

~~This is a bill that is an alarming affront to the rights of property owners and a threat to the economic future of families and communities. In order to satisfy the political needs of this government, the rights of property owners to manage their land, to invest in it and to reap just reward is being curtailed. What this means in many cases is that improvement of property is prevented and job creating and maintaining investment ceases. Landholders' property values are diminished by laws like this. This has flow on effects to the ability of local councils to collect rates and provide services for their communities. Less investment, less production and reduced rates for councils equals a triple whammy against rural interests and rural communities.~~

~~At the AgForce rally yesterday I bumped into a few people from my electorate of Southern Downs. The first one was Mr Linden Charles who is a farmer in Inglewood. He is a grain farmer and has sheep as well. He scoffs at the government's idea that he needs to be regulated in how he manages his own property. He knows his property better than anyone else and he has looked after it awfully well. He has also complained that this sort of attack on landholders' rights diminishes the value of his property and it is threatening his impending retirement. Can members imagine seizing a portion of someone's superannuation arbitrarily? It is unthinkable, but that is exactly the effect it will have on some farmers.~~

~~I also met a leafy green vegetable producer from Bapaume in the Granite Belt part of my electorate, Mr Howard Poole. He explained to me that because of the unique climate of the Granite Belt it is possible to grow many crops a year of leafy green vegetables and that a single 2.5 hectare area can provide \$70,000 crop after \$70,000 crop provided water is available. If water is available but they cannot clear the land to cultivate look at the loss in production, look at the loss in investment and the loss in potential jobs in that very labour intensive industry. What becomes of that potential growth? It is lost. What will be the impact of that lost growth on communities like mine and many others around the state? People who want jobs, people who are working hard in small business and struggling need that economic activity. A government that sits in Brisbane and imposes crazy tree clearing laws on electorates like mine is doing them a great disservice. This bill is an inequity. I oppose it and I will be supporting the amendments foreshadowed by my honourable friend, the member for Burdekin.~~

~~Debate, on motion of Mr Lister, adjourned.~~

LIQUOR (RURAL HOTELS CONCESSION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (12.43 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Liquor Act 1992 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Liquor (Rural Hotels Concession) Amendment Bill.

Tabled paper: Liquor (Rural Hotels Concession) Amendment Bill, explanatory notes.

The bill I present to the House was presented in the previous parliament. It had the support of the committee. Licence fees for small pubs are based on volume of litreage sold in recognition of smaller hotels. It was relative to the size of the enterprise. However, today we have inherited a charge, the pub licence fee, that is the same across the board. Last time I checked it was about \$3,700.

This issue first came to my attention in a handwritten letter with scratchy writing from a small pub owner in a remote area that said his accountant had told him he had made \$38,000 net profit last year and that it was not really worth him owning the pub and keeping it open for the community. He is paying over \$3,500, the same as the Breakfast Creek Hotel, for his pub licence fee and he is not sure that is fair. To put it in perspective, that pub is the only private business in that town. If the local MP wants to go to town and meet with people the pub is the only meeting place. If people want to go and talk about things or have a community meeting they go to the pub. If you are a tourist travelling through the area and you want to get directions on the lonely roads you pull into the pub. It is important we do everything possible to help these remote pubs. This is a way that we can help them.

I have had various discussions over the years with previous Attorney-Generals about how it can be done. There are some difficulties in doing it equitably. No solution is perfect, I will admit, but the best way that we have found was to apply the classification of 'very remote Australia' under the Australian Statistical Geography Standard, as acknowledged in the explanatory notes. Using that classification, there are 110 venues around Queensland, which could represent a cost to the government of around \$300,000 in foregone revenue. I would not say it is a huge cost to taxpayers. It is a cost, I acknowledge that, but one might say that does not sound like too much. The recommended reduction is from \$3,500

down to \$350. I have had a positive response to the bill. People think the cost reduction would make a difference to their operations. The sentiment from the government would also make a big difference to these people. It would be a very good thing for this parliament to pass the bill.

The bill has had support from the Queensland Hotels Association; Clubs Queensland—with some qualifications; the Quilpie Shire Council; and the Mount Isa City Council. In the last parliament about 14 pubs made submissions. I can assure the House that a large volume of correspondence came through to my office saying they hope we can get this bill through. I have had a number of conversation with angry publicans saying, 'You didn't bloody deliver on that.' Pardon my French. I retract that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): I ask you to withdraw.

Mr KATTER: I withdraw. There is a real appetite for this amendment. I have had meaningful discussions with the government and the committee. It is a good initiative that the parliament could implement to help small pubs in remote areas. It is not only about the pub or the town, but also about Outback tourism and trying to preserve the community fabric in those areas that are under stress. I ask for the support of the House on this bill.

First Reading

Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (12.49 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 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

021

~~VEGETATION MANAGEMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL~~

~~Second Reading~~

~~Resumed from p. 887, on motion of Dr Lynham—~~

~~That the bill be now read a second time.~~

~~**Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (12.49 pm): I rise in support of the government's Vegetation Management and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I commend my cabinet colleague the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy for bringing the bill into the House. I also commend the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts for her enormous contribution to the bill that the House is now considering.~~

~~Of course, this bill is being presented in the second term of the Palaszczuk Labor government, having been presented to the House in the first term of the Palaszczuk Labor government. These laws were put to the people of Queensland at the election in 2015 and at the election in 2017. The people of Queensland voted on these laws and elected a Palaszczuk Labor government in 2015 and in 2017.~~

~~I contrast that with what happened in 2012 when, under the leadership of Campbell Newman, those opposite swore that there would be no statutory reduction to the protection of native vegetation in Queensland. That was the promise given by those opposite at the 2012 election. There are many issues that those on the other side of the House put to the people of Queensland and then reneged on. One of the key issues they reneged on was keeping the statutory protections for native vegetation in Queensland. The results have been devastating for our state and our nation.~~

~~The statistics speak for themselves: in the last year alone, in Queensland almost 400,000 hectares have been affected, 40 per cent in Great Barrier Reef catchment areas, and there has been a doubling in the volume of emissions from land use management. Queensland is now leading the nation in terms of carbon emissions from land use management, because Campbell Newman and the LNP lied to the people of Queensland, and changed and weakened tree clearing laws.~~