendation 87. The review report especially acknowledged that, in the case of homicide offences, withholding the location of the victim's body or remains prolongs the suffering of the families, and all efforts should be made to attempt to minimise this sorrow. The review report states—

... a punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

I think that is very poignantly put, when we are considering this matter.

The Northern Territory, South Australia and Victoria have commenced legislation in this regard. As I said before, it was on 17 May this year that Western Australia introduced legislation to implement a policy. The bill provides that the Parole Board must refuse an application for parole for a prisoner serving a period of imprisonment for a homicide offence—that is the Criminal Code offence of murder, manslaughter, accessory after the fact to murder or conspiring to murder; or who has counselled or procured the commission of, or conspired to commit, any of these offences—and the body or remains of the victim have not been located or because of an act or omission of the prisoner or another person part of the body or remains of the victim have not been located, unless the board is satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location.

The cooperation of the prisoner may have happened before or after the prisoner was sentenced for the homicide offence. The bill provides that, when assessing whether the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily, the Parole Board must take into account: firstly, a report provided by the Commissioner of Police about whether the prisoner has cooperated and, if so, an evaluation of the prisoner's cooperation; secondly, any information the board has about the capacity of the prisoner to give the cooperation; thirdly, the transcript of any proceeding against the prisoner for the offence, including any relevant remarks made by the sentencing court; and, finally, any other information the board considers relevant.

The bill provides that the no-body no-parole policy will apply to the following parole applications: first, where the prisoner is convicted and sentenced for the homicide offence after commencement of the bill; secondly, where the prisoner was convicted of the homicide offence before commencement but sentenced for the offence after commencement of the bill; thirdly, where the prisoner was convicted and sentenced for the homicide offence before commencement of the bill and the application for parole is made after the commencement of the bill or was made before the commencement but is not yet determined at the time of commencement of the bill; and, finally, where the prisoner was convicted, sentenced and released to parole but returned to prison, whether before or after the commencement of the bill, and that parole order is cancelled.

In practice, the only prisoners who fall within the target cohort to which the amendments will not apply are those who are already on parole in the community at the time of commencement of the bill, noting that the no-body no-parole policy will apply to them if they are returned to prison and their parole order is subsequently cancelled, or those whose parole order is suspended, as distinct from cancelled. That is, I think, the widest appropriate ambit for the bill.

I urge all members of the parliament to not only support these reforms but also support the amendments to be introduced by the LNP. This is not about a political tit-for-tat argument or claiming who got here first. It is about the process for enacting important reforms that families around Queensland are waiting for. I want to thank and pay tribute to the advocacy, tenacity and strength of Fiona Splitt and Leanne and Gary Pullen. On behalf of the LNP team, I hope that these new laws can help you and your families find closure following the tragedies you have had to endure.

I also take this opportunity to acknowledge the support provided to families of homicide victims in Queensland by organisations such as the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group. I commend the bill and the foreshadowed amendments to the House.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (4.38 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill. I want to firstly thank the Attorney-General for introducing the bill to this parliament and the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee for its consideration of the bill. I also want to thank those who made submissions, particularly Fiona Splitt, whose husband disappeared in 2012. I want to acknowledge Fiona for her advocacy in relation to this very important issue. I understand that Fiona is in the gallery along with other families who have had to endure the

unknown and not be able to say goodbye to their loved ones which adds extra pain and suffering to the grief already experienced by the families of victims. This bill is important to give families much needed closure in these times of suffering.

This issue hit home for me particularly last week at the launch of Missing Persons Week for 2017. I was privileged to represent the Premier and the Minister for Police at the event and to speak to police and family members who have endured the pain and uncertainty of having a loved one who is missing. Missing Persons Week ran from 30 July to 5 August and this year the focus was on 13- to 17-year-olds—the age which accounts for more than half of all missing persons. The reason the event was held at the Gabba was because the capacity of the Gabba at approximately 38,000 represents the number of people reported missing each year in Australia. It is particularly important to note that 25,000 of those people are young people in the age group I just mentioned. The important message of National Missing Persons Week is to support the families who are left behind following the disappearance of a loved one. These families are often left behind not knowing what has happened to someone they care deeply about. This bill will help support these families by giving closure where a body may be missing.

The bill is being implemented as part of the government's commitment to victims of crime. This bill is aimed at reducing the suffering of families and giving closure in the case of homicide offences where the location of a victim's body is withheld. The no-body no-parole policy makes parole release for particular prisoners contingent on their cooperation with police in locating the victim. It will deny the prisoner parole release until such time as the Parole Board is satisfied the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in locating the body or remains or the last known location of the body or remains of the victim. This will encourage and provide an incentive for these prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of the victim.

Apart from reducing the suffering of families, this bill will also ensure that prisoners are not wasting police resources with false or misleading information when it comes to no-body no-parole. This bill captures prisoners convicted of the Criminal Code offences of murder, manslaughter, accessory after the fact to murder, conspiring to murder or those who counselled, procured or conspired to commit these offences. I also commend the Attorney-General for her amendments to extend these provisions even further to capture a broader range of offences. A prisoner who commits these offences will not be granted parole unless the Parole Board is satisfied they have satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of the offence to identify the location of every part of the body or remains of the victim. This is designed to address those cases where some remains have been found but some parts of the body continue to be hidden or missing. When assessing whether a prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily, the Parole Board will take into account a report provided by the Commissioner of Police about whether the prisoner has cooperated, any information the board has about the capacity of the prisoner to give the cooperation, the transcript of any proceeding against the prisoner for the offence, including any relevant remarks made by the sentencing court, and any other relevant information it considers appropriate.

The member for Mansfield said that on this particular issue it is not about who gets in first or about scoring political points, and I agree with him on that and it is great to see that it appears that the opposition supports the substance of the bill. However, before he made those remarks the member for Mansfield spoke about the amendments that the opposition tried to make to the parole board bill in an attempt to introduce no-body no-parole in Queensland. It should not go unremarked that those amendments were in fact ineffective. They forgot to include the specific offence of murder in the definition and the government has ensured that the relevant homicide offences in this bill are clearly articulated and remove ambiguity. Furthermore, the member for Everton and the LNP failed to have any transitional provisions. Their proposal would not apply to any prisoners currently serving time. Under the government's bill, transitional arrangements will be provided and the prisoner will not be granted parole unless the Parole Board is satisfied they have satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation. The lesson is that on important issues such as this these things have to be done properly and with due consideration.

This bill makes necessary changes to give families much needed closure in these times of suffering. It gives prisoners an incentive to cooperate with police in locating the body when the location of a victim's body is withheld. This bill is the result of investigation into similar legislation across Australia and consultation with key stakeholders. It is an important initiative that delivers on the government's commitment to deliver a comprehensive and effective regime for victims of crime and their families. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (4.44 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill and the amendments to be moved by both the government and opposition. This is a policy that we have championed for some time. This is a policy that the LNP has led the way on. In November 2016 the LNP released a policy dealing with what has now been dubbed no-body no-parole following similar moves interstate. As has already been stated by previous speakers, these changes were instigated by a parliamentary petition established by Fiona Splitt of Cooktown—and I acknowledge her presence tonight with her family—whose husband Bruce Schuler was murdered in 2012 and, despite the successful conviction of the two suspects, his body has never been recovered. I, along with everybody on this side of the House, acknowledge Fiona's presence and commend her on her determination to see justice done in this area.

Like Fiona and the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group, we believe that more needed to be done to rebalance the scales of justice in favour of the victims and their families. This was subsequently also recommended by Walter Sofronoff in his review of the parole system. Whilst we will be supporting this bill, we lament the fact that these laws were not passed in parliament over two months ago when the government brought its first tranche of reforms to the parole system. We simply could not understand why this reform was not a priority. We also believed that there was an oversight in that bill—one that needs to be rectified—and I am happy to see that both the minister and the shadow minister have put forward amendments to address that oversight.

I want to speak a little bit about that particular amendment and the reason for it. As has already been mentioned tonight, Gary and Leanne Pullen are in the gallery and I acknowledge them. I acknowledge the pain that they have gone through with the loss of their son. My wife and I were very fortunate to share a table with the Pullens at a victims of homicide support group night not that long ago and what struck my wife and I is that this was a family who was an everyday Queensland family who had been rocked by an incredible tragedy in their lives. There was a lot in common between the two families in that the Pullens had four children—they have three girls and a boy—like our family.

Their son's name was Tim and they lost him in a criminal act some five years ago. To further the pain and horror of losing a son and brother in such terrible circumstances, this family has not been able to close the final chapter in this ordeal by putting their son to final rest as his remains have never been located. That is because the perpetrators never divulged what they did with Tim's body. There was a glimmer of hope when they agreed to a plea bargain. The family agreed to a downgrading of the charge—a gut-wrenching decision for the family—on the proviso that the culprits would reveal where Tim's remains were. After speaking to the Pullen family, they described that process as a charade. The two men who were eventually convicted of accessory after the fact took police out to some remote locality and stated, 'We disposed of Tim's body out here somewhere.'

What sort of comfort does that give the family, a family that felt incredibly let down because they agreed to a plea bargain thinking that they would find the remains of their son? Two of those perpetrators, as I mentioned, were charged with accessory after the fact of manslaughter. These two men were directly responsible for the dumping of Tim's body somewhere. These men should not be rewarded with early release when they have not fully and properly cooperated with the police and the family to advise them of where the remains of their son now lay.

Leanne and Gary have been relentless in this fight not just for no-body no-parole but to ensure that the definition was widened to make sure that their son's killers and those associated with that crime would be covered by this legislation. They have travelled down from Mackay to be in the public gallery tonight. I want to read an excerpt from a letter that Leanne has written to give us a bit of an insight into what these people have been through—

For our family to respectfully be able to say our goodbyes to Tim we need to be able to locate his remains so that we can hold a funeral. We truly don't believe that we have really started the grieving process—

this is five years after he was killed—

as we are living in such surreal circumstances. Burying a child has to be any parents worst nightmare but can you imagine if we were to go to our grave without having said our goodbyes to Tim—that is just inconceivable.

Further Leanne says—

We plea with you that you have this legislation passed now with an amendment to cover accessory after the fact to manslaughter to hopefully put a stop to other families having to suffer the anguish and torment that our family is faced with each and every day.

I am very, very pleased to be part of a parliament that looks like it will not only support the no-body no-parole legislation but also bring in the amendments that will help justice be delivered for the Pullen family.

When you talk to Homicide Victims' Support Group members, a group that of course nobody wants to be a member of, you hear about the pain that is associated with the tragic loss of their loved one through an horrific crime, but that is exacerbated a hundredfold when they do not know where the remains of their loved ones lay at the moment. This legislation will provide offenders with an opportunity to show their remorse for their crime by rebalancing the scales of justice in favour of victims trying to find closure in the tragic circumstances of losing a loved one. How can an offender possibly say that they have been rehabilitated if they have not been open and declared to the loved one's family where the remains of the person that they killed unlawfully are?

This is a tribute to those families that have fought hard and long for this legislation. I pay tribute to the families that are associated with the Homicide Victims' Support Group who come together to find some comfort for themselves but, as importantly, to provide comfort to others who have been the innocent victims of horrific crimes. Nothing will bring back those victims of violent crime, but maybe just a little bit of comfort will be provided when they know that the people who have been responsible for the unlawful killing of their relative will not be rewarded with early release if they have not cooperated with the police with regard to the revelation and the discovery of where their loved one's remains are. We support the bill enthusiastically and we look forward to bipartisan support.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (4.54 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise to speak in the debate on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017, being the deputy chair of the committee. Report No. 58 of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has been tabled. I note in my opening remarks that there are several amendments being moved by both the Attorney-General and the shadow Attorney-General, the member for Mansfield. It would seem that we are all on the one page in that regard. That is very encouraging in relation to the second part of the process that we will be going through this evening.

I thank the Attorney-General for her work on this and I thank the shadow Attorney-General, the member for Mansfield. I thank the shadow police and corrective services minister also for his work in this regard and his heartfelt contribution here this evening. I also, of course, thank Fiona Split and all others who worked with the committee in considering this bill. It was a difficult process for them. It should be acknowledged that they have changed the way the people of Queensland will look at this type of crime going forward. My committee colleagues and the secretariat all worked tirelessly in relation to this bill.

The objective of the bill is to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 to introduce the policy that is colloquially referred to as no-body no-parole in Queensland. The policy is predicated on the notion that by making parole release for particular prisoners contingent on them satisfactorily cooperating in the investigation of an offence to identify a victim's location it will encourage and provide incentive for those prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the remains of a victim.

It is a fact that in November 2016 the LNP released a policy supporting the no-body no-parole laws in Queensland and, following recommendations from the Sofronoff review into parole, the Palaszczuk Labor government announced its support for the no-body no-parole laws in Queensland in February 2017. Once again we are on the same page moving forward. Here we are today on the verge of passing this very important legislation. These are important reforms that will strengthen parole and support the families of victims. All they want is a chance to find out where their family members spent their final moments and to say one final goodbye. It should be noted that these changes were instigated through a parliamentary e-petition from Fiona Split having lost her husband Bruce Schuler in 2012. Bruce's body, as has already been alluded to several times, has sadly never been recovered.

I share Fiona's pain. My family shares her pain, the pain of all of those people who lose a loved one in such a terrible way—to be murdered. I cannot imagine the pain they are going through in relation to the fact that they do not know where their loved one has been laid to rest, if that is the correct term to be used. I cannot imagine the pain for those whose loved one's remains were found but the perpetrator of their murder has not been found. They are compounding effects on something that my family and I have experienced. We knew who the perpetrator was. That perpetrator is in prison. We were able to properly put to rest that family member. That pain is so, so deep and I cannot imagine how much deeper it is for these people.

These are common-sense reforms. I will leave it at that. I know many others want to speak to this bill tonight. I will finish by simply saying that I commend this very important bill to the House.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (4.59 pm): This evening I rise to make a very short contribution to the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. As other members have said in the chamber this evening, the bill will amend the Corrective Services Act to incorporate the no-body no-parole policy to enable access for parole release for particular prisoners who cooperate with an

investigation, including giving details of a victim's location. This change is viewed as an incentive for those prisoners to assist in recovering the remains of the deceased, providing families with an opportunity to grieve and properly farewell their loved ones.

Tonight the Attorney-General will move amendments to the bill and, from the contributions we have heard so far from those opposite, it seems that the amendments are largely supported. The amendments will widen the categories for eligibility to incorporate the definition of homicide offence to include becoming an accessory after the fact to manslaughter. The homicide offence will also be amended to include offences from other Australian jurisdictions that substantially correspond to a prescribed Queensland offence. Finally, there is a provision to expand the definition to apply to prisoners in Queensland who are convicted and sentenced for an offence in another jurisdiction and transferred to Queensland.

In its consideration of this bill, the committee undertook significant research to understand the policy and, in particular, how it has been enacted, in a lot of instances in the very recent past, in different jurisdictions. I thank my fellow committee members: the chair, the member for Stretton; the deputy chair, the member for Coomera, who just made a wonderful contribution to the House; the member for Capalaba; the member for Beaudesert; and the member for Currumbin. It is really lovely to have a bill before the House that does not contain a statement of reservation. As a committee, we have an awful lot of work ahead of us and behind us, as well. It is very nice to be able to stand here this evening and talk about something that has the support of both sides of the House.

I thank the committee staff who work so tirelessly on our committee business. I thank the departmental staff from both the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and Queensland Corrective Services. I thank the submitters to the process: the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties, the Bar Association of Queensland and, of course, Ms Fiona Splitt, about whom we have heard so much this evening. I acknowledge her and her family in the chamber. I thank her for the significant contribution that she has made in this space to bring the legislation to this point. I thank all the witnesses who attended hearings, made contributions and have worked passionately in this space for some time. I commend them for all of their efforts in doing so.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (5.03 pm): The Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 was introduced into the Queensland parliament by the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee on 23 May 2017. A reporting date of 24 July was set. The inquiry process included seeking advice from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General and inviting selected stakeholders and subscribers to lodge written submissions. As a result, four submissions were lodged, a public briefing from the department and Corrective Services was received and a public hearing was held in Brisbane. I wish to place on the record my thanks to the committee members, the secretariat, the department and other agencies, submitters and witnesses. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee has often been acknowledged for carrying a heavy workload due to the number of pieces of legislation that come before it. Despite parliament not sitting for two months, our committee has been very busy.

With regard to the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill, the committee determined that the bill should be passed. In saying so, it is important to note that the LNP first announced support for this legislation in 2016, which would have been implemented by now if the process had not been blocked. As honourable members have heard, the no-body no-parole policy is predicated on the notion that making parole release for particular prisoners dependent upon them cooperating in a satisfactory manner in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location will encourage and provide incentive for those prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of the victim. It is hoped that this will, in turn, offer some comfort and certainty to the families of the victims.

Under the existing parole framework for the offences of murder and manslaughter, the offence of murder carries a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment or the imposition of an indefinite sentence and sets mandatory minimum non-parole periods for the offence of murder. A prisoner serving life imprisonment for an offence of murder committed after 29 August 2012 is subject to a mandatory minimum non-parole period of 20 years imprisonment. Where the offence was committed prior to 29 August 2012, the previous non-parole period of 15 years imprisonment applies. Multiple murder convictions or the murder of a police officer attract higher non-parole periods. A parole eligibility date does not mean the offender is automatically released to parole on that date.

As we have heard, in 2015 an e-petition sponsored by Fiona Splitt attracted 6,259 petitioners who sought amendments to the Corrective Services Act to provide that an application for parole not be processed where a prisoner has been sentenced for the murder and the remains of the victim have not

been found. Fiona has been a tireless advocate for this legislation. I join other honourable members in our wishes for her and other affected families to find some small comfort in the changes to the Queensland legislation now before us.

In addition, a lengthy report by then QC Mr Walter Sofronoff, which came about through a review of the Queensland parole system, made 91 recommendations for a complete reform of Queensland's system. The Parole System Review report, as it is known, was given to the government on 1 December 2016 and later tabled in the parliament on 16 February 2017. As I said when addressing the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the government's response to the report supported in principle 89 of the 91 recommendations. However, only recommendations Nos 35 to 61 were contained in that legislation. Recommendation No. 87, which was not included in the earlier legislation, reads as follows—

The Queensland Government should introduce legislation, similar to that in South Australia, which requires the Parole Board to consider the cooperation of a prisoner convicted of murder or manslaughter and not release the prisoner on parole unless the Board is satisfied that the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of the offence, including, when relevant, by assisting in locating the remains of the victim of the offence.

The Queensland Attorney-General stated that she was looking at the recommendation and will consider the best model. As I have said, it is a pity that these amendments were not introduced when the opportunity presented itself in May.

There are similar models in other Australian states and territories. Northern Territory legislation came first and commenced in August 2016. Victoria started in December 2016, South Australia followed in February 2017 and Western Australia introduced legislation along these lines in May of this year. Whilst each model varies in its language and detail, the underlying policy is clearly that no-body no-parole applies when prisoners have not cooperated in the identification of the location or last known location of the deceased victim. In making the recommendation, the Parole System Review report considered the South Australian legislation and the Northern Territory legislation and concluded—

The 'no body, no parole' legislation is designed to help victims' families and to provide a strong incentive for offenders to cooperate with authorities. A system similar to South Australia's, which focuses more broadly on cooperation with the investigation, has the potential to provide more benefit to the community in incentivising cooperation of all kinds, including the location of the body.

The report continued—

Withholding the location of a body extends the suffering of victim's families and all efforts should be made to attempt to minimise this sorrow.

Of the four submissions that we received, three were opposed to this legislation. They were from the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Council of Civil Liberties and the Bar Association of Queensland. They do recognise the prolonged suffering experienced by grieving families caused by the withholding of information, but nevertheless opposed the provisions within the bill. They had concerns with a number of aspects, including: circumstances where compliance is not possible; the issue of cooperation and its extension into other forms of cooperation which could contradict fundamental legislative principles; failure to protect from self-incrimination; imposition of obligations retrospectively; and wrongful convictions.

The supporting submission was from Fiona Splitt from Cooktown. Fiona's husband, Bruce Schuler, disappeared on 9 July 2012 while prospecting near Palmerville Station north-west of Cairns. Stephen Struber and Dianne Wilson-Struber were convicted of his murder on 24 July. Still to this day they have never cooperated with the police or any other authority to reveal where Bruce is. Fiona stated—

The not knowing where Bruce is, has been a nightmare to me as I'm always expecting him to come home. Although my head tells me that this is not going to happen. My heart (still after five years) will not let go of this, until I can bring him home and bury him with dignity.

No-one should ever have to experience this.

I am sure Fiona's words are echoed by others who have experienced this heart-wrenching uncertainty and grief. May I convey my sincere sympathy to the families in the gallery and throughout Queensland who have had to endure the torment of not knowing where a loved one lies.

I listened to the honourable member for Everton's speech with tears in my eyes as he expressed the deep sense of loss and longing felt by the Pullen family. That is why the intent of this bill is embraced widely in this place and objections have not been supported. I urge honourable members to support the LNP's amendments, as foreshadowed by the honourable member for Mansfield. These are: unlawful striking causing death, or one punch can kill; an offence of misconduct with regard to interfering with a corpse; and accessory after the fact. Let us hope that we can live in a Queensland where there are far fewer murders and less wrongdoing to each other.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (5.12 pm): I will make a short contribution to the debate on this bill. Much of what has been said so far I concur with. I want to turn directly to the submission from Ms Fiona Splitt in support of the bill. The member for Currumbin has just outlined much of her submission in support of the bill. The element that I think Ms Splitt is seeking to have incorporated into the parole system as best as possible is the intangible measure of closure for people who are victims of crime or people who have family members who are victims of crime and lack the ability to bring their loved ones home, bury them and say a proper goodbye.

I have never been through such an experience and I hope that I never have to. I regret that so many people in our society go through that experience. I am glad that this bill has the support of both sides of this House and will pass tonight. I urge members to support the amendments that will be moved to the bill.

There were some reservations expressed by the Law Society, the Council for Civil Liberties and the Bar Association. In particular, I want to address one of them—that is, the concerns raised about wrongful convictions. This is where a person is wrongfully convicted of a crime involving a homicide or an unlawful killing and therefore is not able to cooperate with parole authorities in relation to the location of the victim.

In the public hearing it was stated by, I think, Mr Potts, the former president of the Queensland Law Society, that the failure rate for wrongful convictions in our justice system is approximately three per cent. The risk of a wrongful conviction in all of the circumstances is around three per cent. That is a very low risk. That deals with convictions of all types. The number dealing with unlawful killings would be very small indeed. It was conceded it was a very low risk of there being an inability to cooperate on the part of a wrongfully convicted killer. At the baseline level the numbers are very low. It was identified as a risk, but on the whole the benefit in having this provision put in to give closure to families of victims was well received. That is why the provision is being supported.

This came about through a petition process in 2015 and then a review of the parole system that was undertaken by Mr Sofronoff QC, as he then was, last year. I am proud that my party, the LNP, has been leading the way on this.

The member for Pine Rivers made some comments that it is lovely to have a report that does not have a statement of reservation contained in it. All I can say to that comment is that although we did not make a statement of reservation it does not mean that we do not have reservations about the members opposite. If the government continued to bring more initiatives into this House that are actually LNP policy we would have fewer reports that have statements of reservation.

It is a pleasure to be able to support this bill and bring that element of completion to the justice system. It is a shame, as the member for Currumbin said previously, that the provisions were not enacted back in May when the amendments were introduced by the member for Everton. We could have dealt with this at that time. I am not aware whether there has been any practical impact in the parole system as a result of those amendments not passing at that time, but it is great to be able to support the bill. Hopefully, the amendments proposed by the member for Mansfield will be passed this evening.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (5.16 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. I would like to acknowledge the Splitt family in the gallery tonight. My contribution this evening will be me reading a letter that the Pullen family gave me this afternoon. My contribution will be their words. The letter reads—

Have you ever been faced with that question where the answer eludes you? We are sure that you have and it has driven you to distraction. That is what the victims of homicide where their loved ones' remains have never been located are faced with every day—a life sentence of broken hearts and wondering, always wondering! To truly understand you need to have travelled a similar journey, a senseless journey that is sadly travelled too often.

Our 'elusive question without an answer' began in April 2012 when our beloved son, brother and Uncle Tim was murdered. Tim was maimed or killed, bundled into a car, stored somewhere, possibly a cold room at a night club for the day before overnight being bundled back in to the same car and driven hundreds of kilometres to be discarded like a lump of rubbish in a paddock—such despicable acts of inhumanity.

Six people have so far been sentenced in relation to Tim's murder. Three of these perpetrators are already out of prison, one of them as recently as last week and another eligible for parole in November.

For our family to respectfully be able to say our goodbyes to Tim we need to be able to locate his remains so that we can hold a funeral. We truly don't believe that we have really started the grieving process as we are living in such surreal circumstances. Burying a child has to be any parents worst nightmare but can you imagine if we were to go to our grave without having said our goodbyes to Tim—that is just inconceivable. To be able to start moving forward with life our family needs this 'elusive question' to be answered.

We believe the only hope we have of ever finding Tim's remains is to have the No Body No Parole Legislation passed retrospectively and it needs to encompass any perpetrators who have been involved in a homicide whether the charges be murder, manslaughter or accessory after the fact to either murder or manslaughter. For some reason the charges of murder or accessory after the fact to murder are being downgraded to manslaughter or accessory after the fact to manslaughter more often, especially in regional areas. In cases such as ours where there are multiple perpetrators it is usually the ones charged with accessory after the fact who actually know exactly where the remains are.

We plea with you that you have this legislation passed now with an amendment to cover accessory after the fact to manslaughter to hopefully put a stop to other families having to suffer the anguish and torment that our family is faced with each and every day. We realise that this Legislation isn't necessarily going to make all perpetrators disclose what they have done with bodies but surely the thought of no parole has to be a huge incentive to divulge where the remains are located.

Regards,

Gary and Leanne Pullen and Family on behalf of Tim

On behalf of the Pullen family, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (5.21 pm): Can I acknowledge that contribution read into *Hansard* on behalf of the Pullen family. I think it reflects a sentiment of a lot of members, if not all members, in this chamber this evening. I often say to constituents in the electorate of Glass House when they ask me why is it so adversarial in the chamber that they would be surprised at the level of bipartisan support there is for the vast majority of legislation. It is certainly pleasing to be here tonight knowing that there is bipartisan support for this bill.

The Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 looks to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 to introduce the policy that is colloquially referred to as no-body no-parole here in the state of Queensland. The policy is predicated on the notion that by making parole release for particular prisoners contingent on them satisfactorily cooperating in the investigation of an offence to identify a victim's location it will encourage and provide incentive for those prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of a victim.

I do speak of the bipartisan support because in November last year the LNP released our policy supporting no-body no-parole laws in Queensland. It had been our desire to see these laws come into effect back in May—a little sooner than today—by moving some amendments that were voted down unfortunately. Following recommendations from the Sofronoff review into parole, the government have announced their support for these laws. Therefore, we are here this evening debating and hopefully passing them.

I want to make a short contribution that reflects on what others have already said and what was picked up in the review. The review report expressly acknowledged in the case of homicide offences that withholding the location of a victim's body or remains prolongs the suffering of the families and that all efforts should be made to attempt to minimise this sorrow. The review report states on page 235—

A punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

I want to reflect on one family who I know have experienced that grief and have experienced it for a considerable period of time while they searched for their son's body. Taryn, my wife, and I and our then two kids moved to the community of Palmwoods in March 2003. It was only later in that year that Daniel Morcombe, a fellow Palmwoods resident, was tragically taken from a bus stop not far from our family home. I want to commend Bruce and Denise Morcombe for their tireless efforts to get a level of closure first by finding Daniel, by seeing justice in seeing the conviction of his killer but then in taking his story and turning it into a positive—turning it into a positive message for all children and for all families through their child safety work.

I want to quote from a couple of *Sunshine Coast Daily* articles. The Morcombes joined with the LNP when we made our announcement in November 2016 in support of the proposed changes. They said that they had met families who have not had the opportunity to say farewell to a murdered loved one. Mr Morcombe had told ABC Radio on the Monday preceding this that their family put finding Daniel as their highest priority. It was then followed by finding justice for his killer. For them it was paramount that they found Daniel's body, even more so than they found out who it was who killed him. They are quoted in a subsequent article from earlier this year saying—

"Our extensive travels around Queensland supporting the aims of the Daniel Morcombe Foundation have allowed us to engage with family members who have not had the opportunity to say farewell to a murdered loved one.

"This policy will assist them greatly by providing some comfort with a place to reflect."

With those words, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (5.26 pm): I rise to address the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. By way of background, I should provide some context as to how we have come to be here today debating this legislation. At the outset I certainly want to acknowledge many families who have championed this legislation on behalf of their loved ones and the many people who have signed petitions and written letters to many MPs in this House. I would also like to acknowledge those who are in the public gallery here this evening.

On 28 November last year the Liberal National Party leader, the Hon. Tim Nicholls MP, announced that a future LNP government would deny parole to convicted killers if they refused to assist in revealing the location of their victims. The LNP's no-body no-parole policy announcement at that time was welcomed by friends and families of such victims. In making that announcement, the Liberal National Party gave a commitment to the people of Queensland that they would do so in consultation with families, victim groups, the Parole Board and key organisations involved in the Queensland justice system.

At that time under the LNP's proposed commitment, such laws would apply to offenders serving a prison sentence for murder or conspiracy to commit murder where the murder has been committed. In order to grant parole, the Parole Board would be required to be satisfied that the offender has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the location, or last known location, of the remains of a victim.

The LNP was also keen to make it clear that this was not a retrospective measure—clearly articulating at the time that the policy would apply to criminals who have not yet been released from jail on parole and therefore not apply to those already on parole or out of jail. I would like to acknowledge that the Palaszczuk Labor government indicated their intention to act. I certainly acknowledge the Labor government for the work they have done in this area.

I note that in the Sofronoff *Queensland Parole System Review Final Report*, which was released in November 2016, some time was spent comparing the application of such laws both in the South Australian context and in the Northern Territory. I ask the House to consider the following observations made in the report. In relation to the Northern Territory model it observed—

- 1198. The 'no body, no parole' legislation is designed to help victims' families and to provide a strong incentive for offenders to cooperate with authorities. A system similar to South Australia's, which focuses more broadly on cooperation with the investigation, has the potential to provide more benefit to the community in incentivising cooperation of all kinds, including the location of the body.
- 1199. Withholding the location of a body extends the suffering of victim's families and all efforts should be made to attempt to minimise this sorrow.
- 1200. As a matter of theory, such a measure is consistent with the retributive element of punishment. A punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

Furthermore, I specifically note and bring to the House's attention recommendation No. 87 of the report which recommended—

The Queensland Government should introduce legislation, similar to that in South Australia, which requires the Parole Board to consider the cooperation of a prisoner convicted of murder or manslaughter and not release the prisoner on parole unless the Board is satisfied that the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in the investigation of the offence, including, when relevant, by assisting in locating the remains of the victim of the offence.

I have no doubt that the proposed legislation will provide an incentive for prisoners to assist authorities in finding and recovering the body or remains of victims and deliver on some of the aforementioned intent. There is no doubt that providing some comfort, certainty and closure to the families of such victims is important, and I believe such measures are needed from both a public policy and legislative perspective.

The Queensland parliament would not be debating this legislation today without the leadership provided by the Liberal National Party as well as the leadership of the Labor government, and I acknowledge the Attorney-General on this issue. I would encourage the government to adopt the amendments which the LNP shadow minister, Ian Walker MP, will move as part of this debate. I acknowledge that the Attorney-General has foreshadowed she will be adopting some of the LNP's amendments. However, there are additional amendments which should be given due consideration and I would encourage the government to do that as part of the debate here this evening.

Grief and loss are very powerful human emotions. I remember during my medical training a supervising psychiatrist at the Prince Charles Hospital emphasising to me that significant suffering which occurs amongst those who do not have the option of grieving and then realising adequate closure can lead to further additional long-term psychological harm and other issues that can be with people for many years as far as additional harm to their physical and psychological wellbeing. This legislation is vitally important. I offer my support for it and I acknowledge the bipartisan outcome which will be achieved with this legislation this evening.

 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (5.32 pm): I have no doubt that anyone living in Townsville will never forget the fateful day of Wednesday, 27 June last year when Townsville police discovered the tragedy that was the murder of beloved grandmother, mother and aunty Beth Kippin. Beth was murdered by a man who had been released from Stuart prison that same day.

From that tragedy has come changes to the parole system that we have with us today and that we are debating this evening. While it will never console the Kippin family for the loss of their matriarch, it has, however, changed the parole system in Queensland—and I acknowledge Fiona Splitt for her petition and her continuous work in Queensland—through a review process implemented by the Palaszczuk government which has now contributed to the no-body no-parole bill that we have before us today.

This legislation will help families right across Queensland with their grieving process when a loved one is killed—families like Julie Hutchinson's from Townsville. They said following the trial and subsequent conviction of Julie's husband, Michael Geoffrey Hutchinson, of her manslaughter earlier this year—and this comes from the *Townsville Bulletin*—that they will never forgive nor will they ever forget. More importantly, for Julie Hutchinson's family, finding the body will bring some form of closure. Until that happens, as Julie's sister Christine Teitzel said, the family just want to find her so they could get some respect for her. Christine said, 'She's out there. He's treated her like a dead animal on the road—no respect, no remorse, nothing.'

This legislation will enable those convicted of killing someone and hiding them so that their body cannot be found an opportunity to cooperate with police to recover the body as an incentive for parole. Unless there is change we will continue to have people like Michael Geoffrey Hutchinson who show no compassion for the family or remorse for what they have done. As Justice David North said in his concluding remarks on Michael Hutchinson—

Your lies and your continued lie in not revealing where your late wife's body could be found has deprived your children, Julie's family, your friends, members of your family, of knowing how she died. You deprived all of those persons of a chance to say farewell at a funeral.

You thus reveal yourself as a deceitful man, a selfish man, preferring your own smug silence to the sorrow and uncertainty caused by your silence.

While I, like Julie Hutchinson's family, fully support this bill, an aspect of this work is the retrospectivity of the legislation. According to the bill before us today, it is proposed that the new policy apply to all parole applications regardless of when the prisoner was convicted or sentenced for the homicide offence including where the prisoner—and I will touch on only two of them—is convicted and sentenced for the homicide offence before commencement of the bill and was convicted of the homicide offence before commencement but sentenced for the offence after commencement of the bill. The others have been addressed as well.

While I and perhaps every other person in this chamber today never fully understands the pain and suffering that families go through when a loved one like Julie Hutchinson—and I also acknowledge Fiona Splitt and her family and Leanne and Gary Pullen and their family—has their life robbed from them and their body never found, this legislation takes steps in a positive direction to help give families the opportunity to recover the body and pay their last respects. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Miss BARTON** (Broadwater—LNP) (5.36 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the bill before the House today. At the outset let me say that I am proud to join with both sides of the House in supporting what is very significant reform being passed through the House today. I would also like to pay my respects and tributes to the many tireless and fearless campaigners for this reform. In the face of what is no doubt insurmountable grief and tragedy, they have maintained great dignity and composure to be able to lobby both sides of politics for what is very significant reform and change.

Those who have passed deserve to be treated in death with the same dignity and respect that they deserved to be treated with in life. Unfortunately, not everyone is treated with that respect and their families certainly are not. Murder is one of the most heinous crimes in our courts, and our judiciary treat those who have been convicted of such crimes and who have been involved with homicides with the

contempt that they deserve. The reforms that we will see pass through the House tonight ensure that, after they have been convicted of homicide associated crimes where they do not provide families with the closure that they so deserve, we will continue to treat them with the contempt that they deserve.

For those of us who have lost loved ones, one of the things that is important to each and every one of us is the ability to pay tribute to their life, to celebrate their life and to give them a final resting place with dignity and respect, and for us as loved ones to be able to visit that place and continue to remember them and celebrate their lives and the effect they had on our lives. Unfortunately, the many families of homicide victims whose loved ones have not been found do not have the opportunity to go and place flowers at their grave. They do not have the opportunity on an anniversary to come together at a grave and pay tribute to their loved ones. It is a tragedy that people associated with these heinous crimes are able to apply for parole and live their lives when there are so many who are struggling day in, day out to continue with their lives. I do not know how those families can carry on. I do not know how they feel. Unfortunately, there are members of this House who know the real struggle and the real grief that those families have had to deal with in losing loved ones in such a heinous way, and I hope that I never have to personally experience their grief.

It is good to see that there are times when this House, regardless of what side we sit on, can come together and support some very important and serious reforms, and tonight is another such occasion. The LNP have long advocated this position. Indeed, as has been highlighted by both the member for Mansfield and the member for Everton, we announced our commitment to this reform last year. It is disappointing that the House is only just now considering these reforms, given there was an opportunity earlier this year for what could have been a bipartisan move. We could have sent a bipartisan message to those families who are struggling and suffering that we have heeded their message and we want those who have perpetrated the most heinous of crimes to not be eligible for parole until they have made very significant, real and genuine steps to ensure that these families can have closure and can pay tribute to their loved ones and lay them to rest with dignity and respect.

I know there are some who do not support this reform, whether it is the lack of discretion for the Parole Board or whether it is a sense that there are multiple punishments. For some it will be either; for some it will be both. However, I think these reforms are necessary and I think they are just, because the taking of a life is the most heinous of crime. We as a society and a parliament need to send a message that we will never grant parole to those who will not make reasonable and just steps to ensure that the victims and their families are treated with dignity and respect and that those loved ones can pay respect and tribute to those whose lives have been lost. I support the bill.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (5.41 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. In November 2016 the LNP released our no-body no-parole policy in Queensland. Our policy was based on the idea that, by making parole release for certain prisoners linked to their satisfactory cooperation in identifying a victim's final location, prisoners will have a reason to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of a victim. This would apply to offenders serving a prison sentence for murder and conspiracy to commit murder where the murder has been committed. This would have put Queensland in line with South Australia, as Western Australia, Victoria and New South Wales were actively considering no-body no-parole laws.

We knew these were reforms that were needed as soon as possible. We introduced this policy because Queenslanders needed this to happen. Time and again, we saw other states and territories taking action to introduce strong parole reforms. All these families want is an end to their uncertainty and a chance to find out how their loved ones spent their final moments. Families just need to be able to say their goodbyes.

Many in this House have had the privilege of meeting Bruce and Denise Morcombe who stood with the LNP when we announced our policy. No-one will ever forget Daniel Morcombe and nor should we. In Queensland these changes were instigated through a parliamentary e-petition from Fiona Splitt of Cooktown, who lost her husband, Bruce Schuler, in 2012. Bruce's killers are behind bars, but Bruce's body has never been recovered. Fiona has been a tireless advocate for this reform and, like her, other family members of Queensland homicide victims where the body has never been recovered just want a chance for emotional closure. These are common-sense reforms and need to be enacted as soon as possible.

The LNP has always worked to provide safe and livable communities. In government it was the LNP which introduced an array of much needed reforms to balance the scales of justice in favour of the victim not the perpetrator. It was the LNP which increased funding to victim advocacy organisations to ensure those who had been wronged had someone to advocate for them. It was the LNP which gave an additional \$2 million to organisations that support victims of crime and an additional \$750,000 over

three years to the Women's Legal Service. It was the LNP which brought in the ability for victims to read a victim impact statement before a sentencing court if the victim chose to and it was reasonable in the circumstances.

We on this side of the House can proudly stand on our record in delivering safer communities for our constituents. That is why the LNP announced our support for the no-body no-parole reforms in late 2016 and why we will provide bipartisan support to this legislation. I trust that the government will consider the amendments put forward by the LNP this evening.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (5.44 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill, otherwise known as the no-body no-parole bill. The objective of the no-body no-parole bill is to amend the Corrective Services Act 2006 to introduce the policy that is colloquially referred to as no-body no-parole in Queensland. The Northern Territory, South Australia and Victoria have commenced legislation in this regard, and on 17 May 2017 Western Australia also introduced legislation to implement such a policy. During the development of the bill, consideration was given to the approaches taken in other jurisdictions that have implemented the no-body no-parole framework. The positive aspects of each model were considered, and, ultimately, the approach included in the bill most significantly was informed by the effective approach taken in Victoria. As the Attorney-General said in her first reading speech on 23 May 2017—

This bill reinforces the government's commitment to victims of crime. The loss of a loved one through the criminal act of another is distressing enough, but often this heartache and loss is further compounded when the body or remains of loved ones are unable to be recovered by investigating authorities.

Generally speaking, the term 'no-body no-parole' refers to the principle that a prisoner convicted of murder or manslaughter who refuses to adequately assist police in locating the victim should not be granted parole. As such, a primary focus of the principle is to encourage cooperation by these prisoners by denying them parole release until such time as the parole board is satisfied the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated in locating the body or remains, or the last known location of the body or remains, of the victim.

The no-body no-parole policy is predicated on the notion of making parole release for particular prisoners contingent on them satisfactorily cooperating in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location. It is hoped it will encourage and provide incentive for these prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of the victim. This will in turn, it is hoped, offer some comfort and certainty to the families of the victims. The changes to Queensland laws will mean murderers who have not identified the location of their victims' bodies will not be released without serving the maximum time. The no-body no-parole law was one of the key recommendations of the Sofronoff review into the state's parole system, sparked by the killing of 81-year-old grandmother Elizabeth Kippin in her Townsville home allegedly by a man paroled hours earlier. As stated in the report—

... a punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

The no-body no-parole bill is designed to help victims' families and provide an incentive for offenders to cooperate with authorities. The no-body no-parole bill will apply retrospectively and apply to people convicted of murder, manslaughter, accessory after the fact to murder and conspiring to murder. To be eligible for parole, all future and current prisoners would need to satisfy the Parole Board that they have satisfactorily cooperated with the police to identify the location or the last known location and place of a body.

This no-body no-parole legislation has been an important commitment of the Palaszczuk government. When a killer withholds the location of the body, it extends the already considerable suffering of the victims' families. This is not acceptable. We have taken the time to investigate similar legislation across Australia. We have consulted with stakeholders to ensure this right of victims' families. As a result, unlike the LNP's amendments, our laws will actually be effective and provide that all-important closure for families. Compare that to the LNP's hastily cobbled together amendments which neglected to include the specific offence of murder in the definition and failed to provide transitional arrangements, running the risk the new laws would not apply retrospectively.

I also support the comments of the Minister for Corrective Services, Mark Ryan, in relation to the bill in that the legislation was a recommendation of the Palaszczuk government's Queensland parole system review. He said that in each case Queensland Police would report back to the Parole Board on the prisoner's level of cooperation. The Police Commissioner or delegate would report back information from the investigative police including information relating to the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation, the timeliness of the cooperation, the reliability of the information provided and the significance and utility of the cooperation. This is a key element of the bill to ensure that prisoners are

not wasting police resources with false or misleading information when it comes to the no-body no-parole principle. Stakeholders made it clear that they wanted the opportunity to provide feedback on the reforms through the parliamentary committee process especially to victims of crime.

As a former lawyer, I know of the seemingly endless heartbreak that families of homicide victims suffer when the body of their deceased loved one cannot be located. There is no closure for them, no chance of a final goodbye. We can only hope this legislation will lead to some closure for these families. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (5.51 pm): There are occasions in this parliament—and tonight is one—when I am very proud and very satisfied to be a legislator and a member in this parliament. The joint approach—and I am hoping that tonight every member of this House supports this bill going forward—shows that brinkmanship and political argy-bargy does not necessarily have to be part of our role here in this parliament to bring about a better Queensland, which is what we are elected to do. This particular piece of legislation, the no-body no-parole laws, is a demonstration of the fact that our role as Queensland MPs is primarily to bring about a better Queensland.

It was in my office in Mermaid Beach sometime in 2015 that I received a very unusual—for me—email from Cooktown. Fiona Splitt sent an email through to the Mermaid Beach electorate office. We get a lot of emails, as members would be aware, and some of them are a bit ‘crackpotty’ and some are a bit ‘different’. However, this particular email made enormous sense and, I felt, had enough imprimatur behind it to take it forward. I spoke to our then attorney-general, the member for Kawana, in relation to this particular—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr STEVENS: Correct. I thank the member for Kawana. I spoke to him about no-body no-parole and said how much it should be part of Queensland law. Parole is very much a reward—it is not a right—for people who have wronged society in return for good behaviour and rehabilitation. There is no way that anyone can say a prisoner is fully rehabilitated if he is keeping a major secret to himself in that he knows where the body of someone’s loved one is and yet he is not prepared to come forward with that information but still seeks parole.

The no-body no-parole law that we have here before us tonight is absolutely eminently appropriate. I thank Fiona Splitt for bringing this matter to the parliament’s attention as well as all of her supporters, other people and other victims of crime because they bear the grief for a lifetime. There is no way that a person who has committed these crimes should have their sentence reduced for good behaviour and rehabilitation if they know, or possibly could know, where a body is located and if they can bring about some final closure for those left here on the earth, who will grieve for the rest of their lives.

The objectives of this bill are predicated on strengthening our parole laws by making parole for certain offences conditional on satisfactorily cooperating in investigations and attempting to identify or find a victim’s final resting place so that the body or remains may be recovered. The bill has been a long time coming—as I said, from 2015. Unfortunately, we slipped into the abyss of opposition shortly after March 2015. To his great credit, the now shadow minister, the former attorney-general, chatted with me about the matter. Just like with the four-year terms, he brought these matters to a head in the House. I am so pleased and I congratulate the Attorney-General for taking it further, and we will see it pass into law this evening and then go to the Governor for assent. I believe it is a great night for the Queensland parliament to see this law enacted and I am pleased that I am part of it. The bill has been a long time coming.

The issue of bringing emotional closure for those victims in knowing a victim’s final location will finally be resolved tonight after the LNP first announced their support for the review in late 2016. It was my LNP counterparts in this House who, as part of the debate on the bill to adopt the new parole review—the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—moved to legislate the no-body no-parole laws as an amendment to that bill in May 2017. We could have had these laws in place a fraction earlier. However, the fact is that what we have before us tonight is a wonderful effort. It is reform that my LNP colleagues and I have actually helped the Palaszczuk Labor government come to the table with. We pushed the Attorney-General and the Premier at every opportunity to acknowledge that the families of the victims of homicide deserve the opportunity to say goodbye to their beloved family members one final time at the location of their passing. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (5.57 pm): I rise to speak on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. These are important reforms that will strengthen our parole system and support the families of victims of crime. While other states and territories have moved to implement strong parole reforms, the Queensland government has been a little slow to follow that lead. However, public sentiment and the ongoing agony of the victims and families of homicide who have continued to miss out on the emotional relief have brought us these reforms tonight. It is more than timely, and I am very proud to be in a parliament that presents this bill in a bipartisan way to the people of Queensland.

The existence of this bill owes much to the courage and determination of Mrs Fiona Splitt of Cooktown whose husband, Bruce, was murdered in 2012. I acknowledge Fiona and her family in the gallery tonight. His body has never been recovered even though his killers are behind bars. It takes a special and disconcerting kind of callousness for someone to refuse to disclose the location of a body even after having been convicted of murdering that person. The no-body no-parole provision of this bill is predicated on the hope that making release on parole dependent on cooperating to identify the location of a victim's body will provide incentive for offenders to assist in recovering the body or the remains of a victim.

In November 2016 the LNP released a policy supporting the no-body no-parole laws in Queensland. Following recommendations from the Sofronoff review into parole, the Palaszczuk Labor government announced its support for no-body no-parole laws in Queensland. In February this year the LNP moved to legislate no-body no-parole laws as an amendment to the bill which adopted the recommendations of the parole review in May this year, which was voted down by the government.

Things have changed since then. Tonight I am glad for the victims and families of missing homicide victims—all of us in this parliament have finally decided that enough is enough and we will get on and do the right thing. Death is always a difficult time for the loved ones of a deceased to come to terms with. It is made even more unnecessarily traumatic by the callous refusal of some perpetrators to reveal where a body lies. All that a victim's loved ones want is the opportunity to find out where the deceased person spent his or her last moments and to be able to say a final goodbye as part of a dignified funeral service. The unfortunate reality is that in almost every case the victim's final moments alive would have been far from dignified. The Queensland Parole System Review report made 91 recommendations for the complete reform of Queensland's parole system, including the introduction of the no-body no-parole policy.

Debate, on motion of Mr Elmes, adjourned.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Documents Tabled by the Member for Cairns

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Yesterday I noted that I had requested some redactions from material sought to be tabled by the member for Cairns. These redactions related to imputations and inferences and consisted of three sentences in the bundle of documents.

The documents sought to be tabled by the member for Cairns already contained numerous redactions of names and other matters. I stress that the majority of redactions in the documents were already placed in the documents before being viewed by the Clerk and myself and do not relate to the three redactions that I ordered.

MOTION

Palaszczuk Labor Government, CFMEU

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (6.01 pm): I move—

That this House notes that over \$10 million worth of fines have been levied against the CFMEU and condemns the Palaszczuk Labor government for failing to disaffiliate from these lawless thugs.

Before I commence the debate I acknowledge in the gallery tonight Reg and Ann Atkinson who, as a result of their unfortunate generosity at a 4 Paws charity night, won a raffle to have dinner with me this evening. I apologise to Reg and Ann for what is about to ensue and I hope for their sake they are not members of the CFMEU.

As I noted, this motion condemns the Palaszczuk Labor government again for not dissociating themselves from the union thugs in the CFMEU. Time and time again in Queensland and right around Australia we have seen the lawlessness of the CFMEU and other unions in Australia in their continual

disregard for the laws of the land. We are legislators: we legislate for laws for the protection and good governance of the citizens of the state of Queensland as does the Commonwealth government. We have laws to prevent union thugs from engaging in the types of activities that they engage in, and yet they continually disregard these laws. They say that it is okay and they are allowed to disregard the law. We heard the head of the ACTU say, 'It's okay for unions to disregard the laws because we don't believe the laws should be the laws.' It does not matter if you believe you should be able to do 200 kilometres an hour on the Bruce Highway, the law is that you cannot. The law is that you can do 100 or 110 kilometres an hour on the Bruce Highway in certain sections. We have laws for a reason and the unions—particularly the CFMEU—have been involved in many court cases now as a result of their flagrant disregard for the law.

For the first time in Australia's history they have copped over \$10 million worth of fines as a result of the courts of the land saying they have breached Australian law. They have now racked up \$10 million worth of fines. We have also seen \$13 million given in donations to the Labor Party, so we are up to \$23 million. There is \$10 million in fines and \$13 million given to the Labor Party in donations: that is \$23 million.

Mr Walker: What's left over?

Mr BLEIJIE: What's left over? I suspect there is a lot left over, member for Mansfield, because these are union members' dues they are using to pay their fines as a result of their disregard for the law. That is not to mention the union fat cat thugs who take big salaries home while claiming to represent the poor worker. They get in their Mercedes-Benz and leave Peel Street every night. They get in their \$100,000 or \$200,000 vehicles—

An opposition member: Limousines!

Mr BLEIJIE: Or limousines—they are chauffeured down to their homes with their company credit cards, but the poor union thug official looks after the poor worker! I feel sorry for them, jumping in their black leather Mercedes-Benz. I feel sorry for the union thugs. All they have to worry about is not losing their union credit card—which is paid for by union members—so they can pay for fuel for their vehicles. That is all they have to worry about. We know that the Attorney-General on that side always talks about the courts and having respect for the courts. Let us talk about the courts and some of the cases that have been decided recently. In 2016 Justice Jessup said—

The CFMEU's record of non-compliance with legislation of this kind has now become notorious ... That record ought to be an embarrassment to the trade union movement.

Justice Jessup also said—

I am bound to say that the conduct referred to in the schedule bespeaks an organisational culture in which contraventions of the law have become normalised.

Justice Jessup also stated—

Has there ever been a worse recidivist in the history of the common law?

He was speaking about the union movement, and that is a judge who said that. Justice White said—

It bespeaks an attitude by the CFMEU of ignoring, if not defying, the law and a willingness to contravene it as and when it chooses.

Justice Tracey said—

... bespeak a deplorable attitude, on the part of the CFMEU, to its legal obligations and the statutory process which govern relations between unions and employers in this country.

Judge Jarrett said—

The CFMEU has an egregious record of repeated and wilful contraventions of all manner of industrial laws.

He also said—

Choosing unlawful means to further its industrial objectives appeared to be the business model of the CFMEU.

Judge Burnett said—

The only reasonable conclusion to be drawn is that the organisation either does not understand or does not care for the legal restrictions on industrial activity imposed by the legislature and the courts.

I say they are thugs and they do not care what the courts say. They do not care and the Labor Party is beholden to the union movement. The Labor Party should dissociate and disaffiliate—

(Time expired)

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (6.07 pm): This motion takes me back to one of my favourite musical acts, Redgum, and one of their great songs *One More Boring Night in Adelaide*. This motion is one more boring union-bashing motion in the Queensland parliament by the LNP—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. If I cannot hear the member I know that Hansard cannot record what the member is saying. We have the option to either start again or we allow the member to continue so that Hansard can hear.

Mr KELLY: Thank you for your protection, Mr Speaker. Honestly, they are obsessed with union bashing. This yelling is actually a cathartic experience for them, so I am happy for them to yell at me about unions. If it helps them get it off their chest and move on to something more important for Queensland, let us get that out. I really do not know why they bother with these motions. It brings nothing to our parliament, but let us get this done because I want to go and have dinner with me dear old mum. There were no unions for women who stayed at home and raised seven kids—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. If we have a continuation of this I will invite the member for Greenslopes to start again.

Mr KELLY: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Let us get this debate done, because I want to go and have dinner with my dear mother. There were no unions for women who stayed at home and raised seven kids, but my mother often joked that there should be. She may not have been a union member, but she taught us some great values that stand you in good stead whether you are in a union or anywhere else. She taught us to listen; she taught us to try and get along; she taught us to be respectful; she taught us to stick up for ourselves and our values; and she taught us to watch out for our family and watch out for our mates.

I am pleased that I have been asked to respond to this absolute load of nonsense. Perhaps I was asked to respond because I have been the beneficiary of being part of a strong union for 30 years. I have been part of my union, the Queensland Nurses and Midwives Union, and I have seen the tremendous help it has provided to members over all of those years. I have done my part volunteering. I have done my part supporting my mates. Good unionists do not just back each other; we also back the organisations we work for. We back the employers because we know that a successful organisation creates more work, better jobs and safer jobs.

I could talk about my personal experiences, but I would rather talk about the absolute privilege I had touring the many local coalmining towns as part of the coal workers pneumoconiosis committee. That was an experience I shared with many in this House. Shock, horror: we met a lot of men and women from the CFMEU. Did we meet thugs? Did we meet criminals? No. We met workers who were sick and tired of being forced to work in unsafe conditions. We met workers who were sick of seeing their workforce being divided and conquered by the use of temporary and casual workers. We met workers who told us about temporary workers who made a complaint about safety in the morning and were walked off site in the afternoon. We met workers who were absolutely distressed and disgusted that their towns and communities were being devastated by the employment practices of these big mining companies.

The entire committee—members came from all sides of parliament—treated these workers with respect and dignity. We did not brand them as thugs or criminals; we listened and we delivered a report that will hopefully deliver some justice for afflicted workers and protection for those still in the industry.

Of course at times there has been bad and corrupt behaviour in unions—behaviour that should be stopped, punished and prevented from ever happening again—but does this behaviour make the institution bad? Of course not. Let us consider other institutions that have had corrupt individuals: banks, the military, universities, religious institutions, political parties, the Public Service. Should we get rid of these institutions because individuals do bad things? Absolutely not. We should learn from their mistakes, compensate victims, hold those who were corrupt to account, reform if necessary and celebrate the many great things those institutions do.

I will tell members about one institution I would like to see shut down—that is, the ABCC. When that mob has been in full swing, the number of deaths on construction sites has grown. It is absolutely disgraceful. If anybody thinks that I or any member on this side of the House would support an organisation that makes workplaces unsafe, they really are seriously misguided.

It is sad that the LNP wastes the time of this House on motions like this. I would rather talk about things like the Back to Work program. That is what the people of my electorate sent me here to do. That is what the people of my electorate welcome. I reject this motion. This motion is rubbish. Let us get back to the important work of this House.

(Time expired)

 **Mr CRAMP** (Gaven—LNP) (6.12 pm): I am surprised I am awake after that effort! I thought the member for Greenslopes was going to fire up, but it was not to be.

I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by my colleague the member for Kawana. There is a reason that the words 'union' and 'thugs' go together so well. It is spelt out in five letters: C-F-M-E-U. Those sitting opposite know exactly the kind of behaviour that Labor stooges get up to and they will happily stay in bed with them. Who cares if the CFMEU is a union with a criminal record? Who cares if it has been fined millions of dollars for multiple breaches of the law? Who cares if so many of its officials have been referred to authorities on corruption charges? I can say that those opposite do not care. We have just heard it from the member for Greenslopes. I guess that is because as long as the CFMEU continues to line the pockets of this Labor government there is no problem.

The fact is that those opposite do not care about the \$10 million record of fines levied against the CFMEU. What they care about is that since 2001 the CFMEU has given about \$13 million in donations to Labor. Who pays for these millions of dollars in penalties? That is right: it is their ordinary members. We heard it before. It is the workers that those opposite go out and meet. That is \$23 million in fines and donations made off the backs of hardworking construction workers, who make up one of Australia's largest industries.

With so much money being donated to the Labor Party by the CFMEU, is it any wonder that this Labor government is happy to turn a blind eye to the CFMEU continually thumbing its nose at the rule of law? Labor is happy to take its donations and turn its back on the continued intimidation and lawlessness of these industrial thugs.

As noted by my colleague the member for Kawana, last week in its ruling the Federal Court slammed the actions of CFMEU officials in 2011, when over 600 construction workers walked off sites around Brisbane, as being 'highly coordinated and deliberately orchestrated'. It also noted that the CFMEU was plainly aware that the action was unlawful. Justice Jessup did state—

The CFMEU's record of non-compliance with legislation of this kind has now become notorious.

Government members interjected.

Mr CRAMP: I hear the 'oh's of surprise from the Minister for Industrial Relations. I doubt that the minister is surprised at all, considering her involvement with these guys. Justice Jessup continued—

That record ought to be an embarrassment to the trade union movement.

It is not embarrassing for those opposite, it seems. These cases enabled the CFMEU to break one record, though: being the first union in Australian history to rack up \$10 million worth of fines. Congratulations, champions! Is it any wonder they are regarded as militant union thugs? There could not be a more disgraceful example of corruption and criminal behaviour than the old king of the free thunderbox himself: the infamous Michael Ravbar. I ask the Premier: are free bathrooms considered a CFMEU union secretary position highlight?

An opposition member interjected.

Mr CRAMP: I get it. I have probably set my sights too low. Why stop at a free bathroom when you can have the whole house? Just ask Ravbar's partner in crime Dave Hanna. I know that the Premier loves her CFMEU boys. We have all seen this happy snap of the Premier with her good mate Mr Hanna. I table the picture.

Tabled paper: A4 photograph depicting the Premier with CFMEU official [\[1281\]](#).

Speaking of mates, it seems that, based on media reports, Mr Hanna and Mr Ravbar are not mates anymore. They are too busy blaming each other for trying to destroy CFMEU paperwork to avoid handing it over to authorities.

Mr Minnikin: How much paperwork?

Mr CRAMP: About seven tonnes I believe, member for Chatsworth. The fact is that—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I am having difficulty hearing the member for Gaven.

Mr CRAMP: I could start again, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: He will get a re-run if we cannot behave ourselves.

Mr CRAMP: Do you want me to start again?

Mr SPEAKER: Well, a lot of the chatter is from your side, member for Gaven.

Mr CRAMP: Regardless, I am happy to start again.

Mr Crandon: They are stunned into silence over there.

Mr CRAMP: They want to hear the truth, and I respect that.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, can you assure me that the matters you are referring to are not currently before the courts?

Mr CRAMP: I will move on, Mr Speaker. The fact is that the fish rots from the head. The CFMEU is clearly rotten to the core, and Labor needs to send it the way of the BLF. Once again, the Premier sees and hears nothing. We have former Labor prime ministers Paul Keating and Bob Hawke—the very man who had the spine to cut ties with the BLF—both willing to call out the CFMEU for its actions, saying that they are appalled by the evidence of systematic union corruption. I am sorry, Premier: we cannot hear you. That is because you are saying nothing. Even when the CFMEU is attacking her own ministers, she does not say a word to it. Under Labor we are now the strike capital of Australia and the Premier will not do anything about it, just in case she upsets any of her union mates.

I refer to one small thing the member for Greenslopes said. Is it any wonder that Labor fought so hard against the re-establishment of the ABCC? Let's face it: why would the CFMEU want governance over its criminal standover and bullying tactics on work sites? The best thing it could do—and did—was throw some money at its Labor Party mates to make the problem go away.

(Time expired)

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (6.18 pm): Let me begin by saying that I am a proud member of CFMEU Mining and have been since 1984. In fact, I am a life member of the CFMEU. Why? Because I care. I rise to take part in this debate because I am absolutely offended by the ongoing viciousness of the member for Kawana. Everything he says about the CFMEU he is saying about me, and we should probably go for a walk and have a talk about it. The member displays aggressive, angry behaviour when he attacks the men and women of this state who are members of a union. The member for Kawana comes across as mean spirited, malicious and lacking knowledge in terms of what unions have done for the health and wellbeing of the people of Queensland.

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Pine Rivers, I would urge you not to be disruptive.

Mr PEARCE: It is very clear that the member for Kawana does not understand what the union is about. He knows only that he hates the word 'union' and in doing so shows contempt for the men and women who are part of a union. I put this to the honourable member: how many members of the LNP have sons and daughters, friends and family working in a place where there is a union presence or where the workers in that place have their conditions and wages set by the union? Do those opposite hate those people—their own families? That is what gets to me and I just cannot understand it. The member for Kawana comes into this place and opens his mouth and spews bile on decent men and women but never tells this place about the abuse of workers by employers—employers who fail to pay their employees the right wage, have their employees work in unsafe conditions and environments and working without appropriate penalty rates. Those sorts of things are happening all of the time, but those opposite do not talk about that.

The member for Kawana does not spew the same bile on the unscrupulous employers and the disgraceful behaviour of companies in the mining industry. The member for Kawana is silent on the bad faith behaviour of Glencore for example and other multinationals that operate coalmines in Central Queensland. While he is loud and clown-like on his hate for the union, he is silent on resource companies failing to accept responsibility for the killing of workers who then at the same time will go into a court to cover their backsides and argue for compensation to be as low as it possibly can. He does not argue about people with regard to those matters.

The member for Kawana by his actions in this place condones the behaviour of company management like Glencore—like that at the Oaky North Glencore mine. General manager Darren Nicholls acts way outside the little common decency that Glencore has. Like the member for Kawana, the Oaky North general manager hates union members. Mr Nicholls has been to Tieri primary school to harass the principal because she offered mineworkers who were shut out access to the school grounds to do community work. He is paying security goons to constantly film and record conversations from the picket line. He has goons driving past the schools in Tieri with a little camera stuck out the

window filming women and children. That is the sort of bloke that we are dealing with, but I do not see the member for Kawana saying anything about that because he has only one hate in his head—that is, the word 'union'. Mr Nicholls has abused his position in a number of ways—trying to convince police to turn on the picket line and trying to get the council to alter the conditions of a permit. He has even gone to the extent of having sponsorship signs pulled down from the golf course. This is an unacceptable situation—

(Time expired)

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (6.24 pm): I actually respect the old working-class values of the member for Mirani—I really do—but the trouble is this: no wonder the previous speaker to the member for Mirani from the other side, the member for Greenslopes, wanted to get rid of the ABCC. If we go back only eight weeks ago, the ABCC—which, obviously, does absolutely nothing, member for Greenslopes—produced something which I read with great interest this afternoon. I refer to a document that is an industry update of a court summary of recently finalised matters. It states that the CFMEU was penalised \$86,000 after trying to force Queensland workers to join the union. The CFMEU and a union delegate were penalised \$86,000 after attempting to force two Brisbane construction workers to join their union or be turned away from site. Furthermore, the Federal Circuit Court found that the union's Daniel Barker had demanded the workers pay \$1,290 in fees or they would not be able to work on a Kelvin Grove apartment project. No dough, no start according to the CFMEU! In fact, in his decision on 30 May Judge Jarrett said that the contraventions were serious, member for Greenslopes, because they had deprived two men of their fundamental right to work.

Mr Bleijie: Their right to work?

Mr MINNIKIN: Their right to work; I take that interjection from the member for Kawana. ABCC Commissioner Nigel Hadgkiss said it was against the law to try to force workers to join a union to enter a construction site. To quote his words, and I would ask that the member for Greenslopes in particular listen up, he said—

Membership of a union doesn't determine a person's ability to earn a living in this industry.

It gets better. If you roll the tape further, there is more—more about the CFMEU in court. A court has imposed the maximum possible penalty on the CFMEU's Dave Hanna—the one and only Dave Hanna—for breaching right-of-entry laws during a heated site visit in Brisbane, but we will come back to Mr Hanna if time permits because he makes what the member for Ashgrove was going to do in relation to dump spoil on the Barrier Reef look like nothing. He was going to dump tonnes and tonnes—what did he get rid of; 7½ tonnes?—worth of evidence.

Mr BROWN: I rise to a point of order: sub judice.

Mr MINNIKIN: Moving on, let us cut to the chase: the unions' grip on the Australian workplace has been weakened by the fact that now in the private workforce they represent less than 10 per cent of the workforce. The Premier talks about jobs, jobs, jobs, but what about excessive construction costs resulting from inflated pay rates and work stoppages? I look forward to the contribution from the member for Brisbane Central to explain that. That is robbing around about 1,700 Queenslanders of their right for a job right now. In fact, these higher labour costs are pushing up project costs by around about—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister for Industrial Relations, you will have ample opportunity to respond. Member for Mudgeeraba, I can hear you as well. I am having difficulty hearing the member for Chatsworth clearly.

Mr MINNIKIN: She will have the opportunity to respond, but probably not as eloquently. Time will tell. We will see. We look forward to her contribution because in her contribution of five minutes I would like her to explain to the House why that has added around about \$280 million a year in relation to actual construction costs in this state. If we go through the enterprise bargaining agreement for the CFMEU between 2015 and 2019, it includes amongst other things a pay rise of five per cent a year for five years, union delegates to be reclassified to a higher level five per cent above the trade level—nice if you can get it—a jump-up clause requiring subcontractors to pay the same rates as a main builder on a project and a tool allowance of \$2,380 per year for labourers and \$6,500 for tradesmen. But wait for it: if an employer borrows a power tool for use by another worker, they must replace it with a brand-new tool. Those opposite absolutely need to uncouple themselves from this militant union right now.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. Member for Mount Ommaney, I can hear you too. I call the Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (6.30 pm): It is obvious that the member for Chatsworth has no idea about industrial relations. We heard the member for Chatsworth talk about the CFMEU and how bad they are and yet on 17 April 2012 one of the meetings Campbell Newman had is in his diary: meeting and lunch with Dave Hanna of the BLF in the Premier's lounge. Then in *Hansard* he says, 'We have also had praise from unions such as the BLF.'

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I can hear you loud and clear, member for Everton. You are not on the speaking list and you have missed the boat.

Ms GRACE: We have him on record praising unions such as the BLF and Mr Dave Hanna. On 13 May 2012 he says, 'I thank him.' 'We are very much about creating jobs for workers in the BLF.' Then the CFMEU state secretary Michael Ravbar described the announcement as the boost the flagging construction industry needs. Those opposite praise them when they want to and knock them down when they want to as well. They appointed Dave Hanna to Construction Skills Queensland and here they are bemoaning the CFMEU. Once again they are bereft of any ideas. Here we are in the parliament—and, Mr Speaker, I have to apologise—once again debating the CFMEU.

We heard the member for Kawana talk about the rule of law. He said there are laws about what you have to do and how you conduct yourself. If you drive fast down a freeway there are rules about it. But are there any for employers? Do we ever hear anything about the rule of law for employers? There is not one word. Those opposite have an unhealthy obsession with the CFMEU and we hear nothing about employers actually following the rule law and doing what they should be doing. Let me tell members that ordinary families are not interested in the CFMEU, what they are interested in is the security of work. They are interested in whether, when their children get a job, they are made to get an ABN. My daughter recently got a six-month contract in Melbourne. They made her, a 20-year-old, get an ABN. She does not run a business. That is the point. The only way she could get employment was to get an ABN. The federal government is allowing that to go on.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Can I remind the members for Kawana, Gympie, Mansfield and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition that you are already on your first warning under 253A. Other members will join you if they continue with disruptive behaviour.

Ms GRACE: Nothing is being done. In fact, the federal IR minister, Senator Cash, has not called a meeting of industrial relations ministers around this state for two years.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Gaven and member for Chatsworth, you are now joining the list of those warned under standing order 253A for your disruptive behaviour.

Ms GRACE: They want to be heard when they speak, but they do not like it when they get it back. Senator Cash has not called a meeting for two years.

Mr Hart interjected.

Ms GRACE: On Friday this issue of the misuse of ABNs and the exploitation of workers will be put on the agenda, member for Burleigh, don't you worry about that.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, you are warned under standing order 253A. I find that you are trying to disrupt the minister and speak over the top of the minister. If you persist I will take the appropriate action. That is your first warning.

Ms GRACE: What do we hear from those opposite about issues of exploitation, labour hire, contracting upon contracting, employees not paid any wages proper and penalty rates being stripped? Nothing! We do not hear a word. There is silence—crickets—because they have nothing of substance to offer on these issues. The community is not interested about the views of those opposite on the CFMEU. It simply smacks of union bashing from the party of Work Choices, from the party of attack dogs on the wharfs, from the party that sacked 14,000 public servants and ripped away the rights of workers every single day.

Let me give those opposite some examples of the employers that have been fined: 7-Eleven has incurred more than \$400,000 in fines for underpaying workers—staff received as little as \$13 an hour; a Coffee Club here in Queensland was fined \$180,000 for forcing foreign workers to hand back \$18,000 of their wages; three Japanese restaurants in Brisbane were fined \$200,000 for paying five workers

base rates lower than \$10 an hour; in Maroochy a company was fined \$230,000—listen to this one—for deliberately exploiting their workforce: 22 seasonal workers from Vanuatu were underpaid almost \$78,000.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. It appears to me that the member for Redlands and the member for Mount Ommaney are just pushing the boundaries. You will both now join the list of those on their first warning under 253A. Member for Moggill, you are about to follow if you continue.

Ms GRACE: Before my time runs out let me get to the member for Gaven, the wannabe union official who set up a non-registered union. They are the ones that they support, the ones that do not report, the ones that we do not know what they are up to, the ones that are not registered under the Industrial Relations Act. That is what those opposite support. There he is fighting with his union, fighting with his neighbours, fighting with his conscious about whether he stays in the LNP or goes to One Nation. They are the unions they want to support. They talk about numbers. Who knows? They are not registered. We abide by the rule of law and we will not take anything else.

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 40—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, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 44:

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

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pair: Williams, Seeney.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I think this is the first time there have been members named under 253A after the six o'clock debate and the Leader of the House has sought clarification. It is my understanding that it was always intended that the warnings remain for half the day. For the members for Gaven, Chatsworth, Burleigh, Redlands and Mount Ommaney those warnings will continue for the rest of the evening. That is the understanding I thought we have always had. Those other members are cleared so they can come back and have another go.

Sitting suspended from 6.42 pm to 7.45 pm.

SUSTAINABLE QUEENSLAND DAIRY PRODUCTION (FAIR MILK PRICE LOGOS) BILL

Resumed from 13 October 2016 (see p. 3857).

Second Reading



Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (7.45 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

It is my great honour to present the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill for an act to enable consumers to clearly identify milk for which a dairy farmer has been paid a fair price. Queensland dairy farmers are in a crippling financial crisis. The deteriorating climate of the dairy industry is making it crucial that we pass this legislation which will help to keep dairy farmers afloat. In 15 years, deregulation, natural disasters, the \$1 per litre milk supermarket price wars and unsustainable farmgate prices have slashed the number of Queensland dairy farmers from 1,500 to 430, which is a phenomenal drop. Alarming figures reveal that an average of 70 farmers exit the industry each year. If that trend continues, fresh milk production in Queensland will cease completely by the year 2028.

If there is no substantial change soon, fresh milk may not be produced in this state. The economy of milk production is becoming unsustainable and the relentless cost cutting by the supermarket chains has largely contributed to the decline in the dairy industry. If passed, this bill will give consumers more

control and transparency through a fair milk price logo. The logo will inform consumers of where the milk is produced, that the farmers were paid a sustainable price for the cost of a litre of milk and that it is fresh Queensland milk.

The policy objectives of the bill are to establish the eligibility criteria and legal protection for voluntary logos to be placed on containers of milk. The logo will inform Queensland consumers that a price that achieves a sustainable gross margin has been paid to the dairy farmer who produced the milk. The logo will be a voluntary market mechanism that processors can incorporate into their existing milk label. I repeat: use of the logo will be voluntary. The logo will inform consumers that a price that achieves a gross sustainable margin for the milk produced has been paid to the dairy farmer. It is a voluntary logo; it is not forced on the processor. It is a legal legislated logo in which the people of Queensland can put their faith and trust. Can we put our faith and trust in Woolworths and Coles? This bill is before the House because we do not have faith in Woolworths and Coles. When people go to a supermarket, they will be able to identify, from the logo, that they are buying fresh Queensland milk for which the farmer has been paid a fair price.

Throughout the committee process, neither party came out in support of the dairy industry. Both parties have sent a clear message that they are generally disinterested in the sustainability of the Queensland dairy industry, otherwise they would have supported the bill in the committee process. When the dairy farmers were struggling and crying out for help, the Labor Party marched down the main street with them and said, 'We're with you'. The shadow minister said, 'We are going to tell Woolworths and Coles that we are not happy!' But it is our legislation that is before this House so that we can do something about this.

The bill requires that a fair milk price logo identifies the region in which the milk was produced as the costs of production vary from region to region. The region-specific logo enables consumers to support their local dairy industry. The regions are North Queensland, Central Queensland and South-East Queensland. The design and the wording of each fair milk price logo must be decided by the minister in consultation with the dairy industry and set out in a gazetted notice. The bill provides for the setting of a minimum price to be paid to a dairy farmer for the production of milk carrying a fair milk price logo. The fair milk price logo will signify that the farmer who produced that milk has made a sustainable gross margin. Currently, most dairy farmers do not make a sustainable gross margin. There were 1,500 dairy farmers in 2000 and now there are 430 dairy farmers. When I introduced the fair milk mark bill into the House there were 540 dairy farmers. The number is now down to 430. They are paid a price per litre of milk that is lower than the cost of producing that litre of milk. That is why I have introduced this legislation.

To ensure the validity of the fair milk price logo, this bill provides for a process for determining a fair price to be paid for the production of milk. While the bill does not suggest what this price should be, the bill provides for the utilisation of the Queensland government's Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme report to identify the costs of producing milk for a dairy farmer in each Queensland region and use the QDAS data to determine a sustainable gross margin for milk produced in the particular region.

In addition to this data, it provides that the minister must consult with dairy farmers and industry representatives to determine a gross sustainable margin. This is to be a legislated logo. The bill will require the minister to work with dairy farmers and the Queensland dairy industry and use the Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme to determine a sustainable price.

The bill will boost consumer confidence when purchasing milk with a fair milk price logo. These logos will be backed by legislation and directly support sustainable Queensland dairy production. The bill legislates offences relating to particular conduct in order to protect the integrity of the fair milk price logo.

In early 2011 the two big supermarket chains slashed the price of their home brand milk to \$1 a litre. This quickly became known as the milk wars. Since then the Australian dairy industry has repeatedly slammed these prices as unsustainable and revealed that many farmers have exited the industry as a result. Research shows that the last time milk was valued at \$1 a litre was in 1992. No-one can live on the same wage as they did in 1992. However, dairy farmers are forced to do that and they simply cannot survive.

Last year consumers took a renewed interest in the plight of dairy farmers as stories emerged of those struggling to make ends meet in the face of plummeting farmgate prices. This crisis has attracted widespread media attention, triggering damning comments and pledges of support from the country's leaders. Research has identified that consumers would pay more for dairy products if they knew that the extra cost would result in a sustainable industry.

This bill provides for a legislated logo. It is not a Woolworths or Coles logo because we cannot trust those. Consumers would be able to trust this logo because it would be legislated. It would have the government working with the Queensland dairy industry. This is not reregulation but working with the industry. That is all it is. If members say that we should not work with dairy farmers because it is not right, I point out that we did have 1,500 dairy farmers and now we have 430. We need to start doing something.

I say to all the scaremongers that this bill does not enable regulation of the Queensland dairy industry. It is in line with national competition policy enacted through the federal Competition and Consumer Act 2010. This bill does not force anyone in the supply chain to use the logo. It is a voluntary logo.

Parmalat may be upset about this and may not want to support it. The parliament is probably stupid enough to listen to the fact that they are not happy with this. What about the small processors who are happy with this proposal and want it? I do not want to see the parliament make a decision because it cares about the interests of Parmalat because they expressed concerns. It is a voluntary logo and it is not forced upon any processor.

 **Hon. WS BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries and Minister for Rural Economic Development) (7.54 pm): I table the government's response to report No. 33 of the Agriculture and Environment Committee on the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016.

Tabled paper: Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 33, 55th Parliament—Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016, government response [[1283](#)].

An interim response to the AEC report was tabled in the Legislative Assembly on 13 July 2017. The government will not be supporting this bill. This government is not about reregulating industry. We demonstrated this during the debate over the sugar marketing issues. Our approach is to provide an appropriate level of resources to industry to allow them to address issues.

The government has announced a package of support measures to allow this to happen. Tonight I can announce that the Palaszczuk government is to inject almost a million dollars to help promote Queensland milk. As part of this funding package, \$550,000 will be provided to the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation over three years to design and implement a pilot fair milk logo scheme. The QDO will be able to exercise some latitude in moving the pilot forward. QDO President, Brian Tessmann, has welcomed the funding. He described it as a timely intervention that will help consumers make an informed choice and that this initiative will assist Queensland's dairy farmers promote their milk and give them a fair go.

The Department of Agriculture and Fisheries considers that the current Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme data collected is not necessarily statistically significant or sufficiently representative to be used to realistically generate regionally specific milk price information. New funding totalling about \$120,000 will be provided to DAF for extra staff to encourage increased farmer participation in QDAS and then collect the additional information. The expanded database will be provided to QDO to use in any fair milk logo scheme.

QDO has also asked for resources to assist existing and new small processors and farmers diversify their product range and better develop their markets with improved branding and marketing. Some \$290,000 will be provided to the Office of Small Business to develop tailored mentoring support services and workshops.

The government's 'Go local' campaign will be expanded to support businesses in the dairy industry. It would be useful for consumers to be aware that most—that is 75 to 80 per cent—of the milk consumed in Queensland is sourced locally. This bill provides for the establishment of logos for containers of fresh milk produced in particular regions, and for which fair prices have been paid. It also describes how a fair milk price should be set. It establishes the eligibility criteria and legal protection for voluntary logos to be placed on containers. The desired outcome of this proposal is to promote sales of Queensland produced milk by informing consumers through logos that dairy farmers have been paid a fair price for their milk.

It is assumed that consumers will buy more of these products. In addition, it assumes the gazettal of pricing information would pressure milk processors to pay dairy farmers more for milk at the farm gate. The beneficiaries of low price milk are consumers. A risk of the legislative approach is that the government could be seen to be trying to increase prices to consumers. By gazetting a fair milk price, the government would be indirectly interfering in the milk market.

The bill raises a number of issues of both implementation and principle. Indeed, some of its provisions are unworkable. There are a number of issues with a legislative approach. As participation by processors is voluntary, it is possible that a regulatory framework could be established but never used by industry. The Agriculture and Environment Committee report notes—

Beyond the practical challenges of implementing the Bill, its validity under the Constitution may be called into question. Specifically, the Bill may offend s 92 of the Constitution, which aims to create a free-trading area within the borders of the Commonwealth of Australia.

...

In the case of the Bill, the fact that the logos are available to milk produced within Queensland, but not to milk produced in southern states, is sufficient to establish that the Bill is discriminatory.

The government shares community concerns for the viability of Queensland dairy farmers. There has been a continuous decline in the number of dairy farms since deregulation of the dairy industry in 2000. In 2000, there were approximately 1,550 dairy farms; now there are 419 accredited dairy producers in Queensland. As the number of dairy farmers in Queensland has decreased since deregulation, there has been a corresponding decline in annual milk production. In 2015-16, Queensland's dairy industry produced 405 million litres of milk.

While recent milk production in Queensland has been consistently less than Queensland milk sales, Queensland milk sales continue to grow, essentially in line with Queensland's population growth. The forecast farmgate gross value of production for the Queensland dairy industry in 2016-17 is \$233 million. Dairy Australia has reported that in 2016-17, Queensland year-to-date milk production from July to April has increased by 1.4 per cent compared to the same period in 2015-16. During the same time period, total Australian milk production has declined by eight per cent. Queensland is the only state to increase production over this time period.

The Queensland dairy industry is part of a national market which is greatly influenced by supply, demand and pricing in the global market. The dairy industry is subject to the supply and demand pressures of the national milk market as processors trade milk to meet their own supply and processing requirements and balance regional demand and supply through an inter-region milk transfer. When the differential between the higher farmgate milk prices in Queensland and lower prices in the southern states is greater than the added cost of transporting milk, processors have the potential to shift lower cost milk from the southern states into the Queensland market.

Marketing of milk and the setting of farmgate prices are purely commercial activities and are the responsibility of milk suppliers and milk processors. The way milk is marketed and priced is complex. There is no quick-fix legislated solution to redistribute wealth in the supply chain. The Dairy Australia *Dairy Situation and Outlook* issued in June 2017 noted—

Price pressure is also a feature of the Australian domestic market, though supermarket sales volumes continued to grow strongly for most key dairy categories. Milk sales have been particularly robust, especially in fresh white full cream and flavoured milk ...

The outlook states that, in the 12 months to April 2017, nationally—

Fresh white milk grew strongly, up 3.9% in volume to 1,077 million litres, and 8.2% in terms of value. The strong growth in the sales value of the fresh white milk segment is due mainly to increased sales of higher-priced branded milk, which retailed at an average price of \$1.88/L, compared to \$1.04/L for private label milk.

The dairy industry's own research and development corporation situation analysis highlights some of the variations and complexities of the Australian dairy industry. This bill is not the way to support the marketing of milk.

On 18 July 2017, I met with QDO representatives who advised me that if the bill were not supported in the Legislative Assembly then they would like financial assistance and support from government to devise and operate an industry operated marketing scheme. In addition, DAF research, development and extension are focused on improving the profitability of the northern dairy industry. Dairy Australia is supporting Queensland's research, development and extension through a major project focused on improving the efficiency of the feed base. A developmental trial at the Gatton dairy facility is evaluating and demonstrating more profitable production systems for dairy producers.

The QDAS service DAF provides offers farm management accounting and analysis of various dairy production systems in Queensland. The Queensland government also provides financial assistance to dairy farmers through the Drought Relief Assistance Scheme and the Primary Industry Productivity Enhancement Scheme administered by QRIDA. In conclusion, the Palaszczuk government sees no role for government interfering in the commercial decisions of industry.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (8.05 pm): I rise to speak to the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016. Let me say at the outset that the LNP will be opposing this bill. The LNP will be opposing this bill not because we do not support the dairy industry in Queensland—far from it—but because this bill is impractical, ill conceived and nothing short of a stunt by the Katter's Australian Party which will do nothing more than give our hardworking dairy farmers false hope. It is worth noting—and it does not happen very often—that the bill was rejected by the Agriculture and Environment Committee, who unanimously agreed that the bill should not be passed. That decision reinforces the fact that this bill is fundamentally flawed.

There is no question that the dairy industry in Queensland is doing it tough through a combination of market pressures, unsustainable returns, natural disasters and the ongoing price war between the major supermarkets who persist in selling milk for \$1 per litre. The last thing the dairy industry in Queensland needs right now is more red tape and bureaucracy because if there is a single message coming out of all this it is simply: do not impose more regulation on the industry. This attempt by the Katter's Australian Party to reregulate the dairy industry will potentially breach ACCC fair trade regulations and return the dairy industry to the pre-2000 days of regulation.

This bill seeks to establish eligibility criteria and legal protection for voluntary fair milk price logos on milk containers. Logos would be designed to inform consumers of the region where the milk was produced and that the dairy farmer who produced the milk received a minimum price for the milk. I note that the price for the milk would be calculated using the Queensland government's Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme and decided by the relevant minister.

As members of parliament, we are entrusted by the community to introduce legislation that has been well researched, practical and lawful, and will address an identified need or shortcoming. We should not be introducing legislation into this place for the sake of introducing legislation or to address a need that can be met on a voluntary basis or is the domain of another jurisdiction.

There is merit in the concept of a fair price logo and I am not disputing that, but it should be on a voluntary basis and left to industry to implement. We do not need to legislate logos on milk containers. The industry is more than capable of undertaking this task, and I fully support this initiative to give consumers information about local content. This practice is already in place in some areas of Queensland where dairy farmers have developed niche markets. What this bill will do if passed today is impose a regulation on those processors who have used their initiative to develop logos promoting their product.

One of the fundamental flaws in this bill is the attempt to reregulate the price of milk. Queensland does not produce enough milk for local consumption, with approximately 30 per cent of our milk freighted in from the southern states. Our current annual production is 405 million litres—some 180 million litres below annual demand. Our large processors such as Parmalat and Dairy Farmers regularly truck milk from interstate which is mixed with locally produced milk for bottling, and therein lies a significant problem. The bill requires that a fair milk price logo identifies the region in which the milk was produced. If the milk is trucked to Brisbane and mixed at a large processing facility such as Parmalat, it will make it impossible to identify the area from which the milk came.

Any regulation to segregate Queensland milk would add substantially to the costs of large processors and risk operations. Queensland dairy farmers are currently paid more for their milk than their southern counterparts which also needs to be taken into consideration. QDO Vice President, Ross McInnes, acknowledges the branded milk pricing consumer dilemma when he says, 'When the price of branded milk rises consumers go back to \$1/litre milk.'

Let me repeat my earlier statement that labelling for local content and fair price paid can be done by industry on a voluntary basis with smaller processors already adopting this practice. I use the example of Cooloola Milk at Gympie which has successfully established a niche market in that area.

Mr Krause interjected.

Mr LAST: I take the interjection from the member for Beaudesert: the Scenic Rim has also developed that market using its own logo. Of more concern to me at the present time is the decision by the Palaszczuk Labor government to award a tender to Parmalat for the supply of milk to hospitals within the Cairns and Hinterland Health and Hospital Service district. The Premier should come into this place and explain how Labor's buy Queensland first policy applies to her government's decision to dump Atherton Tableland produced milk for Cairns and other FNQ hospitals and hand contracts to a factory more than 1,600 kilometres away.

What this decision has done is jeopardise the local dairy industry centred on the Malanda milk factory. Two weeks ago the Premier announced her government will give local suppliers within a radius of 125 kilometres of where goods and workers are needed a 30 per cent weighting in awarding contracts. Does that mean the Malanda milk factory and its local dairy farmers will get the supply contract because Parmalat's main factory is more than 1,600 kilometres away in Brisbane? It is a simple question the Premier and the health minister need to answer. I know the member for Surfers Paradise raised this issue during budget estimates with the health minister, and we are still waiting on a response, as are the 40 dairy farmers on the Atherton Tablelands who supply the Malanda milk factory.

I have been in contact with the federal department of agriculture and there are no plans afoot to establish a sustainable gross margin for producing milk that can be uniformly applied across Australia.

Mr Knuth interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! Member for Dalrymple, you have had a really good go. The member for Burdekin is not taking your interjections so it might be time to be a little quieter.

Mr LAST: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The attempt to establish a sustainable gross margin potentially places at risk the entire dairy industry in Queensland with major processors likely to import even more milk sourced at cheaper prices from the southern states.

This reaffirms my position that any attempt to establish a sustainable gross margin for producing milk needs to be nationally driven and applied. The LNP is committed to working with the federal government to ensure our dairy farmers receive a fair price for their milk and that the industry is supported with appropriate growth strategies in place. The marketing practices of national companies such as Coles and Woolworths should be the primary focus of attention with a view to putting a stop to this ridiculous \$1-a-litre price war.

In response to a comment made by the member for Dalrymple, I can say that I have contacted Coles and Woolworths regarding this price war and received a positive response from one of those companies that they would investigate ceasing that ridiculous practice of discounting the price of milk. There is some light at the end of the tunnel, but it needs to be driven at the federal level through trade practices having regard to what they are doing in the market.

I would like to see a return to the days when Queensland dairy farmers could supply enough milk to meet the demands of this state, and the LNP is committed to working with our dairy farmers to put in place a strategy to achieve this goal. I am pleased tonight to hear the minister announce that \$1 million will be committed by the government to assist the industry. That is exactly where the money should go: back to the industry which is best suited and best placed to utilise that money to develop logos and local markets. That certainly mirrors the course of action that the LNP was taking. What I do not want to do is implement legislation that will impose obstacles and more red tape for our dairy farmers. Our job should be to facilitate growth in the industry and provide a vision that will see our dairy industry grow and prosper. Unfortunately, this bill before the House falls a long way short of meeting that requirement.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (8.13 pm): I rise to speak to the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016. The bill was introduced into the parliament with a lot of passion from the member for Dalrymple. There has been a lot of lobbying and media attention in the community regarding the price of supermarket milk, especially the \$1-a-litre milk in large chains. We need to have a sustainable milk price at the farm gate because our dairy farmers are doing it tough and are under extreme economic pressure.

This bill proposes to establish a scheme for the voluntary use of a series of fair milk price logos for fresh drinking milk. It is intended by the bill that the introduction of the logo labelling will influence customer behaviour when purchasing milk. The logo will inform customers of the region of the milk and that the supplier of the raw milk was paid a sustainable price for their farmgate produce.

Small producers in regional areas processing milk from their region are already placing logos on their milk, so people can already see where the milk is coming from. The bill also has provisions for the minister to set a sustainable price for farmgate milk. The appointed minister will set a price for the raw milk by using the data supplied by the Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme.

The committee found that the cost of producing milk within Queensland can vary depending on the region of the state the producer is farming in. The data will be collated from the three separate dairy-producing areas set out in the bill with a set payment price for each of the three regions.

Australia is a milk exporter, making our milk prices sensitive to not just local production conditions but also worldwide fluctuations. There are potential problems for Queensland milk producers being locked into pricing that is set and gazetted by the minister. Farmers will not be able to negotiate and could be at a disadvantage to deals that could be struck with producers from other states.

Not all milk produced is processed into drinking milk. There are other products including yoghurt, custard and ice-cream, as the committee observed while visiting Parmalat in South Brisbane. Milk processed at a large factory like Parmalat would be difficult to follow through the processing plant to its end product. At the Parmalat factory we saw milk arriving at the factory in tankers and transferred into large vats. The milk came from not just Queensland but also northern New South Wales. The milk from the regions is mixed in the vats so there are no distinct milk pools. The milk is then sent to different areas of the factory. It was diverted into other products such as ice-cream, yoghurt and custard, and some of it was turned into bottled milk.

The processing plant in Rockhampton processes about 20 million litres of milk from Central Queensland. The remainder of milk to make up 90 million litres comes from outside the region. During the summer months Queensland cannot produce enough milk to keep up with demand so we will be buying in milk from other places as well.

The sentiments of the bill are sound, but its application would be flawed and the bill needs amending. I applaud the package announced by the minister. This will go a long way to supporting the milk industry. I cannot support the bill in its present form.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (8.18 pm): I rise to speak to the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016 as the deputy chair of the Agriculture and Environment Committee. The bill was introduced into the House by the member for Dalrymple, Mr Shane Knuth, with the intention that milk containers would be labelled with a fair milk price logo. Whilst the intention of the bill is relatively easy to understand, the practicality of implementing such a scheme is fraught with difficulties as the committee process discovered. The scheme would see the minister set what would supposedly be a fair price per litre paid to the dairy farmer by the processor across the three regions of the state based on data supplied by the Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme.

This sounds simple but it is not. Some small processors, such as Maleny Dairies, are already doing this and are able to because they source all their milk locally and can guarantee the milk that is in their vat has all been paid what they and the producer deem to be a fair price. Larger processors, such as Parmalat, source milk from a much wider area, including the southern states, and all milk is delivered to the plant and combined in the same vats making it impossible to segregate what region the milk is sourced from or even what state it comes from.

Whilst processors in Queensland largely produce drinking milk, other products such as custard, yoghurt and ice-cream are also manufactured in the state. The department provided data relating to raw milk prices in other states as well as Queensland and this shows a wide range in prices in the years up to 2016, which were the figures the committee was given. Whilst Queensland prices for 2015-16 average 58 cents a litre, in the Riverina region of New South Wales and northern Victoria prices average 44 cents and 47 cents per litre for the same period. Whilst the cost of producing milk is cheaper in the southern states, the cost to freight milk from the Riverina is 15 cents a litre, effectively putting a cap on prices that are paid in Queensland.

The decline in the number of dairy farmers in Queensland has been happening over a number of years and cannot be linked to one individual reason. There were 1,500 dairy producers in 2000 and that is down to approximately 425 producers today. The rising costs of production—such as electricity, labour and fodder, particularly during the prolonged drought conditions—have all contributed to farmers exiting the industry. We have also seen an emergence of large-scale dairy production where these farms are run along the lines of a feedlot combined with a dairy.

Accessing accurate and up-to-date data proved to be a challenge to the committee during the process. The committee was reliant on data supplied by the Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme which conducts an annual voluntary questionnaire regarding costs, efficiency and profitability. There were questions raised throughout the committee hearings regarding the accuracy of the data provided by QDAS. This was concerning, since QDAS would be the body advising the minister on what the fair and sustainable milk price would be. The committee heard that the data was not a statistically representative sample of the industry, with some areas having very low reporting levels. Central Queensland was a particular example of this, with only one producer participating in the survey. When you consider that this is the data the minister would rely upon to set the fair and sustainable milk price and there is no provision in this proposed legislation to appeal the minister's decision, this was very concerning to the committee indeed.

In addition to these concerns, there are conflicts with the Constitution, specifically section 92 of the Constitution which aims to create a free-trading area within the borders of the Commonwealth of Australia. The practical effect of this section is that the High Court will hold any law, whether originating from the Commonwealth or a state government, invalid to the extent that it seeks to impose border

duties or discriminatory fees or charges. The court will also disallow non-fiscal controls on interstate trade which seeks to protect a state's domestic industry from competition elsewhere in the Commonwealth. It was because of these issues that the committee was unable to recommend that the bill be passed. The committee did recommend that the minister work with the industry to investigate the potential for an industry operated marketing and labelling scheme and to work with other states and federal counterparts to increase the sustainability of the dairy industry.

Really, the biggest threat that I can see to the dairy industry in this state is the total lack of support from the Palaszczuk Labor government and its ministers who seem to do all in their power not to support our dairy industry. I am certainly not opposed to voluntary labelling if that prompts consumers to buy Queensland milk, but what about the impact of soaring power bills as a result of this government's management and gross mismanagement of electricity—loading the generators up with debt and expecting farmers and ordinary Queenslanders to pay? What about the decision of this government to turn its back on local producers for the milk supply contract for the Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service, including the Cairns Hospital? This was a pathetic decision and flew in the face of the Palaszczuk government's buy local policy. It seems the Palaszczuk government and the health minister, Cameron Dick, have been forced into an embarrassing backdown on their decision to cancel the supply contract with the local Tableland Milk factory at Malanda and award the contract to Parmalat based in Brisbane—1,700 kilometres south. It would be helpful during this debate to have the Premier, the health minister or the agriculture minister confirm to the Tableland dairy farmers who supply the Malanda factory that their milk will continue to be used for the Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service, including the Cairns Hospital.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (8.25 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate concerning the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016. The bill provides for the establishment of logos on milk containers indicating the region where the milk was produced, that a fair price be paid to milk producers, that a mechanism for setting prices be set and that offences be created in relation to the misuse of logos.

Subsequent to the first reading speech by the member for Dalrymple on 13 October 2016, the bill was referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee for review. In its report, the committee made three recommendations: firstly, that the bill not be passed; secondly, that the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries direct his department to investigate options for supporting the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation to devise and operate an industry operated marketing scheme, potentially including fair milk price logos; and, thirdly, that the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries consult with his counterparts in other states and territories and with the Commonwealth Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources regarding the institution of similar schemes in order to increase the sustainability of the Australian dairy industry as a whole.

The committee found that if the bill was adopted it would likely be subject to legal challenges, including a High Court challenge for breaching section 92 of the Constitution which guarantees free trade between the states. The committee also found that, because of the blending that occurs at major milk processors, it would be almost impossible for processors to separate out milk from particular regions, another requirement of the labelling scheme. As a result, any logo scheme would have no effect on the majority of dairy farmers in Queensland who supply the major processors. Finally, the committee found the bill would require the government to become reinvolved in the state's dairy industry which it left in 2000 when the industry was deregulated.

The committee is aware that Queensland dairy farmers have consistently received the highest farmgate prices in Australia since 2000, but it also found that there was a significant power imbalance between dairy farmers and milk processors and warned that some processor contracts with dairy farmers may well be in breach of Australian consumer law. While the committee was unable to recommend that the bill be adopted, the committee did find that there was merit in providing marketing assistance to the industry. As such, I was very pleased to hear the announcement by the Minister for Agriculture and Fisheries tonight of an assistance package in that regard.

Since 2000 the number of Queensland dairy farmers has declined from 1,500 to about 430 and Queensland has gone from being a net exporter of milk to an importer, with around 25 per cent of the milk used in Queensland now sourced from interstate. Given that the dairy industry was a bigger employer than many other types of agricultural industries and given dairy farms are generally the most productive use of the land they are sited on, it is in the state's interests to support the dairy industry. The committee recommended that the state government assist the Dairyfarmers' Organisation by running a marketing scheme.

The Australian dairy industry is the third largest agricultural industry in Australia after the beef and wheat industries. The manufacturing sector of the Australian dairy industry is diverse and includes farmer owned cooperatives and public, private and multinational companies. Prior to 2000 the supply and price of milk was regulated by a complex combination of federal and state policies and legislation. In most states the dairy authorities control the distribution, sourcing and pricing of milk. In Queensland the dairy industry was administered through the Dairy Industry Act 1989, which provided for the management of market milk supply and the establishment of the Queensland Dairy Industry Authority, the QDIA. In the regulated market it was possible for the price of market milk and manufacturing milk to be quite disconnected, with the former reacting to domestic conditions and government preferences and the latter to global commodity prices. However, on 1 July 2000 all Australian states repealed legislation governing the dairy industry.

The impact of dairy deregulation at a farm level varied across Australia. A number of farmers took advantage of the exit payments offered by the Dairy Industry Adjustment Program scheme to leave the industry. The \$1.74 billion compensation scheme was the largest package ever provided to an agricultural industry to assist with structural adjustment pressures. Until deregulation, dairy farmers who sold milk as market milk received substantially higher farmgate prices than the average price paid for manufactured milk even though there was little distinction between the products.

With no legislative control over milk prices, processor companies now pay farmers for their milk. The price farmers receive varies greatly across states and reflects how dairy products are produced in those markets. For example, in southern states farmers receive a price which incorporates both drinking and manufactured milk while in Queensland producers mainly produce drinking milk and rely on commercial contracts with processors.

While the proposed labelling scheme in the bill is well intentioned, the fact is that most packaged fresh milk in Queensland is blended milk from not only different producers but different areas and, in some cases, different states. This could leave the legislation vulnerable to future legal challenge on constitutional grounds. This is because the scheme seeks to grant a competitive advantage to Queensland producers not available to interstate producers whose milk is supplied here in Queensland. The fact that the proposed labelling scheme is voluntary in Queensland does not avoid this legal complexity.

In Queensland there are some producers that are already producing labelled milk such as Maleny milk. In some cases they even indicate the type of cow that the milk comes from such as Maleny guernsey milk. These companies are proving that they have a market advantage on the basis they offer a quality local product and it is well known that they provide farmers with a fair price. This includes paying a fair price for the milk they receive from farmers and they manage to do this without any logo legislation.

In my teenage years I did work on dairy farms. I know how important the dairy industry is to state regional economies and I know what a unique lifestyle it offers families. For this reason I fully support the recommendation of the committee that the government should assist the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation, or a similar body, to run a marketing scheme to assist consumers make better informed decisions about the milk they purchase. I believe this is the best option for the Queensland dairy industry.

In closing, I would like to thank my fellow committee members of the Agriculture and Environment Committee. I would like to thank the secretariat. I would like to thank the submitters, particularly the dairy farmers and the Dairyfarmers' Organisation, that took the time to make submissions to the committee. Unfortunately, I cannot support the bill in its present form.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (8.34 pm): I am the proud son of a dairy farmer. My dad, his dad and for a time my mother's dad—before he became a coalminer—were dairy farmers. Milking cows, working on the farm, feeding calves and cleaning the dairy were activities that constituted daily work experience for me from the age of about six until I left home.

I meet with many of our dairy farmers in the Beaudesert electorate on a regular basis. I know how hard they work. Smaller farms in our region might have only one person working on them, meaning no holidays, seven days a week work, milking twice a day in the morning and night and hard work fencing, planting, fixing machinery, branding or myriad other jobs in between. On freezing cold mornings and on 40-degree afternoons the milking goes on. Through cold and flu and other ailments I saw my father carry on and get the job done because that is what needed to be done with no sick leave and quite often nobody else to take his place. Larger operations of course have people employed to work on farms, but the flip side to this is that these dairy farmers often take on other businesses or off-farm

employment to keep the money flowing. My dad left the industry in 2001 after a year of working for no profit. Our home town now has very few dairies left, although the Scenic Rim remains one of the largest, if not the largest, dairying areas in all of Queensland.

I have the greatest amount of respect for all the hard work that our dairy farmers do. I learnt how to get my hands dirty, walk knee deep in cow waste and work hard on the farm. In my view it is a job like no other. Our dairy farmers are, to borrow a phrase, 'legen-dairy'. That is why it makes me angry to see how our dairy farmers are treated. It makes me angry to see the blatant abuse of market power by retailers who hold our dairy farmers over a barrel. The \$1-a-litre milk price is killing the livelihoods of farmers and, sadly, in some cases leads to terrible situations where farmers take their own lives—entrapped by debt and cruel predatory practices by processors and retailers.

All of us in this place should do everything we can to support farmers—all farmers. I have spoken so many times in this place about the impact of energy prices on our farms. In government we got Energex and Powerlink spending under control to stop the massive spikes in network charges that make up about half of every bill. We have announced that we will reinstate the agriculture and energy council to get farmers back to the table when talking about energy because energy prices are the major issue facing all rural industries and yet this government is rushing headlong towards policies that will only make that matter worse.

The LNP has defended farmers' rights to manage their own vegetation, which is so important for all rural landholders and farmers. We want our farmers to be able to make a living. For my part, I want our government and our community to buy from our local farmers wherever possible. In 2014 I spoke in this place on a bill very similar to that before us today. In that debate I clearly stated that what dairy farmers needed was to be paid more for their milk. It is the same now as it was in 2014. Let's look at how this bill proposes to implement a fair milk mark.

The mark will be implemented on a voluntary basis by processors. An assessment determining the fair price for milk would need to be developed taking into account all the different types of farms across three designated regions. A design for the mark would need to be developed and the mark itself would need to be promoted throughout the state to ensure that consumers know what the milk mark means. All of this costs money, both to get things set up at first and also on an ongoing basis to set the fair milk price. No doubt these costs will be passed on to farmers that supply the milk to processors.

Will this scheme guarantee a better price for dairy farmers' milk? No. If adopted, will it cost farmers? Yes. Dairy farmers need to be paid more for their milk but the major problem here is the 75 per cent to 80 per cent concentration of retail power held by the retailers and their abuse of market power in dealing with milk processors and, by extension, farmers. Does anybody seriously think that retailers who have withstood six years of public pressure, government pressure and farmer pressure to abolish the \$1-a-litre milk are going to all of a sudden turn around and agree to implement a fair milk mark being placed on their products with higher prices being paid to farmers on a voluntary basis? They could be doing this already if they wanted to. The bill really does not change anything because the fair milk mark will be a voluntary scheme.

What we need to do is break the power of retailers, both by getting our competition laws right—and the ACCC with teeth—and also by changing consumer behaviour and attitudes towards products like the \$1-a-litre milk. Most of these issues need to be dealt with in the Commonwealth sphere, but we can all get behind the idea of supporting our local farmers. In my electorate, an area that encompasses over 10 per cent of Queensland dairies and about 15 per cent of total milk production in Queensland, we have a very prominent local brand of milk that is produced locally with local cows and is then processed, bottled and delivered directly from the farm to the shop.

People know it is a local brand that is locally processed and owned by locals. It is marketed as the choice to make to support a couple of local farming families. Similarly, there are various other brands and processors around the state who are widely known to be local family brands or that support farmers from particular regions. They cost more than the \$1-a-litre milk, but people support these brands because of the position they have taken in the market to support farmers. In effect, this is a fair milk mark in action through the development of local brands produced with local milk. This is being done voluntarily. They did it without a piece of legislation and it is being done without the minister determining what the fair price for milk is, which of course is going to vary from region to region and farm to farm. In a practical sense, this bill will do nothing to increase the price paid to farmers, and in fact it offers false hope to dairy farmers. I know that many dairy farmers are looking for assistance of any type, and I am always looking to work with farmers and their representative bodies to address issues they have, but we also need to be honest with people.

I have considered deeply over a long period of time whether this bill or an amended version of the bill—where the mechanism for the government to determine what is a fair price for milk is removed—could be implemented by the industry itself. If the dairy industry sees the value in implementing such a measure, they could no doubt implement the fair milk mark. It does not require an act of parliament. The bill itself sets up the voluntary nature of the logo, and in fact the industry adopting this itself provides a much more flexible approach because the industry can adopt the fair milk mark and other parts of the scheme in a fast, efficient and flexible manner. As most farmers appreciate, involving the government in anything related to agriculture—while starting well intentioned—can quite often lead to unintended consequences and unwanted intrusion into the operation of farms, not to mention higher costs of doing business.

All that is needed for the industry to do this without any legislation is processors who are willing to put the mark on their products, which is the same scenario that would be faced by the industry if this bill became law. I would say to all farmers, the industry body and processors that, if you see the value in the fair milk mark, get together, develop the fair milk mark, set up the process for determining the fair milk price and get your processors on board to get it on the milk. Take it to the marketplace of all Queensland consumers to bring what dairy farmers need: dairy farmers being paid more for their milk.

In closing, I note the announcement from the minister about \$550,000 over three years being provided to the QDO for the implementation or development of a fair milk mark. Obviously, that sort of commitment is not something that the opposition is able to deliver; however, it is in line with discussions I have had with QDO officials in relation to the voluntary nature of the scheme, and I am pleased that the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation has had success in this endeavour dealing with the government.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (8.43 pm): I rise to speak on the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill. On Australia Day 2011, Coles began selling \$1-a-litre milk as a marketing strategy to increase their market share of milk sales. This began a milk price war between Australia's two major retailers, Coles and Woolworths. The price war also led to smaller grocery chains introducing \$1-a-litre milk to remain competitive. This bill seeks to establish an act to provide for the establishment of logos for containers of fresh milk produced in particular regions for which fair prices have been paid to dairy farmers, provides a mechanism for setting fair prices and details offences for particular conduct in relation to those milk logos.

In 2000 the national dairy industry was deregulated, and all state and federal legislation that regulated milk prices was rescinded. Since deregulation, approximately 1,115 Queensland dairy farmers have exited the industry, according to the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation, leaving approximately 430 dairy farmers. Regrettably, only 28 per cent of dairy producers operating in the year 2000 are operating today. Currently, an average of 70 dairy farmers leave the industry each year. If this continues, there will be no fresh milk production in Queensland by 2028. As a result of privatising the Queensland power industry and the current Labor government's obsession with their 50 per cent renewable energy targets, significant increases in electricity and grain costs have made life even more difficult for Queensland dairy farmers. In 2014-15 the average price paid for milk was 63.2 cents per litre. The total cash cost of production in Queensland for the same period was 59.4 cents per litre, which means that the farmers out there were making 3.8 cents per litre.

Our farmers have spent a lot of money on building infrastructure to produce milk to a standard required by the processors. On current estimates they have spent \$1.5 billion. Just imagine the social and economic impacts if there were no fresh milk production in Queensland: the processing plants and transport companies would shut down, employees would lose their jobs, communities would suffer severe flow-on effects and more than 3,000 Queenslanders would be put at risk. The economic loss to Queensland would amount to about \$250 million per farm gate, approximately \$400 million at the factory gate and approximately \$700 million in retail sales. They are staggering numbers.

It is my understanding from reading the explanatory notes and the bill that the establishment of logos for containers of fresh milk produced in particular regions would advise Queensland consumers that a price which achieves a sustainable gross margin for producing that milk has been paid to the dairy farmer who produced the milk. I also understand that the logo is a voluntary market mechanism which processors can choose to incorporate into existing milk labels for milk that meets the eligibility criteria for that use.

I am not sure why this is a voluntary course of action. I would think that every fair-minded Queenslanders would want our long-suffering dairy farmers to be paid a fair price for their milk, so why not make it a mandatory measure so that consumers can make an informed decision as to whether they purchase a container of milk which does not bear a label, thereby letting them know that the poor

old farmer who produced that particular container of milk was probably ripped off at the farm gate. This bill requires the fair milk price logo to identify the region in which the milk was produced, as the costs of production vary from region to region. It is good for the consumer to know they are supporting their local dairy farming industry.

Section 5 of the bill states that for each Queensland dairy region there is to be a sustainable gross margin for producing a litre of fresh milk in that region. The sustainable gross margin must be decided by the minister and stated in a milk price gazette notice. In deciding the sustainable gross margin the minister must: consult with dairy farmers across the Queensland dairy region and organisations representing the interests of dairy farmers in the region; consider the costs and margins of producing fresh milk for a typical dairy farmer in the region; and also consider how best to encourage the sustainable production of fresh milk and the use of best farming practices and innovation in fresh milk production. The minister must publish a milk price gazette notice at least twice during each year.

That all sounds fine, but again I ask: why don't we make this mandatory? I was very fortunate to be born on a dairy farm like the member for Beaudesert and a few other people in this House I have heard speak tonight, but what I have heard is political bureaucracy gone mad. Think about my earlier comments: how many dairy farmers have been pushed out of the industry? How many dairy farmers are there right now? Where are we going to get milk in the future and everything that flows from milk? I know that the Hoppers up in Maleny are doing a great job, but they are marketing their brand and getting it into all the little markets in the area and they are doing pretty well. I think that state and federal governments have to do better.

We should stand up to them. We support overseas markets and all of the people who come to this country, but we are not looking after our own people. It is about time governments put people before politics. It is about time we put the interests of Queenslanders first, and dairy farmers are the ones we should be looking after. My grandfather was a dairy farmer. My father was a dairy farmer. I was born on a dairy farm. My father was the local milkman in Mount Morgan—one of the biggest Labor towns in this country—when the Labor Party had a heart and when it stood up for workers and country people—but not today: it is just after big business like Cross River Rail here in town.

The government only cares about Brisbane. It does not care about the rest of the state. It does not care about farmers. I am not too sure about those in the opposition anymore. I think the National Party is dead and gone. It is still present in Canberra, but nobody here is representing its interests, as they should be. If they did, they would be voting in favour of this bill tonight. At least that would show that we care, that we have a heart and that we are interested in doing something for an industry that is on its knees.

In the 2020s, when this industry is gone, what will members think about their kids then and the future of this great state? Milk is a product that will be necessary for a very long time. Members of this House who are a little older may remember when we used to give milk to kids at school. That became a bad idea for some reason. Maybe we should look at that again. Maybe we should subsidise the dairy industry. Maybe we should look at doing a whole lot of things that we did in the past.

What I see in this House is a bunch of bureaucrats who have now lost their way. They do not know what happens outside South-East Queensland. We have to think of all Queenslanders, be they in North Queensland or Western Queensland—every part of this state. Tonight members have a chance to back dairy farmers. I think the Katter party has done a good job. We keep hearing, 'This bill does not fit. It is just not right.' That is all we hear in relation to any bill that does not meet the standard or the direction of the two major parties. They are looking after big business. They are looking after Woolworths and Coles. They do not care about the rest.

Everything that happens in this House is about the two major political parties. That is why the minor parties are doing extremely well in this state and across the country. There is a wave of change coming and it will run on the back of the taxi industry, the dairy industry, and pubs and clubs. The change is coming and I do not think the major parties recognise it. If they do not change their ways soon, they will be overrun. That wave is coming and it will take them out. Tonight it is a wave of milk that will hit them. A couple of weeks ago it was a wave of taxis. Next it will be a wave of pubs and clubs, with the scanning machines and what the government has done to that industry. They do not like it either. Government members should be ready for it. It is coming. If they are asleep at the wheel they will run off the road and crash or run into something. Tonight government members can make a difference. They can stand up for an industry that they should stand up for.

We can make a difference here tonight by amending this bill to make it a little better. The government and the opposition have a lot of staff support, yet they have the hide to say, 'Your bill is not good enough.' Why did they not try to help the Katter party to change the bill earlier in the process?

'No, we'll just let it go to parliament. We'll do them over like we always do.' Queenslanders are sick of it. I am sick of it. I am sure that the Katter party is getting sick of it. Let us just wait and see what happens. I am looking forward to an election. It will be a lot of fun.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (8.52 pm): I oppose the Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016. I will start by telling members what I am sick of. I am sick of going through a committee inquiry process, carefully considering issues, recognising that there are deep concerns for the dairy industry, putting forward recommendations that the committee thinks will achieve what the bill was trying to achieve but in a way that will not cause significant problems and seeing that people are too lazy to read the report and too lazy to get their heads around the issues but instead come in here and peddle a load of populist rot such as we have just heard.

This bill is well intentioned. It seeks to create a sustainable dairy industry. That is an objective that I support; however, this bill has many issues that make it impossible to support. I thank the member for introducing this private member's bill. This is a very important issue, and the advocacy shown by the member for Dalrymple and the member for Mount Isa on this issue should be acknowledged and respected.

There are many sound reasons why our community should want a sustainable dairy industry beyond the reason of providing a valuable and essential food source for our community. The industry has a long history in many areas, contributing much to our local culture. It creates significant employment and it has the potential to create—and it has actually created—tourism benefits.

The stresses that people in the industry face were extremely evident throughout the hearings. There can be no doubt that there are significant power imbalances affecting the dairy industry that interfere in the functioning of an efficient and effective market. The bill sought to improve consumer information by sending a signal to consumers that a particular brand of milk had come from a dairy farmer who had been paid a fair price. Any student of microeconomics will know that information, preferably perfect information, is a key feature of an efficiently functioning market. While good information will impact on consumer choices, this bill sought to do more than just place information before the consumer.

The key issue with this bill was that it sought to create a mechanism for setting a farmgate price for milk. This mechanism required the minister to set the price using Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme data. The potential for political pressure, lobbying and interference inherent in having a minister set prices is very real, regardless of what data might be used by that minister to set the price. The Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme is designed to give dairy farmers information that assists in driving efficiency in production. It is a voluntary scheme. The voluntary nature of the scheme makes the data it generates inappropriate for use in the manner suggested by the bill.

The concept of a fair price would also be very difficult to determine for anyone. Dairy farms are businesses and supposedly subject to business investment decisions—that is, an individual or a corporation makes decisions about risk and rate of return. A minister being asked to determine a fair price would presumably be attempting to make a universal decision on the rate of return for investors in the dairy industry. Clearly, the rate of return required is going to vary greatly amongst many people and corporations that invest in this industry.

Returning to the role of information driving consumer behaviour, there can be no doubt that good information can drive consumer behaviour. We have numerous examples of logos being used effectively to do just this. Dolphin-friendly tuna and Heart Foundation ticks are great examples of this. Both of these examples and others I could name do not just put a logo on a product; they are also supported by a range of processes based on social and behavioural marketing techniques that seek to build awareness of the benefits of changing the behaviour and create confidence that what the logo promises will actually be delivered.

The committee found during the inquiry that many companies are already using branding to promote their product and create a competitive advantage. These businesses promote their product as being a quality local product that is produced by treating farmers, animals and the environment well. That is what led the committee to make the second recommendation of this report. We were actually trying to do something to assist the dairy industry. I thank the committee members for engaging in good discussion around that and coming up with a good recommendation.

There is scope to create a labelling scheme that changes consumer behaviour based on a set of criteria without the mechanism of setting a price. The committee recognised that this approach would take resources to be established and ideally would need to be driven by an organisation that is capable of implementing such a scheme. The committee felt that the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation was well suited to fulfil this role.

There can be no doubt that the dairy industry does not have a market that is delivering sustainable outcomes for farmers. This certainly needs to be addressed, but the possible mechanisms to do this sit well beyond the scope of this bill. While this bill is a genuine attempt to support the industry to remain sustainable, the mechanisms contained in the bill are problematic for reasons already outlined. The committee has made some alternative suggestions, and I am extremely pleased with the announcements of the minister tonight. I acknowledge that the minister has taken our recommendation on board and has done the hard policy work to come up with some good policy initiatives. I also acknowledge and congratulate Katter's Australian Party for their bill introduced to the House and for their strong advocacy in this area. The bill has created good policy discussions and actions towards achieving sustainability in the dairy industry. I thank the secretariat, the submitters and the committee members.

As I said, I am extremely pleased with the announcement by the minister in relation to recommendation 2. I am most pleased for the individuals and families in the dairy industry. I hope this sends a strong message that the Palaszczuk government does support the industry.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (8.58 pm): I will start my contribution by reading the chair's foreword to the committee report. It states—

It is difficult to escape the fact that dairy farmers in Australia, and particularly in Queensland, are labouring under tremendous economic pressures. Certainly, anyone sitting through the hearings conducted by the committee would be plainly aware that there are significant power imbalances affecting the functioning of the dairy market.

That is an excellent statement and a good summary to start off with. Everyone acknowledges that there are enormous pressures on this industry. Everyone seems to have a great deal of sympathy for that. The big question is: what do you do with that sympathy and how do you convert that into action that will have some meaningful outcome for these people who are desperate for some help and looking to us for help? The committee report continues—

... 'fair' price determinations for milk farm gate prices, as the Bill proposes. That role of government ceased with deregulation of the dairy industry back in 2000.

Be that as it may, that is an observation, but we are policymakers. We need to acknowledge that, despite what happened with decisions of the past, it is in a diabolical state now and the number of dairy farmers left is diminishing. I do not know the dairy industry. I did not grow up in it and I do not know it intimately, but I know that when I drive around dairy regions such as Gympie and the Atherton Tablelands I do not see any new cattle yards and I do not see a newly built big shed with the new Toyota in it. They are all run down. The parents of a very good friend of mine sold up years ago because they just could not make money out of it at Nanango. I see an industry in decline everywhere. If I was the son of dairy farmers trying to buy out that farm, I could not see the bank lending me the money. I think it would almost be foolish to borrow the money from the bank to buy a business in a market that is declining, so I see an industry with no future.

As policymakers we have to ask: does this industry have a future? Do we want fresh milk? Do we want farmers on the Atherton Tablelands, Ipswich and Gympie? Given the trend, if we do not do something they are not going to be there. At some point we have to decide that the government needs to intervene and do something. We have tried to do something practical here and be as discrete as possible because everyone finds government intervention abhorrent these days. People say, 'There's got to be a free market and we can't touch any of it. Let the market prevail.' At some point we have to challenge these policies. We do not have to go right to the other end of the spectrum, but perhaps in some cases we have to do something.

Sometimes we cannot just go back to farmers and say, 'You sort it out yourselves. Why don't you just do a little scheme and we'll try and pat you on the back as you do it?' No, we have to be more proactive than that. I would say that, given these circumstances, we have to be a hell of a lot more proactive than that. We should not just be trying to encourage people and be really careful because we do not want to interfere too much. Small milk processors are doing their own boutique thing right now. Everyone has said that tonight, but it is not working. The industry is still declining, so it is not enough. That is why the QDO unequivocally said in the hearings, 'That is not enough. We acknowledge that, but it's not going to do the job.' Here is something that might help. It is not great and it is not a solution, but it might help. We are asking—we are begging—for this parliament to help us.

I turn now to the issue of collective bargaining. I heard someone say before that there have been a lot of things that hurt the industry. Collective bargaining is deregulated now. There are some co-ops, but mostly there are individual processors but there is an imbalance in market power. It happens everywhere. Everyone talks about Coles and Woolworths and, yes, that is the problem, but who is going to tell me that they are going to fix that? Are we going to fix that? If not, let us find something else to do. Here is something else we can do, because I would love to fix Coles and Woolworths but that does not seem to be happening. Do not try and deflect the problem down to Canberra and say that it should be fixed there.

As the member for Dalrymple mentioned, when the precursor to this bill came in during the last parliament the then minister said, 'This is all good. You're a bit silly, KAP, and you don't understand things well, but leave it to the grown-ups. We'll go down to Canberra and sort all this out.' The member for Dalrymple brought that up in the hearings and asked the QDO whether anything transpired from that. Did they go down to Canberra with the QDO to try and sort it out? They said, 'No, nothing.' Everyone can turn up at the protests—and I saw members from both parties at the dairy protest—and stand arm in arm with them and say, 'We're going to help you.' Do not tell them that you are going to help them and then do nothing. If you do not tell them, that is fine, but do not tell them that you will and stand out there protesting with them but then do nothing. When you are given an opportunity to help them, you help them.

Yes, this has some risks. Yes, the QDAS data may not be as robust as we think it is, but it will still do the job. It is still something. The alternative is to do nothing and hope that some of these boutique processors can still stay alive. There is an option here given the alternative that this whole industry could collapse in the future. We are already 180 million litres short per annum in Queensland of producing our own milk—that never used to be the case—but there is nothing to stop that from going down to zero in the future because we are losing competitiveness. I challenge anyone to go to the dairy regions and pick some areas that are going really well and show me some farms where it is viable and there is a strong future. I wish there was, but there is not.

I want to zero in on the DAF officers who gave evidence to this committee. Let me say—and I am being kind—that it was very disappointing. By the time they had finished, some of us were really confused because, judging by the summary they gave, the industry looked pretty good. I was pretty cranky and I said, 'This is your one opportunity to talk to politicians about the health of the state of the industry. Who really cares if it is good or bad, but just tell us how it is.' Nothing groundtruthed from what they said compared to what I see on the ground. I am no expert, but from the information they were giving I would almost go out and buy a dairy farm. They were saying that things are good in terms of production. By all accounts it is in a terrible state, and that is all we want—good, frank information from them. I cast a very harsh judgement on those DAF officers who really were not giving a clear picture in terms of the state of the industry when there was a great opportunity for them to do that. At least the committee chair and the committee itself came together to say that there are big problems, but we certainly were not given that impression from the presentation by the DAF officers.

Everyone seems to be in favour of voluntary labelling, but there is a huge step of having government control—exactly what the QDO endorsed in the hearings. It said that the labelling was good but that the government needs to do it and lead it. That was the statement that was made. Everyone agrees with the concept. People say, 'We all want it, but, no, the government can't do it.' It runs deeper than that. It is often unsaid in this place, but the reality is that it is a political thing. This bill has been presented from the crossbench and therefore it will not be supported. That is tragic for those dairy farmers. I did not meet one who did not support this bill. If I knew nothing about government policy, I would go to the QDO and say, 'Does this sound good? You guys should be a pretty good arbiter of what works and what doesn't.' It said unequivocally in the report, 'This is a good thing. This is what we need.' It said that last time when a similar bill was brought in during the last parliament and it said that again this time. No-one in this House will be able to dispute that because that is what happened and that is the reality. It is unfortunate that we have come to this position and I think it reflects badly on this parliament that we cannot do something more than we are for those dairy farmers.

I want to take up something the member for Burdekin said earlier to which I take exception. There have been some good contributions and respectful contributions made here tonight, except from the member for Burdekin who said that this was a stunt. Do you know what? If it were your bill, member for Burdekin, great, and I would back it—like we do all the time—but you love criticising when we get up here and try something. Guess what happened tonight? Some \$550,000 has come out for the dairy industry. Guess what would have happened if you sat there and did nothing? Nothing! At least we generated a response. At least we are having a go, and you did nothing but all you do is criticise.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! One moment, member for Mount Isa. I appreciate that this is something that you feel very passionately about, but all comments in this House must be directed through the chair and members should not be arguing with each other across the chamber.

Mr KATTER: My apologies, Madam Deputy Speaker. I have said enough. Clearly I am quite angry. I can accept criticism of the bill itself, but do not say that we are coming in here to play games because we have always tried to do things working with both sides and we have done this in the best interests of dairy farmers. There are people dying out there and, if the best you can contribute is saying that we are playing pranks, well shame on you!

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Dalrymple, I want to acknowledge in the gallery the deputy principal and students from Kenmore State High School in the electorate of Moggill.

Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (9.08 pm), in reply: I introduced the fair milk mark bill in 2013 and it was debated in 2014 and we heard the same nonsense then that we have heard tonight. It was said that there were problems with electricity. Yes, there are problems with electricity for dairy farmers but there are problems because they are not paid a fair price. Dairy farmers are not provided with a sustainable price to produce a litre of milk. Those against the bill use the spiel of 'look at overseas markets'. We have heard that before too. We have also heard that it is a federal problem, the sky will fall in or it is flawed legislation. I introduced that legislation back in 2013. It was debated in 2014. When I tabled that bill there were 540 dairy farmers. There are now 430. Since that night many have gone and the dairy industry is still going down, down. I will read what the previous agriculture minister, Dr John McVeigh, said—

I support the view that there is a lack of transparency in the retail marketing of milk and that the current dollar a litre for drinking milk campaigns, whilst benefitting consumers, are causing difficult outcomes for farmers.

...

The Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee's recommendations included a point of clarification and suggested that I outline the government's plan to assist the Queensland dairy industry. I wish to inform the parliament that I am in the process of establishing a dairy industry round table to continue work on a development plan to enable further consultation with stakeholders. The plan will build on my findings from the dairy industry forum that I convened and I chaired in August 2013. In particular, the plan will reflect on the government's continuing commitment to the dairy industry.

...

The Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee found that milk processors do not support the proposals. We will continue to take a practical and dogged approach to the development of the dairy industry. This government has rolled up its sleeves to do that. We have done that over an extended period of time, as evidenced by my reference to meetings in this contribution tonight. The Newman government does not support the ill-conceived proposals of the Milk Pricing (Fair Milk Mark) Bill 2013, though it will continue practical discussions.

They were going to do something. Nothing has been done. There were 540 dairy farmers at the time that he said these words. Now there are 425.

The chair of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, Mr Rickuss, recommended to the minister that the minister work with industry and his federal counterparts to bring more equity into the milk market and help farmers reach overseas markets. Nothing was done. As I said, we had 540 dairy farmers; now we have 430.

We have heard a lot of reasons why they are not supporting this bill tonight. I will read from a press release sent out by the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation and also a statement in *Queensland Country Life*. I do acknowledge the \$1 million, which is \$1 million more than the LNP government had provided to the Queensland dairy industry. I can guarantee some of these speeches here tonight had to have been written by Woolworths and Coles. The LNP says that it is flawed legislation and there are problems with the Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme, which is a government provided scheme through the department of agriculture. The press release from the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation reads—

The Fair Milk Bill that was tabled in state Parliament last week by the Katter Australia Party's Shane Knuth, provides an opportunity to help deliver both better product information to consumers and a more sustainable dairy industry in this state. The Bill sets out to provide milk processors a consistent label that can be used to identify milk products that are sourced from local dairy farmers at a sustainable price. It was disappointing in 2013 when a similar bill was voted down by the two major parties despite strong farm sector support.

Tonight we hear that the bill is flawed, it cannot be done, it will not work, yet we had 1,500 dairy farmers; now we have 425. The press release further states—

Importantly it will also signify that the Queensland dairy farmer who produced the milk has been paid a recognised sustainable price. The state minister will draw on information from departmental and other independent sources including Queensland Dairy Accounting Scheme (QDAS), dairy farmers and dairy representative organisations twice yearly to establish what the sustainable price should be.

Of course this will be a completely voluntary opt in process for any milk processors to consider whether their brand would benefit from identifying their milk as sustainably sourced.

The fair milk logo scheme is built upon the concept that as a general rule consumers wish to support the local dairy farmers. The recent and very public 'I Buy Branded' campaign, which encouraged consumers to shift from \$1 milk to processor brands, was a clear manifestation of this support. During the campaign there has been some confusion over what 'branded milk' was, the Fair Milk Logo would solve this.

The future of the Bill now solely rests with the major parties. It is time for Labor and Liberal National Party to both put politics aside to support the Queensland dairy industry by empowering consumers.

We appreciate the fact that there has been \$1 million provided to the Queensland dairy industry. Last year we lost one million litres of milk that was produced. That is \$500,000, so within two years that \$1 million will be gone. The government and the opposition went to the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation and said they were not going to support the bill. They had no choice but to at least get something out of this. I will read from a statement dated 25 April 2017 from Brian Tessmann, the President of the QDO. It is titled 'No fair go for logo'. It was after the decision was handed down by the committee not to support the bill. It says—

Disappointment and bewilderment sum up the reaction from local dairy farmers after the Parliamentary committee report into the Fair Milk Price Logo Bill recommended that it not be passed. The report did not even attempt to amend the proposed legislation as is convention with other bills. The only takeaway for Queensland dairy farmers was a flat 'no'.

It is clear the committee did its best to find reasons not to pass the bill. The few reasons it gave resemble a joke rather than the respectful response our industry deserved.

Some members brought up that this may infringe section 92, but the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation said—

The claim the logos would be in breach of section 92 of the constitution, the section that guarantees free trade between states, was an exaggeration of the highest order.

This is not coming from politicians, this is not coming from me; this is coming from the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation. It further states—

Section 92 restricts states from excluding product from other states or imposing disincentives such as tariffs. The Fair Milk Logo Bill would assist in identifying local product, not restrict or impose any tariffs.

The Labor Party and the LNP were saying that it may infringe this section. They were trying to find whatever excuse possible, but the Dairyfarmers' Organisation said it does not infringe on section 92 at all. It further states—

The report misappropriated my claim that the logo may lead to an increase in value of Queensland produced milk as evidence of 'restricted trade'. Most people would see this as simply a result of positive consumer reaction from the logo, rather than a constitutionally contentious outcome. The committee's rejection of the Fair Mark Logo Bill is the equivalent of questioning the merits behind the 'Made in Australia' logo because it would discriminate against imported goods.

Farmers have been shocked that the two major parties have, to date, not been prepared to assist consumers to identify local Queensland milk.

While I said that tonight, those are the words of the Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation. It continues—

As with the previous attempt to get the logos through the parliament, the idea has been thrown back to the industry. Promised support has never materialised and we have no belief this committee's words have any more meaning than last time. The only workable outcome is for Parliament to pass the Bill and finally do something for dairy farmers in the state they claim to represent.

The 2014 bill was rejected with the same spiel that we have heard tonight. From the words spoken by government and opposition members, this bill will also be rejected tonight.

It is quite simple: this is a voluntary logo. A processor can choose to embrace this voluntary logo to identify that the farmer has been paid a fair price. If that farmer has been paid a fair price—most farmers across Queensland are not—the fair milk price logo will be put on his bottle of milk. When a mum goes to the supermarket, she will be able to clearly see that logo. When you go into supermarkets, there are milk bottles everywhere. You have Coles milk, you have Woolworths milk, you have home-brand milk. The whole idea behind the logo is that shoppers can clearly see which milk to choose to support and sustain the Queensland dairy industry. It is so simple.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Members, the volume of conversation is really too high. If members wish to have a conversation, please take it outside the chamber so that we can hear what the member for Dalrymple has to say.

Mr KNUTH: We have talked about the logo being introduced by the industry, but the industry has gone to the government because they are desperate. That is why they have been protesting outside this place. We used to have 1,500 dairy farmers and now there are 425. When I tabled this bill, there were 540 dairy farmers and now there are 425. The night that we debated the fair milk mark bill, we heard exactly the same tripe as we have heard tonight, and in the meantime the dairy farmers are going down, down, down.

While the other parties do nothing more than talk about finding other means or looking overseas, we are losing 70 dairy farmers every year. By 2030 there will be no dairy industry in Queensland. We have to remember these moments when we took the initiative and tried to do something. We have put our resources and energy into trying to help this industry, but that help is being flatly rejected. The Queensland Dairyfarmers' Organisation encourages both the government and the opposition to support this bill, because if we do not do something we will see the end of the milk industry.

This bill is in line with the National Competition Policy enacted through the federal government's Competition and Consumer Act 2010. The bill does not force anyone in the supply chain to use the logo. It is a non-compulsory market mechanism that processors can adopt if they want, but they do not have to use it if they do not want to.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr KNUTH: What did the member's government do? They said that they would look at overseas markets, but they did nothing. What happened? Big mouth over here—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw.

Mr RICKUSS: Madam Speaker, I am highly offended. I ask him to withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Dalrymple has withdrawn.

Mr KNUTH: The bill does not force anyone in the supply chain to use the logo. The Sustainable Queensland Dairy Production (Fair Milk Price Logos) Bill 2016 does not provide full rectification of the losses and disadvantage to the Queensland dairy industry, nor does it interfere with the supply chain of fresh milk to Queensland consumers. Fundamentally, its aim is to increase consumer engagement in the economy of dairy production in Queensland by establishing an eligibility criteria for a market based mechanism for a legally protected and easily identified logo. Supporting this bill shows that we are listening to our communities and are helping desperate dairy farmers stay afloat and continue to provide fresh Queensland milk. This bill sets a national precedent, with Queensland spearheading a policy platform for a sustainable Australian dairy industry.

This bill is about survival. I am speaking up for dairy farmers across Queensland. As they have said, it is disappointing to see what happened with procurement. We want to support the dairy farmers in the regions, particularly with the hospitals now negotiating to purchase milk 1,000 kilometres away. This bill is about the survival of the dairy industry. I fully commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Before I go to the question, I welcome in the gallery the Brisbane Punjabi Community Club Calamvale from the electorate of Stretton.

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

AYES, 5:

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 81:

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

LNP, 40—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, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pair: Williams, Seeney.

Resolved in the negative.

CORRECTIVE SERVICES (NO BODY, NO PAROLE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2112, on motion of Mrs D'Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (9.32 pm), continuing: The review report expressly acknowledged that in the case of homicide offences, withholding the location of a victim's body or remains prolongs the suffering of families and all efforts should be made to attempt to minimise that sorrow. The report also states—

A punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

I was interested to note that submissions to the committee included those from the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties and the Bar Association of Queensland, all of whom opposed the bill. I can understand their cautious approach to the proposed changes, but I do not support their opposition.

There may be the risk of a convicted person being disadvantaged by these changes because they do not know where a body is and so cannot reveal the location. On the balance of probabilities, I believe that is a very small risk and one worth taking with this legislation. The rights of victims and their families must take precedence over those of perpetrators.

I also note the proposed amendments from both the opposition and the government to further strengthen this legislation. I congratulate both sides on the work they have done in this regard. These are common-sense reforms which need to be enacted as a matter of priority. They have the potential to bring emotional comfort and a sense of finality for the families and loved ones of homicide victims whose bodies have never been found. They also recognise that parole is not automatic or an entitlement.

A person convicted of homicide or directly related offences cannot possibly be rehabilitated and be ready for release if they have not had the decency to reveal where the body is. The denial of parole for offenders who refuse to disclose the whereabouts of their victim's body will bring a greater sense of justice to our justice system.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.35 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill reflects the Palaszczuk government's commitment to victims of crime and their families and our promise to swiftly implement the Sofronoff recommendations. Not only will this bill incentivise prisoners incarcerated for some of our most heinous crimes to cooperate with police in identifying the location of victims' remains, but ultimately it aims to provide closure to the families of the victims of homicide related offences.

No-body no-parole is a recommendation of the Sofronoff review, but it also stems from the tireless advocacy of those who fought to bring their loved ones home, allowing them to properly grieve and say goodbye. It is for this reason that I would like to take a moment to acknowledge all the victims' families who have advocated for this legislation, and none more so than Fiona Splitt. Fiona is in the gallery tonight along with her daughter, Lisa, and sister-in-law, Tania. Leanne and Gary Pullen are also in the gallery tonight. I would acknowledge their advocacy for this legislation.

I met Fiona in March in Cooktown. I was immediately struck by her dedication but also her passion for these laws. In March in Cooktown I said to Fiona, 'We will get this done.' I am very pleased that we are able to deliver on this tonight. Fiona has fought for almost two years to introduce laws in Queensland that would see those convicted of murder who refuse to assist police with information regarding the location of the remains of a victim denied parole.

Today not only recognises Fiona's dedication to ensuring those who were convicted of her husband's murder face consequences for not disclosing where the remains are, but her legacy will be that other families will benefit from her not giving up in what, I can only imagine, would be some of the most agonising and difficult times of her life. Fiona, on behalf of those Queenslanders who will benefit from this legislation, thank you. Thank you for remaining strong. You will be remembered as a result of this legislation. I know that I speak for Fiona when I say that this day means so much to her and her

family. What started as an individual mission to bring her husband home has manifested into advocating for all victims' families and pursuing government to introduce legislation that would go some way to provide grieving families the opportunity to properly say goodbye.

This government recognises the significance of this legislation, with the bill building on the largest reform of Queensland's parole system in decades. No-body no-parole provides that the Parole Board Queensland must refuse to make a parole order for a prisoner serving a period of imprisonment for homicide or a homicide related offence, unless the board is satisfied that the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the location, or the last known location, of the body or remains of the victim and the place where the body or remains of the victim may be found. In practice, this will be directed at instances where the body or remains of the victim have not been located at the time of the parole hearing—that is, if the victim is missing at the time of sentence and if the victim is still missing at the time of the parole application, the provisions in this bill will be enlivened.

The bill also establishes a process for assessing a prisoner's cooperation and provides that the Parole Board must take into account the following: a report of the Police Commissioner, or delegate, about whether the prisoner has cooperated and which evaluates the prisoner's cooperation; the capacity of the prisoner to cooperate; the record of the court in relation to the offending, including any sentencing remarks; and any other matter which the board considers relevant to its consideration. In preparing the report, the Commissioner of Police, or delegate, must evaluate the prisoner's cooperation in the investigation of the offence and include information relating to the nature and extent of the prisoner's cooperation, the timeliness of the cooperation, the reliability of the information provided and the significance and utility of the cooperation.

The bill also provides for the retrospective application of the amendments and captures the following: a parole application where the prisoner is convicted and sentenced for the relevant offence post commencement of the act; a parole application where the prisoner was convicted before commencement but sentenced after commencement; a prisoner who was convicted and sentenced prior to commencement and the parole application is to be made after commencement or was made before commencement but is not yet determined at the time of commencement; and, finally, a prisoner who was convicted, sentenced and released to parole but then returned to prison before or after commencement and the parole order is subsequently cancelled.

I trust that this bill, if passed by this House, will provide some comfort, some closure, to those families who have not been able to finally say goodbye to victims of homicide related crimes. I acknowledge again the advocacy of all of those families out there who have had to endure a period of time which is just so terrible, so sad. I trust that this bill will bring closure to them. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr CRAMP (Gaven—LNP) (9.42 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. The Northern Territory, South Australia, Victoria, Western Australia and New South Wales either already have these laws in place or have commenced legislation to implement similar policy, so it is good to see the chamber get to where we are today with these laws.

I am proud to be part of an LNP team that in November 2016 released our policy supporting no-body no-parole laws in Queensland. In February this year the Labor government in turn tabled their response to the recommendation and confirmed that the legislation would be introduced to prevent a murderer from being granted parole where she or he has not revealed where the victim's body is located.

The LNP announced our support for these reforms in late 2016. Labor only moved to support the changes in response to the Sofronoff parole review in February 2017. The LNP does not oppose this bill. However, we move to include three additional offences for when the no-body no-parole provisions will apply. This policy is predicated on the notion that, by making parole release for particular offenders contingent on them satisfactorily cooperating with the investigation of an offence to identify a victim's location, it will therefore provide an incentive for these prisoners to assist in recovering the body or remains of the victim. The final report of the Queensland Parole Board System Review, undertaken by Mr Walter Sofronoff, states on page 235—

A punishment is lacking in retribution, and the community would be right to feel indignation, if a convicted killer could expect to be released without telling what he did with the body of the victim. The killer's satisfaction at being released on parole is grotesquely inconsistent with the killer's knowing perpetuation of the grief and desolation of the victim's loved ones.

The bill provides that the Parole Board must refuse an application for parole for a prisoner serving a period of imprisonment for a 'homicide offence' as per the Queensland Criminal Code and the body or remains of the victim have not been located or, because of an act or omission by the prisoner or another person, part of the body or remains have not been located, unless the board is satisfied the

prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location. The cooperation by the prisoner may have happened before or after the prisoner was sentenced for the homicide offence.

Furthermore, the bill provides that when assessing whether the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily the Parole Board must take into account the following: a report provided by the Commissioner of Police about whether the prisoner has cooperated and, if so, an evaluation of the prisoner's cooperation; any information the board has about the capacity of the prisoner to give the cooperation; the transcript of any proceeding against the prisoner for the offence, including any relevant remarks made by the sentencing court; and any other information the board considers relevant.

When in government the LNP introduced numerous strong law reforms and supported victims of crime and their families through increased funding to victim advocacy organisations. The LNP continues to stand on the side of the victim. I am proud to be part of a team that introduced laws that enable a victim to read their victim impact statement before sentencing, if they so wished and it was in reasonable circumstances. The LNP team also committed an extra \$2 million to organisations and groups that support victims of crime and an additional \$750,000 to the Women's Legal Service.

These no-body no-parole reforms are important for Queensland and will strengthen both the parole process and support the families and victims of crime. All these families want is the chance to find out where their family member spent their final moments and to say goodbye. These are common-sense reforms and need to be enacted as soon as possible.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (9.46 pm): I rise to speak to the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill. As set out in the explanatory notes, the no-body no-parole policy is predicated on the notion that, by making parole release for particular prisoners contingent on them satisfactorily cooperating in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location, it will encourage and provide incentive for these prisoners to assist in finding and recovering the body or remains of a victim. This will, in turn, it is hoped, offer some comfort and certainty to the families of the victims.

I spoke in relation to the inquiry and subsequent report by Mr Walter Sofronoff during debate on the Corrective Services (Parole Board) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill back in May this year. At the time, I made reference to the report tabled by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. The report made reference to a submission by the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group in relation to a no-body no-parole provision. The Homicide Victims' Support Group submitted that a person accused of murder or manslaughter should only ever be eligible for parole for 'a period of two years ... following the last of any legal appeals during which the prisoner be directed to reveal where the body of the deceased can be found. After that period the offer of future parole be denied'. The Homicide Victims' Support Group made this suggestion to ensure that homicide victims' families have the best chance possible of retrieving their loved one's body. A note in the report stated—

The absence of such a restriction on the offer of parole in exchange for a prisoner disclosing the location of the victim's body risks, for example, development or construction that makes it impossible to locate a body.

I said that I agreed with the Homicide Victims' Support Group and that the comment that development or construction may make it impossible to locate a victim's remains was a bit of a cop-out. I am heartened to see within the bill the introduction of section 193A. Section 193A specifically applies to applications for a parole order from prisoners serving a particular period of imprisonment for a particular homicide offence and the body or remains of the victim of the offence have not been located or, because of an act or omission of the prisoner or another person, parts of the body or remains of the victim have not been located. The latter would capture instances where the prisoner may have dismembered the body of the victim and deposited the parts of the body at various locations, or the prisoner may have taken a part of the victim as a trophy or souvenir of their killing.

I note that the Parole Board must refuse to grant the application for parole unless the board is satisfied the prisoner has cooperated satisfactorily in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location. For the purposes of section 193A, the victim's location is a reference to the location, or the last known location, of every part of the body or remains of the victim of the offence and the place where every part of the body or remains of the victim of the offence may be found. The prisoner's cooperation in this regard may have happened before or after the prisoner was sentenced to imprisonment for that offence.

When assessing whether the prisoner has satisfactorily cooperated, the board must take into account the following: a report of the Commissioner of Police, or delegate, which evaluates the prisoner's cooperation in the investigation of the offence to identify the victim's location; any information

the board has about the prisoner's capacity to give the cooperation; the transcript of any proceeding against the prisoner for the offence including any relevant remarks made by the sentencing court; and any other information the board considers relevant.

I turn to the report by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. The report gives details that the Department of Justice and Attorney-General had advised that the policy of the bill would be activated where the body, or its parts, of the victim have not been located at the time of the parole hearing—that is, if the victim is missing at the time of sentence, noting that cooperation may have already begun on behalf of the prisoner upon conviction but the body is yet to be found by the time of the sentence; and, if the victim is still missing at the time of the parole application, noting that cooperation may have been given by the prisoner yet the victim is unable to be found—for example, because of the passage of time or environmental factors or subsequent interference with the remains by someone else or an animal—the no-body no-parole policy would be activated. I am not quite sure how it could ever be established that 'environmental factors or subsequent interference with the remains by someone else or an animal'—particularly an animal—actually played any part in a victim's remains no longer being at a particular location, but I am happy to listen to the Attorney-General address that later in the debate this evening. I note that the report makes reference to the following—

The Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Council for Civil Liberties ... and the Bar Association of Queensland ... supported the intended outcome of the proposed legislation in incentivising eligible parolees to provide information on the location of the victim's remains and acknowledged that this may provide some comfort to the families of victims. For example:

The Queensland Law Society understands the concerns that have driven the preparation of this bill, particularly having regard to the very human need to retrieve, honour and properly grieve those who have been lost often in mysterious circumstances which gives rise to fear and horror. Naturally, people imagine the suffering their loved ones must have endured in their final moments. In dealing with their loss, the return of the remains of their loved ones is an important step in the process of psychological healing.

However, the Queensland Law Society, the QCCL and the Bar Association opposed the amendments proposed in the Bill:

- the Queensland Law Society opposed the Bill on the basis that 'there are a number of inherent flaws in the proposed legislation, including considerable problematic obstacles that, in our view, will limit its success'²⁶
- the QCCL submitted 'this Bill has the capacity to lead to serious miscarriages of justice and that cannot be outweighed by the objectives of the Bill',²⁷ and
- the Bar Association 'opposes the Bill in its current form and opposes any retrospective application of such a scheme'.

The Queensland Law Society submitted—

... there are numerous circumstances within which it would not be possible for an offender to provide accurate information about a victim's location, including where:

- an offender is not aware of the location of a body—'natural events, including floods, rain, changes in topography, as well as where a body has been disposed of at sea, would prevent a convicted person from accurate information', and
- a person who has maintained their innocence, and is in fact innocent, despite being convicted ...

The last point regarding someone who is innocent is indeed problematic. I would hope that the legal process would ultimately right that wrong. In regard to the assertion that a victim may have been disposed of at sea, that would be a matter for further investigation. Did the offender have access to a boat? If so, whose? Were they assisted? Did someone help them get the victim into the boat? There may be other things that could be investigated to test the legitimacy of the offender's claim in that regard. I return to the committee report, which states—

... if the victim is still missing at the time of the parole application (noting that cooperation may have been given by the prisoner yet the victim is unable to be found e.g. because of the passage of time ...

That in itself should create an incentive for offenders to come clean in relation to the location of their victim at the earliest opportunity. Likewise I am sure that members of the legal fraternity will advise their client at the earliest opportunity after conviction and sentencing that they need to assist with locating their victim or suffer the consequences of not being eligible to be considered for parole. Simply knowing that that they will not be considered for parole because of section 193A will encourage offenders to divulge the whereabouts of their victim as soon as possible.

This is about real people. This is about people who have been murdered and giving the people who have been left behind the certainty of knowing what happened to their loved ones and where their remains may be found. I know that everyone in the House will support this bill tonight. It is a very worthy bill. It is a bill that the Queensland parliament should be proud of.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (9.55 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill is really about the victims who are left behind when a heinous crime has occurred. I will read a statement from the submission of Mrs Fiona Splitt, who wholeheartedly supports the bill. She states—

The loss of a loved one is never easy to deal with, but the grief can be even harder to overcome, when you can not lay them to rest. When families lose a loved one, to the callous act of murder, the heartache and pain is overbearing, but to not know where your loved one is, or be given the opportunity to have closure and say goodbye, causes constant unbearable pain and suffering to victims' families.

That is why we are all here tonight and that is why we all agree: because we would like to play what small part we can to reduce the unbearable pain and suffering that a victim's family will feel. We need to look at why parole exists. Parole exists to try to help someone who may have been incarcerated for a long time to readjust into society once they have served the time apportioned to them by the judiciary, but I think it makes good sense to not allow them that privilege if someone else has not been able to continue their life fully adjusted back into society because they have been denied the opportunity to grieve and to pay their respects to their loved one who was taken from them.

I wholeheartedly support this bill. I think any prisoner who continues someone's suffering after committing such a crime should continue to be punished, and we should have legislation to ensure that. For those reasons, I think the bill is very worthy. I pay tribute to the many families and individuals who have fought for this over a period of time. I pay tribute to all members of the House who have worked to ensure some level of relief for that ongoing pain and suffering. I do not think anyone here can imagine what it would be like to live that life. We should not be letting people back into our community who are denying people the opportunity to grieve and to say goodbye in an appropriate way.

For me, this is about making sure the victims are looked after by the legislation that we pass here. We make legislation for many different things. When a crime like this is committed, some of it is about punishment and some of it is about making sure that the scales of justice are balanced so that people who do these things to families and members of our community are not allowed to participate in our community.

For me, on a personal level someone who would not cooperate with police, not see the error of their ways, not understand the effect they have had on victims and not understand the ongoing effects and consequences that has for our whole community should not be considered for any form of early release at all. They should serve the absolute length of time that they were given.

I will be supporting this bill. I thank the families again for their ongoing efforts to make sure that this House not only has heard their pain and their suffering but has acted on that to try to provide whatever relief we can to them. We obviously cannot right the wrong, but we can make sure the people who committed those wrongs do not get an opportunity to enter back into our society. In that way, we can at least do all we can to reduce that pain and suffering.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (10.00 pm), in reply: It is an absolute pleasure to rise to speak in response to the contributions that have been made in this debate. I truly thank each and every one of the honourable members sitting around this chamber for their contributions to the debate on the Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017. The bill itself has one objective: to implement a robust and effective no-body no-parole policy in Queensland in accordance with the government's commitment to implement recommendation 87 of the Queensland Parole System Review. The policy framework in this bill should provide much needed assistance to those families who find themselves in the distressing position of enduring the unknown when their loved one's remains unable to be found by investigating authorities.

It must again be acknowledged that this bill is a direct product of the strong advocacy of a number of people, but I must single out Fiona Splitt and her contribution and advocacy. Mrs Splitt has made tireless representations to the government and met with Mr Sofronoff QC, as he then was, during the consultation phase of the Queensland Parole System Review. We have heard members also referring to the petition that she put together. I also want to acknowledge Gary and Leanne Pullen for their contribution and I thank them so much for talking to me about their personal story and heartache. Everyone in this chamber certainly feels for you tonight in this debate. None of us can truly understand the pain that any of you are going through. We can, as family members, as parents, have some inkling of what it is like to lose a loved one, a child or a partner but we can never truly understand unless we are in the position that you have been in. Tonight this is for all of you, for all of those families out there.

Tonight we will finalise the second reading of this bill and tomorrow as it appears we will pass this bill. I want to acknowledge the opposition with their proposed amendments and the government's amendments and I thank the member for Mansfield. We have worked together throughout the evening and we have reached agreement on those amendments so we will stand here in this chamber tomorrow and unanimously support this bill and what I believe will be the strongest no-body no-parole framework in this country. I thank each and every one of you.

This bill is yet another reform which demonstrates the Queensland government's ongoing commitment to provide assistance to victims of crime. I would like to again thank all of the key stakeholders for their contribution and cooperation during the committee's consideration of the bill. I appreciate there are those in the legal profession who do not necessarily hold the views that this bill should go ahead, but I do believe, as the member for Mansfield said, that the benefits certainly outweigh the concerns that have been raised. I do believe that families deserve some closure. If we as elected members in this parliament can make a decision here in this parliament that can put in place provisions that potentially could result in that closure, we should do so and that is what we are going to do with this bill. I am very proud to be moving this bill. In conclusion, I thank all of the honourable members for their contributions during the debate. I thank the committee, the stakeholders and the committee secretariat. 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.

Debate, on motion of Mr Hinchliffe, adjourned.

PRIVILEGE

Correction to Record of Proceedings and Apology

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.05 pm): Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. On 15 June this year I made a statement in relation to the 2017-18 budget and the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning staffing establishment. While I made the statement believing it to be absolutely true and correct, information has been provided to me that on reflection shows that I had inadvertently misled the House. I apologise to the House for this error and would like to correct the record.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.05 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Harms, Mr O

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (10.06 pm): Last week saw the sad loss to his family and to the Miriam Vale community of police officer Sergeant Owen Harms. Following his shock death, tributes are pouring in for this highly respected and loved family man, husband and father. Sergeant Harms was stationed in the small and tight-knit community of Miriam Vale in my electorate for 20 years, and he dedicated his life to protecting, serving and improving the community he loved so much. He was a decorated officer held in the highest regard by his fellow officers over a 30-year career of service. In addition to the Australian Police Medal and National Medal, Sergeant Owen Harms received a Certificate of Merit from the Royal Humane Society of Australasia for his part in trying to save two boys trapped in a collapsed sand tunnel in Agnes Water. Described as a 'true blue Aussie with a heart of gold', Owen was presented with an award and recognition for his diligence, ethical conduct and commitment to his community.

Owen rallied the local sports and volunteer community around him as he championed the upgrade of the facilities at Gary Larson Oval. His commitment and vision to encourage families to get out and get active was highlighted when 800 Miriam Vale residents attended the unveiling of the facilities that he worked so hard to get. I personally worked alongside Owen to support the Miriam Vale community in their calls for funding to upgrade the lighting at Gary Larson Oval and can attest to his deep love of his local community.

Owen had recently heard that his long battle with cancer was over, but his battle with the demands of one of the hardest, most selfless jobs in society was not. Owen's struggles with the confronting requirements of his role as a police officer came at a cost, and that price is one we all bear responsibility for. His passing is a devastating loss to his family—Lyn, Brendon and Bree—to his police colleagues and to all of us, and we mourn with them the loss of a fine man and a fine police officer. It is most fitting that I quote from a message by his beloved Miriam Vale Magpies Rugby League Club—

Owen, our community pillar, our hero, our mate!

Forever etched in our hearts and minds are the memories of this tremendous man! May you rest in eternal peace Owey. We love you and will miss you terribly.

On behalf of the Maggies family we are all holding Lyn, Brendon and Bree very close in our hearts and thoughts at this devastating time. May you draw strength and courage from the outpouring of love and support.

My reflections are that he never wanted to let anyone down. That was the sort of guy he was. He would never speak ill of anyone and he always strived to make his community a better place. Members, we must in this place ensure our community knows and seeks support before tragedy confronts us. We must deal with the issues of mental illness and suicide. I remind everyone in our community that if they need help please call on Lifeline or beyondblue.

Kallangur Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government

 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (10.08 pm): I rise tonight to report to the House that the Palaszczuk government has yet again delivered for the Kallangur electorate. I spent the first two years of this term of parliament cleaning up the mess made by those opposite—fixing a legacy of cuts and downgrades to the Redcliffe Peninsula line, making sure that the contractor consulted with the community and did not close roads to perform work that they had quoted to do under traffic, and stopping the sale of our school ovals just to name a few issues.

Indeed, when I was first elected, I made a promise. I made a promise to the Dakabin-Kallangur community that I would not accept any more bandaid solutions to the transport woes plaguing Dakabin station. I promised that we would find a solution that was more than turning up and cutting ribbons to so-called upgrades. There would be no more photo opportunities outside the station when steps had been replaced with steps and no more taking advantage of the plight of frustrated commuters. A full disability upgrade was what I was after. I have delivered; our government has delivered. It has been truly satisfying to tell the hundreds of families in Dakabin and surrounds that this Labor government has listened. We are upgrading the station. We are delivering a disability compliant station; we are delivering a station that eases traffic congestion and parking restrictions, and we are doing it all without selling assets.

Sadly, there are some who have sought to talk down this achievement and the achievements of this very fine budget. My predecessor spent his term in office promising but never delivering. The Dakabin community rightly rejected the bandaid solutions that the LNP Newman government promised them and tipped them from government in overwhelming numbers. The LNP candidate who seeks to come to this place instead of me has so far failed to convince the member for Clayfield to even back this project or the Petrie roundabout upgrade. It did not even rate a mention in the budget reply speech. Sadly, I note that the predecessor of the member for Pine Rivers, who also seeks to return to this place, has joined his former colleagues in this chorus of chaos and continues to prove that he is not so independent after all.

Let me tell honourable members about Elisha Wright, a constituent of mine. Ms Wright suffers from a chronic condition that impacts her life every single day. She regularly uses public transport to get to and from her medical appointments. It is a sad indictment that Ms Wright has had to suffer a station that did not provide a single ramp or piece of disability assistance infrastructure. Ms Wright did not need her life made harder by the inertia of government. This win is for her. It is for the mums and dads who are catching the train into work. We want them to get there faster so they can come home and see the kids sooner.

In delivering this project I want to thank the member for Sandgate, who commissioned the options study while he was minister for transport. I want to thank the Mayor of the Moreton Bay Regional Council, Allan Sutherland, who has always put politics aside for the benefit of my electorate. Last, but certainly not least, I thank our Deputy Premier and her entire office. Our Deputy Premier has supported this upgrade occurring from the minute she learnt about it. I say: thank you, Jackie; your leadership in this area has helped to alleviate a significant concern for our community. I say thanks also to Emily Brogan in the Deputy Premier's office, who has fielded countless calls from me about this matter. I look forward to updating the House as the plans are put in place and works begin.

Callide Electorate, Roads

 **Mr SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (10.11 pm): I rise tonight to talk about a response that I received from the then minister for main roads, Mr Bailey, to a quite large petition that I tabled in the House calling for the unsealed sections of the Monto-Mount Perry Road and the Gayndah-Mount Perry Road to be sealed. The minister said in his response, 'Sealing of these roads is not considered a high priority at this time.' The whole purpose of the petition was to demonstrate to this parliament that for the people in those communities these roads are a high priority. They provide the only link between those communities and the medical services that they must access in Bundaberg. They are gravel roads that are notoriously dangerous.

The Monto-Mount Perry Road has been the scene of some horrific accidents that have shocked the community. The Monto-Mount Perry Road was upgraded from the Royalties for the Regions fund when we were in government—it cost \$15 million to upgrade half of the gravel section—along with a whole range of other roads in the state, I might add. Despite the desperate attempts from those opposite to try to discredit the Royalties for the Regions program, the results of that program are out there on the ground: the Monto-Mount Perry Road upgrade, the Cracow-Eidsvold Road upgrade and the Panorama Drive upgrade in the electorate of Keppel that the current member belittles and runs down every time she gets a chance to speak in here. Those were roads that the community thought were a high priority for them. They may not have been a high priority for the traffic planners in the minister's department, but they were high priorities for communities that badly needed those roads for access in order to make their communities livable, and the Royalties for the Regions program addressed that. In all of those cases we provided those communities with the road infrastructure that they had been wanting and not getting from successive governments for so many years.

In reference to the minister's response to this petition, I suggest that while the glib line in the letter is almost a throwaway for officers in his department that this road is not a priority, it certainly is for those people in the community. The current Minister for State Development has continued the work that we did upgrading the airports in the Callide electorate.

Mrs Frecklington: How's that going?

Mr SEENEY: Absolutely! He is upgrading the fourth airport in the Callide electorate and there are a couple more to go. I would suggest to him that these are the roads that most desperately need upgrading in the Callide electorate. He should use the hollow and anaemic replacement for the Royalties for the Regions program to try to do something to address the concerns that the community has expressed in these petitions.

Suicide Prevention

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (10.15 pm): I would like to share with the House some important news occurring in our city of Townsville around a particular and serious issue of recognising and reducing suicide rates in our community. As we know, with suicide there is no particular targeted group. Our community and our city, including the ADF community, have experienced losses due to suicide. One of the most important aspects of responding to the very real issue of suicide is to ensure it has a whole-of-government approach including working closely with the local community. To put it in context, in 2015, 749 Queenslanders died by suicide. In stark contrast, there were 279 deaths from transport accidents in Queensland in the same year. Which one receives more media commentary?

I have no doubt that every member in this place has most likely been touched by the sad reality of knowing someone who has committed suicide. That said, suicide prevention is a priority for our government. The Queensland Suicide Prevention Action Plan 2015-2017 was developed by the Queensland Mental Health Commission as a whole-of-government plan aimed at reducing suicide and its impact on Queenslanders through such measures as building stronger community awareness and capacity. At a local level in our community, some outstanding people have been working quietly in the background to listen to the voice of lived experience, consult widely throughout the community, map services, find gaps and gain insights into the data around suicide in our city. Suicide prevention is indeed everybody's business. It takes a whole community, united in purpose and vision to effect change.

The Townsville Suicide Prevention Network is an organisation doing exactly that, bringing our community together on a journey to help recognise those who need help and ultimately reduce rates of suicide in our community. It is an organisation led by chair Alison Fairleigh and a whole group of determined people like Adriel Burley. There is a host of other like-minded people from our community, business leaders, state agencies such as fire, police and QAS, representatives and leaders including

Mr John Caligari AO, Lieutenant General (retired). He also has a vision to assist in reducing rates of suicide with Australian defence personnel who are committing suicide at a higher rate than the wider civilian population. As he has said, these individuals also have families who are immediately affected and, sadly, are often forgotten. Like most others, John Caligari is determined to make change. I know this because of my previous career as a paramedic. Not only have I responded to countless suicide attempts and, sadly, those who have succeeded but I have also lost some good mates in the Ambulance Service along the way. That is why I commend, and I am determined to work with, the Townsville Suicide Prevention Network, and I wholly endorse their community action plan.

Pacific Motorway, Exit 41

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (10.18 pm): I rise to raise the issue of exit 41. These are the sorts of emails I receive about it. One excerpt states—

... recently traffic lights were installed at exit 41 ...

This morning the traffic was at a complete standstill. My usual 12 minute drive to work took 35 ...

Another states—

Just writing in regards to the new traffic lights put in on the two roundabouts at exit 41. ... I was 30 minutes late to work today ... 30 minutes to get from Ormeau Coles to Burnside Road ...

Another states—

The lights were turned on today at the round about at exit 41, what a disaster. ... Took me 50 minutes to get through and across to head Gold Coast bound. 12 minutes alone at the bridge ...

Another states—

Wish to advise about the disaster that has been caused by the lights recently installed at Exit 41 ...

Another states—

... quick email regarding the new lights at exit 41, I have lived in Ormeau for 15 years and never in my life have I seen the traffic as bad ...

Another states—

We have staff members within our office who were 20—30 minutes late—

arriving for work. Another states—

As myself and other colleagues had to wait 45 minutes from the time we took the exit and exit the 2nd round about ...

Another states—

My residence is in Lewani Palms and I had an appointment at ... 9am—

but they got there 15 minutes late.

The last point is that traffic not only affects residents; it affects businesses. It is costing them an absolute fortune. What has been happening at exit 41? Absolutely nothing. Here are some shots of the traffic movements at exit 41 over several days. They are supposed to be fixing them. There is one for the 20th, and I table that.

Tabled paper. Bundle of photographs depicting Pacific Motorway exits [\[1284\]](#).

Have a look at these, Minister. It needs to be looked at. The dark red is very, very slow or stopped; the green are all going fine. All of these are exit 41 several days apart: 24 July, 26 July, 31 July and 7 August, which was just the other day. They are still the same: still red. We still have the same issue of ramping back onto the M1. This is what I heard from the department—

As you may be aware, the traffic signals at 41 have been installed to reduce the identified safety risk associated with traffic queuing back onto the Pacific Motorway.

Tabled paper. Email, dated 21 July 2017, from Mr Andrew Wheeler, Department of Transport and Main Roads, regarding traffic signals at Exit 41, Pacific Motorway [\[1285\]](#).

This is a failure! It is not working. It is still going back onto the M1, and now we have traffic much worse than it ever was. There are some more photos for the minister to take into consideration about just one of the exits: exit 41. These photos are proof positive that the traffic lights, which should never have been put in and were never requested, should not have been put in. We need a permanent solution for exits 41, 45 and 49. When is this government going to do something about it?

Greenslopes Electorate, Scouts and Girl Guides

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.21 pm): There are four great Girl Guide and Scouts organisations in the electorate of Greenslopes: Wynola Girl Guides, Holland Park Girl Guides and the Victor and Majestic Park Scout groups. I have seen the great work of these organisations in our community. I have visited various activities of each group at their huts, observed their members at Anzac Day commemorations and witnessed the charitable work they do in the community. This great work is rewarded with waiting lists for membership for every single group. The leaders and volunteers in all of these groups are inspirational. I have previously spoken about the Wynola Girl Guides when they were celebrating their 90th anniversary, and in particular I mentioned Dixie, who has been a leader since 1968. We should acknowledge the huge difference that leaders like Dixie have made to the lives of young people in our community.

Over the last few years my family has become a part of the scouting movement. It has been an overwhelmingly positive experience for my entire family. I have watched my daughters grow in confidence as they learn new skills, push themselves to attempt new challenges, build their independence, make new friends and, most importantly, just have fun. I should acknowledge Echidna and Hawkeye at Victor Scouts who have been outstanding leaders, not just in the Scouts but in our community. I spoke about the benefits I have witnessed for my own kids, and I know that every parent would want those things for their kids: new skills, increased confidence, new friends and fun.

I was so pleased to learn that Nursery Road Special School has recently established a Scouts group so that young people with a disability can enjoy the benefits of the scouting. It gave me great pleasure to join the Nursery Road Special School Scout group for a parade recently. I greatly enjoyed having afternoon tea with Billy, Bailey, Eden, Stephen, Ethan, Monique, Alexander, Riley and Finn. We then moved to the parade ground and raised the flag. It was wonderful to watch the Scouts using communication boards to recite the Scout promise. I would like to table a copy of the communication board that contains the Scout promise.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'The Scout promise' [[1286](#)].

After parade we moved on to the activity of the day. The Scouts certainly put me in my place when it came to bowling. We had a fantastic game of bowls and I saw the Scouts growing in confidence, attempting new challenges, making new friends and having fun. I would like to thank Wendy Windley, who is the leader of the group. Thanks should also go to Scouts Queensland regional development and support officer Karl Lingard for assisting to establish this troop. I would also like to thank the mother of the principal of the Nursery Road Special School, who donated the uniforms for the group to get started. I wish this group all the best in the future. I know they will have many years of scouting, and I know this will bring great joy to themselves and their entire families.

I would like to finish by wishing the best of luck to all the Scouts from my electorate who are undertaking Night Hawk this Saturday. Scouts as young as 12, including my daughter, will be walking through the night out near Pittsworth—no doubt a chilly, challenging and uplifting experience from which they will all return much better people as a result of being involved in the Scouting movement.

Mount Ommaney Electorate

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (10.24 pm): I often speak in this House of the wonderful community spirit that we have in my electorate of Mount Ommaney. In the last couple of weeks there have been some exciting events and there are more still to come. For the past 15 years the Centenary Rocks Festival has been a highlight on the Mount Ommaney electorate calendar, and this year was no different. Unfortunately, this year was the last year that we will see the festival in its current form. Volunteers have worked so tirelessly for the last 15 years for this two-day event. We have had some great acts over the years including John English, Dragon, Ross Wilson and other local talent. We always finish with a great fireworks display on Saturday night. The volunteers have been small in number but so enthusiastic, and after 15 years they felt it was time to have a break. While we are very sad to see that festival come to an end in its current form, we were also very pleased to have such a successful two days. We really went out with a bang.

I am also pleased to inform the House that next Friday week in my electorate I will be holding my annual seniors morning tea for the fifth year. This year will be as exciting as every other year. Last year our guest speaker was John Connolly, the former Wallabies coach, who was fantastic. He gave us some great entertainment and stories. This year our guest speaker is a senator from Queensland and a strong representative for seniors, Barry O'Sullivan. He is coming along to speak about his journey

from copper to senator. Constable Ben Harm will discuss security issues for seniors, and for entertainment our wonderful Centenary State High School choir will perform for us. On that note, the Centenary State High School also has another feather in its cap.

Yesterday the Rugby under-15s sevens union team took out the premiership in the western suburbs. I am pleased to say that my son Cooper was the captain. They had a convincing win over Kenmore—I was pleased to tell Dr Christian Rowan—40 to 10. This Friday we also have the Mount Ommaney Small Business Awards which I am very proud to host in conjunction with the Chamber of Commerce. This year over 100 businesses were nominated by 2,000 local residents. There are always things happening in Mount Ommaney.

Queensland Multicultural Awards

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (10.27 pm): Last Sunday I attended the Queensland Multicultural Awards at the Logan Entertainment Centre. The Queensland Multicultural Awards recognise the valuable contributions of Queenslanders who support and promote a united, harmonious and inclusive Queensland community. This year the theme recognised creating welcome, building opportunity and celebrating diversity. The Mackay Mesh & Knots MASSI MATSI group nominated for the local club or community group. They were finalists in this division.

The Mackay Mesh & Knots group describe themselves as an Australian South Sea Islander and Mackay Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women's group. They are passionate about meeting the needs of their community and informing the broader community of their history, who they are today and how they plan to be part of the future of their community. The Mesh & Knots MASSI MATSI Women's Group are elders of the Australian South Sea Islander community who are very passionate advocates for the Australian South Sea Islander community in Mackay. They raise awareness of their heritage by promoting their culture through community projects, education and sport. Some of the Mesh & Knots projects include: the cemetery project, which is the identification of 114 unmarked graves; development and delivery of an historical component for inclusion in the education curriculum at Mackay State High School; the inaugural Kanaka Proud Cup; and the Greg Fatnowna Memorial Shield.

The group is also working on strengthening ties between the Mackay and Rockhampton South Sea islander communities. It has contributed to the celebration of the 150th anniversary of the arrival of the first South Sea islanders in Mackay. While Mesh & Knots consider themselves to be Australian, with a deeply rooted history in Queensland, they are committed to contributing their stories to the Mackay conversation and promoting the township as their home town and the home of their ancestors—a place where all people are welcome. This group did not win their division, but they took out the minister's cultural award. Congratulations to Marion Healy, Aunty Maud Corowa and their team on a job well done.

Yarraman and Nanango, Men's Shed

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.30 pm): I want to congratulate two people from Yarraman—Kerry Wyvill and Graham Lancaster—who are taking up the good fight with me so we can secure a Yarraman Men's Shed. The tale I will relate today is unbelievable. Back in 2010, when the Labor government sold the forestry plantations, the forestry town of Yarraman was left with an empty building, kept in the ownership of the government. That building has remained empty from 2010 to 2017. Kerry, Graham and 20 to 30 local men in Yarraman have identified this shed, which has a concrete floor—it is a perfectly great big shed—as an ideal place for the Yarraman Men's Shed, and why not? I wrote to the minister thinking that common sense would prevail—but no. They have decided that it is not a good enough spot for the men's shed and they do not want to look after the men's shed.

There is precedent for something like this. When Jeff Seeney was the deputy premier he made a way for the Murgon Men's Shed to take an old QR building. He offered the Murgon Men's Shed a lease of that land and enabled these men to get into that men's shed. We talk in this House all the time about issues surrounding men, particularly in regional areas. We need to be looking out for our communities. That is what I am doing and that is what Kerry Wyvill and Graham Lancaster are doing. Common sense needs to prevail. I will not stop until the Yarraman Men's Shed is given a building within Yarraman. There are empty government buildings there. It is completely crazy that this government is going to spend, we have heard, \$300,000 to demolish that shed for no good reason. I will wait to hear an answer in this House.

I move on now to the Nanango Men's Shed. I want to thank both Graham Firth and president Alan Sheppard for hosting me at the Nanango Men's Shed the other day and presenting me with a sign that reads 'Deb's Kitchen—Proudly created by Nanango Men's Shed'. I will be writing to you, Mr Speaker, to seek permission for that to be hung in the kitchen on level 19.

I also want to give a quick shout-out, because it is Ekka week. We love the Ekka. Toogoolawah State High School has beaten 27 other schools to take out the interschool team young judging. I congratulate Taylor Williams and John and Olivia Delaforce, who took out first place in young team judging at the Ekka. What a fantastic thing for Toogoolawah.

Mount Lindesay Highway

 **Mr POWER** (Logan—ALP) (10.33 pm): I was absolutely shocked when the LNP opposition leader recently left his northside suburb of Clayfield and reluctantly visited the roadside of the Mount Lindesay Highway. I was shocked because the member for Clayfield and the LNP failed on the Mount Lindesay Highway. I was shocked because he did not take the opportunity to apologise. Everyone in this place knows that I fight for the Mount Lindesay Highway. It is the lifeblood of the western part of Logan and is a vital economic and social connection.

The Palaszczuk Labor government and the former minister understand the importance of the Mount Lindesay Highway. However, the member for Clayfield, the leader of the LNP opposition, has shown by his actions that he does not support the Mount Lindesay Highway. In his three years as treasurer the member for Clayfield added only \$680,000 to the budget for the Mount Lindesay Highway. It was an insult to the people of Logan. Despite strong population growth in the area, he saw the Mount Lindesay Highway as just another thing to cut, cut, cut.

I know that the people of Logan deserve better, and I would fight for more. Soon after we were elected we initiated the Mount Lindesay Highway safety review. Through this program, important projects such as the \$8 million Camp Cable Road intersection were completed—and I will ask for more works this year. I knew that we needed more. Some said to me, 'You've already got so much more funding than the LNP and the last government.' To anyone who said that to me I simply said, 'We need more because we have to make up for the member for Clayfield failing to fund the highway.'

That is why I was pleased to see \$20 million in funding for the upgrade of the Greenbank Road intersection and the service road from the Chambers Flat intersection opposite the Greenbank Road intersection that the community and I fought for. We will continue to work with local businesses and shoppers for the best safe access for local businesses. By working together and listening, I believe that we can improve this great project. In the most recent budget we delivered a further \$20 million for the highway, for four-laning in Park Ridge South. This is vital funding so that families returning home will not have to merge together and then exit at Stoney Camp Road.

These are positive investments and they are welcomed by everyone in Logan, but they do not yet catch up with the disaster that was the budget under the LNP, under the member for Clayfield. We know that the LNP did not invest in the Mount Lindesay Highway. I will continue to fight to make up for the woeful lack of investment in the three years of the LNP under the member for Clayfield. I will continue to fight to ensure that he will not control the budget and let down Logan once again.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.36 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, Seene, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting