



# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

## FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

### Wednesday, 24 May 2017

Subject	Page
<b>ASSENT TO BILLS</b> .....	<b>1321</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 May 2017, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 May 2017. ....	
	1321
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1321</b>
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member</b> .....	
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Correspondence from the member for Redlands, Mr Matt McEachan MP, and the member for Pumicestone, Mr Rick Williams MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House. ....	
	1322
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1322</b>
<b>Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier and a Minister</b> .....	
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 15 May 2017, from the member for Mount Ommaney, Mrs Tarnya Smith MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House. ....	
	1322
<b>PETITION</b> .....	<b>1322</b>
<b>TABLED PAPER</b> .....	<b>1322</b>
<b>ORDER FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS</b> .....	<b>1323</b>
<b>PRIVILEGE</b> .....	<b>1323</b>
<b>Failure to Comply with an Order of the House by a Minister</b> .....	
	1323
<b>MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1323</b>
<b>Manchester Incident, Motion to Take Note</b> .....	
	1323
<b>Budget</b> .....	
	1324
<b>State of Origin</b> .....	
	1325
<b>North Queensland Regional Plan</b> .....	
	1325
<b>Queensland Economy</b> .....	
	1325
<b>Health, Innovation</b> .....	
	1326
<b>Advancing Queensland Schools; Dreamworld</b> .....	
	1327

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 24 May 2017

Taskforce Maxima .....	1327
<b>Solar Energy; Tow Truck Industry</b> .....	<b>1328</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Map titled 'Queensland Renewable Project Pipeline, May 2017'.....	1329
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document by Department of Energy and Water Supply titled 'Solar Tracker'.....	1329
<b>Hot DesQ</b> .....	<b>1329</b>
<b>Workplace Health and Safety, Audit</b> .....	<b>1329</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements</b> .....	<b>1330</b>
<b>NOTICE OF MOTION</b> .....	<b>1331</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Crime</b> .....	<b>1331</b>
<b>PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS</b> .....	<b>1331</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Leadership</b> .....	<b>1331</b>
<b>Cape York, Traditional Owners</b> .....	<b>1331</b>
<b>Carmichael Mine</b> .....	<b>1332</b>
<b>Back to Work Program</b> .....	<b>1332</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Carmichael Mine</b> .....	<b>1333</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk MP and Adani Group Chairman, Gautam Adani.....	1333
<b>QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE</b> .....	<b>1334</b>
<b>Adani, Royalties</b> .....	<b>1334</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Briefing note, undated, to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment, Hon John-Paul Langbroek, regarding the release of QSchools smart phone application and commercial in confidence information. ....	1334
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from diary, covering 21 May to 27 May 2014, with hand written name John McVeigh.....	1334
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 7 June 2012, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Scott Emerson MP, to Mr Neil Laurie, Clerk of the Parliament, regarding a petition response and commercial in confidence information. ....	1335
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Leadership</b> .....	<b>1335</b>
<b>Mining and Energy Industries</b> .....	<b>1336</b>
<b>Adani, Royalties</b> .....	<b>1338</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk and Adani Group Chairman, Gautam Adani.....	1338
<b>Arts Funding</b> .....	<b>1338</b>
<b>Adani, Royalties</b> .....	<b>1339</b>
<b>Keppel Electorate, Tropical Cyclone Debbie</b> .....	<b>1339</b>
<b>Carmichael Mine</b> .....	<b>1340</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and regional Queensland mayors touring facilities at Mundra, India. ....	1340
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ministerial diary extract, of Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, dated 1 to 31 March 2017, detailing dinner hosted by Adani Chairman and Board on 17 March 2017 and attendees. ....	1340
<b>Business Development Fund</b> .....	<b>1341</b>
<b>Carmichael Mine</b> .....	<b>1342</b>
<b>Specialist Outpatient Strategy</b> .....	<b>1343</b>
<b>Adani, Royalties</b> .....	<b>1343</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from <i>Brisbane Times</i> , dated 24 May 2017, titled 'Tim Nicholls can't say whether he supports Adani royalty holiday'. ....	1344
<b>Tourism Industry</b> .....	<b>1344</b>
<b>Ministerial Champion Program</b> .....	<b>1345</b>
<b>Bruce Highway</b> .....	<b>1345</b>
<b>TransLink, Russell Island State School</b> .....	<b>1346</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 April 2017, from Mr Benjamin James, external affairs TransLink, to the member for Redlands, Mr Matt McEachan MP, regarding Russell Island Ferry timetable. ....	1346
<b>TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (PERSONALISED TRANSPORT REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1346</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1346</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament— Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, government response. ....	1347
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Meeting points with the Shadow Minister'.....	1352
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 21 May 2017, to Mr Andrew Powell MP from Limo Action Group, regarding proposed amendments to passenger transport legislation.....	1353
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Pamphlet titled, 'Queensland - It's in your hands' outlining One Nation policy. ....	1366
<b>MOTION</b> .....	<b>1367</b>
<b>Palaszczuk Labor Government, Crime</b> .....	<b>1367</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 12 May 2017, titled 'Crims Think We're A Joke' Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to. ....	1367
Resolved in the negative.....	1373
<b>TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (PERSONALISED TRANSPORT REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL</b> .....	<b>1373</b>
<b>Second Reading</b> .....	<b>1373</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release from the Taxi Council Queensland, dated 15 September 2015, titled 'Taxi Council welcomes KAP illegal taxi crackdown'. ....	1378

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 24 May 2017

<b>Consideration in Detail .....</b>	<b>1382</b>
Clauses 1 to 14, as read, agreed to .....	1382
Clause 15—.....	1382
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment	
Bill 2017, amendments to be moved by Mr Rob Katter MP .....	1382
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1383
Resolved in the negative .....	1383
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated .....	1383
Clause 15, as read, agreed to.....	1383
Clause 16—.....	1383
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated .....	1384
Clause 16, as read, agreed to.....	1384
Insertion of new clause— .....	1384
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment	
Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments .....	1384
Amendment agreed to .....	1384
Clause 17, as read, agreed to.....	1384
Clause 18—.....	1384
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to .....	1385
Resolved in the negative .....	1385
Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) negated.....	1385
Amendments agreed to .....	1385
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1387
Resolved in the negative .....	1387
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated .....	1387
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to .....	1388
Resolved in the negative .....	1388
Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated .....	1388
Clause 18, as amended, agreed to .....	1391
Clauses 19 to 37— .....	1391
Clauses 19 to 37, as amended, agreed to .....	1391
Schedule 1—.....	1392
Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to .....	1392
<b>Third Reading.....</b>	<b>1392</b>
<b>Long Title.....</b>	<b>1392</b>
<b>TRADING (ALLOWABLE HOURS) AMENDMENT BILL .....</b>	<b>1392</b>
<b>Second Reading.....</b>	<b>1392</b>
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 37—Trading (Allowable	
Hours) Amendment Bill 2017, government response .....	1394
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release titled 'Queensland Government Supports extending trading hours	
despite risking the livelihoods of thousands of independent Queensland Retail Businesses' .....	1401
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Facts sheet for Qld trading hours liberalisation' .....	1402
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 10 May 2017, and attachment, from the Executive Officer of	
Hardware Australia to the member for Kawana, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP, regarding trading hours .....	1402
<b>ADJOURNMENT.....</b>	<b>1406</b>
<b>Ergon Energy, Mackays Bananas .....</b>	<b>1406</b>
<b>Creeks Restoration Works.....</b>	<b>1407</b>
<b>South West Hospital and Health Service Board.....</b>	<b>1407</b>
<b>Glancy, Ms S.....</b>	<b>1408</b>
<b>Tropical Cyclone Debbie.....</b>	<b>1408</b>
<b>Ipswich Show .....</b>	<b>1409</b>
<b>Toowoomba, Rail .....</b>	<b>1409</b>
<b>Bundaberg Electorate, Indue Card Trial .....</b>	<b>1410</b>
<b>Gold Coast, Law and Order .....</b>	<b>1411</b>
<b>Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital; Body Corporate Governance .....</b>	<b>1411</b>
<b>ATTENDANCE.....</b>	<b>1412</b>

## WEDNESDAY, 24 MAY 2017

---



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

### ASSENT TO BILLS



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from His Excellency the Governor a letter in respect of assent to certain bills. The contents of the letter will be incorporated in the *Record of Proceedings*. I table the letter for the information of members.

The Honourable P.W. Wellington MP  
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly  
Parliament House  
George Street  
BRISBANE QLD 4000

I hereby acquaint the Legislative Assembly that the following Bills, having been passed by the Legislative Assembly and having been presented for the Royal Assent, were assented to in the name of Her Majesty The Queen on the date shown:

Date of assent: 19 May 2017

A Bill for An Act to amend the Water Act 2000 and the Water Supply (Safety and Reliability) Act 2008 for particular purposes

A Bill for An Act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1981, the Building Act 1975, the Local Government Electoral Act 2011, the Planning Act 2016, the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016, the Planning (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2016 and the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 for particular purposes

A Bill for An Act to amend the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994 and the State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999, and to amend the legislation mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes

A Bill for An Act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting) Act 2004, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Acts mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes, and to repeal the Child Protection (Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2008

These Bills are hereby transmitted to the Legislative Assembly, to be numbered and forwarded to the proper Officer for enrolment, in the manner required by law.

Yours sincerely

Governor

19 May 2017

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 19 May 2017, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 19 May 2017 [[762](#)].

### PRIVILEGE

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



**Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 10 May 2017, the member for Redlands wrote to me alleging that the member for Pumicestone deliberately misled the House in his matter of privilege on 9 May 2017 when he stated—

I refer to documents tabled in the parliament this morning. They include three complaints made against the company Accident & Breakdown Towing Pty Ltd. My wife and I divested of this company in 2013.

In his letter to me, the member for Redlands claimed that the member for Pumicestone's statement to the House that he had divested himself of the Accident & Breakdown Towing Pty Ltd in 2013 was incorrect and misleading because the member was still a director of the company until 26 May 2014 and retained a 10 per cent shareholding until 18 February 2015. The member for Redlands claimed that, as the statement was on a topic relating to the member for Pumicestone's personal affairs and was read from a prepared statement, the member for Pumicestone must have intended to mislead the House.


I sought further information from the member for Pumicestone about the allegations made against him in accordance with standing order 269(5). The member for Pumicestone advised that, while he did not dispute that his statement was misleading, his statement was based on his involvement in the company, where from July 2013 he no longer took an interest in the day-to-day operations of the company. He further advised that he used the term 'divested' to express that he did not have control of the day-to-day running of the company. The member for Pumicestone also advised that on reflection he came to appreciate that the words used may not have accurately conveyed what he was trying to express and hence rose on another matter of privilege the day after his original statement and corrected the record in a clarifying statement.

On the evidence before me, I am satisfied with the member for Pumicestone's explanation that he was referring to not having an interest in the day-to-day running of the company and his subsequent clarifying statement to the House the following day to correct the record. Therefore, I have decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Correspondence from the member for Redlands, Mr Matt McEachan MP, and the member for Pumicestone, Mr Rick Williams MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House [\[763\]](#).

## PRIVILEGE

### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier and a Minister

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 15 May 2017, the member for Mount Ommaney wrote to me alleging that the Premier and Minister for the Arts and the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business deliberately misled the House on 10 May 2017 in the Premier's response to a question without notice when she stated—

I am more than happy to have a look at the document that has been tabled. This issue was canvassed in the parliament last time. My understanding from the minister is that this was a draft document.

In her letter to me, the member for Mount Ommaney claimed that the Premier's statement to the House that the document was a draft report was incorrect and misleading because the report does not contain any reference to being a draft and included the cover letter to the minister indicating that it was the final version. The member for Mount Ommaney advised that she included the minister in the complaint and referred to the statement made by the Premier as 'their statement' because the minister interjected during the Premier's response, advising the Premier that the report was a draft.

On the evidence before me, I am satisfied that, as the Premier's statement was so heavily qualified through the use of the preface 'My understanding from the minister' and as the minister did not make any official statement to the House in response to the question without notice, the matters as raised are technical in nature at best. I have therefore decided that the matter does not warrant the further attention of the House via the Ethics Committee and I will not be referring the matter. I table the correspondence in relation to this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 15 May 2017, from the member for Mount Ommaney, Mrs Tarnya Smith MP, to the Speaker, Hon. Peter Wellington, regarding an alleged misleading of the House [\[764\]](#).

## PETITION

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

### Pimpama, Yawalpah Road, Upgrade

**Mr Crandon**, from 61 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the City of Gold Coast undertakes the essential and necessary roadworks to turn Yawalpah Road into two lanes, for 250 metres, leading to the roundabout at Exit 49 [\[765\]](#).

Petition received.

## TABLED PAPER

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Cairns (Mr Pyne)—


[761](#) Fraser Coast Regional Council—Organisational Review and Development Plan (redacted)

## ORDER FOR PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

**Mr CLERK:** In accordance with standing order 29, I advise the House of the following outstanding order: order of the House dated 1 March 2017 requiring the Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning to produce to the House a report from Queensland Rail on the outcome of the chair's 'stress test' of the Citytrain timetable.

## PRIVILEGE


### Failure to Comply with an Order of the House by a Minister

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (2.07 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Mr Speaker, as the Clerk has just informed the House, the Deputy Premier has now failed to comply with an order of the House to produce the outcome of the Queensland Rail chair's 'stress test' since 1 March 2017—a period of nearly three months. Notwithstanding the correction of the record by the Premier yesterday, I ask that you consider this matter and rule on when the delay constitutes a contempt of parliament and what remedies are available to the House.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I will consider the matter.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

### Manchester Incident, Motion to Take Note

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.07 pm): I once again send the condolences, thoughts and prayers of Queensland to the people of Manchester who witnessed so much evil wrought upon the most innocent among their society. Any parent farewelling their children to a concert should expect to see them again—but, for many parents in Manchester, just over 24 hours ago they received the worst news a parent possibly could.


Twenty-two people, including children, are dead for no reason other than pure evil, and 12 children aged under 16 are among the 59 injured. While many of those who lost their lives are yet to be formally identified, eight-year-old Saffie is among those killed in this horrendous attack. Saffie's headmaster described her as 'simply beautiful in every aspect of the word'. The names of others identified are Alison Howe, Lisa Lees, Kelly Brewster, Megan Hurley, John Atkinson and Georgina Callender. We grieve with their parents, their siblings and their friends.

Young people going out to a concert is something we all did at that age. Such shocking violence which seems targeted at young people, especially young girls, is sickening and simply heartbreaking. Anyone who saw the images last night of the Manchester community standing together as one in the face of this tragedy and evil that occurred just hours earlier could not help but be moved. The united face they presented—across all races, all religions and all nationalities—speaks volumes. The message was clear: united in the face of tragedy, united in grief, united as one.

I can advise the House that this morning I have written to the British Prime Minister, Theresa May, and the British High Commissioner to send our love, support and sympathy on behalf of all Queenslanders. I can also advise the House that last night I, along with Minister Mark Ryan, received a briefing from Police Commissioner Ian Stewart here at Parliament House. Commissioner Stewart advised me that the Queensland Police Service remains in close contact with the Australian Federal Police on these matters. He has reassured me that there is no known threat to Queensland and our level of threat remains unchanged. Commissioner Stewart also advised me that, following events like this, security arrangements at major events where people are likely to gather are reviewed, and this is happening.

I note that the Union Jack today flies at half-mast at Parliament House in a fitting tribute to the people of Manchester, and I thank you, Mr Speaker, for this heartfelt gesture. Just as people in Manchester stood side by side with each other in defiance of those who wanted to disrupt the freedoms of their society, we as members of this House and as Queenslanders stand side by side with the global community united against such acts of evil. I move—

That the House take note of the statement.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.10 pm): I join with the Premier in saying that, like all Queenslanders—and, in fact, those throughout the civilised world—I am shocked, horrified and deeply saddened by the terrorist incident in Manchester. As a father of three teenagers,

the brutal and horrific scenes of petrified kids running for their lives hit home for me, as I am sure it did for many of us. Watching the video footage of children screaming and hearing the voices of desperate parents searching for their missing children can only be described as harrowing.

How dare someone attack innocent kids and families simply attending a pop concert! It was pure evil and an evil which must be tackled head-on. What type of deranged, sick and cowardly person or persons would do this? I am sure there are many members in this House who feel the same way I do. I am sure there are many members of this House who, with their children, have attended concerts of a similar sort or have dropped them off. I dropped my daughter, Kate, to see Taylor Swift and One Direction, and my son to see an AC/DC concert. It is just a normal part of life. Kids should be able to go to concerts and to come home safely, and parents should not have to fret.

From the carnage, however, come reports of some truly inspiring and remarkable acts of bravery and sacrifice. Take Kelly Brewster, who died while shielding her 11-year-old niece from the blast. Take homeless man Chris Parker, who ran into the Manchester arena to help the wounded without any regard for his own safety. He tended to a woman who was badly hurt in the bombing with serious leg and head injuries who passed away in his arms. He then turned his attention to a little girl who had suffered horrific injuries and wrapped her in a T-shirt to stem the bleeding before paramedics arrived.


If we could all be half as brave as Chris Parker and Kelly Brewster then the world would be a much better place. It is people like Chris and Kelly who ensure that good prevails over evil. Love will always triumph over hate. Wherever we live, whatever the skin colour or religion of our neighbours, we can defend the best of what makes us great by refusing to give in to hatred, but sometimes—just sometimes—that resolve is well and truly tested.

On behalf of the entire Liberal National Party—members and MPs—I want to pass on my deepest condolences to the victims, their families, Manchester residents and the British people. As the Premier has said, we have stood with you before and we are standing with you again in these dark days.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## Budget


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.13 pm): Next month the Treasurer will deliver our government's third budget for Queensland. This budget will put jobs for Queenslanders front and centre. My government is determined to keep our commitments and continue to deliver for Queensland. We have restored front-line services, particularly in health and education, following the slash-and-burn approach of our predecessors. We have introduced programs and initiatives to back Queenslanders, whether it gets them into work, expands their businesses or increases their reach into new markets, interstate or overseas. We have detailed and funded plans for a growing Queensland to build our road, rail and social infrastructure; harness our resources, renewable and non-renewable; protect our environment; attract visitors to our state; and, most importantly, invest in our people to ensure they have the support they need and the encouragement they deserve to have rewarding lives.

Queensland is growing. As an export state, we posted a record \$52 billion in trade revenue for our goods in 2016, with the agriculture and resources industries bouncing back. As an energy state, we are the only state developing coal, gas, and renewables, and pursuing an ambitious biofutures agenda. As a tourism state, we are enjoying double-digit growth of visitors from interstate and overseas. As an innovation state, we are investing from our classrooms to our boardrooms to ensure our people lead in the fields of science and research and can have those breakthroughs and products commercialised which will create jobs.

As a healthy state, we are investing in our health system to ensure Queenslanders have access to care and that we work together to reduce chronic disease and increase resources for preventative health initiatives such as the Healthy Futures Commission. As a caring state, we are increasing the protections enshrined in our laws and in our communities for those vulnerable or threatened.

The budget we deliver on 13 June will be an investment in Queensland's future and Queensland jobs. As we put the final touches to the budget, I want to thank my ministers for their hard work and all caucus members for their contribution to the preparation of the budget. This budget will deliver for Queensland.

## State of Origin

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.16 pm): In speaking of Queensland, there are some things we associate with late May in this part of Queensland—cooler mornings, morning fog and the excitement that can only come from the State of Origin. I am slightly surprised to see so many members in this place given that to get here they have had to drag themselves away from a meeting with those magnificent men in maroon, otherwise known as the 2017 Queensland State of Origin team.


It was a pleasure to welcome Kevvy Walters, Cameron Smith and the rest of the team here, including the world's highest profile 18th man, one Johnathan Thurston. We have long known that Origin is so much more than football, and this year the inaugural Maroon Festival—'Maroon Fest'—will confirm that. For four days from 28 May everything Origin will be the centrepiece of a cultural festival across the river at South Bank, kicking off on Sunday. I would like to see as many people and as many families there as possible to welcome their heroes. I would urge Queenslanders from all corners of the state to get along and enjoy this wonderful build-up to Origin 1.

There is a tradition that the premiers of Queensland and New South Wales have a friendly wager over the result of the series each year. I have put to my counterpart that for one night the losing state has to colour its parliament—in this case, Macquarie Street—in the colours of the winning state—maroon. Mr Speaker, thank you very much for agreeing to this friendly wager. We are waiting to hear back from New South Wales.

In closing, I thank the Parliamentary Friends of Rugby League, especially the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Everton, and everyone who attended today. It was a wonderful opportunity. There is only one word left to say: Queensland!


**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the Deputy Premier, I am informed that we have students from St Bernardine's Catholic School in the electorate of Logan observing our proceedings. Welcome.

## North Queensland Regional Plan

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.18 pm): Good regional planning means a better future for our regions. That is why I am pleased to inform the House that we have commenced our conversation with the residents of North Queensland to create Queensland's first ever planning blueprint for the north, the North Queensland Regional Plan. A North Queensland Regional Plan will create a clear direction for the next 25 years and will give the councils and communities of Burdekin, Charters Towers, Hinchinbrook, Palm Island and Townsville a chance to address issues specific to the north. This is a very exciting opportunity for North Queensland to join in the conversation, tell us what is special about their region and how we can best plan for their future.

North Queensland is already the most densely populated part of Northern Australia, and over the next 25 years the population covered by this regional plan is expected to grow to almost 340,000 people. Working together, we will shape the region to harness its potential and continue to boost economic development, employment and liveability. Between now and 9 July, North Queenslanders can have their say on planning for their future by visiting our ideas hub at various community events located around the region or getting involved online. The framework of the draft regional plan is currently being developed based on research and expert input from local government, traditional owners, industry and environmental representatives and other government agencies. The conversations with the community will also focus on helping people understand the planning process and the community will have another chance to have their say during formal consultation on the draft plan, which will be released later this year. This plan will focus on embracing the region's strengths to help maximise opportunities, respond to challenges and lay out a clear planning direction for the future so that our children and their children have the best home in which to live, work and play.

## Queensland Economy

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.21 pm): With less than three weeks to go to the 2017-18 state budget, a range of indicators confirm the strength and growth of the Queensland economy. The improved position of the Queensland economy is reflected in the Queensland State Accounts. The December quarter 2014 result, under the LNP, was 0.8 per cent growth over the previous year. This was the poorest performance since the global financial crisis and a legacy of the Newman LNP government. Under Labor, our economic plan to stimulate economic



activity, create jobs and innovate is delivering results. The December quarter 2016 shows 2.6 per cent growth in trend gross state product over the previous year. This result is higher than the 1.8 per cent recorded in the rest of Australia.


State final demand was up 1.6 per cent over the year. This was the fourth consecutive positive quarter after eight consecutive negative quarters. While GSP takes into account our trade performance, state final demand does not so it is a good measure of the health of our state's domestic economy. When it comes to looking at business investment, significantly, there was a 0.5 per cent growth in business investment. This is the second consecutive rise in business investment after 11 quarterly falls. This is a good result for Queensland and one that we will continue to update Queenslanders about.

While Tropical Cyclone Debbie is estimated to have caused around \$2 billion in economic losses, the resilience and diversity of our state economy means we are still forecast to experience strong statewide growth. Our state's export performance is also evidence of our strong and growing economy. Higher coal prices drove nominal merchandise exports to a record high of \$59.3 billion in the 12 months to March 2017. That is a record. It is more than \$1 billion a week in export earnings.

The state's LNG industry continues to deliver real growth in overseas exports. Importantly, our strong export performance is not confined to resources, agriculture and other merchandise. We see more opportunities for tourism and education, in addition to the growth we are already experiencing. Queensland is increasingly seen as an attractive tourism destination in the growing Asian market. We all know how great Queensland is, and more and more people want to come and see Queensland for themselves. We also know the Queensland economy is undergoing an economic adjustment following the once-in-a-lifetime resources investment boom. This transition is not without challenges, particularly in regional Queensland. That is why our economic plan has been critical in supporting economic growth and seeing confidence return to Queensland households and businesses. That is why we have a suite of initiatives to promote Queensland, with more jobs and more economic opportunities, particularly in regional Queensland. This includes our Back to Work program, the regional jobs and growth program and Works for Queensland. We on this side of the House will continue to focus on job creation and on supporting regional communities and economies. I can assure Queenslanders that the state budget to be delivered on 13 June will be a budget for all Queenslanders, no matter where you live.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the Minister for Health, I am informed that we have student leaders from numerous high schools in the electorate of Springwood observing our proceedings. Welcome.

### Health, Innovation


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.24 pm): Queensland continues to be a destination of choice for health innovation. Recently I spoke at the international immunotherapy conference, where the world's foremost immunotherapy experts, including Sir Marc Feldmann AC, convened in Brisbane to discuss a new field of research and treatment which is being driven by the cutting-edge work that QIMR Berghofer and Queensland's Translational Research Institute are undertaking.

Last year Admedus, an Australian based company that has a global profile in immunotherapies, relocated its corporate office from Perth to Brisbane. I was delighted to be part of that corporate office opening. Last year, the Palaszczuk government and BGI, formerly the Beijing Genomics Institute, announced it had chosen the QIMR Berghofer Medical Research Institute as its research and development and commercialisation headquarters for the Asia-Pacific region. These stories are great examples of Queensland being a destination of choice for health innovation and follow my successful health and life sciences trade mission to the US and China in October 2016.

The Palaszczuk government wants to ensure Queensland continues to be at the top of the table when it comes to new investment in health innovation in Australia. The government's \$405 million Advance Queensland initiative is at the heart of our economic program to create the knowledge industries and jobs of the future. This week, our government is hosting a high-powered Chinese delegation seeking new investment opportunities in health innovation in the state. The Torch Centre invests in health innovation projects, and we are very pleased to host high-level Chinese government and business delegates from seven Chinese provinces. Their visit to Queensland shows we are already prominent on the global map of health innovators. The Palaszczuk government's *Advancing health 2026* strategy has innovation as a key direction. This visit represents a wonderful opportunity to showcase our capability to the world. The delegation will visit QIMR Berghofer and the Translational Research Institute in Brisbane to view their important work, before heading to the Gold Coast to inspect the Gold Coast Health and Knowledge Precinct.

The Palaszczuk government already has six government-to-government agreements in place with a focus on collaboration in health and medicine, and Queensland universities and researchers also have numerous research and commercial agreements with China. I want this key delegation to know that Queensland is the best place in the world to invest in health innovation today and into the future.

### **Advancing Queensland Schools; Dreamworld**

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (2.27 pm): We are very proud of our record of investing in state schooling. I want to join with the Speaker in acknowledging in the gallery today the school captains from Springwood State High School, Shailer Park State High School and Rochedale State High School. It is wonderful to see them here. There is a very proud member for Springwood beaming behind me.

Through our \$200 million Advancing Queensland Schools infrastructure program, we are delivering new and upgraded halls at 30 schools across the state. I am pleased to announce that tenders will be called for this work this week. This school infrastructure program is driving job creation across Queensland. Fifteen design firms have already been engaged, and this investment will support more than 500 jobs. Following the awarding of tenders next month, we will see more jobs created for subcontractors and suppliers. We want to ensure where possible these construction projects are delivered by locals, supporting local tradies and local suppliers, just as the Premier directed.


We are building: a new multipurpose hall at Kingaroy State High School in the electorate of Nanango; a new hall at Mansfield State High School in the electorate of Mansfield; a new performing arts centre at Wavell State High School in the electorate of Nudgee; an upgrade to the Lockyer District High School hall in the electorate of Lockyer; a new multipurpose hall at Cleveland District State High School in the electorate of Cleveland, which is funded in this budget and not in any other budget before this budget—despite what the member for Cleveland might want to tell the parliament; it is an upgrade in his local community, but, anyway, that is another story; an upgrade to the Yeppoon State High School hall in the electorate of Keppel; a new hall at Marsden State High School—

**An opposition member** interjected.

**Ms JONES:** The member talked about it; I delivered it. We are also building an upgrade to the Emerald State High School hall. I want to thank the Minister for Housing and Public Works and his department's Building and Asset Services division for their support in preparing these projects for tender. This is all part of our government's commitment to deliver a quality education for all students.

While I am in the parliament today, I want to address another issue. Today I have spoken with the Dreamworld CEO, Craig Davidson, and I can confirm that Dreamworld is here to stay. Dreamworld is committed to a long-term future for the theme park and has today released a new master plan for the whole site. This master plan is all about ensuring the long-term sustainability of Dreamworld and diversifying the offer and experiences for visitors to this theme park. It will include new visitor experiences, including new restaurants and retail in an integrated resort. Dreamworld is a national tourism icon and I can confirm to the House that Dreamworld is here to stay.

### **Taskforce Maxima**

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (2.29 pm): Our police right across Queensland are working relentlessly to tackle all forms of serious organised crime in their communities and our government supports their outstanding efforts. The Palaszczuk government has continued to work hard to provide our police with the resources and tough laws needed to get those involved in all forms of serious organised crime off our streets.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members! It is not an opportunity to become a rabble.

**An honourable member** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No, not at this time.

**Mr RYAN:** Last month I announced that Taskforce Maxima will be established as a permanent unit within the Organised Crime Gangs Group in the Queensland Police. Under those opposite, Taskforce Maxima was a temporary unit. Under us, it is a permanent unit. Just like our resolve to tackle

all forms of organised crime here in Queensland, it is a permanent focus of our government. Under the new Organised Crime Gangs Group staffing numbers will increase and there will be a surge capacity for the Queensland Police Service to respond as circumstances demand. I am happy to say that from 1 May 2017 the new Organised Crime Gangs Group has been up and running and is already achieving outstanding results. Due to Taskforce Maxima's relentless pursuit, the number of OMCGs in Queensland has almost halved. Patched OMCG membership has plunged from 1,158 in late 2013 to 695 as of last week, down—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr Mander** interjected.

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

**Mr RYAN:** It is down to 695 as of last week and the advice I have from the Queensland Police Service is that number continues to reduce. As well as that, 179 members have formally disassociated themselves from their gangs. Taskforce Maxima detectives report that when compared to other states, public violence involving crime gangs in Queensland is lower. The Palaszczuk government has introduced the toughest and most effective laws in the nation that are working and deal with all forms of serious organised crime in our state.

We committed an additional \$20 million over four years for the Queensland Police Service to specifically target serious organised crime in our state. We continue to be focused on disrupting and dismantling outlaw motorcycle gangs. We are also committed to eliminating all forms of horrific serious organised crime in our state. We introduced tough new laws to tackle child exploitation material on the internet and target those who use technology to promote and distribute offending material and conceal their offending. Our government backed up those new, tough, successful laws with more police, more resources and cutting-edge technology. The Palaszczuk government will always put the safety of Queenslanders and our front-line men and women who serve them first.

### **Solar Energy; Tow Truck Industry**



**Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.33 pm): I have great news for Queensland.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr BAILEY:** Finally the opposition is excited about solar! Today Queensland, the sunshine state, becomes Queensland, the solar state. New figures show that Queensland solar rooftops have now surged past the Gladstone Power Station as Queensland's largest power station. Latest Energy Queensland figures show that there are now more than 438,000 residential solar rooftops and 1,706 megawatts of solar PV power in Queensland. We are well on our way to meeting our target of one million solar rooftops, or 3,000 megawatts of solar power, by 2020.

Queensland has the highest installed capacity of solar rooftops in Australia by a large margin. We also have one of the highest solar penetration rates per capita anywhere in the world. We are home to a mix of residential and large-scale commercial and industrial solar installations supplying Queensland's electricity grids and homes and businesses with cheap, clean energy. We remain committed to increasing renewable energy to 50 per cent by 2030 and adopting a planned and measured approach to maintain affordability, reliability and security of supply.

Our response to the independent Renewable Energy Expert Panel final report will be released soon. We came to government with a clear commitment to increase the uptake of renewable energy after a renewable energy blackout under the LNP when it lost 1,300 renewable energy jobs in only three years. In just two years the Palaszczuk government has kickstarted a brand-new large-scale renewable energy industry boom in Queensland: 16 projects and more than a gigawatt of power committed, delivering around 2,000 direct new jobs and \$2.1 billion in investment. There are latte sippers as far as the eye can see! They are part of a broader pipeline of 4,200 megawatts of solar, wind, biomass, hydro and geothermal projects in our state. By and large these projects are in regional Queensland. The 25 megawatt Barcaldine Solar Farm is currently commissioned and feeding 15 megawatts into the grid as we speak. In North Queensland a raft of new, clean energy power stations are coming on line at Kidston, Lakeland, Clare, Collinsville—there are quite a few at Collinsville—and, of course, at Mount Emerald. There are many more—and I know those on the Darling Downs will be very pleased to hear this—in

Central and Western Queensland; there is a range of them there. I table a map showing the extent of these projects all over Queensland. I also table the solar tracker with details of the largest power station in Queensland.


*Tabled paper:* Map titled 'Queensland Renewable Project Pipeline, May 2017' [766].

*Tabled paper:* Document by Department of Energy and Water Supply titled 'Solar Tracker' [767].

Each of these large-scale projects delivers local jobs right across our state—jobs in design, jobs in permitting, jobs in construction and jobs in maintenance. The Palaszczuk government's commitment to the renewable energy industry is creating new jobs and diversifying the state's economy and, importantly, putting downward pressure on wholesale prices by increasing generation. We are committed to an energy mix that, along with traditional thermal generation, will ensure affordability, security and sustainability for Queenslanders.

I wish to address a question that was directed to the Premier yesterday by the member for Glass House. The matter raised appears to refer to the recovery of a stranded vehicle on a beach and, as such, is beyond the scope of current legislation. I invite the constituent of the member for Glass House to contact the towing hotline on 1800681636 or to make a submission to [towing.industry.investigation@tmr.qld.gov.au](mailto:towing.industry.investigation@tmr.qld.gov.au). This is another area that the Palaszczuk government is reforming, which was ignored for three years by Tim Nicholls and Campbell Newman.

### Hot DesQ


 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.38 pm): I am pleased to update the House on the Palaszczuk government's Australian first Hot DesQ program, which continues to attract successful international and interstate start-ups to Queensland and create jobs. Hot DesQ offers world-class early-stage and established start-ups, including successful Australian expats, the chance to base themselves in Queensland, share their knowledge, experience and ideas, and give back to the local start-up community. The program is part of our \$405 million whole-of-government Advance Queensland initiative with the inaugural 25 recipients announced last October. Although round 1 is not yet finished, we already know Hot DesQ participants have employed Queenslanders, appointed interns, attended numerous start-up events and facilitated international business connections on behalf of other Queensland start-ups.

Hot DesQ recipients have been located in regional centres like Cairns and the Sunshine Coast to help local start-ups in these regions develop. In addition, several Hot DesQ recipients have been travelling to regional Queensland through the Hot Entrepreneurs program. One of them, Ingrid Rodriguez from Eikonic—an award-winning global research and development company—recently indicated that she will remain in Queensland with the intent of hiring a Queensland based head of corporate and business development and a Queensland based executive assistant in the next six to 12 months. Six regions currently have co-working spaces registered as potential hosts for Hot DesQ recipients: Cairns, Townsville, Toowoomba, Ipswich and the Gold and Sunshine Coasts, with more to potentially follow.

Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland chief executive officer Stephen Tait says that he is hugely impressed with the calibre of start-ups being attracted to Queensland, a number of whom are working from CCIQ's collaborate co-working space. According to Mr Tait, Hot DesQ start-ups are helping cement this state's position as a global leader in medical and advanced manufacturing industries and artificial intelligence.

There is a buzz of excitement in Queensland about this government's collaborative attitude towards entrepreneurialism, as highlighted by a 60 per cent increase in the number of applications for Hot DesQ round 2. Round 2 applicants have expressed interest in a range of locations across the state, which indicates that they see the innovation potential of regional Queensland.

### Workplace Health and Safety, Audit


 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.41 pm): Each and every Queenslanders deserves to go home to their loved ones safe and healthy at the end of every working day. Keeping workers healthy and safe is a priority for the Palaszczuk government. Who could ever forget those shocking images of the workplace tragedies from last year and the unimaginable loss and pain for the families of those who lost their lives. These tragic deaths brought home the need for continued and

sustained efforts to improve safety at all of our workplaces and public venues. That is why in October last year the Palaszczuk government announced that it would undertake a best practice audit of our work health and safety procedures and laws.

The scope of the audit is wide and includes all of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland's functions including inspections, investigations, prosecutions, laws and audit procedures. We are totally committed to making sure that our workplace health and safety laws and regulations are the best possible. We want world's best practice health and safety audit procedures for all of Queensland. The terms of reference for the best practice audit include that consideration be given to the introduction of the new offence of negligence causing death and whether current penalty provisions and processes act as a sufficient deterrent. I am pleased to advise that, after careful consideration of all of the material before him, the government has accepted the interim recommendation of best practice auditor Tim Lyons that this offence needs to be created as a matter of priority. We have publicly released our decision with regard to this important matter.

As part of the best practice audit, Tim Lyons is working with stakeholders on the best way to give effect to the proposed new law of negligence causing death. We need to start the wheels in motion now so that stakeholder groups can focus on recommending a best practice model for the introduction of this offence rather than further considering the merits of its introduction. We owe it to the victims and families of these terrible events to ensure that everything will be done to prevent this from ever happening again.

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Achievements

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.44 pm): Our government's first two budgets have helped restore good relationships with North Queensland councils. This investment has created on-the-ground local jobs in such a way that local councils do not feel tied up in red tape. A great example of that which I know every member in this House is aware of is the partnership with the Townsville City Council for the North Queensland stadium. Working closely with Mayor Jenny Hill we have committed \$140 million, pressuring the federal government to come on board. I am pleased that so far 182 North Queensland companies have registered interest for work packages in the stadium. It is expected to generate 750 jobs during the design and construction stages.

Our North Queensland councils have played an important role in delivering the more than \$15 million that has been invested through the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program. In North Queensland, so far 600 people have been employed and another 340 have gone on to further training under this program.

Another great initiative of the Palaszczuk government is the Building Our Regions program. Across North Queensland we have invested over \$62 million to fund local council projects, supporting over 450 jobs and generating new business opportunities in these communities. These projects, which mean so much to North Queensland families and businesses projects, include the Mackay showgrounds redevelopment, the Gregory water treatment plant solar project, the Tate River crossing upgrade and the Townsville southern suburb sewerage main. When I talk to North Queensland mayors the first thing they tell me is—

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

**Mrs O'ROURKE:** When I talk to North Queensland mayors, the first thing they tell me is what a success our Works for Queensland program has been. We announced \$119 million for North Queensland councils for shovel-ready maintenance and minor infrastructure projects that are well underway. This supports almost 850 jobs across the region. It happened quickly, efficiently and, most importantly, it helped North Queensland locals.

There is a lot to be said for working together closely on shared visions and goals because it builds and strengthens relationships. Our relationships with our North Queensland councils were the bedrock of disaster assessment and recovery after Cyclone Debbie. The mayors have worked so well with state agencies to get their communities up and running. Our government is proud of the work we have done with North Queensland councils to drive regional job creation, and I look forward to continuing to do so.

## NOTICE OF MOTION

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Crime



**Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (2.47 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for being soft on crime and putting the safety of Queensland families at risk.

## PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Leadership



**Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.47 pm): This is a bitterly divided government so riven by power struggles that it is freezing out Queenslanders from the more than 6,000 jobs which would be created by the Adani Carmichael mine. Since the election of this inexperienced do-nothing Labor government 15,000 young Queenslanders have lost their jobs. The Adani project had given them hope, but as it stands now that hope has been dashed—lost to a petty and pitiful Labor Party indulgence over who is the boss. In failing to stand up to the Deputy Premier and the green preference whisperers who threaten her seat, the Premier has failed the test of leadership.

When it comes to the Deputy Premier, the Premier's nod is as good as her wink, but when the Premier shakes hands on a deal with the Adani mining company it delivers nothing but duplicity to job-hungry Queenslanders. That is not leadership: it is craven buckling to the factional warfare of the Labor Party with ramifications that are now well beyond the usual internet sniping. Adani is reeling, this Premier is now staggering and the public sees her as the face of a cabinet in crisis.

Last week we had a malicious leak from the left which was designed to scuttle the \$16.5 billion Adani Carmichael mine. Instead of staring down this emergent threat to Queensland's jobs, billions of investment, hundreds of millions in taxes and royalties and the next wave of resource projects, we have a Premier who blinked. By her failure to lead and her failure to take strong decisive action, the Premier pushed away an exasperated Adani. The Premier now says to Queensland jobseekers, 'All bets are off'. Today we learned of a leak from the right—first we had the left and then we had the right—about a secret letter from the Under Treasurer to Adani confirming that a deal had been done—the same deal the Premier shook hands on in March, during her much vaunted tour.

How can Queensland business leaders be expected to trust the Premier's word when she does not honour her handshake deals? This Labor government has abandoned workers and jobs to court dirty Greens preferences. For a Premier of Queensland there can be no more demonstrable failure.

*(Time expired)*

**Ms Jones** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister for Education. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

### Cape York, Traditional Owners



**Hon. M FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (2.50 pm): Last Wednesday in Cairns it was difficult to not be overrun by emotion when three Cape York clans—the Wuthathi, Kuuku Ya'u and Northern Kaanju people—took back control of their ancestors' land. The physical act of putting pen to paper on behalf of the Palaszczuk government to hand back almost 1,600 square kilometres of land to Cape York's traditional owners was a moment in history 31 years in the making. It is a significant step in our state's reconciliation journey.


This is no ordinary tract of land. Located about 800 kilometres by road north of Cairns, the isolated area known as Bromley is enormous—larger than the entire Brisbane local government area. Bromley is rich in cultural and environmental heritage. It is where in 1986 the Bjelke-Petersen government wanted to build what would have been the world's first commercial spaceport. It planned to trash the area by launching Russian rockets from pristine Temple Bay. There was no appreciation of the area's unique environment or the traditional custodians of the land. The Bjelke-Petersen government did not ask the traditional owners; it just took the land. Thirty-one years on, Bromley stands as an example of the extraordinary overreach that characterised so much of the Bjelke-Petersen government.

The Bjelke-Petersen government's lack of consultation is in stark contrast to the actions of the Palaszczuk government. The handback sees the birth of two new national parks, sprawling over more than 51,000 hectares, jointly managed by the traditional owners and the Queensland government. Some 113,000 hectares has been designated as Aboriginal freehold land to provide economic opportunity and Indigenous jobs through innovations such as ecotourism. It also means that culturally and environmentally sensitive areas are protected for future generations.

Bromley is part of a wider Palaszczuk government program that has returned almost 3.7 million hectares of land to traditional owners on the cape. The Palaszczuk government understands the importance of land ownership for economic development. What the Bjelke-Petersen government did was wrong. I am honoured to be part of a government that has returned this land to its rightful owners. This is the good thing governments do. Good governments deliver to the rightful owners of the land.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Hinchinbrook, a question has been asked about the consistency of my rulings on interjections. I have made it pretty clear that I am more tolerant of interjections during private members' statements when they are provocative than when ministers are making ministerial statements which are not provocative.

### Carmichael Mine

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (2.53 pm): Over the past few days we have seen one of regional Queensland's most significant and shovel-ready economic development opportunities, Adani's Carmichael coalmine project in the Galilee Basin, shaken to its foundations because of the administrative and political incompetence of the Palaszczuk Labor government. The uncertainty that has been created across Central and North Queensland is extraordinary. It is severe and it is unforgivable. These communities have lived with Labor's politically schizophrenic position on the Adani Carmichael coalmine project for many years. The support is on and off. It is hot and cold and changes diametrically depending on whether government members are talking to people in Bowen or Brisbane. It is disgraceful and it is pathetic. It is certainly no way to run the state.


Yesterday the Deputy Premier ambushed the Premier in parliament. Ministers avoided like the plague saying the word 'Adani' during ministerial statements—it was just as farcical as that classic episode of *Fawlty Towers* where no-one was allowed to mention the war—until the Deputy Premier broke cover and staked out her ground on behalf of the loony left. The efforts by the Premier and the Treasurer to close the deal with Adani, reportedly over the past two years, to try to secure an investment for Queensland, have been undone by the naked political ambition of the Deputy Premier. They have now joined the ranks of the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines in that hopelessly compromised position of having one leg either side of the barbed wire fence erected by Labor's left faction.

The Deputy Premier's statement before cabinet on Monday and her opportunistic answer to the question from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition yesterday are a clear indication that there is one almighty blue going on within the Palaszczuk government for the soul of the Queensland Labor Party. Meanwhile, thousands of jobs in Central and North Queensland hang in the balance. The most viable first mover into the Galilee Basin has been derailed. A final investment decision, worth tens of billions of dollars, has been indefinitely delayed. The Premier of this state is effectively a political hostage to the left faction of her own party and a lame duck who cannot deliver. Even one of their own, Townsville Mayor Jenny Hill, has said—

If some people who live in coffee-sipping inner Brisbane think they are going to destroy the rest of Queensland, they have a huge fight on their hands.

Tens of thousands of Queenslanders would benefit from the development of Adani's Carmichael coalmine project, yet Labor's left faction is blocking it to preserve a subversive political alliance with the extreme activist groups and to satisfy Labor's addiction to Greens preferences.

### Back to Work Program

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.56 pm): I stand here today as a proud representative of those good, coffee-sipping people who live in the inner-city electorate of Brisbane Central. Today I have good news for Queensland. We have achieved another milestone. I am pleased to inform the House that more than 4,000 regional Queenslanders are now back to work, thanks to our \$100 million Back to Work program. To be exact, 4,017 people have been directly employed throughout regional Queensland due to this program. Over 2,000 of those are young people in the regions.

Those opposite are convincing no Queenslanders with their crocodile tears about jobs in this state. The previous government sacked 14,000 public servants, but it did not stop there. Do members remember all of those community organisations that were defunded? Many jobs were lost when those community organisations lost their funding and were gagged from raising any concerns. Those opposite have a lot of front to cry crocodile tears and think they are convincing anybody. If you have to show leadership, you show leadership in the right way. If we talk about deals and if we talk about straddling—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** We will pause the clock until we have silence.

**Ms GRACE:** Talk about straddling the barbed wire fence! The Leader of the Opposition is an expert at that. He has been asked time and time again in this House to come clean about any deals with One Nation and he has refused.

**Mr Sorensen** interjected.

**Ms GRACE:** You know you are doing well when you hear the shrill from Hervey Bay! Time and time again we have asked the Leader of the Opposition to come into this House to say that there is no deal with One Nation, but he will not rule it out. They come in here crying crocodile tears about jobs. The only jobs they are interested in are their own, but they are not fooling any Queenslanders with their talk. Show some leadership! The Premier showed leadership on jobs. We are creating jobs in regional Queensland. We will have a budget that will create even more jobs and the Leader of the Opposition has an opportunity to stand up and rule out a deal with One Nation. Come on: rule it out now! Get up on your feet; say it now!

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No. Thank you, members. I think you are finished, Minister.

**Ms GRACE:** I am not finished; I have seven seconds on the clock.


**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** All right, members. Let us get back to work. Minister, you have seven seconds left.

**Ms GRACE:** Our program has injected \$20 million so far into regional communities and \$53 million is on its way.

*(Time expired)*

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Carmichael Mine

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (3.00 pm): You know Queensland is not heading in the right direction when the employment minister cannot even utter the words 'Adani Carmichael mine' and the jobs at risk there. The actions of this government and the way it has mishandled Adani have been nothing short of duplicitous. Prior to the 2015 state election the Premier tried to walk both sides. She wanted voters in regional seats to think she supported regional jobs but also knew that green preferences were needed in inner Brisbane seats. She tried to have it both ways. This was the Premier's catchcry when asked about it during the election campaign: 'I'm for jobs in the Galilee Basin, but it must stack up commercially.' The member for South Brisbane went even further. The then deputy opposition leader said that Labor would abandon 'unprecedented' support for the Adani project and said any secret deal was 'simply an outrage'.

After the election the Premier changed her tune. With every visit to Townsville or Rockhampton, the Premier tried to present herself as the champion of the project. We have now learned that as far back as June 2015 the Cabinet Budget Review Committee provided approval for the Treasurer to start discussions on a secret royalties deal with Adani. This is the exact type of secret deal the Premier and the Deputy Premier had raged against in opposition, yet the public was kept in the dark. As this secret plan was developed, the Premier took every opportunity to pose alongside Adani's representatives about jobs and shout about these jobs. I table a photograph of her with Mr Adani himself shaking hands about this great project.

*Tabled paper:* Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk MP and Adani Group Chairman, Gautam Adani [\[768\]](#).

When Townsville was confirmed as Adani's regional headquarters, the Premier called it a 'new dawn'. In another media stunt, the Premier took a delegation of regional mayors to India and, as I said, the Premier called it a 'new dawn'. It has now been reported that prior to that visit the Under Treasurer




made a secret formal offer over royalties rates to Adani. Tellingly, the Under Treasurer also formed part of the trip to India in March. In the same month the Premier was in India, left factional leaders the Deputy Premier and the environment minister met with militant activists determined to kill the project including GetUp! and the Environmental Defenders Office. While the Premier was in India, the Deputy Premier was meeting the detractors of this project. The battlelines for this civil war were drawn then. The fix was in.

Knowing Adani was only a week away from making a final investment decision on this important project, last week Labor's left damagingly leaked details of the proposed royalties holiday. The Deputy Premier, who had argued against secret deals in opposition but had reportedly known about the secret deal for over a year and a half, made the decision that her job was more important than the jobs of regional Queenslanders. This act of sabotage has put the Adani project on indefinite hold. The people of Queensland have been held ransom by a small group of vested green interests. The Premier's handshake has been shown to be worthless. Her leadership has failed the test. Queenslanders deserve better.

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

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

### Adani, Royalties

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (3.04 pm): My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that Under Treasurer Jim Murphy issued a letter to Adani about the royalty arrangements for the Carmichael mine? Will the Premier now table it and detail its contents?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As is usual government practice, from time to time ministers and under treasurers meet with different people to discuss different matters and these are commercial-in-confidence.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** No, just wait. This is usual government business. Let me state this for the public record as well so we can be very clear about this: a briefing note obtained when John-Paul Langbroek was minister for education, employment and training states—

11. Application development costs are Commercial-in-Confidence.

I table that.

*Tabled paper:* Briefing note, undated, to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment, Hon John-Paul Langbroek, regarding the release of QSchools smart phone application and commercial in confidence information [770].

When John McVeigh was the minister he had a meeting on 27 May 2014 and what was listed there under reasons for discussion? 'Commercial-in-confidence'. I table that.

*Tabled paper:* Extract from diary, covering 21 May to 27 May 2014, with hand written name John McVeigh [771].

When Scott Emerson was asked to respond to a petition in the parliament, once again—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Can the member just be quiet please?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I rise to a point of order.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Does the member want to listen?

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Thank you, members. I do not need a cheer squad.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I rise to a point of order. We are hearing the Premier refusing to answer a question. The question was very clear: did Under Treasurer Murphy issue a letter to Adani about its royalty arrangements for the Carmichael mine? Will the Premier table it and detail its contents? Mr Speaker, there was no mention of any other aspect that the Premier is now attempting to avoid answering the question on and I would ask you to bring her to relevance to the question.

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** Mr Speaker, on the point of order, the question did frame the matters that the Leader of the Opposition has reiterated. He is taking the opportunity through the point of order to restate the question, which is something that I think you have made rulings on before. I want to acknowledge and note that the Premier's answer is clearly answering the question by citing the significance and the practice of commercial-in-confidence issues. In relation to dealings such as these,

then this is clearly answering the question that the Leader of the Opposition has asked. If he is asking about whether this matter will be released, the Premier is clearly giving an indication that it will not be because it is subject to principles of commercial-in-confidence.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you. I find the Premier's answer is relevant at this stage. She still has time on the clock to answer it.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Yes, thank you. From time to time the Treasurer or the Under Treasurer will have discussions with companies which are commercial-in-confidence. That is standard government practice. Not only do they happen under my government; they happened when those opposite were in government. Let me make it very clear. Let me give members another example. When Scott Emerson was minister for transport and main roads—

**Mr Seeney** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. I apologise, Premier. Thank you, member for Callide. The Premier's answer is relevant.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you. When Scott Emerson was a minister and was asked for information about the delivery of timber railway sleepers, about which he wrote back to Neil Laurie, he said—

While pricing—

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Wait.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Yes, yes, yes. He said—

While pricing and information relating to vendor businesses is Commercial-in-Confidence ...

I table that.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 7 June 2012, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Scott Emerson MP, to Mr Neil Laurie, Clerk of the Parliament, regarding a petition response and commercial in confidence information [\[769\]](#).

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I rise to a point of order. Seriously, is the Premier complaining about the delivery of timber sleepers versus a \$16½ billion investment creating jobs for Queenslanders?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, Leader of the Opposition. There is no point of order. The Premier has time to continue speaking, or I am happy to move on.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Bleijie:** Jackie, help her! Help her, Jackie!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** So rude today—so rude!

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** No, very rude.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** That is right: that is what the public expects from them. Those opposite were arrogant in government; they are arrogant in opposition. They were out of touch in government; they are out of touch in opposition. They have a leader, but no-one knows who he is.

### **Palaszczuk Labor Government, Leadership**

**Mr NICHOLLS:** Let us see how we go with this one. Last week, leaks emerged of confidential cabinet information—

**Mr HINCHLIFFE:** I rise to a point of order. I am not sure if that was the question, but the Leader of the Opposition needs to direct his question to one of the ministers. He did not point out which minister he was directing his question to.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There is no point of order. Leader of the Opposition, who is your question to? Could you please put your question?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** My question is to the Premier. Last week, leaks emerged of confidential cabinet information damaging the Premier. Today, reports suggest that Labor's right faction has leaked against the Deputy Premier. Is the Premier just a lame duck in a bitterly divided, do-nothing government?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My government is delivering for Queenslanders right across the state. We are about to deliver our third budget, which is measured and responsible and focused on growing the economy and all aspects that I have mentioned over the course of this parliament over the past two years, including diversifying the economy, making sure that people get jobs, whether it is in the south-east of this state or in regional Queensland. Let me put that in sharp contrast to the man who is sitting opposite. He was born in Melbourne. On State of Origin day, he is wearing blue.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, members. Premier, did you have anything further to add?

**Mr Seeney:** You're a disgrace to the office that you hold.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** No, that was Campbell Newman, Jeff Seeney and Tim Nicholls.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Callide, I urge you to put your interjections through the chair. If you have a point of order, you know how to follow the procedure.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I have put up with the abuse from the member for Callide over the past five years. I am happy to put up with it for another six months until we have an election, because then it will be goodbye.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, members. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** What is the legacy of those opposite? They trashed this state. All we saw were cuts to services, cuts to non-government organisations, talking down the economy.

**Mr Nicholls** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, you have had a pretty good go. You asked the question. You are trying to speak over the top of the Premier.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have made a number of rulings, but when direct attacks are made by other members across the chamber, you allow more leeway. Quite clearly, the Premier is taking advantage of being able to do that. It is only fair and reasonable that the leeway that you graciously refer to is also given to the opposition. I would submit that it is unreasonable to expect people to sit here in those circumstances.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I also submit that we need to have some proper conduct in the chamber during question time. Premier, do you have anything further to add?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Mr Speaker, yes, I do. Of course I do. The Education budget delivered by the Minister for Education is the largest Queensland has seen and there is a record budget in Health. Let me continue to remind those opposite of what they did to the health system in this state. Over 4½ thousand people were taken out of the health system. What did we have to do? We restored front-line services. What did they want to do? They wanted to sell off the assets. How could we forget that one! How did that go for them? All of that money was invested in getting people to do all of the costings to sell it off.

**Mr McEachan** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Redlands. You are warned under standing order 253. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** At least we all now know who the member for Redlands is. We will continue to invest in Queensland. We back Queenslanders; they sack. We will back our State of Origin team on Wednesday as well.

### **Mining and Energy Industries**

**Mr KING:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier inform the House of the outlook for resource and energy investment and jobs in Queensland?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** As I said very clearly, my government is looking very closely at developing basins right across our state. We know that there is high unemployment in many areas, especially in regional Queensland. We need to put together a plan that will facilitate the development of those basins to create jobs as soon as possible.

What did the members opposite do when they were in government? Straightaway they jacked up royalties. We want to get people into jobs and that is exactly what we will do. Today, we heard the Minister for Energy talk about our renewable energy sector. This is one sector of which we can be incredibly proud. Where are the jobs? They are in regional Queensland.

Those opposite are against those regional jobs. They are against renewables. Why are they against that? It goes all the way to the top, to the Leader of the Opposition, who called people who had solar panels on their rooftops 'latte sippers'. That is the attitude of those opposite. Is it any wonder they ended up on that side of the House?

I will be going down to COAG in a couple of weeks time. I think I mentioned in this House that one of the agenda items is Northern Australia. We will be discussing that in Hobart, but I put that aside. We will be talking about energy policies, because we know how important it is to grow our renewable industry and how important it is to grow our gas industry. We understand how important our resources sector, including coal, is for jobs in this state. Anybody in this House knows how important growing our resources sector is as well as growing our renewables sector.

**Mr Seeney:** All talk.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** No, it is not. Not only are we going to build the infrastructure and get the jobs going but also we are going to deliver in health and education for people right across our state. We will continue to do that, because we believe in the people whom we represent. We will remind Queenslanders of the broken state that those opposite left Queensland in after just three years in office. They were elected with the largest majority in Queensland's political history. Seven of us sat opposite and copped the abuse and copped what those opposite did to the people of Queensland. We heard the Minister for Employment talking about how the opposition gagged groups from even speaking out.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr SPEAKER:** Before I call the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, member for Hinchinbrook, you have been warned. During the Premier's response you were speaking over the top of the Premier. Will you please leave the chamber for 30 minutes under standing order 253A. You have already been warned.

*Whereupon the honourable member for Hinchinbrook withdrew from the chamber at 3.20 pm.*

**Mr SEENEY:** I rise to a point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Resume your seat, member for Callide. I have taken further consideration of one of the questions that was asked by the opposition earlier. If the opposition wants to ask, in my view, a provocative question it is reasonable for the minister, or Premier, answering the question to respond. What was your point of order, member for Callide?

**Mr SEENEY:** My point of order goes to the unreasonableness of your ruling in asking the member for Hinchinbrook to leave the chamber.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Resume your seat, member for Callide. That is a reflection on the chair. Will you withdraw?

**Mr SEENEY:** I withdraw. I rise to another point of order.

**Mr SPEAKER:** What is your point of order?

**Mr SEENEY:** When the Leader of the Opposition was making his statement earlier, both the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Education interjected for the entire three minutes. You did not warn either of them, let alone ask them to leave the chamber. I think there needs to be some consistency in the rulings.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Callide, that is a reflection on the chair. Will you withdraw?

**Mr SEENEY:** I withdraw, but I ask you to—

**Mr SPEAKER:** That is not an unconditional withdrawal. You are warned under standing order 253A for your disorderly conduct. Resume your seat, member for Callide.

### Adani, Royalties

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** My question is—

**Ms Grace** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Minister for Industrial Relations, you are warned under standing order 253A for your interjections. You are aware of the rules. People asking questions are entitled to have them heard in silence. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** My question is to the Premier. What handshake deal did the Premier make with Adani and why will she not honour it?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Will you table the prop?

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I am happy to table the photo.

*Tabled paper:* Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk and Adani Group Chairman, Gautam Adani [772].

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Nanango very much for her question. I thank her very much for putting that photo up. That was a photo taken in Townsville. That was a meeting we had where we discussed at length about the headquarters being in Townsville and also that there would be no 457 visas for construction. That is what that handshake was about.

We have been hearing a lot about commercial-in-confidence today. I note the member for Callide has interjected a couple of times in relation to it. I have come across an article dated 17 November 2014. It was about the deputy premier at the time, state development, infrastructure and planning minister Jeff Seeney. What did Mr Seeney have to say? This is going to be very important for our continued discussions today. Let us see what he said—

These are going to be commercial negotiations and these commercial negotiations, as you would expect, are going to be conducted in a somewhat competitive environment and I have to be very careful about how I make that information available.

I say to the member for Callide: do not dare come in here and start lecturing me about commercial-in-confidence because you are just not believable—not credible at all. Let me say—

**Mr Minnikin:** You are struggling!

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** And let me say to the member that he will not be here next term! The member for Southport, I understand, won his preselection by four votes. That is what I am hearing. There is another preselection coming up on the weekend. Let us see how that goes. I am looking forward to the next question on commercial-in-confidence because we know in government on both sides there—

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON:** I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Premier was asked: why will she not honour the deal reflected in the handshake?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I did! We spoke about the headquarters in Townsville and no 457 visas for construction.

### Arts Funding

**Mr MADDEN:** My question without notice is to the Premier and Minister for the Arts. Will the Premier please update the House on the government's investment in the arts?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** On this side of the House we believe in the value of arts and the arts community in this state. I am very proud to be the arts minister as well as the Premier. When the former government was in office it cut arts funding massively. We had to pick up the pieces and slowly rebuild our arts community, not just in the south-east but right across the state. Today I am very pleased to announce that, along with our Queensland Arts Showcase Program, an \$11.8 million investment over four years to support the development and growth of vibrant arts communities across our state, in the latest funding round of \$430,000 I have approved 12 projects across the state to promote our artists and to get the community involved.

Townsville members will be pleased to hear that we have invested \$15,000 so there can be a theatre production in Anderson Park. The member for Mackay will be pleased to hear that her community will benefit from a special Fijian art exhibition created by local artists for \$37,000. The member for Bundaberg will be pleased to hear that the Crush Festival will also include WriteFest, thanks to \$42,000. The member for Ipswich West, who asked me that question, will be receiving money for a production of the Big Red Bash and Beyond. I am sure people in his community will enjoy that.

Gold Coast members might also like to know that they are going to get \$60,000 for *By the Bleach* program, which will culminate in performances in the 2018 Bleach Festival at the 2018 Commonwealth Games. In the electorate of the member for Mount Isa, the Giants of the Outback will receive \$50,000 for the Winton Outback Festival to expand Indigenous participation in that festival. We all love Winton. We all know how important that local community is in Western Queensland.

I also want to update the House that the member for Greenslopes will get \$39,000 for a production in his electorate called *Spectate*. The member for Cook will be happy to know of \$60,000 for *Ghost Nets of the Ocean*. They are taking the exhibition over to Singapore. That is really good news and I think that the member for Cook will enjoy that. The member for Brisbane Central's electorate will receive \$26,000 for the Lev Vlassenko Piano Competition—very nice! As members can see, we are contributing to the arts, we are backing our arts and we are backing our artists right across our state.

### Adani, Royalties

**Mr EMERSON:** My question is to the Premier. If the deal was commercial-in-confidence with Adani, why did the *Townsville Bulletin* report the Premier was going to text it when the royalty deal had been agreed to by cabinet?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I am happy to follow up on what the member for Indooroopilly said, but there was never any confirmation from me about any communication. I do not know where he is getting that from.

### Keppel Electorate, Tropical Cyclone Debbie

**Mrs LAUGA:** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the Cyclone Marcia—sorry—Cyclone Debbie recovery—

**Mr Costigan** interjected.

**Mrs LAUGA:**—and the progress on the Yeppoon foreshore and lagoon project?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Whitsunday, I have just warned the Minister for Industrial Relations in relation to speaking whilst a member is asking a question. I understand the Leader of the Opposition was going to raise a point of order on that matter. I urge you not to push it too far. Member for Keppel, please repeat the question.

**Mrs LAUGA:** My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the Cyclone Debbie recovery and the progress on the Yeppoon foreshore and lagoon precinct?

**Ms TRAD:** I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday, whose community was severely impacted by Cyclone Debbie. I want to place on the parliamentary record my absolute disgust that he should trash any sort of question related to cyclone and disaster recovery in this place.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, members. The member for Keppel has not raised an issue.

**Ms TRAD:** For the member for Whitsunday to ridicule a question about cyclone recovery is absolutely disgusting and every single member in the Whitsunday electorate should know absolutely that their elected member has no regard—

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, I take your guidance earlier when rightfully chipping me. I do apologise to you and I accept your wise counsel. On behalf of my constituents I can say that it was Cyclone Debbie that came to town, not Marcia.

**Mr SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Ms TRAD:** For the member for Whitsunday to now say that somehow the victims of Cyclone Debbie are more deserving than the victims of Cyclone Marcia shows that this man's absolute outrageousness is disgraceful.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I rise to a point of order. I take offence at what the Deputy Premier has just said and I ask the Deputy Premier to withdraw.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, the principle is that if a member finds something personally offensive it needs to be withdrawn.

**Ms TRAD:** I withdraw. I find personally offensive the member for Whitsunday's comments in this place around cyclone recovery.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, it was a complete withdrawal.

**Mr Hart** interjected.

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

**Ms TRAD:** Unlike the member for Whitsunday, who has placed on record in this House his views about cyclone recovery, I want to note that the member for Keppel has been staunch in her support for her community around cyclone and flood recovery. When the flooding came to Rockhampton after Cyclone Debbie, the member for Keppel, pregnant as she was, was filling sandbags and hoisting them on to the back of trucks, so that the people of Rockhampton were prepared. That is the calibre of the representation you get from the member for Callide and I contrast that—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, members. I think it is a bit challenging for everyone this afternoon and we still have half an hour to go on question time.

**Ms TRAD:** I unreservedly apologise to the member for Keppel for that mistake. I am terribly sorry.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, I can quite easily adjourn the proceedings and come back, if that needs to happen. Deputy Premier has time on the clock. Deputy Premier, do you have anything further to add?

**Ms TRAD:** I do. I note that the recovery and rebuilding of Queensland after Cyclone Debbie is well underway. I place on the parliamentary record my appreciation for all of the amazing work done by Brigadier Chris Field and his dedicated team of ADF personnel, in terms of responding and recovering those communities affected by Cyclone Debbie. Brigadier Field has travelled more than 30,000 kilometres and visited more than 85 communities. He is wrapping up his service to the people of Queensland at the end of this week. I put on the parliamentary record our deep gratitude to him and his team for assisting us in our time of need.

Last week, I was in Keppel with the member for Keppel to turn the sod on the Yeppoon foreshore and lagoon precinct revitalisation project. It is a fantastic project to which the Palaszczuk Labor government has allocated \$29 million. It is going to be an iconic project that, after Cyclone Debbie, the community can celebrate and really know that they have turned the corner.

*(Time expired)*

### **Carmichael Mine**

**Mr BLEIJIE:** My question is to the Premier. While the Premier was meeting with Adani in India on 17 March—and I table a picture taken in India, not Townsville, of the Premier planting a tree—Labor's left faction leaders, the Deputy Premier and Minister Miles, were meeting with green activists, including GetUp!, the EDO and others on 21 March. I table excerpts of their diary.

*Tabled paper:* Photograph of the Premier, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, and regional Queensland mayors touring facilities at Mundra, India [773].

*Tabled paper:* Ministerial diary extract, of Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jackie Trad MP, dated 1 to 31 March 2017, detailing dinner hosted by Adani Chairman and Board on 17 March 2017 and attendees [774].

Can the Premier guarantee that her deputy and minister did not cut a deal with those known opponents to Adani's Carmichael mine to kill it off?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Kawana for that question. I also thank him for showing those beautiful photos of me in India. I had a lovely tour of Mundra Port, where I planted a tree. I thank the regional mayors who accompanied me on that excellent trip.

**Mr Bleijie:** Is that where you dug a hole for yourself?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** We were planting the green shoots.

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, you have had a good go.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** We missed him in the last parliamentary session as well.

**Mr SEENEY:** I rise to a point of order. There is a longstanding tradition in this place that you do not refer to the absence of a member.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** He is here.

**Mr SEENEY:** The Premier was referring to his absence in the last parliamentary session.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I apologise. I withdraw. Again, I place on the public record my thanks to the regional mayors who came with me to India to tour the port—

**Mrs Frecklington** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action. That applies to both sides.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** While we were over there, the other key issue we discussed was Adani's massive investment in solar. They have the largest solar farm in the world, which the regional mayors were able to visit. Adani is investing in solar in Queensland, as well. As we back our resources sector, we are also backing a growing renewable energy sector in this state. Why are we doing that? Because the renewable energy sector is growing jobs in regional Queensland, as is the resources sector.

In relation to meetings, I make it very clear that I expect my ministers to meet with as many people as they possibly can, because that is their job. We do not have meetings such as those opposite had when they were in office, which were held behind closed doors and which advisers did not sit in on. I remember the member for Callide may have had a few of those mentioned in those times.

**Mr Pitt:** Clive Palmer.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I take that interjection. I think Clive Palmer was his name and we know what Mr Palmer did to Queensland Nickel.

**A government member:** And Sibelco.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** Sibelco as well. I take that interjection. My government prides itself on being a consensus government that listens to a range of views right across the sector. That means business groups, it means resource companies, it means environmental groups and it also means union groups. That is a hallmark of my government and it is one that I am incredibly proud of. We are unlike those opposite, who picked fights. Let us go back through some of those fights. They picked a fight with the doctors. Does everyone remember that fight? That worked out really well. I am sure the former minister for health remembers that one very well. They had a fight with the lawyers. The member for Kawana knows all about that fight. He was the biggest—

*(Time expired)*

### **Business Development Fund**

**Ms LINARD:** My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please update the House on the latest developments of the government's Business Development Fund?

**Mr PITT:** I thank the member for Nudgee for her question. She is one member in this House who is absolutely keen on supporting start-ups and innovation. It is great to get this question from her.

The Palaszczuk government announced the establishment of the \$40 million Business Development Fund. This is about looking at how we will stimulate the activities and ideas of entrepreneurs. We have had a long track record in this state under Labor governments of being the Smart State and now we are advancing Queensland. The Business Development Fund is a critical part of that.

We have been seeing some excellent outcomes. We launched the fund in 2015. It was about addressing the gaps in local venture capital investment in Queensland based businesses. This has been really well received. This is another example of our government getting on with the job and doing things the way governments should—that is, playing an important role at the right time.

The Business Development Fund has already invested over \$10.9 million to support a range of diverse initiatives, including: developing export programs for electric vehicle technology, in the Bulimba electorate; developing software platforms connecting people and the community; and increasing innovative journey management software in North Queensland with JESI management solutions, literacy development programs and others.

**A government member:** Joe Hoolahan.

**Mr PITT:** Joe Hoolahan; I take that interjection. I am pleased to inform the House that earlier this month I had the opportunity to visit the Brisbane offices of legal tech company Lawcadia. Lawcadia is one of the latest recipients of funds. I thank the CEO, Warwick Walsh, for the opportunity to visit and



meet with his team. It is a small team, but their idea is something that could well go into the stratosphere. It is very exciting. They received half a million dollars to expand their innovative legal procurement business which is already attracting significant activity and interest across Australia, but, more importantly, export interest across the Asia-Pacific region. This homegrown company is the first legal tech start-up to receive support from the fund. It is exactly the kind of business that we are looking to support under the Business Development Fund.

Decisions about investment from the Business Development Fund are made by an independent experienced panel of investors and entrepreneurs. This panel already has very distinguished people on it. They have made some fantastic outcomes come to life already. I can announce today that there will be three new members of the BDF panel—Dr Adam Kossak, Dr Patrick Silvey and Ms Nicola Vaisey. Dr Kossak is a venture capitalist who is currently a non-executive director of Find-Me Technologies. Dr Silvey has extensive experience in commercialisation and is currently the managing director of VenturePro Pty Ltd. Ms Vaisey has worked on a number of innovative projects in the medical, engineering and infrastructure space.

Wherever I go across Queensland people say that we are absolutely locked in and have the reputation as the start-up state. Nothing could make me prouder.

### **Carmichael Mine**

**Mr LAST:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Townsville mayor and Labor member Councillor Jenny Hill has said of opponents to Adani's Carmichael mine, 'They are going to destroy the rest of Queensland,' and 'They have a huge fight on their hands.' Why will the Premier not stand up to her deputy and stop what the *Townsville Bulletin* calls the loony left from destroying the rest of Queensland?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for the question. I am very pleased that he has quoted Mayor Jenny Hill because Jenny Hill works very collaboratively with my government. It was at a meeting that Minister O'Rourke, the member for Thuringowa, the member for Townsville, the Deputy Premier and I had with the mayor when we were in Townsville travelling around with our Working Queensland cabinet subcommittee that she said to us that if we could get some extra money to councils they could get their projects up and running and we could get some money out the door. As a result of those direct representations from the Mayor of Townsville, the Deputy Premier put together a great package with the Treasurer of \$200 million worth of works for Queensland.

That is what is called working collaboratively. I have said very clearly in this chamber that we are working on developing the resource basins of this state. We are working to make sure that we develop our resource sector, our renewables sector and our gas sector. That is something which other states are still not doing. When we look at other states, especially New South Wales and Victoria, we see that there is no or very little gas exploration. What are we doing? We have been opening up those gas exploration tenements for jobs. We know that if we open up those tenements now there will be jobs for the future.

We have just heard from the Minister for Employment, but I can reassure this House that with our Back to Work program we have now reached the halfway mark of 4,000 jobs created in regional Queensland. I am incredibly proud of that program. That was a direct result of my Working Queensland cabinet subcommittee travelling across regional Queensland, looking at new initiatives and new ideas and then being able to put that in place in our last budget—\$100 million. We have already reached the halfway target of 4,000 jobs created. I thank the Minister for Employment for that. I thank the Treasurer for putting more staff onto that project. There are about 1,900 applications pending—

**Ms Grace:** Down to 1,100.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** It is down to 1,100 now. There are 1,100 applications that we are working through to get people into work. That is what we do.

The budget we will be handling down next month is about jobs. Everyone in this House had better get ready for it. Those on the other side of the House had better get ready for it. It is focused on jobs and growing this state. We will back ourselves and we will back the budget because a jobs bonanza budget is coming very shortly.

What we will see is continued diversification of our economy with the \$405 million Advance Queensland program. As Minister Leeanne Enoch said, 2,000 jobs have already been created with the Advance Queensland package and there is more to come.

### Specialist Outpatient Strategy

**Mr WHITING:** My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister please update the House on the progress of the government's \$361.2 million specialist outpatient strategy?

**Mr DICK:** I thank the member for Murrumba for his question and for his support of our government's strategy to get people out of the waiting room and into a specialist room in a public hospital. I thank him for his support for our public health system in Queensland.

We have some very positive news for Queensland. When we came to office 104,114 people were waiting longer than clinically recommended for a specialist outpatient appointment. By 1 May this year that number had fallen to 50,033. That is a fall of 52 per cent in just two years, despite annual increases in the number of referrals of 10 per cent a year.

Those figures are very significant for those Queenslanders who are impacted. They are also significant given the impact of the cancellation of appointments caused by Cyclone Debbie. This side of the House recognises the impact Cyclone Debbie and the floods in the south-east had on Queensland. That affected not only outpatient appointments and outpatient treatment but of course elective surgery. That will continue to wash through the system for a while to come.

Since the election we have employed more than 1,300 doctors and over 4,000 nurses. What that says is that if we fund the front line we lose the long wait. That is what we have been able to do over the past two years. We on this side of the House are very proud of that record. There is more work to be done. Increasing demand on our health system puts pressure on our performance. There is no question about that.

We are doing our best to address that and those numbers reveal that. It is a very significant contrast to the approach taken by those members opposite. Over 4,000 people came out of the health system, including 1,800 nurses and midwives. Taking up where the Premier left off, how can we forget the attack and assault on doctors in Queensland? Specialist clinicians crammed into public meeting spaces to complain about the conduct of the previous government—an arrogant government led by an arrogant premier who thought he could do whatever he liked because of his record majority. Didn't that work out happily ever after?

Here are some highlights: for the Metro North Hospital and Health Service, which includes the north side of Brisbane and the Moreton Bay Regional Council area, the list of people waiting longer than clinically recommended for a specialist outpatient appointment has fallen from 22,354 to 8,983—a decrease of 60 per cent; for the Metro South Hospital and Health Service the list has reduced from 42,208 to 14,723—a decrease of 65 per cent; for the West Moreton Hospital and Health Service, which includes Ipswich, the list has reduced from 2,797 to 308—a decrease of 89 per cent; and for the Darling Downs Hospital and Health Service the list has reduced from 2,210 to four—a decrease of over 99 per cent. That is what Labor governments do. We fund the front line.

**Mr Watts** interjected.

**Mr DICK:** Nothing would happen without the funding from the Labor government, member for Toowoomba North. We fund the front line and reduce the long wait.

*(Time expired)*

### Adani, Royalties

**Mr WALKER:** My question is to the Deputy Premier. When did the Deputy Premier learn of the Premier's royalty deal with Adani and when did she sign off on sending the Under Treasurer's letter of offer?

**Ms TRAD:** I thank the member for Mansfield for the question. As the Premier has outlined, in terms of cabinet-in-confidence discussions that occur within the cabinet and the CBRC, they are a matter of confidential discussions.

As the Premier has already outlined, there is a proposal being worked through that addresses the unlocking of three significant resource basins within Queensland. That is to drive economic growth in regional Queensland and to create jobs in regional Queensland—not only to create jobs in our traditional industries such as resources, tourism and construction but also to fuel the innovation of the future. We know that we need our resources to fuel the innovative industries that Queensland and the rest of the world are so hungry for. We understand that implicitly. That is why we will work through a plan that cabinet will endorse that will see the realisation of these three important basins to Queensland.

This, can I say, has been adopted and supported by the Leader of the Opposition himself in terms of his press conference today. When asked about whether or not they agreed to a royalty holiday for Adani, the Leader of the Opposition simply could not say. What he did say is that he is going to wait until Labor comes out with their plan. I table a copy of the media report for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Article from *Brisbane Times*, dated 24 May 2017, titled 'Tim Nicholls can't say whether he supports Adani royalty holiday' [775].

**Mr SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier, I urge you not to debate the issue with the opposition.

**Ms TRAD:** Mr Speaker, I think I am addressing the question in relation to the arrangement that the member for Mansfield referred to.

**Mr WALKER:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. My question was about when two things happened. Those are matters of dates, not matters of disclosing anything confidential or commercial-in-confidence. The Deputy Premier cannot use commercial-in-confidence to hide from the issue of when she knew or signed certain things.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I find that the Deputy Premier's answer is relevant. Do you have anything further to add, Deputy Premier?

**Ms TRAD:** No, I do not.

### Tourism Industry

**Mr RUSSO:** My question is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please advise what steps the state government is taking to generate jobs in Queensland's tourism industry?

**Ms JONES:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I note that no-one is going to be asking me questions about handshakes, are they?

**Ms Trad:** No.

**Ms JONES:** No, not after the last campaign when someone—the then leader of Queensland—refused to shake my hand. But we have moved on and now we have a premier who is willing to shake the hands of people, particularly when it means jobs for Queenslanders.

Talking about jobs for Queenslanders, we know on our side of the House that investing in tourism is about investing in the livelihoods of Queenslanders. We know that one in every 11 Queenslanders works in the tourism industry and that this is an industry that is going from strength to strength. Indeed, the industry is growing so quickly that we envisage that we will need an extra 5,000 workers over the next five years to come into the tourism industry in a range of areas and with a range of skills—from chefs to people who work in the hotel sector, as well as marketing and communications, and graphic design. The breadth of jobs that are available to be taken by young Queenslanders is there in the tourism industry—more than 5,000, as I said, in the next five years.

We thought it was really important that industry leaders—young people working in the tourism industry—were able to go into classrooms and explain the opportunities that are there for young people if they choose to have a career in the tourism industry. I am very pleased that we have had overwhelming interest in the first round of the Young Tourism Leaders Program. Indeed, today I can announce that we are going to open a second round of the Young Tourism Leaders Program. I see Joan Pease up the back nodding. We launched the first round at a school in her electorate—Wynnum State High School. I thank her for that. I got to meet some wonderful young people who are working in the industry and who are aspiring to work in the industry. It has been such a success that today we are announcing round 2. I call on all members to get involved if they would like to and nominate people who they know are young leaders in the tourism sector. Round 2 will be available from Friday. I encourage members to do that. We know that you need leadership if you want change. If you want change, you have to show leadership. That is why we are calling on the young leaders in this industry to do that.

I will also take this opportunity once again to call on the Leader of the Opposition to come clean on his, to use his own words, 'dirty deal' with One Nation. For him to come in here and lecture us and our government about our position, there is a pox on all of this House. This is a man that 10 years ago said that One Nation were the end of the earth. That is when he was trying to appeal to voters in Clayfield. He cannot look me in the eye because he knows that his position is flip-flop flip-flop. He is all about his own leadership potential. He is a disgrace.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, Minister.

**Ms JONES:** This is a man who wants to accuse our government of not holding a position from breakfast to lunch when he jumped into bed with One Nation at morning tea.

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

### **Ministerial Champion Program**

**Mr GORDON:** My question without notice is to the Premier and Minister for the Arts. Can the Premier outline for the benefit of the House how the government is measuring the success, effectiveness and benefits of the government's ministerial champion initiative in the state's Indigenous communities, particularly in relation to improving their quality of life, specifically closing the life expectancy gap of Indigenous Queenslanders? If there is no such mechanism for measuring the success, benefits and effectiveness of this initiative, will the Premier implement one?

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I thank the member for Cook for that very important question. It was actually an idea of mine. In the past we had directors-general who were champions for different Indigenous communities across our state.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Just wait one moment, Premier. There seems to be some discussion on the back benches.

**Mr Cripps:** Not me this time.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No. You are fine, member for Hinchinbrook.

**Mr Cripps:** Don't pin that one on me.

**Mr SPEAKER:** No, I will not, I assure you.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I then asked my cabinet to become ministerial champions for the different regions. My ministers are doing an excellent job in terms of visiting those communities and seeing firsthand what is happening. I have been to many communities myself as well. There are wonderful people in all parts of our state. To visit those communities is an absolute privilege. The Minister for Education and I went to Aurukun. I have also been to the Torres Strait. The Minister for Women's champion group are the Torres Strait Islanders and she spent a few days up there just last week as well. I am also incredibly proud that Leeanne Enoch, my Minister for Innovation, is in the cabinet.

We know that there is disadvantage in parts of our state. It is an area of need and one that we must address. That is why the cabinet carefully considers the infrastructure needs of our Indigenous communities and also looks at what we can do to improve people's lives. We will continue to work very hard in those communities to look at where we can close the gap. We are seeing some improvements, especially around education. I put on the record, too, the enormous amount of work that the staff do in these communities. I know personally, having visited—

**Mr GORDON:** Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. With all due respect to the Premier, the question was: how does her government measure the success of this initiative? How do we know it is making a difference?

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you. I call the Premier.

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I also asked the Deputy Premier, when I was on a trade mission, to convene a meeting in Cairns to talk about the initiatives. How are we measuring it? We are looking very closely at health and education, especially the number of children going to school. We are looking at those measures because we are seeking to close the gap. If the member for Cook has any ideas, we are more than happy to sit down and include him in those discussions. Once again, I stress that we need to work together when it comes to closing the gap and eliminating disadvantage in our state.

### **Bruce Highway**

**Mrs GILBERT:** My question is to the Minister for Main Roads and Road Safety. Will the minister please outline to the House the Palaszczuk government's commitment to upgrading the Bruce Highway?

**Mr BAILEY:** I acknowledge that the member for Mackay is doing a fantastic job on behalf of her community. She achieved the Vines Creek bridge upgrade in her first term in office. The Bruce Highway continues to be a key priority for the Palaszczuk government, and the 10-year, \$8.5 billion joint federal-state commitment to improve safety, flood immunity and capacity is continuing.

The Bruce Highway upgrade is the largest program of roadworks currently underway in Queensland, and it will support nearly 2,400 jobs throughout the life of the program. A total of 240 projects have already been completed under the program, with 140 to go. We have made a significant impact to improving safety along the Bruce Highway with an approximate 30 per cent reduction in the number of crashes, fatalities and serious injuries since the program began. Last Thursday I joined the federal infrastructure minister to turn the first sod on the Bruce Highway's Caloundra Road to Sunshine Motorway upgrade which will create 700 jobs and turn four lanes to six including major upgrades at both interchanges. This is welcome news for the 40,000 motorists who travel on this road daily.

While I welcome the federal government's recent budget announcements on the Bruce Highway, after investigations I have concerns about some of the finer details. For starters, it is not clear how the federal government arrived at its \$530 million funding figure for the Pine River to Caloundra upgrade, and it is doubtful that will be enough to complete the project. It is also simply not possible to spend that amount of money in one financial year regardless. The federal government knows our process for the joint planning program that is due to be completed at the end of the year, fast-tracked by six months, and the detailed design process begins after that. My serious concern here is that there has been an allocation and they know full well that it cannot be spent. That is a travesty in terms of misleading people on the Sunshine Coast.

A more serious concern is that, after working through all the federal government budget figures, it appears more than \$100 million is missing from the Bruce Highway contingency fund. The Turnbull government has raided the Bruce Highway. Around \$90 million of the wider Queensland contingency also appears to have been raided. Add this to the \$150 million they ripped out of Queensland under the Northern Australia Roads Program and the Turnbull government has secretly squirrelled \$350 million of Queensland's fair share of roads to spend in other states. We cannot trust Canberra. They are ripping off Queensland roads just like the member for Clayfield ratted on regional roads when he cut \$600 million from roads—

*(Time expired)*

### **TransLink, Russell Island State School**

**Mr McEACHAN:** My question is to the Premier. Premier, member for Redlands; here I am. Does the Premier endorse TransLink's position—

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Redlands, will you start your question again please?

**Mr McEACHAN:** Does the Premier endorse TransLink's position that both missing school lessons and waiting alone at a ferry terminal are acceptable for Russell Island State School students? I table some correspondence from TransLink for the Premier's edification.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 10 April 2017, from Mr Benjamin James, external affairs TransLink, to the member for Redlands, Mr Matt McEachan MP, regarding Russell Island Ferry timetable [776].


**Ms PALASZCZUK:** I am more than happy to look at the specifics of the question. I am happy to see if the Deputy Premier can have a meeting with you about that issue.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Question time has finished.

## **TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (PERSONALISED TRANSPORT REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL**

Resumed from 21 March (see p. 601).

### **Second Reading**

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (4.05 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

From the outset I would like to extend my thanks to the Public Works and Utilities Committee for its consideration of the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. This is a comprehensive bill dealing with significant reforms, and I commend the committee for its thorough examination of the bill focusing on fundamental issues such as safety. The committee has already considered draft regulation amendments dealing with key aspects of the reforms including licensing, compulsory third-party insurance and security cameras.

I would like to acknowledge the role of the committee's chair, the member for Kallangur, in leading the scrutiny of these reforms. This includes his role as chair of the Transport and Utilities Committee in considering the taxi and limousine industry assistance adjustment package late last year as part of the Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The committee's understanding of the complex issues involved with these reforms and its balanced approach in considering these matters is evident in the report and its recommendations.

The committee received over 300 submissions from the personalised transport industry, customers, advocacy groups and industry groups, and I thank all of these individuals and organisations for their important contribution to the examination of this bill. The committee's report was tabled on 15 May and includes 16 recommendations. The government has considered the committee's report and the range of views expressed by submitters, and I am pleased to advise the House that the government supports, or supports in principle, all but one of the committee's recommendations. I table the government's response to the committee report.

*Tabled paper:* Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 37, 55th Parliament—Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, government response [\[777\]](#).

The committee has unanimously recommended that the bill be passed, and I thank all members for their support of this important and necessary reform of the personalised transport industry. There appears to be consensus among committee members on the fundamental objectives of committee reform that customers should have greater choice of, and access to, personalised transport services while ensuring safety, accessibility and accountability in the provision of these services. Although there may be different views about the best way to achieve aspects of these reforms, I am encouraged by the bipartisan support on these fundamental objectives.

All members of this House will acknowledge that the world has changed. Technology has transformed many aspects of our life and work, and the personalised transport sector is not immune. This is the hard reality confronting governments across Australia and worldwide, and difficult decisions have had to be made on how best to respond to this change. Every Australian state and territory has now either legalised ride-booking services or indicated that they will do so in the coming year. I note that following the passage of this bill Queensland will have one of the strictest safety regimes across the country for personalised transport.

Before addressing the committee's recommendations, I will briefly recap the key elements of this bill. First and foremost, the bill will enhance the safety of personalised transport services. In particular, primary safety and fatigue management duties will be imposed on all parties in the chain of responsibility including booking entities, licence holders, operators and drivers. The bill will also introduce a new annual booked hire service licence and booking entity authorisation to ensure booked hire services are appropriately authorised within a fairer regulatory framework where all personalised transport services must be licensed and providers can be held accountable.

Substantial penalties will apply for the provision of unauthorised services and related unlawful conduct. This includes escalating financial penalties for repeat offenders and non-financial sanctions including driver licence suspension and cancellation of service licences and authorisations. These penalties are intended to deter unauthorised and unsafe services, and enable effective enforcement where services are provided outside of the law. The government will be vigilant in stamping out these unsafe services to protect our community.

Accessibility will also be promoted by this bill. The current scheme for subsidised taxi travel for persons with disability will remain limited to taxis in the short term. However, the bill allows for this scheme to be extended to booked hire vehicles and other payment platforms. The bill is also designed to promote innovation within the personalised transport industry by removing a number of regulatory requirements. This includes the requirement for a taxi booking company to hold a service contract. As far as possible, industry participants should be left to decide how best to operate and improve their businesses, and the bill allows this to occur while ensuring appropriate safeguards are in place to ensure safety, accessibility and accountability.

Phased commencement of the bill is proposed from next month, with most provisions due to commence in the second half of this year to allow time for industry to prepare and for appropriate systems and transitional arrangements to be put in place. Regulation amendments will also be progressed for Governor in Council approval following passage of the bill to fully implement the reforms.

I turn now to the committee's recommendations and in particular the safety aspects of the report. The committee made a number of recommendations on driver fatigue management, which is vital to ensuring safe services. In support of these recommendations, an outcomes focused fatigue management framework will be detailed in a regulation in addition to the general fatigue management duty contained in the bill. This framework will identify clear obligations on all parties in the chain of responsibility and establish clear data capture and reporting requirements on fatigue management, which will also support cross-platform work by drivers.

There will be a consistent approach across the personalised transport industry to hours of work requirements and other key aspects of the fatigue management framework. The proposed standard hours requirements will be similar to those used in the heavy vehicle industry under the Heavy Vehicle National Law. This is proposed to include a maximum shift length of 14 hours in any 24-hour period, followed by a continuous seven-hour break. Similar requirements are also proposed to apply for shorter shifts. For example, if a driver works eight hours, this must include 30 minutes of break time. The proposed framework will continue to be developed in consultation with industry to ensure it will be both practical and effective in managing driver fatigue.

In support of the committee's recommendations on security cameras, driver and passenger safety will be closely monitored, focusing on the effectiveness of the proposed new security camera provisions to be set out in the regulation in ensuring safety. Government will report to parliament on these matters 18 months from the commencement of these provisions. Security cameras will be required in personalised transport vehicles based on the risk profile of the service. They will be required where the vehicle provides taxi services due to the risk of assault associated with the anonymity of passengers and drivers where a vehicle is obtained from a rank or hailed off the street. These risks are reduced for booked hire services, as booked entities will be required to make a record of all bookings including passenger and driver details. Security cameras will be also be mandatory in any personalised transport vehicle, including booked hire vehicles and limousines that provide services that accept payment in cash or payment in person during the journey due to the risk of theft or fare evasion associated with these transactions. Queensland is leading the nation in implementing this risk based approach to security cameras. Most other jurisdictions only require taxis to fit a security camera due to the anonymity of rank-and-hail services.

Driver misconduct was also a key issue raised by the committee. The government supports a requirement for booking entities to notify the department when a driver has been disaffiliated for serious misconduct, particularly for reasons related to public safety. While the person's driver authorisation can already be suspended in the case of a charge or conviction for certain offences, mandatory notification of driver behaviour that represents a risk to safety will allow the department to consider whether similar action is warranted on public interest grounds. Drivers whose authorisation is cancelled because of serious misconduct will no longer be able to provide personalised transport services for any booking entity.

The committee's recommendation regarding compulsory third-party insurance is also supported. The Motor Accident Insurance Commission will review the new CTP class for booked hire vehicles and limousines 18 months after commencement of the new class, particularly to assess the impact on limousine premiums. With regard to public liability insurance, it is not proposed to amend the bill to require industry participants to hold this insurance as the committee has recommended. However, the department will continue to encourage all industry participants to hold appropriate insurances such as public liability, personal injury and accident insurance, and comprehensive vehicle insurance based on the risk profile of their individual business. The government believes that insurance matters should continue to be industry led and reflect the individual circumstances of each business. We also echo the sentiments of the committee's reasoning behind this recommendation, noting it is important that all members of the personalised transport chain of responsibility are appropriately insured.

Another important focus of the committee was ensuring that the exclusive rights of taxis to provide rank-and-hail services are preserved. The bill maintains this protection through a number of means. Any person who provides a taxi service in a vehicle other than a licensed taxi will commit an offence with a penalty of up to \$365,000. This includes rank-and-hail services and any other service where a motor vehicle and its driver are hired on the spot for a journey to start immediately or shortly after. In addition, only taxis will be able to provide services requested through a fixed booking device that essentially acts as an electronic pick-up zone. Providers of booked hire services, except those in a taxi, must also keep and produce for inspection booking records to ensure they are providing booked services only.

The committee also recommended the government consider options for preserving the rights of special purpose limousines. In response, the government is proposing to retain existing special purpose limousine licences, rather than phasing them out over the next three years as previously announced. This will preserve the existing entitlements under these licences and align with the retention of all other limousine licences.

The government also supports the committee's recommendations to enhance compliance and enforcement in relation to unauthorised personalised transport services. In particular, a three-month driver licence suspension is proposed where a driver continues to flout the laws after an initial one-month suspension. This sanction complements hefty financial penalties of up to \$365,000 for the provision of unauthorised services.

Recruitment and training of additional compliance resources is a priority for this government, with recruitment to commence before the end of the financial year as previously outlined in the introductory speech. Compliance data relating to personalised transport services will be published on a regular basis to provide transparency regarding enforcement.

In support of the committee's recommendations relating to driver conditions, the government will work with the personalised transport industry to develop industry standards. The government also commits to reviewing and reporting to parliament on driver conditions 18 months after removal of the legislative requirements for bailment agreements. Let me be clear. The removal of bailment agreements does not prevent their usage, nor does it invalidate existing bailment arrangements. Instead, this change recognises that bailment agreements are largely a workplace relations matter and its removal from transport legislation will allow drivers and industry to establish industry standards that reflect broader industrial relations practices. It also acknowledges the breadth of employment arrangements utilised across the personalised transport sector.

The committee also made recommendations relating to implementation of the reforms. The government is committed to reducing regulation for industry where possible without compromising the effectiveness of the new regulatory framework in achieving its objectives. This includes exploring online solutions for obtaining personalised transport licences and authorisations to streamline processes and reduce costs.

Finally and importantly, the government supports the committee's recommendations relating to the establishment of suitable administrative arrangements and independent oversight of the regulation of the personalised transport industry as part of the implementation of the reforms. The government is committed to establishing an ombudsman or dispute resolution body to provide complaint monitoring and advisory and referral services to parties in the personalised transport industry, including customers and drivers.

This will include reporting to government on complaints based matters in the personalised transport industry and providing information and advice to industry participants and the public on complaints management and dispute resolution options. In addition to complaints monitoring and reporting, it is envisaged that the new role will have the ability to provide non-binding complaint mediation on certain issues including customer complaints about particular safety or discrimination matters and industry complaints about workplace issues. Importantly, it will also be an advice and referral source for customers and industry participants on binding dispute resolution options. Formal dispute resolution can often be a daunting process and having a source of advice on the options available will be a key benefit to industry participants.

There will also be clear boundaries for the new independent oversight role with matters related to policy development, compliance and service reviews to remain the remit of the Department of Transport and Main Roads preventing duplication and, importantly, additional red tape. The establishment of this role and associated functions is a significant undertaking which requires comprehensive legislative and regulatory amendments. Due to the legislative time frames forced upon this bill it has not been possible to include amendments on this issue in the bill. However, the government commits to introducing these changes by the end of the year to establish the role.

I will move amendments to the bill during consideration in detail to give effect to committee recommendations. They include amendments to clarify the limited circumstances in which a booking may be made in person for a service provided in a vehicle other than a taxi, to extend the period of subsequent driver licence suspensions to three months for repeated unlawful driver conduct after an initial one-month suspension period and to clarify the effect of a driver licence suspension where the person does not hold a driver licence. I will also move a number of other amendments to strengthen and improve the new regulatory framework.




While these other amendments do not arise directly from the committee's recommendations, they are consistent with these recommendations and will enhance the effectiveness of this bill. In particular, a new offence is proposed to enable enforcement in circumstances where a person systematically takes steps to avoid detection of an offence related to the provision of personalised transport services. The maximum penalty will be 3,000 penalty units, or \$365,000. This will provide a deterrent to the use of avoidance tactics such as those commonly known as 'greyballing' and allow the government to take action against those engaging in such conduct.

An amendment is also proposed to enhance the protection of taxis' exclusive rights to use ranks. This will allow regulation to prescribe the offence of a driver stopping in a taxi zone as a relevant driver offence for the purposes of imposing a driver licence suspension. This will mean that where a driver of a limousine or booked hire vehicle stops at a rank, this will not only be an offence under the road rules with a fine of \$243; it will also count towards the three offences needed to suspend the person's driver licence. This is intended to strengthen the deterrent effect of this sanction and preserve ranks for taxis.

A specific regulation-making power for security cameras is also proposed to be included in the bill to ensure police are able to access relevant evidence for the purposes of investigating and enforcing the laws. Other less material amendments are also proposed to address minor, consequential or technical matters and do not alter the intent of the bill.

In closing, this bill and the amendments I will move during consideration in detail provide the public with safe choices in personalised transport services. I ask members to support this bill to deliver on these fundamental objectives of reform. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (4.23 pm): The revolving door of Labor transport ministers—Trad, Hinchliffe, Bailey—sorry Trad, Hinchliffe, Trad, Bailey—

**Mr BAILEY:** I rise to a point of order. I am not the Minister for Transport. The member is actually factually incorrect.

**Mr POWELL:** I have not finished my sentence.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stewart): Will you withdraw?

**Mr POWELL:** He has not taken offence, Mr Deputy Speaker. I have not even finished the sentence. If he had allowed me to do that he might actually appreciate the nuance—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Do you take offence to what the member has said?

**Mr BAILEY:** The member is factually incorrect when he says I am the Minister for Transport. He has made the same mistake as the member for Southport. It is not a good start to the debate I have to say.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is no point of order.

**Mr POWELL:** The revolving door of Labor ministers responsible for the personalised transport industry—Trad, Hinchliffe, Trad, Bailey—has consistently bungled the changes to the taxi and rideshare industry. First, we had the Deputy Premier sit on her hands for nine months despite promising the industry—promises that I have had reiterated to me by taxi owners and operators across the length and breadth of this state—and promising passengers that these changes would be in place with the expiry of the Queensland taxi strategy at the end of 2015.

The government then embarked on a 12-month review, stringing everyone along while not providing an industry in turmoil with certainty. The member for South Brisbane really is the epitome of the 'review, not do' mentality of this government. What is more, they promised to position the industry for the future. They promised but they did not deliver because the member for Sandgate subsequently announced a policy literally from nowhere catching stakeholders by surprise as it had very little in common with the issues or the options canvassed by the Varghese review. This policy was little more than a glossy brochure detailing nothing other than the repeal of a number of regulations by 5 September. That is the time these bills should have been introduced. Given the nine-month delay, the 12-month review and policy that had clearly been written while Jim Varghese was still undertaking his review, these bills with the lack of certainty they provide should have been put in place from the moment the industry was largely deregulated in September of last year.

People do not govern by ripping out laws leaving a vacuum while they roll the dice to decide what to do next. The regulations proposed to be ripped out by this Palaszczuk Labor government were ill thought through and it was up to the LNP opposition to disallow some of these changes in the interests of driver and passenger safety. It was then up to the LNP to shame the member for Sandgate into getting his industry assistance package into parliament. Without the LNP there would have been no

payments going out to licence owners before Christmas last year. While we received a concession from the government that the payments would be extended to operators and licences held in trusts, the government refused the LNP's amendments to remove the unfair two-licence cap. I point out to the many taxi licence owners and operators who are listening to this debate this afternoon that that is indicative of our ability from opposition to influence key aspects of legislation pertaining to the personalised transport industry. The opposition is limited in its ability to influence financial aspects of industry assistance packages in accordance with longstanding laws of this parliament. That is not to say we have not desired to do that—and clearly removing that two-licence cap would have been preferable—but we were unable to do so.

It was the LNP's amendments which held the government to a time frame, a time frame that has seen the introduction of these final stages to the legislative changes. Without the leadership of the LNP, the industry would still be strung along by a dithering, do-nothing government. The uncertainty and instability was crippling the industry, and the passengers were getting fed up. In contrast to this bungling government, I would like to share with the House the LNP's plan.

After listening to passengers, drivers, owners and operators, the LNP believes the government's efforts with the personalised transport industry should be refocused to stand up for the safety of passengers and provide the industry with certainty and stability. The LNP will continue to listen, plan and act for passengers and the industry to fix Labor's mess. Our policy announced alongside small business owners in the taxi industry restores certainty, gives industry a real seat at the table and sets out our principles in building the future of the personalised transport industry. We guarantee that an LNP transport minister or, if the Minister for Main Roads wants to be precise, the LNP minister responsible for personalised transport, will hear about issues and ideas firsthand from stakeholders because what we have heard from the industry is that this minister and his many predecessors simply are not listening.

They do not want to listen to passengers, drivers, owners or operators. A Tim Nicholls LNP led government will also appoint an independent personalised transport commissioner whose role will be outlined in legislation and remove politics from the lives of small business owners who have been neglected as a result of the actions of this government. Our independent commissioner will advise government on policy settings and regulatory functions. They will be appointed after consultation with the industry, act as an ombudsman for the industry and be a source of frank and fearless advice to the minister. These things have been clearly missing under the tenure of ministers Trad, Hinchliffe and Bailey.

Importantly, the commissioner will look to the future to see how we can restore fairness in an industry that has been decimated by uncertainty. In the future we do not want to be in the situation where our laws are not adaptive enough to deal with change. The LNP's policy for an independent commissioner will enable them to make recommendations about safety laws and regulations on such things as cameras, licensing requirements and vehicle identification. These are serious issues regarding safety and technical specifications. The commissioner will also look at removing unnecessary red tape which puts extra costs on to small businesses, drivers and passengers. To ensure that industry voices are always heard by the government, the LNP will appoint a personalised transport ministerial council consisting of the minister, commissioner and industry stakeholders. This will give industry a regular opportunity to raise issues with the minister and contribute to future directions of policy.

What this industry needs is a government with clear principles in relation to the future of personalised transport in the state of Queensland. The LNP will: ensure safe transport for passengers and drivers; reduce red tape for cheaper fares; respect owners, operators and drivers; and introduce a level playing field with certainty and stability for businesses. The government claims that this bill achieves those elements, and I will read out some of the key aspects of the bill that this legislation claims to achieve. Measures to strengthen safety standards across the industry include: a new chain of responsibility; a general duty relating to the management of driver fatigue; extending the requirement of a zero blood alcohol concentration to any person who drives; and providing a specific power to make regulations relating to the use of security cameras and other recording devices. It also claims to provide greater customer choice and flexibility by: introducing a new licensing framework for booked hire services; preserving existing taxi service licences and introducing a new licensing framework for taxi service licences; and preserving existing limo service licences and allowing limousines to be used to provide booked hire services.

The bill speaks of driving innovation and improved customer service standards by: removing requirements for taxi service bailment agreements between operators and drivers; giving the chief executive discretion to not charge the taxi industry security levy for a particular financial year; and

allowing maximum fares to be specified for all taxi services and booked hire services for certain persons or types of vehicles or in a taxi service area subject to market entry restriction of using only taxis or limousines. Measures in the bill to ensure accountability and clearly defined obligations include: a new booking entity authorisation regime for booking entities; significant financial penalties and non-financial sanctions for the provision of unauthorised taxi or booked hire services; and establishing audit powers for investigating compliance. That is what this legislation claims to achieve, but in reality it misses the mark.

I do not want people to take my word for it, because whether you are a taxidriver, a taxi owner, a taxi operator, a limousine licence owner or operator, or a ridesharing driver or company, it seems that everyone is unhappy with some or all of this legislation. Yesterday I spoke to some members of the Limousine Association of Queensland. I would like to refer to notes they provided me, which state—

1. The new licensing framework will provide customers with greater choice and flexibility. A booked hire service licence will be created ensuring that all personalised transport service providers are licenced
2. Page 3 of the release dealt with “Practical Licensing arrangements. Namely
  - a. Taxi Service Licences
  - b. Limousine Service Licences, and
  - c. Booked Hire service licences.
3. When this was released the Limousine Association was pleased to see that the Limousine section of the Transport horizon was going to be retained. We had met with the minister on a couple of occasions stating our case for the industry to be retained.
4. In the amendment bill a new chapter 7 was inserted and contrary to the Minister’s release giving the definitions, only the Taxi and Booked Hire services were defined, There have been a couple of insertions mentioning Limousines but as a distinct class they have not been defined as per the Ministers release.
5. In the explanatory notes TMR have inserted that the concept of a distinct class will not be retained as Luxury services can be provided using a booked hire vehicle.
6. We the LAQ total repudiate that statement as in the release the Minister outlined the privileges that Limousines would be retained.
  - a. The right to use priority lanes or areas, bus and transit lanes
  - b. The right to advertise themselves as a Limousine
  - c. Existing exemptions under the liquor Act 1992 that enables the serving of alcohol

**These are not permitted in a ride booking vehicle.**

We have had numerous meetings with TMR and on all occasions they have strenuously advised us that they can only do what the Minister directs them to do.

It appears that with the release of the amendment bill TMR have not followed the directions of the Minister or they would have defined the 3 classes in chapter 7 and clarified it in section 91.

It appears the Committee hearing while acknowledging our concerns with Chapter 7 did not seem to understand the ramifications if the 3 distinct classes are not stated in the definitions.

They did however pick up on the “hire on the spot” definition only related to Taxi services.

I am happy to table that contribution for the minister’s consideration, because it does outline the LAQ’s position when it comes to possible amendments for consideration by the government.

*Tabled paper:* Document titled ‘Meeting points with the Shadow Minister’ [\[778\]](#).

I have also heard from members of the Limo Action Group. Their concerns with regard to the legislation include the topic of lease and surrender. I again quote from their contribution, which states—

The draft legislation provides for Limousine Licence to be either leased or surrendered. Considering the uncertainty in the industry due to the governments initial announcement that they were going to cancel Limousine Licences, and this draft legislation allowing for regulation to offer a parallel licence at an incredibly low cost, many Limousine Licences are not leased. Also, in a normal market there are periods of change and disruption when Licences may not be leased.

Without an amendment to the legislation it would allow for these perpetual licences to be seized by the department without any opportunity for the owner of the licence to lease his licence.

They go on to talk about the proposed regulation and their concern about the proposed ride-booking fee of \$237.26. They go into a considerable explanation and state—

**An annual booked hire fee already exists.** A Special Purpose Limousine Licence is currently an annual booked hire licence. It has been in place since 2007 and the current annual fee is \$2480.80.

These licences are referred to by the Minister as “*substantially similar*”. The explanatory notes on this Bill state “*that the new booked hire service licence will effectively take their place.*” and they “*effectively permit the holder to provide the same services for the same term*”

It is not surprising that the Limo Action Group ask how the licence fees can be so different—\$237 compared to nearly \$2,500—if they are providing a similar service. They also have concerns with regard to looking and acting like a limousine. They go on to state—

There are regulations that ensure only a Taxi can look and act like a Taxi. The Limo Action Group require similar regulations for Limousines.

Currently we often see ride booking vehicles with personalised plates to impersonate a Limousine.

The minister will again see examples provided by the Limo Action Group in that regard when I table this correspondence. The Limo Action Group also has concerns about CTP. They want to remain in class 4 and for ride booking to have their own class of CTP. They further state—

The committee recommendation was to review the CTP in 18 months after Limousines and Ride Booking were in class 26. The Limo Action Group request that Limousines remain in class 4 and the same review be made in 18 months to consider moving Limousines to class 26.

I table that contribution from the Limo Action Group for the benefit of the Leader of the House and particularly the minister.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 21 May 2017, to Mr Andrew Powell MP from Limo Action Group, regarding proposed amendments to passenger transport legislation [779].

The Taxi Council made its objections very public by issuing a 20-point list of requirements. I will spend some time addressing each of these requirements. I am pleased to say that all of these points either are supported by the LNP or will be addressed by the independent personalised transport commission set up by our policy, should the LNP be successful at the next election.

The first requirement is to establish an independent personalised transport commission. That is a big tick for the LNP. We have made a commitment to set up an independent personalised transport commission. Point 2 relates to bailment agreements. The LNP members of the committee made it clear that this government has it around the wrong way. The agreement should remain while a review is undertaken. If the minister is unable to make that change today then the LNP's independent commissioner will address this potential gap in employment conditions as a matter of priority.

Point 3 relates to security camera requirements. We have made our position regarding cameras very clear: passenger safety has to be the priority. While the Palaszczuk government has said that it wants to move towards outcomes based requirements for in-car cameras, we have seen no detail in this regard. Again, the LNP's independent commissioner will provide advice in relation to the standard of technology used and the extent this is required throughout the industry.

Point 4 relates to the GPS tracking of vehicles. Again, we need to see what standards are being proposed by the government. Point 5 relates to a requirement to have in-car emergency systems. What is clear with these points is that passengers and drivers must be safe. There must be no politics around their safety. That is why, again, our independent commissioner will be providing advice with regard to these safety points.

Point 6 is about ensuring that personalised transport laws are consistent with disability discrimination and occupational health and safety laws. The government has said that training standards will be set by the chief executive. We have not yet seen what those requirements will be. At this stage we will take the government at its word that safety and disability standards will be maintained. We will be watching with keen interest to see what requirements are set by the department. Point 7 is about dedicated numberplates for personalised transport vehicles. Again, the LNP has been clear from the start that this will be considered by the independent commissioner.

Point 8 relates to compulsory third-party insurance. There seems to be a significant argument that limousines and ride-booking vehicles should not be contained within the one CTP class, as I just outlined in relation to the Limo Action Group. The LNP believes that this needs further review and that only a fair and independent personalised transport commissioner can ensure there is a balanced assessment of CTP classes and premiums. In relation to point 9, the LNP supports the call to ensure all operators or drivers are covered by appropriate public liability insurance.

Point 10 refers to vehicle age restrictions or standards. In the absence of vehicle age restrictions, the TCQ wants to establish clear vehicle quality and usage rate standards and hold operators accountable. It was the LNP that wanted to retain some form of age restriction on vehicles in the first place. We would consider an alternative way of ensuring the standard of vehicles on our roads and, based on the independent commissioner's advice, we will consider introducing vehicle standards for personalised transport services.

Point 11 relates to licence fees for booked hire service drivers. The LNP members of the committee were keen to find out if the current fee regime accurately reflects TMR cost recovery. They were unable to get a straight answer. The LNP will ensure there is funding available for compliance activities. We are also cognisant of the fact that higher costs for any part of the industry puts pressure on fares paid by passengers. Serious consideration should be given to the modernisation and automation of these processes and the reduction of paper forms and applications to put downward pressure on those costs and, ultimately, on fares.

Point 12 relates to ABN and GST. All drivers must have an ABN and be registered for GST before receiving a driver's authorisation. The LNP will explore how these requirements of the federal government can work with the application process undertaken by TMR, bearing in mind that we are hesitant to see more red tape and paperwork.

Point 13 relates to chain of responsibility and fatigue management. The LNP has heard a number of stakeholders express concerns that the proposed fatigue management and chain of responsibility laws do not do enough to address drivers who may be working on different platforms and are therefore in breach of fatigue management requirements. I note that the minister spent some time addressing this in his second reading speech and has suggested that they will be based on the Heavy Vehicle National Law in relation to both fatigue management and chain of responsibility. It would be good for the minister to again clarify what the government intends to do about this loophole. If what is being proposed does not fully address it then it is certainly something we will be asking the independent commissioner to look at further.

Point 14 relates to fully integrating taxis into the go card public transport network in the short term. We genuinely think this is a worthwhile policy which the government should be considering through the next generation ticketing project. If it will not, we certainly will.

Point 15 relates to hailing and touting. The LNP is supportive of measures to increase penalties where taxi ranks are used unlawfully or where personalised transport vehicles other than taxis are caught undertaking hail jobs. Consideration should be given to increased enforcement of these zones and the use of technology in monitoring registered personalised transport vehicles. The LNP will also consider the legal definitions around 'hailing' and 'touting' to provide clarity to drivers.

Point 16 relates to expressly prohibiting the establishment and operation of booked hire service pick-up and drop-off zones on public and private land which represent pseudo taxi ranks. The LNP believes there does need to be clarity around what constitutes a taxi rank. Regarding private property, we would need to carefully consider the implications on property rights. Changes would have to be in the interests of road safety and protecting passengers.

Point 17 relates to a register of drivers. As part of the driver authority system, the department should be maintaining a register of drivers that have been disaffiliated.

In relation to points 18 and 19, the LNP believes that processes should be put in place to ensure the Queensland Police Service is able to access relevant evidence in the possession of taxi, rideshare or other personalised transport operators. I do note that the minister addressed this in some way in his contribution. Provision should be made for access to travel and customer trip data in the same way that camera vision must be provided to authorities in relation to criminal or illegal activities. The safety of passengers and drivers must be the first priority of the Queensland government's laws and the QPS should be able to undertake police checks.

In relation to point 20, the TCQ has requested laws to maintain the capacity of the minister to enter into service contracts at their discretion. This ability will be reviewed by the independent commissioner. While we understand the need for the minister to be able to act quickly in the interests of the market and passengers, we have been clear and consistent about the need for certainty in the industry. I have explained in some detail the LNP's position on each of the points in that comprehensive list of requirements by the Taxi Council Queensland.


I said earlier that no element of industry seems to be happy with this legislation. I am also aware that ride-booking services like Uber are also unhappy with elements of the legislation, including changes to mandatory vehicle signage. The Palaszczuk Labor government has achieved an astonishing feat: not one element of the industry it is regulating is happy with what it has produced. One member of the industry who appeared before the committee, Mr Andrew Francis, communicated to me, 'I think it needs a major rewrite because there are so many problems with it.'

When legislation is this bad, your starting point would be to vote against it. However, following extensive consultation with each of the elements of the industry—taxi, limousine and ride booking—one thing they are all seeking is a level of certainty and stability. We have been clear about the need for confidence to be restored to the industry. After talking to stakeholders, including the TCQ, it is clear that the industry would not be served well by the LNP voting these laws down. If this bill does not pass there will be a void in the laws allowing for cowboy operators and potentially putting passengers at risk, so the LNP will not be opposing this bill.

If we are not opposing the bill, the next question we need to consider is whether the legislation should be or can be amended and, if so, how it should be amended. I think I have clearly enunciated that the bill should be amended. Whether it can be amended is another question altogether. There is always a danger in amending bad legislation. Experiences by all parties in this chamber, both in government and in opposition, have shown amendments passed on complex legislation at the last minute can often go badly awry. So what then?

The LNP has articulated our alternative approach. That will be the plan we will put to the personalised transport industry and to Queenslanders. The LNP will ensure: safe transport for passengers and drivers; reduced red tape for cheaper fares; respect for owners, operators and drivers in a fair playing field; and certainty and stability for businesses. Our plan centres around, as requested specifically by the taxi industry, the appointment of an independent commissioner. Quite frankly, you do not agree to appoint an independent commissioner and then support kneejerk substantive amendments to this bill, so we will not be doing that. Instead, we will task that independent commissioner with considering the outstanding concerns raised by each element of the industry including, but not limited to, vehicle identification, safety and cameras, bailment agreements, service agreements, CTP, rank-and-hail enforcement, fatigue management, fees and red tape and, most importantly, how to truly prepare the industry for the future.

In conclusion, passengers, drivers, owners and operators know that it will be an LNP government and the LNP's policy for an independent personalised transport commissioner that will restore fairness, restore certainty and restore respect to the taxi, limousine and rideshare industry.

 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (4.51 pm): I rise to support the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. There is no denying that the personalised transport industry is in a state of rapid change. Many jurisdictions are struggling to come to terms with the growing phenomenon of rideshare. Consumers, as with many new technological advances, have embraced the entrance of rideshare operators into the Queensland personalised transport industry with vigour. On the other hand, the taxi industry has always been the major provider of personalised transport services and has a wide reach in Queensland and provides personalised transport to communities all over the state and represents small, medium and large business interests. The taxi industry has a significant role in providing affordable transport for seniors, people with disability and many others across the state, with other examples being relocatable home parks, people who live in rural communities and others. It is an industry that is well regulated and a critical part of all of our communities—inner city, regional and rural.

The combination of rapid entry of rideshare with its technological ease and consumer support into our personalised transport market and the important need to ensure that our vital taxi industry is able to continue its service delivery and strong business potential has required this government and this parliament to move with a considered and consultative approach towards this legislation. Our government and our committee have never shied away from the challenge of getting this balance right. I know from many conversations I have had with the taxi industry, including the many small taxi operators in my community, that they have no fear of, and in fact expect, competition in the personalised transport industry. They are the professionals who saw it coming. What they want, however, is a safe and equal playing field. The bill before the House is designed to achieve a levelling of the playing field within the industry and to put in place the considerations of all involved, be they taxi owners and operators, rideshare operators, limousines and their drivers and of course all consumers who use personalised transport services.

The stage 1 reforms which were delivered last year helped to compensate the taxi industry and were brought about urgently to help the taxi industry weather the storm while we worked on the stage 2 legislation to level the playing field between the sectors of the industry. This is what has made this body of work for our committee so involved. Creating legislation to help one sector of the industry survive while allowing other sectors to emerge, all the while providing consumers with choice, has not been the easiest task our committee has faced, but I think we have reached a good outcome. I thank members of the committee—Rob Molhoek, the deputy chair and member for Southport; Joan Pease, the member

for Lytton; Chris Whiting, the member for Murrumba; Matt McEachan, the member for Redlands; and Jason Costigan, the member for Whitsunday—for their largely bipartisan approach to the bill. As always, I thank our amazing secretariat staff—Kate, Rachelle, Mishelle and Lyn. I also want to thank everyone who supplied a submission and those who attended our public hearing.

The bill sets out to: strengthen safety standards, including establishing a general duty relating to the management of fatigue, a requirement for zero blood alcohol levels for the drivers of all public passenger vehicles and providing a specific power to make regulations relating to the use of security cameras in vehicles; encourage customer choice within a fairer regulatory framework, including introducing a new licensing framework for booked hire services and for taxi service licences, preserving existing taxi service licences and existing limousine service licences, and allowing limousines to be used to provide booked hire services and removing provisions relating to peak demand taxi permits; reduce red tape and allow industry to innovate and improve their service offerings, including replacing the requirement for a person administering taxi services to hold a service contract with a simplified authorisation regime for all booking entities and removing legislative requirements for taxi service bailment agreements between operators and drivers; and ensure industry accountability, including establishing a new chain of responsibility to ensure each party involved in providing taxi and booked hire services takes reasonable steps to prevent the commission of an offence and to minimise safety risks, imposing significant financial sanctions and non-financial sanctions for unauthorised taxi or booked hire services and establishing audit powers for investigating legislative compliance.

Our committee made 16 recommendations to the minister after reviewing the large volume of submissions and the evidence from the public hearing. Recommendation 1—that the bill be passed—was accepted unanimously. The majority of the other recommendations were also accepted, and I will go through them quickly. The committee recommended: that the minister continue to explore opportunities for cost reduction while not compromising compliance and moving as technology allows for online authorisations; that limousine special purpose licences be retained—I am pleased that that was accepted—as well as a review of CTP insurance categories after 18 months for limousines to make sure that class 26 is not having a detrimental effect on the industry, which further addressed concerns raised by limousine owners; that a register of disaffiliated drivers reported by booking agencies be kept with the department where a driver has been disaffiliated from a platform on the grounds of serious misconduct and that this register be available to booking agencies to check from and that there also be an appeals process set up for drivers to dispute the record; that all payment transactions must be performed by a booking agency and are accompanied by a tax invoice or itemised receipt and these transactions are recorded for auditing purposes; and that fatigue be controlled through a maximum number of driver hours and a maximum shift length and there be a chain of responsibility to stop drivers doing ridiculous shifts over multiple platforms and creating safety concerns on our roads. During the hearing it was clear to us that there is real concern that passengers may experience harm while the rideshare vehicle is not moving and CTP does not cover this, so public liability insurance is vital, whether covered by the driver or booking agency, and the industry should make sure of this.

I now want to address a range of commentators' criticisms and in particular the dissenting report from members opposite. As stated, we made 16 recommendations to the minister. Far from indicating that the bill has deficiencies, rather it highlights the in-depth deliberations, thoughtful considerations of public hearings and many witnesses and a desire to get things right. This is in many ways uncharted territory for the state. Queensland is a far more demographically diverse state than our southern neighbours and consumers and personalised transport industry players are found all over the length and breadth of the state.

The statement of reservation by those opposite, as usual, disappoints me, especially after the extensive work done by all committee members. Again, I feel it is protest for protest's sake. With regard to safety cameras, those opposite propose that cameras be mandatory in all known trouble spots like nightclub precincts. While this sort of motherhood statement sounds great, it would be virtually impossible to police and tie up so many departmental resources that they would be able to do little else. I have been to the Valley and Brisbane city as well as the Gold Coast on a weekend and seen the rideshare players operating and to individually monitor who does and who does not have a camera in these precincts is, I feel, a ludicrous ask. Even if this was somehow achieved, the rideshare operators, who have shown just how adaptable they can be, would just drop off and pick up outside these precincts. I would hate to think of the potential for harm that could come to some young nightclub patron who, after a few too many, heads off alone down a dark alley to get outside a precinct to meet a rideshare vehicle. For the life of me, I cannot understand why those opposite, in their statement of reservation, would consider that, or something that would potentially allow that to happen.

I have to confess that I was an advocate for cameras in every vehicle. I am still a passionate advocate for driver and passenger safety, but I have altered my view slightly based on the strong evidence presented through the submissions and the public hearing. We were not previously made aware that not all taxis in Queensland have to have cameras installed. Some of the areas where taxis do not have to have a camera because they are considered regional areas are Bribie Island, Gatton, Glass House, Kilcoy, Woodford, Beaudesert, Childers, Chinchilla, Dalby, Goondiwindi, Kingaroy, Nanango, Oakey, St George, Barcaldine, Biloela, Clermont, Emerald, Longreach, Moranbah, Charters Towers, Gordonvale, Mission Beach, Mareeba, Thursday Island, Tully and Weipa. I have named only a few. Are those opposite suggesting that these areas are less important than the nightclub precincts of Brisbane and the Gold Coast? I hope not.

The committee was also made aware that, when cameras were mandated in 2005, the government paid \$8 million to compensate the taxi industry players. It would be hard to come up with similar compensation, which I am sure would be asked for, if cameras were mandated across-the-board. The limousine industry also lobbied hard against enforced cameras. It stated that it has operated safely without cameras without compromising driver and passenger safety. The limousine industry would fall into the category of having to have cameras if the limousines were not prebooked and paid for. The conditions that we are asking of the rideshare industry in relation to cameras are the strictest in Australia. We have also asked the minister to review how those conditions are working over the next 18 months. To clarify, there is nothing stopping rideshare operators from installing cameras as long as they meet the set criteria and if commuters want the safety and security of a camera while riding, they can always opt to take a cab.

In relation to bailment agreements, the recommendation will remove the legislative requirement for bailment agreements. Queensland is the only jurisdiction to have bailment agreements contained in its transport act and one of only two states to have bailment agreements at all—New South Wales being the other and that state's bailment agreements are in its IR legislation. Bailment agreements will still be legal, and existing agreements will remain in use. The industry can still employ under these agreements, but do not have to under legislation. This part of the bill provides a choice for the industry and I am surprised that those opposite want to stifle choice.

In relation to fatigue management, I feel that I need to further reassure those opposite that worker, driver and consumer safety is a priority and it always has been for any industry. I remind those opposite that our committee recommended that industry standards are developed so that drivers are not platform hopping and working extreme hours.

I believe that those opposition members of the committee, when pushing for an independent commission, have once again gone with opposition to what we are doing for politics' sake and have not tried to work with the evidence presented. The department stated—

The proposal to establish an independent commission does not meet the 'threshold test' prescribed by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet in the Public Interest Map Policy which requires there to be a compelling reason why a government department cannot or should not undertake the proposed activities. Furthermore, functions and resources would be duplicated between the department and the commission resulting in confusion for industry and customers as well as creating issues with coordinating an integrated passenger transport network. Government would also incur significant additional costs to establish an independent commission, adding to the total cost of implementing the reforms and these costs would be passed on to industry through higher fees.


In their statement of reservation the opposition members say that they are concerned about red tape but, with this issue, they seem to be bending over backwards to create some. The department went on to state—

Implementation, monitoring and regulation of a personalised transport industry is being led from a dedicated personalised transport reform unit. There is a dedicated unit that has been established to provide the dedicated focus on development and implementation of these reforms. That was our preferred model within Transport and Main Roads rather than moving to establish an independent commission at this stage.

Yet the non-government members, in their statement of reservation, appeared to wish to replicate this unit outside and create more cost and red tape. As well as dedicated departmental resources for the industry, we have recommended that the minister ensure that an ombudsman, or equivalent entity, is allocated responsibility for dealing with disputes in the industry in a timely manner. This is the role that the opposition members see for their proposed independent commissioner. I think we all agree on this issue, but, once again, those opposite want to disagree for the sake of it.



The process of this report and the stage 1 reforms has been lengthy and a bit of a trial for our committee, not to mention the industry as a whole. Once again, I thank all of those who have contributed to the process. I hope that this legislation will level the playing field and provide a fair outcome for all players. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (5.05 pm): It is my pleasure to rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. What a journey it has been! Last year, we spent many months reviewing the first raft of changes, proposed reforms and the compensation package proposed by the government in respect of the taxi industry. Also last year we had the privilege of visiting many major centres across the state. We spent hours, if not days, hearing testimony and presentations from taxi owners, taxidriviers and many of the families impacted by the changes in the industry. We also conducted more hearings in Brisbane.

We heard substantive submissions and presentations from the taxi industry and from other significant players in the industry, but we had the pleasure of Uber's presence on only one occasion. Uber's representative arrived, answered the questions, made a brief submission, and then left. Such is the heart of those who have a passion for disruptive technology. Throughout the last inquiry, we asked questions on notice of some of the rideshare organisations. They were a little evasive, or were unable to provide the responses that we had hoped for.

Having said that, we heard some interesting submissions from the industry. I visited the Uber training centre in my electorate of Southport. I was told that there are 11½ thousand pick-ups each month just in my electorate around Griffith University, the university hospital and the Southport CBD. I was also told that 900 people within my electorate have signed up to be rideshare drivers. This is not an issue that we can take lightly.

My concern throughout this whole process—and I believe the concern of all of us on the committee, but more particularly my opposition colleagues on the committee—has been about the slow rate of response in seeking to level the playing field and giving the taxi industry a quicker start to respond and compete while at the same time bringing a level of enforcement to the changes to make sure that the rideshare industry is doing the right thing.

I am pleased that one of the recommendations of this report on the legislation is the new class of CTP insurance. I have spoken with many parents and many businesspeople who were shocked to learn that, under the old provisions, the CTP insurance of a rideshare driver does not necessarily provide a guaranteed cover for passengers, because the cover is provided for private use, not for business use. I believe that it is important to address those concerns. I am pleased that the legislation will address those concerns and provide a new class of CTP insurance.

I think it will be very interesting to see what happens with that CTP pool over the next year or two as we start to see claims—or maybe no claims—coming through as a result of the activity of rideshare drivers. The challenge, of course, is when we start to speak in terms of a level playing field. It is not a level playing field. A taxidriver will pay something like \$8,500 a year for their insurance whereas even with the new proposals a rideshare operator's premium, albeit that theoretically they will be operating a lot fewer hours each week, will be more in the order of \$500 per annum. It will be very interesting to see where that pool goes.

Through the inquiry process I did ask a lot of questions of the insurers and the department around how those premiums are actually calculated for the taxi industry. We heard that the fees are set by three major insurers. They all charge exactly the same. It is hardly a competitive insurance pricing scheme where owners are given a choice to shop around for a better premium with a different insurer but it does not matter which insurer they go with the premium is exactly the same.

My hope is that if this is the direction we are going, and I completely understand that disruptive technology is challenging to deal with, then the disruption should be fair on all sides. Sadly, because of the way that this transition has been handled by those in government, the disruption has been quick for those in the rideshare industry and quick and damaging for the taxi industry because it has taken so long to bring about the reforms needed to support an industry that has for so long supported many Queenslanders.

One of the challenges still not addressed particularly well is just what is going to happen in terms of the provision of services for the elderly, the disabled and those specialist services that we see the taxi industry providing. There is no rideshare for those with a disability who need special vehicles. There are no clear safety provisions or services provided by the rideshare industry for parents who are wanting to book a regular service to have their kids picked up from school. Even under Uber's own terms, one

of the requirements is, in fact, that you have to be over the age of 18 to use an Uber unless you are there with your parent. I have been very surprised to speak with parents of some of my sons' friends and other parents in my community who had no idea that that was actually one of the provisions.

The technology that Uber use is impressive. On my visit to the Uber centre I was particularly interested to see that they are able to track the time, the duration and the exact journey that every vehicle takes through their spatial tracking system—through Google mapping, so to speak. All trips are, in fact, recorded and logged and they can be reviewed retrospectively.

I note that the minister has said that they broadly support in principle all or most of the recommendations of the committee. One of the concerns that I have relates to the minister's comments in reference to recommendation 15. It is the government's response that they support the recommendations of the committee, but on reading the minister's comments in response it is clear that the department and the minister's office has not really understood the spirit of what we were actually asking the department and the minister to consider by way of amendment. One of the recommendations is not only should the legislative requirement be such that camera footage is available and driver logs are available in case there is a need for a police investigation or there is some incident, but we also asked that the legislation be revised so that in a sense there was provision in the legislation for our compliance officers and our police officers to actually use disruptive technology to monitor disruptive technology users.

In the hearings we raised some issues with the ridesharing organisations and we asked specific questions around how robust their systems were and how capable they are of monitoring the trips of passengers. We heard some great commentary on that. While we were in the inquiry I opened up the Uber app on my phone and I was able to watch some of the Uber vehicles moving around the city. Just as the question was being answered I observed one of the Uber cars doing an illegal U-turn in George Street. I raise this example simply to make the point that if we are serious about compliance then our compliance officers should be given the resources and the legislative powers they need to use this same disruptive technology to monitor and enforce the behaviour of rideshare operators and, for that matter, taxidriviers and other personal vehicle operators. It would, in fact, be possible.

One of the changes foreshadowed in the legislation is that there will be penalties for rideshare operators who actually pick up or seek to pick up passengers from hail and ride ranks. Given that every single rideshare trip is tracked, logged and monitored, it would be a very simple matter to provide a log of any pick-ups that occurred by a particular vehicle at a rank-and-hail facility within the city, or anywhere else in the state for that matter, and it would support the enforcement actions of the department. I would simply ask that the minister and the department revisit the recommendations of the committee, particularly in reference to recommendation 15, because it would appear that they have missed the third bullet point in that list of recommendations, which was a direct request of the committee and one that was unanimously supported.

As the member for Kallangur rightly said, we certainly are very grateful for the work of the secretariat. It has been a long and arduous review. It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge their hard work and thank each of them. I also acknowledge the work of the committee. The member for Kallangur is right: there are many things that we were able to reach agreement on, but there were some matters that we struggled to reach agreement on. As the shadow minister said earlier, we have been very concerned about the rate of change and how slow the government has been to adopt the necessary changes to level the playing field and deal with some of the challenging issues around a rideshare industry that has fundamentally been out of control.

I want to turn for a moment to the issue of safety cameras. Again it is a challenging issue. It is potentially expensive to insist that every single vehicle have cameras. As the member for Kallangur pointed out, quite rightly, about five per cent of taxis in Queensland do not have cameras in them. It is fundamentally because they are considered to be in areas where there is not the risk that is involved in other areas. My concern is that there are some areas, like the nightclub precinct in Fortitude Valley and down the Gold Coast on some occasions, where I believe there is a case for all vehicles to be fitted with cameras. I think there is a risk in simply relying on a computer logged trip inventory as the basis for evidence in the event of an assault or serious sexual assault or attack.

During the committee process, we asked the department if there are any statistics on incidents involving taxis and rideshare vehicles. While the data is limited, for me of concern is that, for the year 2016, there was a significant number of driver assaults. In fact, according to the report, there were 105 driver assaults, 24 passenger assaults and a range of other significant concerns and complaints raised. There were 345 police investigations during the 2016 period listed.

One area that is not as much of a concern is fare evasion, because of the way that the rideshare app works. Even the taxi industry is adopting that technology to make it easier for people to pay via their app. This matter needs further review. While I am pleased that at least the minister has said that it will be reviewed in 18 months, I am a little concerned because it seems that the government reviews everything in 18 months. I note from this morning's committee meeting that, while I have been asking to see the new housing strategy from the minister that was supposed to have been released some time ago, we are still waiting for it.


The rideshare industry itself has raised concerns around personal security. I received an email from one gentleman who directed me to the website [whosdrivingyou.org/rideshare-incidents#sexualassaults](http://whosdrivingyou.org/rideshare-incidents#sexualassaults). Some of those statistics are concerning. This is an area that we need to watch very closely over the next 12 months. My sincere hope is that there are no incidents. I would love nothing better than to be standing in the House in a year or a year and a half from now, looking at a report from the government or the department that highlights that there has not been an increase in incidents and no loss of life or serious assaults. That is my sincere hope. However, I remain concerned about this issue. While I do not want to see another layer of cost imposed on the industry, it concerns me, particularly when so many young people and elderly people are reliant on taxis and, under the current changes, are using rideshare services more and more.

During the hearings, we heard from a number of organisations, including a couple of rideshare organisations. We had the privilege of receiving a representation from Shebah, the female ridesharing organisation from Sydney. They brought some interesting information to the table. They expressed concerns about the safety of passengers, which is why they have chosen to set up a service that is only for women and children. I suspect that perhaps that is not such a bad thing. We heard from many individuals. We received some 300 submissions in a very short period, some from peak organisations and some from taxi companies, and many private owners and drivers made individual submissions.

One submission that I relied very heavily on for my line of questioning, as it also flagged some significant concerns, was from Professional Taxis Gold Coast, which happens to operate a significant number of taxis within the city and is based within my electorate of Southport. I am pleased that the minister has taken on board its concerns around sections 71 and 72 of the legislation, where there is a need for further clarity around the issue of who actually can pick up passengers at a rank and what constitutes a hire on the spot. From the minister's statement earlier, I note that one of the amendments has taken that concern on board.

As we heard from the shadow minister earlier, the company also raised concerns about the decision to remove bailment agreements from the legislation. Government members have said that that is really more of an IR issue, but I would rather see the bailment agreements left in place during the 18-month review period, so that there is still a tool or instrument that provides drivers in the taxi industry with some guarantees around their conditions of employment. Following the review, those bailment agreements or some other work conditions may be then moved into more relevant legislation. This has sat within transport legislation for a significantly long time and I see no need to remove it, particularly given that the taxi industry has asked that it remain until there is an opportunity for a more fulsome review by a commissioner or a departmental appointee who can monitor what happens over the next 18 months. As the shadow minister has said, we will be supporting the legislation.

*(Time expired)*

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (5.25 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. I am sure everyone in this room would agree with me that technology is changing the way in which we live our lives and go about our business. From nanny cams to driverless cars, technology is considered to be a disruptor to the traditional way and sometimes causes angst within the various sectors of the community that it impacts upon.

I recall very clearly—and this is obviously showing my age—how retail outlets were concerned when the internet was introduced and online shopping started. Everyone thought that the sky was going to fall in. However, the retail industry has survived and every industry that is associated with online shopping is marching on quite nicely. The industry responded by changing and meeting the needs and expectations of shoppers and now works alongside online and retail outlets. Bayside locals can stroll down Florence Street, Edith Street or Bay Terrace and window shop. They can pop in to DBS Menswear, Got-a-Go or any of the other wonderful little gems in Wynnum.

The personalised transport industry is now faced with the technological disruptor of rideshare operators. For many years the taxi industry, which is significantly regulated, has had a significant share of the personalised transport market, providing valuable and important services to the community. I know that local bayside cab drivers regularly go above and beyond for their clients, and I thank them for that.

With the arrival into Queensland of rideshare apps, like many other jurisdictions around the world the Palaszczuk government has responded to the new technology to ensure the industry is fair and well regulated and that customers are safe, while ensuring that the views of all involved—taxi owners and operators, rideshare operators, limousine owners and drivers and, of course, customers—are considered. The popularity and growth of rideshare apps has been rapid, with many consumers embracing the new technology.

The Palaszczuk government responded with *Queensland's personalised transport horizon: five year strategic plan for personalised transport services 2016-2021* to introduce stage 1 reforms that were delivered late last year. On 9 March 2017 the government released the *Queensland's personalised transport horizon: stage two implementation*. The four key aims of the new regulatory framework are to strengthen standards for the whole personalised transport industry, encourage competition and provide customers with greater choice and flexibility, drive innovation and improved customer standards through reduced red tape, and ensure accountability and clearly defined obligations across the industry.

This bill was introduced into the House on 21 March 2017 and was referred to the Public Works and Utilities Committee for consideration. The committee invited stakeholders and subscribers to lodge written submissions. Further, the Department of Transport and Main Roads was requested to provide written advice on the bill. The committee received 328 submissions, as well as written advice in answer to questions on notice from DTMR. We also held a public briefing with representatives from DTMR and a public hearing with representatives from a number of invited stakeholder groups. I would like to thank those who lodged a submission and also the stakeholders who attended the public hearings. I would also like to thank the department for their clear briefings.

I know that the committee has done significant work on this important issue. I have only recently joined this committee. I have been impressed by my colleagues' passion and commitment, working towards a good outcome for all members of the sector. I know that it has not been the easiest task for my colleagues from both sides of the House.

I acknowledge the work done by committee members: the chair, Mr Shane King MP, the member for Kallangur; Mr Chris Whiting, the member for Murrumba; Mr Rob Molhoek, the member for Southport; Mr Matt McEachan, the member for Redlands; and Mr Jason Costigan, the member for Whitsunday. The secretariat provided their usual professional support—thank you. I note that the member for Kallangur has spoken about the largely bipartisan approach to the bill. Therefore, it was very disappointing to read the statement of reservation by the deputy chair which was another example of what seems to be opposition for opposition sake.

This bill, as I discussed early, introduces a new licensing framework for booked hire services and taxi services, driver authorisation and vehicle requirements, booking entity authorisation, security, chain of responsibility including fatigue management, working conditions, penalties and sanctions and complaint mechanisms. During the committee process, as I indicated earlier, we listened to various stakeholders and reviewed the submissions lodged. We considered the information presented to us and as such the committee made 16 recommendations to the minister for consideration. Importantly, recommendation 1, that the bill be passed, was agreed to unanimously. The majority of the remaining recommendations were also accepted unanimously.

Currently in Queensland there are two types of licences for limousine services: limousine service licences for services which provide limousine services in a specific area of Queensland; and special purpose limousine service licences for services which offer a tourist service or services for weddings and student events such as formals. At the public hearing we heard from the department that the special purpose limousine is different in that the type of vehicles that are used under a special purpose limousine licence are more vintage or classic type cars that perform limited work in terms of their hours of operation. They are afforded the same privileges as limousines in terms of having special plates and they can also access the transit lanes and also serve alcohol et cetera.

I am particularly pleased that the government listened to the concerns of the limousine industry and will retain limousine licences, including special purpose limousine licences. Whilst no new limousine or special purpose limousine licences will be issued, existing licences will be preserved and holders of those licenses will be able to continue to provide the same service they have prior to the reforms.

The services that limousines can provide will actually be increased by the bill. For example, limousines will no longer be limited to trips with prearranged fares or preagreed fares. Limousines will also continue to enjoy other privileges that will not be available to booked hire licence holders. They will retain their L-plates, their ability to use special purpose lanes and serve alcohol and the right to advertise as a limousine. Restrictive vehicle requirements will be removed for limousines, but vehicles are still required to have a wheel base of at least 2.8 metres or to be at least 30 years of age. Vehicles currently attached to a limousine or special purpose limousine licence will automatically be approved to operate.

Further, implementation of personalised transport reform is occurring in stages. Stage 1 involved reforms to legalised ride-booking services from 5 September 2016 and eased the regulatory burden on the taxi and limousine industries by removing almost 80 requirements.


Stage 2 involves comprehensive reform through this bill and regulations to establish a new framework for personalised transport services, including a new booked hire service licence and booking entity authority and a new industry chain of responsibility. Phased implementation of stage 2 reforms is proposed to ensure an orderly transition to the new framework. While some provisions can commence in June 2017, most aspects of the new framework will commence in the second half of this year to allow industry participants time to adjust their business systems and processes and government system changes to be completed.

Finally, stage 3 will involve continuous monitoring, review and evaluation of the new framework. This review stage is critical to ensuring the framework operates as intended. Where any unintended consequences or new issues are identified appropriate action will be taken to address these issues to ensure that the reforms are fit for purpose and align with policy objectives.

As well as monitoring all reforms on an ongoing basis, stage 3 formal review will also be undertaken focussing on particular aspects of the reform. For example, the appropriateness of fees for a personalised transport industry will be reviewed 12 months post implementation. The effectiveness of reforms relating to vehicle security cameras, compulsory third-party insurance and driver working conditions will also be reviewed 18 months from commencement as recommended by our committee.

Further engagement with the personalised transport industry and other stakeholders will be undertaken in developing and implementing the reforms, including the requirements relating to driver fatigue management and an industry standard on driver working conditions. During implementation the government will also explore opportunities to reduce the regulatory burden on the industry, whilst ensuring services remain safe and parties are held accountable. This includes options to automate processes to ensure a more streamlined customer experience and reduce cost.

Finally, effective enforcement is critical to successful implementation. Compliance resources will be focused on ensuring public safety, protection of the rank-and-hail market and regulatory compliance by all industry participants. As such, DTMR compliance resources will be significantly enhanced, with an additional 16 front-line compliance officers—with 14 of these officers primarily dedicated to on-road enforcement and the remaining two dedicated to specialist investigations and enforcement activities related to compliance within the new chain of responsibility. These new resources will be funded primarily by revenue from the fee for the booked hire service licence and the booking entity authorisation. I commend the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017 to the House.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (5.36 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, introduced in the House by the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports on 21 March and subsequently referred to the Public Works and Utilities Committee for consideration. I would like to acknowledge the many hours that the committee invested in their deliberations, which are reflected in the number of recommendations in their report. As honourable members have already heard from the shadow minister, the honourable member for Glass House, the personalised transport industry is not happy with the way this Palaszczuk Labor government has treated them.

Part 1 of the state government's personalised transport reform passed in the House in December 2016 as part of the Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I spoke on that bill after a number of deeply distressed taxi and limousine operators from the Currumbin electorate met with me to highlight the devastating impact upon their businesses of Labor's do-nothing approach while their businesses and huge investments were left in limbo, dwindling before their eyes. Helpless to do

anything, one solo operator likened the situation to Nero fiddling while Rome burned. They remain deeply distressed and really frightened about their futures. That is why I promised them I would convey their feelings to the House when this bill came up for debate.

The Palaszczuk government has much to answer to—to these mum-and-dad small businesses who feel that they have been abandoned. Let me be very clear, the LNP believes in competition in the market—fair competition on a level playing field. More should have been done sooner by this government to reach a reasonable outcome. The LNP was successful in passing an amendment to the Heavy Vehicle National Law and Other Legislation Amendment Bill which required the minister to table a draft bill and propose subordinate legislation by March 2017. The bill before us today is the second tranche. We pushed for further amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1991. The LNP will continue to push for a level playing field for all operators in the personalised transport industry and safety for all passengers.

The committee received an impressive 328 submissions on this bill which is not surprising given the disruption and regulatory uncertainty experienced by the industry since ridesharing gained popularity in Australia. While the committee did recommend that the bill be passed, I note the non-government members of the committee raised a number of issues shared by many industry members from the Currumbin electorate who have contacted me over the past few months. The following are concerns that the taxi industry believe the Labor government has not addressed sufficiently: certainty and stability in the industry, safety cameras, police access to information and data, bailment, CTP insurance, enforcement of rank-and-hail regulations, fatigue management, and fees and red tape.

Instead of forging a clear pathway for all affected parties, this bill has further confused the industry and its customers. On the other hand, the LNP offer a way forward. A major component of the LNP's taxi and rideshare policy released in April 2017 is the introduction of an independent personalised transport commissioner to advise the government on policy settings and regulatory functions and act as an ombudsman for the industry. This was a consistent request of stakeholders during the consultation period, and its exclusion is a significant pitfall of this bill. The introduction of an independent commissioner would assist in addressing many of the concerns I mentioned and would be able to further investigate and make recommendations on safety laws and regulations like cameras, licensing requirements and vehicle identification.

A vocal supporter of the implementation of a personalised transport commissioner is the Taxi Council Queensland. I quote from their media release from 16 May, which states—

“These recommendations show just how clueless the Government is in this space and only highlights the need for an independent transport commission as we have suggested and as the LNP has endorsed.

Another supporter of the need for a commissioner is Professional Taxis Gold Coast. This local company raised a number of concerns with me including the removal of bailment agreements, as they identified in their submission to this committee, stating—

The introduction of Bailment Agreements within the industry meant that both operators and drivers had certainty around the terms of their agreements and written evidence of what is agreed, so that either party can enforce that agreement in circumstances of dispute.

The Taxi Council Queensland further explained bailment agreements, saying—

In Queensland, traditionally, as a peak body we have advocated for a percentage split. Generally it is 50-50, where the owner or operator of the vehicle is to carry all of the costs and the person delivering the service gets 50 per cent of whatever the take is, but has no burden of cost sharing in that. It is the most equitable way of doing it. The bailment is where you set out the terms of that negotiation.


Professional Taxis Gold Coast identified bailment agreements as being integral in protecting the working conditions of drivers in such a unique industry. The Taxi Council Queensland share such trepidation at the removal of bailment agreements, stating—

The proposed Bill and Regulations seeks to repeal the worker protections enshrined in Bailment Agreements without establishing a replacement regime that continues to legislate minimum rights and conditions of taxi drivers.

Integral safety recommendations such as camera installation and GPS vehicle tracking are, according to the committee report—

... currently being finalised and will be dealt with in subsequent subordinate legislation. These policies will be focused on ensuring the safety of drivers and passengers.’

The taxi industry has lost its patience and awaits these new amendments with a degree of suspicion. Those who have chosen to join ridesharing initiatives are also wondering about their future because of the dithering inaction of this government and failure to act in a timely and transparent manner. It seems the Palaszczuk Labor government still have not got their act together and finalised their policy, leaving the industry and its customers to play the waiting game in the meantime. As the shadow minister said, the LNP will continue to listen to the industry's voice and to ensure a fair and balanced system can operate and prosper in Queensland.

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (5.43 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill. The minister and the chair have already dealt with many of the outstanding issues addressed in the bill, so I wish to add some comments on only a few of the more pressing issues.

The issue of cameras, which has been addressed here, has been a vexing one for both sides—taxis and rideshare—and is also a complex issue for both sides of parliament to tackle. I will give two examples to show that it is not straightforward. I visited one taxi licence owner specifically to inspect his camera setup. I was impressed. Cameras can record the front seat, the back seat and what is happening outside the driver's door. The unit is very tough—the whole car can be incinerated and the recording unit installed on the vehicle will still survive. The recordings cannot be broadcast. They are encrypted and can only be read by the home or mother computer. You have to take out the disc and plug it into the home computer to get the recordings. The member for Kallangur and I both saw this and were very impressed. It is a good outcome for protecting privacy. The cameras are unobtrusive and can cost \$2,800 to supply and install.

If you are picking up people you do not know and cannot trace and the driver is handling cash, cameras are an important part of your business model. That is why the state government in about 2005 spent about \$8 million to install cameras in Queensland taxis, at a cost of about \$3,000 each. On the other side, cameras may not add much for the security of rideshare drivers and their passengers. Last Saturday I met and talked with two local rideshare drivers—Alex and Heath. Heath only drives on his way to and from work in the city—that is only eight hours a week. They agree with the general rule of thumb assessment that only 20 per cent of Uber drivers drive full-time. These drivers' vehicles return to private use if they are not on duty—they carry kids around and people do the shopping. Sometimes they use leased vehicles for rideshare, so it is not practical for them to drill holes in the car to install a camera system.

The other feature of their business model means that they do have some extra security built in. There are no cash transactions—the passenger has to use their credit card to pay. That means that you can be traced if you do the wrong thing. It also means no runners. The driver and the passenger know each other. The driver's profile and all of his necessary documents can be found on the app. You can see the driver's rating by his passenger and testimonials. The passenger's history as a paying customer is also on display. The driver can rate the passengers. One of the drivers said he has the option of not making himself available if the customer has been rated only 3.5 out of five as a passenger. This discussion shows why we have arrived at where we have on the issue of cameras in rideshare. However, as has been stated, we do have the mechanism to review the need for cameras if it arises.

On the matter of the \$237 annual fee for a booked hire service licence—that is for the car—and the \$140 annual renewal fee for driver authorisation—that is for the driver—let me note this: taxi owners and drivers say it is too little. They believe that rideshare drivers are starting a small business and that these are reasonable start-up costs. On the other hand, rideshare drivers say it is too much. Many of them say that they do not drive enough to warrant that kind of expenditure. They pointed out that New South Wales rideshare drivers only pay \$40 or \$50 a year to register as a rideshare driver.


The question is: do we have it right? I believe that we have landed in the middle. I think that we have arrived at the right position on the issue of these fees. It was interesting that none of our witnesses at the hearings had an issue with the register of disaffiliated drivers. We heard that the Queensland system of driver authorisation, with its thorough police record checks and medical checks, is one of the best in the country in maintaining safety standards in the industry. The register of disaffiliated drivers will extend our system of keeping passengers and drivers safe.

Another issue that I think deserves comment is that of employment conditions. We have heard about issues regarding the bailment system. The bailment system has worked very well, but if you talk to a lot of taxidrivers they feel that more needs to be done in terms of protecting their employment conditions. This bill marks the start of steps to address employment conditions of drivers. One of the

biggest areas of concern for all of us on the committee was how taxidriver and rideshare drivers can make a decent living and make a living in a safe way—how to make sure that they can come home at the end of their shift. This will be an ongoing process.

Recommendations 7 and 8 of our report seek to establish ways to manage driver fatigue, which is a very important issue in this industry. Recommendation 12 sets out a process to establish industry standards for driver conditions, including reviewing bailment conditions and contractor arrangements. As I said, the bailment system is a traditional model of employment or contracting in this industry. Essentially they are contracts that deal mostly with the income split between drivers and owners. Yet Queensland is the only place in Australia where such agreements are regulated through transport legislation. I think that this review and the creation of an ombudsman or equivalent will be the first steps in creating a better employment environment for our personalised transport drivers and taxidriver as well.

I believe this bill goes a long way towards sorting out the incredible disruption that we have seen in this industry through the arrival of this technology, but I know that this technology is here to stay and we do have to deal with it. Rideshare is incredibly popular throughout many parts of Queensland and it has been embraced quickly. I think this bill is the best way forward to preserve and build this industry. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (5.50 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. I have been an advocate for mum-and-dad Queenslanders who have invested their hard-earned savings, even their superannuation, in purchasing taxi and limousine plates as a way to provide for their retirement. Enter the other ridesharing entities. I understand that these ridesharing entities are having a detrimental effect on around 3,400 small business taxi-plate owners in Queensland or 21,500 Australia-wide. Various Queensland governments have put out to tender and ultimately sold licences worth hundreds of millions of dollars. I am told that in 2015 several were sold for over \$600,000 each. As my correspondent puts it, with our money in their Treasury pocket and with the stroke of a pen they have made these licences which they sold to the public worthless—less than half their market value pre 2015.

On 1 April I received correspondence from a gentleman and his partner who had spent 23 years serving in our Defence Force until his retirement. In part, the gentleman stated—

My personal circumstance is that, after serving in the Australian Defence Force for twenty-three years I elected to retire. My then service superannuation payout would not support us, so I invested my Service Superannuation into a taxi-plate, as I and many others had been informed by successive Queensland Governments since the 1990s through to 2015 the industry was totally safe and government regulated so it couldn't be hijacked.

I am advised that they have already had to decrease lease returns by up to 30 per cent. They wanted to provide for themselves in retirement and not be a burden on Australian taxpayers in their twilight years. That dream has been shattered. They continue—

That has just been killed by the Queensland Government, as we lose our business and possibly our house and go onto the old age pension. That makes several thousand people in Queensland alone about to become a burden on the Australian taxpayer for about half a billion dollars a year cost to the Federal Government.

They are very unimpressed with the offer of \$20,000 as compensation for a \$500,000 taxi plate. I am advised that it costs more than \$20,000 per year in costs for registration and CTP insurance. Comprehensive vehicle insurance is around \$7,000. Then throw in other costs such as public liability insurance, service licence fees, accreditation fees and levies plus mandatory GPS and cameras. This is all before other running costs such as fuel and maintenance.

I sponsored a petition which was posted on 5 April this year. The subject of the petition calls for the repeal of rideshare legislation and/or payment of fair and proper compensation to Queensland taxi licence owners who have suffered financial loss on both an income and capital basis due to actions and inactions taken by the Queensland government.

In response to submissions from the taxi and limousine industry on this bill, I note from the report of the Public Works and Utilities Committee tabled on 15 May this year that the committee considered the issue of financial compensation—in particular, that the government should buy back taxi and limousine licences. The department responded to these calls for compensation by stating—

The provision of industry adjustment assistance is consistent with the approach to implementing legislative reforms associated with National Competition Policy and generally endorsed by state and federal governments, including in response to similar personalised transport reforms in other jurisdictions. The approach adopted is that there should not be a presumed right to compensation for economic losses due to pro-competitive reform, however, adjustment assistance has been made available but only where there were net social benefits in doing so ...



The department's response continued—

While the personalised transport reforms are expected to result in significant consumer benefits, the magnitude of funding required for a licence buy-back would outweigh the expected benefits of reform.

A buyback may or may not be financially prudent. However, it appears that this Labor government cares little for the financial wellbeing of taxi licence owners even though it is this Labor government that is plunging them into financial ruin. I have also heard that some taxidriviers have become so desperate that they are working a full shift driving a taxi and once that shift is completed they hand their taxi over and then get into another vehicle to commence work as a rideshare driver in order to supplement their income. The potential there for a tragic set of circumstances to arise is very concerning. Imagine a cabbie working for eight to 10 hours and then immediately jumping into another vehicle to do another six, eight or 10 hours behind the wheel as a rideshare driver, with no rest and probably little worthwhile nourishment. As I said, that is a very scary scenario to contemplate.

I would like to see where the LNP stand. We know exactly where Labor stand. They have got us into this position. That is why we are where we are today. The previous transport minister and now shadow Treasurer let the taxi industry down when he was the minister, and now the LNP is trying to have a leg on either side of the fence. You just cannot do it. You have to choose. You have to make a decision.

What will be put forward tonight by Katter's Australian Party—and I greatly admire what they are doing—is an amendment to this legislation that will give the LNP an opportunity to show the people of Queensland and the taxi industry throughout this state—which is watching this—exactly where they stand. They have an opportunity to put video cameras and audio in cars. That is one amendment that will be put forward. Another amendment is for comprehensive vehicle insurance up to \$7,000 which will create a level playing field, and that is all everyone wants to see.

I sit here and watch this parliament operate and I watch people throughout the state of Queensland continually going broke. It does not matter where it is, but at this time of the evening it is the taxi industry. I will continue to bring the One Nation policy into the House. I will read another page because we are getting plenty of wins on the board. It states—

Recent decisions by both major parties to legalise the use of ride-sharing services in Queensland has created chaos with the Taxi industry trying to compete on an uneven playing field. Taxi business owners have paid large sums for plates and license fees, as well as insurance premiums, driver training and other industry costs across many years. Ride-sharing services are not subject to such costs. Profitable taxi businesses have been cannibalised and the industry has been forced to maintain existing standards in all areas.

All providers should be subject to the same standards.

We intend to establish a level playing field for the taxi industry and rideshare businesses. All providers will need to comply with the same standards with comparable insurance cover, installation of security cameras, minimum standards of training and cleanliness and be subjected to the same complaints process. I table that document.

*Tabled paper:* Pamphlet titled, 'Queensland - It's in your hands' outlining One Nation policy [\[780\]](#).

I keep tabling these in the House and our ideas keep getting taken. We do not mind that at all. Please call my office; I will send out as many booklets as are needed because this is the policy that Queensland is starting to be run by, regardless of whether it is crocodiles, no-body no-parole, or the taxi industry, which is what we are debating here tonight. It disappoints me so greatly that both of the major parties have lost their way and that we continue to put people before politics. That is what the party I work for is about. We want to give people the power back. I can see tonight that it is slowly but surely getting taken away.

The taxi industry has worked so hard for so many years and there are so many people who have invested their livelihoods and everything they have got. I am sure many people in this room are related to a taxi-driving family. If not, they will probably hear from them in the not-too-distant future. They will be driving around not with signs promoting either of the two major parties in parliament but with other signs letting them know how the world has changed and what they are going to do about it. You can only push people so hard. You push people into a corner and you knock them down to the ground and they have only one choice. They will push back and they will let you know that they are not happy to go down this path.

I will leave the LNP with this thought. LNP members have an opportunity tonight to support an amendment that will be moved by Katter's Australian Party that will deliver what the LNP have said they are going to do. I have heard LNP members say that they are all about an independent commissioner. This is code for a holding pattern, and that is a holding pattern that I am sure will still be around after the election. It is about trust. If this is about trust, the LNP have just failed.

Debate, on motion of Mr Dickson, adjourned.

## MOTION

### Palaszczuk Labor Government, Crime



**Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House condemns the Palaszczuk government for being soft on crime and putting the safety of Queensland families at risk.

Labor's softly, softly approach on crime in Queensland is starting to wear the Queensland public down. The evidence is there for all to see. Drug and violent crime is increasing across the state, youth crime in North Queensland is out of control, our jails are bursting at the seams, we have youth detention centres that are described as war zones and of course the bikies are back. Let me provide a bit more detail on some of those areas.

Our youth detention centres lurch from one crisis to the next, with riots occurring on a regular basis and the staff at these centres having no confidence whatsoever—nor do they feel protected. We have a government that, rather than punishing habitual youth offenders, seeks to understand them—seeks to understand these poor souls. We have an Attorney-General who supported the delay in calling police to quell a recent riot because they were concerned about the negative impact it would have on the youth perpetrators. The result was that a youth detention officer was seriously injured and he could lose his sight. Imagine how much worse it is going to be when 17-year-olds come back into youth detention centres. This is a government that puts the rights of offenders ahead of the rights of victims of crime.

Let me talk about police morale. Who can forget the front page of the *Courier-Mail* on Friday, 12 May, which stated 'Crims think we're a joke'? I table that document.

*Tabled paper:* Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 12 May 2017, titled 'Crims Think We're A Joke' [\[781\]](#).

The article stated—

A senior police officer says crime is "out of control" and has apologised to Queenslanders for letting them down.

Senior Sergeant Phil Notaro claims morale in the Queensland Police Service is at its lowest since the Fitzgerald Inquiry and called for an inquiry into its mismanagement.

"The criminals are laughing ... all the way to the next crime spree."

The criminals are laughing at us because they know that the laws are being weakened and that the police are powerless to stop them. I hear this story right across the state. The police on the front line have had a gutful. Morale is at an all-time low because they feel so unsupported.

As we mentioned last week, the bikies are back. We are seeing constant media reports stating that the bikies are back in business because Labor watered down the organised crime laws. Labor have watered down the strong bikie laws that were put in place by the LNP in 2013 to prevent and detect organised crime. These laws were working. One of those measures was our tough antiassociation law. If you were part of a declared organised crime gang, you could not associate with more than one other. This broke the back of the bikies. What has the government put in its place? Labor has introduced anticonsorting laws.

Rather than saying how their government has stopped bikie gangs coming together, the police minister recently announced, quite proudly, that they have issued 107 consorting warnings since March 2017. I can imagine how spooked the bikies are that they have been warned not to come back together again. What do these warnings mean? What do these warnings look like? How many warnings do they get? How do the police administer warnings? When they come to somebody who is part of an organised crime gang, do they ask them, 'Have you been warned before? How many warnings have you received?' Can members imagine the red tape and bureaucracy that is associated with this new law? It is frustrating our police and it is not doing anything to stop the bikies come together. If I can say


anything about the success of the LNP's antibikie laws, I cannot say it better than the Premier and the current police minister, who have both said that the official number of patched bikies in Queensland has fallen from 1,158 in late 2013 to 696 today—

**Mr Ryan:** Under us.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I would urge the cheer squad to step outside if they want to conduct themselves like that.

**Mr MANDER:** When were the tough antibikie laws introduced by the LNP? It was on 15 October 2013.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (6.05 pm): I oppose the motion. What a ridiculous motion that this House has to consider today. All we have to do is look at the past two years of our government. There are more police on the beat than ever before. There are more resources for police than ever before. There are more prisoners in our correctional centres than ever before. We have the toughest, strongest, most comprehensive, effective and working serious organised crime legislation in the nation.

We have tough new counterterrorism laws—laws which the LNP did not oppose. We have tough new child protection laws—laws which they did not oppose. The fact is that our government has been taking strong action not only to support our police but also to ensure that our communities remain safe and that our police have the resources they need to ensure that our community remains safe. The fact is that, irrespective of who you are, if you commit a crime in Queensland, you will feel the full force of the law—no ifs, no buts.

When I travel around our state and meet with our hardworking police officers, I firstly thank them for the job that they do—because it is a tough job, and it is especially tough when those opposite continually criticise the work they do every single day—but I also commend them for their courage and professionalism in helping to keep our community safe. I tell them to keep going. Notwithstanding the criticism they receive from those opposite, I tell them to keep going because the work they are doing is helping to keep our community safe and they will always have the support of the Palaszczuk Labor government in the work that they do.

The numbers speak for themselves. Our government has delivered record budgets when it comes to supporting our police. What is more, we have delivered specific, additional resources for particular areas of crime to support our police. We have seen \$39.1 million delivered to tackle all forms of serious organised crime, including child exploitation and drug trafficking among others. We have injected an additional \$16 million to enhance our counterterrorism capabilities. Over the last two years, we have delivered an extra 266 police to the beat here in Queensland.


What is more, with those additional police that we have delivered, we have also made sure they are properly resourced—not like those opposite who, when in government, failed to provide the resources our police needed to do their job. They failed to provide body worn cameras, they failed to provide QLITE and they failed to provide additional police vehicles. That is their record. Our record is one of supporting our police. We have not only rolled out over 2,500 body worn cameras—which not only help our police with the work they do but also contribute to community safety—but we have also rolled out QLITE. These are the Apple iPads for our police officers which allow them to do more work on the beat, to be more effective and to be more visible on the street, rather than being stuck behind a desk doing paperwork.

I mentioned in my introduction that we have more prisoners in our correctional centres than ever before. I make no apologies for that, because if someone commits a crime in Queensland then they will feel the full force of the law and they will be incarcerated. I also want to take this opportunity to commend and thank our hardworking correctional officers for the work they do. Not only do they work very hard every day to ensure our correctional centres stay safe, but they are contributing to the overall safety of the people of Queensland.

Members opposite absolutely hate hearing this, but the fact of the matter is that we have the strongest, toughest, most comprehensive and effective organised crime legislation in the nation. When we hear them criticise me for saying it, let's see who also says that we have the strongest, toughest, most comprehensive serious organised crime legislation: the Police Commissioner. When they criticise me for saying it, they are criticising the Police Commissioner. Who else says that? Queensland Police Union President Ian Leavers says it. When they criticise me, they are criticising the Queensland Police Union President. One of our hardest working organised crime police officers, Superintendent Mick

Niland, the commander of Taskforce Maxima, says our laws are working, they are effective and they are disbanding organised crime. When they criticise me, they are also criticising Superintendent Mick Niland.

The fact of the matter is our government is delivering on a safer Queensland, supporting our police and making sure that our community is safe.

 **Mrs STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to proudly support the motion moved by the honourable member for Everton. Who on earth was that minister trying to fool? I have to tell honourable members that the people of Queensland are smarter than that and we have actually got the facts to prove it. Nothing has changed. Labor governments, one after the other, have been soft on crime. It is in their DNA and this Palaszczuk government is no different to any other. Crime in Queensland is rising—fact, F-A-C-T—but all we get from this lazy, sit-on-their-hands, do-nothing government is review after review after review. The crooks are laughing.

Last night I spoke about crime in my electorate and the fact that two Lone Wolf bikie members wearing no colours in broad daylight thumped the living daylight out of somebody leaving a pub at 4.30 in the afternoon in the street in Coolangatta. They have no fear of the laws that this government has brought in—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. I apologise, member for Currumbin, but your own side is making it difficult for me to actually hear. If I cannot hear, I am certain Hansard cannot hear to accurately record what you are saying.

**Mrs STUCKEY:** They are excited. As the shadow minister said, on 12 May the *Courier-Mail* said that crims think that we are a joke. I do not know if the minister does not read the paper, but there is a very strong message being sent there. We know it has gotten to a really bad state when a senior police officer says that crime is out of control and apologised to Queenslanders for letting them down. Crime is up, morale is down; that sends a very bad message to Queensland. Our Auditor-General reports into crime data reveal figures that should shame members of the Palaszczuk government. Not one but two reports from the Auditor-General, one tabled in November 2016 and the other in April 2017, paint a very frightening truth about poor data collection that is putting society at risk. Prisoners are being released early or late. Who cares? Members opposite do not. The report also states that figures are being fudged. Police are getting victims to withdraw complaints and are altering crime data statistics. Who ordered this? The Premier, the minister or the commissioner? Did they order our police to do this in order to try to deceive the general public? The report used words like 'questionable stats' and 'unreliable data'.

I would like to place on record the praise I have for my two stations, Coolangatta and Palm Beach. My officers have told me that there is no way, no matter what pressure was put on them, that they would participate in anything like this. The LNP have a proven track record of being tough on crime, especially organised crime. I should know because I have the unfortunate reputation of having a bikie clubhouse still owned in my electorate. We had laws that were working. They vanished off the scene. Confidence in citizens on the Gold Coast was restored. However, Labor have rolled out the red carpet to criminal gangs and organised crime is now set to flourish again. We see clubhouses set to spring up.

Every term of government I do an electorate-wide survey. It costs a lot of money to do and I get 3,000 respondents. I have done five of them and all but one had law and order as the most important issue. The term that it was not No. 1 was when the LNP was in government. But by mid-2015 guess what? Law and order was back up there at No. 1. I asked my residents whether they wanted to see our laws repealed and do honourable members know what they said? No; 92 per cent of 3,000 people said no, they did not want our tough bikie laws repealed.


I want to spend a minute or so on youth crime, and I spoke about this last night. They are becoming more brazen. Kids barely in their teens are committing car hijacks, assaults and armed hold-ups—not hardened crims but kids, 12-, 13- and 14-year-olds. I am really glad the minister was here earlier—and I hope he is listening—because we do not need a review to know that we need a school based police officer in Currumbin. We need them elsewhere, too. In October 2012 the LNP announced 15 additional school based police officers. There have been none for five years and none are planned. They create a positive interaction with students at a young age in our schools and forge close working relationships with school staff. They provide positive role models and become involved in schools' curriculum by giving students crime prevention and safety advice.

Tonight in this House I call on the minister to reactivate the school based police officer program and approve one for the two high schools in Currumbin. Failure to do so is to turn his back on the welfare of our students.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr Minnikin** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Chatsworth. Thank you, we will wait.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (6.15 pm): It is always interesting to listen to these contributions from the member for Currumbin. I note she was getting shouted down by her own side today.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Thank you, members. I now invite the member for Stretton to start again please.

**Mr PEGG:** We hear the contributions from the member for Currumbin. She talks about DNA a lot; I have heard that before from her, but today we heard about her survey that she does every year that costs her a lot of money, that always gets 3,000 respondents and always gets the same results. That is what we learnt from the member for Currumbin today. I rise to speak against this motion.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Unfortunately, the member for Stretton does not have a loud voice. The microphone is on.

**Mr PEGG:** I rise to speak against this motion. This government has never been soft on crime—never, ever. Today we had the mighty maroons visit the Queensland parliament. It was great to see Cameron Smith, JT and the boys here. JT's shoulder seemed pretty good to me, so I am very hopeful he will be taking the field next Wednesday night. It was not a great day to be wearing blue, although many of those opposite did not get the memo. Next Wednesday night blue jerseys will not be very popular. However, our men and our women in blue are very, very popular in our community for all the hard work that they do.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock.

**Mr Hinchliffe** interjected.

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

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I am in your hands, members. You have four minutes left, member for Stretton.

**Mr PEGG:** I intend to use those very wisely. Along with one or two other Queenslanders, I am waiting with bated breath for the announcement of whether or not the member for Everton will be doing 'Twitter ref' again this year. I will be looking forward to it. I am sure there might be one or two people accidentally following that.

Our men and women in blue are out there day after day, day and night in summer and winter in cyclones and floods serving the people of Queensland. The police do fantastic work supporting our community with programs such as Neighbourhood Watch. I have wonderful Neighbourhood Watch groups in Stretton and I want to particularly recognise the efforts of Darryl Sampson, the area coordinator, and all of those involved in Neighbourhood Watch in my local area. The Calamvale 9 Neighbourhood Watch had a wonderful local gathering last month which other locals and I attended, and I commend the work that Darryl has done—and continues to do—to support Neighbourhood Watch in my local community.


One of the best ways of combating crime in our community is to have strong communities, and in the gallery this evening I would like to recognise Mr Murat Guzel, the principal of Wisdom College, and Mr Abdul Celil Gelim, the executive director and co founder of the Queensland Intercultural Society. They do tremendous work supporting strong communities not only in my local area but across the state. They run a fantastic home and community iftar program, and for many years they have run an iftar program in parliament. I see the Minister for Multicultural Affairs nodding. I am sure that many members have attended the parliamentary iftar dinner in the past, and I am sure that many will in the future.

**Mrs Lauga** interjected.

**Mr PEGG:** I take the interjection from the member for Keppel. We also have wonderful police liaison officers, and what wonderful work they do in our community. I particularly want to mention Jim Bellos. I do not think I am giving any secrets away, but I am very lucky that he lives in my electorate. I know that many members know Jim. He does fantastic work in our local community and he does so much to improve our community. Indeed, all police liaison officers do tremendous work, and I particularly commend the work they do in my electorate. My electorate is the most multicultural in the state. It has the highest number of people born overseas of any electorate in the state, and the electorate of Stretton also has the highest number of people who speak a language other than English. I know that police liaison officers do tremendous work in our community, and of course we also have other people who make a fantastic contribution such as our hardworking detectives. They are the ones who conduct investigations when crimes are committed, and we also have our Volunteers in Policing who do tremendous work. In fact, Volunteers in Policing recently did some great work in my local community around the Sunnybank Hills area with their Coffee with a Cop event.

The member for Everton concluded his speech by talking about 2013. We all know that he is someone who likes to live in the past, but I want to question his credentials on this issue—and I know how much the member for Currumbin likes statistics—because in the leadership ballot in February 2015 the member for Everton received 20 votes and the member for Southern Downs received 23 votes. When you fast-forward 13 months to May 2016, where was the member for Everton? With 10 votes at best.

*(Time expired)*

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (6.23 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Everton. Haven't those opposite brought out their big guns tonight! That was an extraordinary diatribe from the member for Stretton, who could not even mention the word 'crime'. Another night goes by with the local residents of Townsville not only losing sleep but also losing their hard-earned possessions—their money and vehicles—due to the bumbling incompetence of those opposite.

I have been lucky enough to call Townsville home for 17 years, but the beautiful city of North Queensland is not the safe place it used to be. For example, in one 24-hour period this month there were 18 home invasions and six stolen vehicles; however, that is not unusual. That is just another day in a city that has been deemed the crime capital of Queensland. It is a tag we do not want. What are those opposite doing about it? Absolutely nothing.

Let's talk about the numbers that were put forward by the Minister for Police 10 minutes ago. I saw him over there getting legal advice and helpful hints from the member for Pumicestone, and I am sure they were well received. As of May this year robbery has increased by almost 29 per cent; unlawful entry has increased by nearly 40 per cent; and car thefts have increased by a staggering 32.7 per cent. It would be fair to say that the residents of Townsville have had an absolute gutful. We heard the police minister stand up in this place earlier today and announce his tough-on-crime stance. He said that the numbers would speak for themselves, and they certainly do. On behalf of north Queenslanders I say to the minister that he has gone past 'F' for fail and reached 'H' for hopeless. An online poll in the *Townsville Bulletin* showed that 69 per cent of the people surveyed said that they were affected by Townsville's crime wave. That is an extraordinary statistic and a damning indictment on this government and its law-and-order platform.

Crime is rampant in Townsville despite the best efforts of our hardworking police officers, and tonight I also acknowledge the hard work that they do. Crime continues to rise to unacceptable levels. Even senior police are now breaking ranks—and you have no idea what they are doing when they break ranks—to talk about the hopelessness they feel in terms of fighting this escalating crime problem. Only last week Gus Dalle Cort, who runs the Kalamia Hotel in Ayr, came to my office and told me that he had been belted in the head with a shovel by a juvenile offender when he refused to sell him alcohol in his bottle shop. That is right: a shovel. Is he angry? You had better believe it! It is my fear that honest hardworking citizens are going to start taking the law into their own hands because they have lost faith in this government. They have lost confidence in this government to do something about the spiralling out-of-control crime rate, particularly in North Queensland. These are the same residents who are sick and tired of screaming at their state members to wake up and smell the burning car bodies before it is too late. They want action, and they want it now.


Even when these young crims are locked up, this inept and hopeless government cannot even run our detention centres in a safe manner. The crims are running riot on the outside and they are running riot on the inside. You can have a review, and a review of the review, and hide behind the findings, but it does not change the fact that this government has lost control of the juvenile prison

system in this state. How many riots do we need? How many more of our staff have to be injured before something is done? You can host all the round tables, the forums, the workshops and the summits that you like, but it does not hide the fact that every single day in Townsville houses are being broken into, cars are being stolen and people are being assaulted.

Almost a year ago the member for Everton and I attended a crime forum in Townsville where all sorts of promises were made by the Attorney-General and police minister. Almost 12 months on we are still waiting for a response as to how we are going to stop these young thugs from breaking into houses and stealing property. What about the police minister do? Diddly squat. First of all he decided to blame the victims of crime. Is it any wonder the community is up in arms? The comment, 'Only the Palaszczuk government has tried to address the causes of crime,' is absolute garbage. In fact, it is insulting not only to the LNP but to the hardworking locals of Townsville.

There is clear evidence that under the previous LNP administration crime rates were falling. We had a plan and it was working, and when the LNP is returned to government we will strengthen bail laws, review the no-pursuit policy, provide more resources for police and bring in tougher penalties for repeat offenders. The LNP will hold criminals to account.

*(Time expired)*

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (6.29 pm): The LNP must be preparing for an election campaign, because here we go again! They are pulling out their normal predictable tricks. It is the same old, same old LNP. They talk tough on crime except they cannot help but overreach every single time and play cheap politics when it comes to law and order. They do it all the time. They overreached under Campbell Newman in government and they are overreaching under Tim Nicholls as Leader of the Opposition. Nothing changes when it comes to the LNP and playing the fear campaign that they always do when they see that an election is coming.

**Mr Hinchliffe:** It is in their DNA.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take that interjection. It is in their DNA. What has become clear about the LNP in the Justice portfolio and right across government is that, despite their bluster and chest beating, at the end of the day the LNP has no strategy, no answers and they do not believe in evidence based policy.

As those opposite proved when they were in government and have continued to prove in opposition, they are not committed to delivering and they are not capable of delivering for the people of Queensland. In contrast, the Palaszczuk government is proudly committed to making Queensland a safer place to live, work, raise our kids and enjoy time with family and friends.

Those opposite talk about youth justice. To understand the LNP's absolute refusal to look to evidence based policy you only need to look at their history in relation to youth justice. They set up a boot camp in Cairns, but the first two who went in there escaped. One held a knife to an older woman's throat. They committed offences. The LNP shifted to another boot camp, spent millions of dollars and saw no reduction in recidivism. It was a complete failure.

This government wants policies and programs that reduce recidivism and stop young people offending in the first place, because that helps make our communities safer. This government has brought in Transition 2 Success, trauma informed practice, the first nations action board working with Indigenous people, staff and elders in the community to recognise the problems with not just Indigenous youth but also Indigenous adult prisoners, restorative justice, court referred youth justice conferencing which those opposite scrapped, transition from detention, Childrens Court committee, specialist Childrens Court magistrate in Townsville, justice reinvestment, mental health services, the Stronger Communities initiative in Townsville, the community youth response, improved flexible education—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take that interjection from the member for Kawana. They say that it is not working, but they love to cherry-pick crime statistics. They did it when they were in government; they are doing it in opposition. They do not believe in facts; they just believe in scare campaigns.

**An opposition member** interjected.

**Mrs D'ATH:** I take the interjection from the member for Kawana, because he loves to quote—

**Mr Bleijie:** I didn't say anything.

**Mrs D'ATH:** Someone on the other side of the House said, 'What about Judge Shanahan?' Those opposite love to quote him. The honourable Judge Shanahan was highly critical of the LNP's changes in youth justice. They should stop verballing him, stop cherrypicking from his reports and start being honest with the people of Queensland.

It is this government that has brought in serious organised crime legislation that does not look only at criminal motorcycle gangs but also at child exploitation and financial crimes, which are rife on the Gold Coast. Mums and dads and pensioners are being ripped off. Those opposite never talk about that. It is this government that is taking action on ice. It is this government that has dealt with the issue of alcohol fuelled violence and did what those opposite did not have the guts to do, that is, pull back liquor trading hours.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. I am reluctant to name members during this debate, but members are pushing my tolerance a little bit, quite frankly.

**Mrs D'ATH:** It is this government that is investing in our police and that is investing in a broader youth justice strategy and a crime strategy to reduce offending and recidivism. You cannot just lock people up and expect that when they get out again they will not commit another offence. You have to have a strategy to deal with crime. That is where the LNP fall down every single time. They just want to lock people up and they have no strategy to stop offending and recidivism when they get out.

**A government member:** Turnstile.

**Mrs D'ATH:** It is a turnstile. Whether it is on alcohol fuelled violence, serious organised crime or youth justice, it is this government that does the hard work based on evidence that puts the policies in place, to work with the community to get real reform to keep our communities safe.

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

**AYES, 41:**

**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, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

**PHON, 1**—Dickson.

**NOES, 42:**

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

**INDEPENDENT, 1**—Gordon.

Pair: Byrne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.


Sitting suspended from 6.39 pm to 7.40 pm.

## TRANSPORT AND OTHER LEGISLATION (PERSONALISED TRANSPORT REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

### Second Reading

Resumed from p. 1367, on motion of Mr Bailey—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr ELMES** (Noosa—LNP) (7.40 pm): I rise to speak to the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill. This bill is indicative of the challenges we as lawmakers face in the 21st century as technology clashes with tradition and established practices are threatened by the novelty and efficiency of newer processes. That does not mean that newer is necessarily better, but it does mean that newer technologies cannot be ignored as they gain popularity and market share. The older and the newer both have to be accommodated as the balance between them shifts and the effects on established providers become realised. Sometimes, as is the case with ridesharing, it involves utilising technology to provide goods or services outside the rules which have applied to established similar businesses, raising the need for the creation of a new paradigm. That



does not mean that we should abandon those who have invested money and their lives in established technologies which have helped to make this state the great place it is to live. Indeed, we have a responsibility to make sure that we support those affected by change to either compete on a level playing field or transition out of the industry on just terms. This bill does neither.

The explanatory notes for the bill set out what would have been an acceptable framework for the development of policy around personalised transport reform. The explanatory notes state—

At a time of significant structural change in this sector, it is important to provide a policy and regulatory framework that acknowledges existing, new and potential industry participants and allows existing businesses to adjust while also accommodating new market entrants.

I agree with that approach. Unfortunately, this bill fails to meet its own basic test for validity and fairness. The simple reality is that ridesharing cannot be ignored and the even simpler truth is that this government has fallen short in its attempt to deal with the issue. It has compounded its short-sightedness by delaying the introduction of this bill, thereby hurting small business owners and drivers throughout the state who were looking for certainty. If the government had used the extra time to consult honestly and to produce a better and fairer piece of legislation then the delay may have been excusable, but it has not and Queenslanders are suffering as a result. This debate is not about big corporations or anonymous larger commercial groups that can channel losses and profits from one entity to another to balance the good and the bad times. It is about individual Queenslanders—individuals who have families, mortgages and staff to support out of earnings from their taxi businesses. These are people who are having a go in the best Australian tradition—people who invested money and have taken a chance for a better future based on an existing regime of regulations and safeguards. Then along comes Uber and the Palaszczuk government to trash any hopes these people had for a better future.

Let me give the House an example of a local taxi owner in Noosa who came to see me and laid out the facts and figures of how financially disastrous the actions of this government have been for him. He has made a large investment by leasing a number of taxis in the Noosa area. He has estimated his loss so far this financial year compared to the same period last financial year at \$245,531 for his vehicles. That is an ongoing loss of \$24,553 per month. If the predictions for increased ridesharing use in the future are true, the situation can only get worse for him. As great as competition is, we cannot turn our backs on those who purchased their licences in good faith. The local owner who spoke to me established his business based on a known business environment and now has had that trashed by this Labor government. He cannot just cancel the lease on any of his taxis because he is locked into long-term commitments which he was able to meet under the pre-existing system. Now he is struggling to break even and we all know what unfortunate circumstances will come about if he cannot, and we cannot forget the drivers he employs. Their earnings have dropped significantly; for the drivers in my area, by around 50 per cent since the introduction of ridesharing. They are struggling to support their families and to meet other financial commitments on reduced earnings.

If this government believes it consulted stakeholders sufficiently on this bill, then it can think again. The biggest single stakeholder in this discussion is the Taxi Council representing the interests of thousands of taxi owners and drivers across the state. Taxi Council of Queensland President Max McBride did not hold back when providing an opinion of how open, transparent and consultative the government had been. He wrote in his own industry journal—

After being promised an independent, evidence-based inquiry and taking the government at its word, industry members were aghast that an Australian government, of any persuasion, could behave in such a deceitful way.


He went on to say—

Once again, the government has lied to the Queensland people and has acted to placate Uber, ignoring anything the taxi or limousine industries, disability groups, or even the Rideshare Driver's Association, has had to say regarding a fair and consistent competitive environment.

They are harsh words which no amount of rhetoric and self-justification from those opposite can wipe out.

The LNP plan to establish an independent personalised transport commissioner to provide a mechanism for outstanding issues to be dealt with. The Taxi Council and operators of ridesharing businesses will have an independent authority with which to raise ongoing issues. All parties will have the level playing field and the fair, competitive commercial environment to which they are entitled. The commissioner will also serve as a direct conduit to an LNP government through the transport minister to ensure that issues are dealt with effectively and that Queenslanders can be confident that they have

the safest personalised transport system with choice based on fair competition. Whatever financial features the bill might include aimed at bringing personalised passenger transport into the 21st century are buried by the mountain of reactionary, poorly considered aspects which diminish the value of the bill as presented to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (7.47 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017. I often get asked by journalists and the media, 'Why the hell are you guys talking about taxis so much?' There are 30-something taxis in my electorate and probably not many more in the member for Dalrymple's electorate. The answer is that it offends me to my core the way this industry has been encroached upon or invaded by this global company that has muscled its way into our market. We cannot debate this bill without considering the way that it has operated and come into this space and that we are now reacting to and that was the genesis of this bill before the House. It still insults me the way it has treated our laws in this state and the way it has treated this parliament.

It is a good time to reflect on the fact that while that company was operating illegally in this state it was blocking the phones of Department of Transport officers so they could not issue fines. It was stopping them from doing their job with regard to the laws that we make in this House. We have sat by and watched them and let them get away with that. The bill that we introduced into the House was a pretty discreet way of dealing with the issue in terms of demerit points, but that bill did get up because this House voted it down. That bill went some way in an attempt to put some fairness back into the system, but it is on the record that this House voted that bill down.

We are now trying to tidy up some of those issues. I acknowledge that the minister has made an attempt to address some of the issues, but we all know that there is a public yearning and fervour—almost an ideological zealotry—to deregulate everything, that everything new is good, that anything that is regulated must be bad and, therefore, we will get rid of it. Sadly, people have not considered the consequences of that. Many consumers are not properly informed of the safety and security measures that are contained in the regulations. Those regulations have been put in place over the years to protect customers from being ripped off on pricing and to keep them safe. It is not so much in this parliament, but so many people celebrate the fact that this new, swanky industry has been developed. All it is is an app that has helped Uber bypass regulations that were set up to create a functional transport industry that was doing its job.

Over time, many people invested in that transport industry because they believed that it was a good, decent industry. They believed that governments in this state looked after small business and that their interests were protected. An \$80 billion global company comes in and we just let them go on their merry way and smash the capital value of these people's investment. Uber bulldozed its way into the market, consumed all of that capital value and repatriated it overseas so as to avoid paying tax in Australia. We in this state seem to have celebrated that—that we can let all of our Queensland businesses fall over. That started in this House when our bill that related to demerit points was voted down. We told Queensland businesses and mum-and-dad operators then, 'We're not going to back you.' Tonight, the KAP—the member for Dalrymple and I—will move amendments that were formulated with input from the Taxi Council. I understand that the government has tried to address some of the concerns of the Taxi Council with its legislation, but it does not go far enough. The amendments that the KAP will move later bring true fairness back into the industry.

It offends me to hear members talk about fairness when, with this legislation, it is not really what is happening. At the moment, there is no fairness. Tonight, we have heard members acknowledge that Queensland owned businesses are going down the toilet. All of that business is going into the hands of an \$80 billion multinational company. I encourage members to have a good think about the KAP's amendments. We are giving the House an opportunity to back what the Taxi Council has recommended on behalf of its drivers so that we can deliver fairness.

These amendments do not overstep the mark. All we want to do is make sure that people benefit from security cameras in taxis—which they have had for the past 30 years—24-hour rolling security checks on drivers, mandated wheelchair accessible taxis, regulated wages for the drivers and regulated pricing so that they do not get ripped off by surge pricing. People have become accustomed to that. Five or 10 years down the track we do not want people saying, 'Actually, it was pretty good how it was before. We wish someone had acted like a grown-up and given us a bit more guidance, because we were not well informed.' We in this House are well informed. We know the level of safety and security that is needed in the marketplace. With this legislation as it is now, that will not happen.

I want to talk about regulated wages. A big part of the ridesharing market is this appetite for getting rid of all regulations—and, in some cases, that is a virtue; that has its place. There is a public fervour that Uber is fantastic, that it is a cheaper product because it bypasses all of those pesky regulations that the government put on taxis. One of those regulations relates to wages for drivers. I find it ironic—if it were not sad, it would be funny—that Uber now has a union of drivers calling for regulated wages. We are seeing the birth of a new taxi industry in the ridesharing industry. However, this is really nothing new. This occurred in the taxi industry 30 years ago. In the next 30 years we are going to keep adding regulations, like we are doing now, to these ridesharing apps to provide the same security and service standards that we have now in a taxi industry that we take for granted. We are also recapitalising the value of Queensland businesses because this multinational company barged its way in.


Without these amendments, this bill will fall short of the fairness test. This \$80 billion multinational company has come into our state and disregarded the laws that we have made in this House. We do not matter, because that company has \$80 billion. Uber will do whatever it wants to do in the marketplace. It will completely disregard our laws. Uber will block our transport officers from doing their job in trying to find drivers who are operating outside the law.

Uber knew that it was going to win the fight in this House and that the regulations were going to go in its favour, but it could not wait for that. Uber had so much arrogance. It knew that its money will get it through in the end, that it could buy public opinion with its trendy apps and marketing campaign. The ill-informed public were taken advantage of. We are now inheriting a system that will not deliver the safety standards that the public believes it will.

I believe that security cameras were introduced to taxis in Perth some 30 years ago. At that time it was believed that a serial killer in that city could have been a taxidriver. Who knows how many deaths, rapes or bashings have been prevented through the installation of security cameras in taxis? We do not know how many disabled people have been helped by taxidrivers. If the KAP's amendments are not accepted, we will be throwing all of that away.

We should not use \$200 million of taxpayers' dollars as an acknowledgement to our taxi industry that we have allowed rideshare companies such as Uber to operate in this state and that our taxi industry has been displaced because Uber has ridden roughshod over our laws. We should take that money off Uber. Uber should buy its way into this market. Uber should be providing any money that it is given to the taxi industry. That \$200 million is a paltry sum. It should be \$1 billion, but even if that amount is \$500 million, Uber or any other rideshare app that has barged its way into the market should be providing it.

*(Time expired)*

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (7.57 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, which gives effect to stage 2 of the government's personalised transport reform program, stage 1 having been implemented in 2016 through amendments to the Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Regulation 2005 and other subordinate legislation. From the outset, I wish to acknowledge the outstanding work of all of the members of the Public Works and Utilities Committee, chaired excellently by the member for Kallangur, Mr Shane King. I have not discussed the process with any of the opposition members, but I know from my discussions with the government members on that committee how thoroughly they examined the amendments contained within this bill and the compassion that they felt for the many issues that were raised during their consultation. Their commitment to trying to strike the right balance is really admirable and I know that it cannot have been an easy process for those committee members.

This bill proposes amendments that strengthen safety standards, encourage customer choice within a fairer regulatory framework, reduce red tape and allow the industry to innovate and improve their service offering. Specifically, the bill retains exclusive access to rank-and-hail work for taxis with increased infringement penalties while ensuring that all booked hire drivers and vehicles are licensed to provide the service, will have appropriate compulsory third-party insurance cover and a framework for fatigue management. I see that, on top of these amendments, the committee recommended that all booked hire vehicle services have public liability insurance cover, that there be increased sanctions for rideshare drivers who repeatedly operate outside the regulatory framework and that vehicles that are currently used under a special purpose limousine licence retain the right to serve alcohol.

I would like to acknowledge those taxidrivers who are my constituents, who take an enormous pride in their job and who spent many hours talking through their concerns with me about this whole reform process. I imagine that I am like every other member in this House in that I always maintain an

open door for all taxidriviers, regardless of how angry or upset any one of them might be. I want to publicly acknowledge the concerns of those constituents and reaffirm to them that I will always respect their views and always make sure that their views are heard.

I also acknowledge the rideshare drivers who have been to see me. They feel equally passionate about their position. I thank the current and former minister and the staff of those offices for always being responsive and sympathetic to the issues I have raised, as they have in turn been raised with me by constituents, and always allowing me to get back to those constituents as quickly as I possibly could.

Regardless of what anyone thinks about Uber or any other rideshare company, rideshare is here to stay; consumers are signalling that very clearly in the choices that they are making. What the government said when we announced our personalised transport reforms was that we wanted to ensure that in such an environment, an environment of high-impact digital disruption, the taxi industry was able to operate on a level playing field with rideshare operators, that we were not asking them to compete with their hands tied behind their backs. The amendments contained within this bill are the next steps in creating that level playing field and certainly seek to address a number of the issues that have been raised with me.


I am very pleased to hear that stage 3 will be a monitoring, review and evaluation stage put in place to make sure the reforms are working in the way in which they are intended. For me this is absolutely critical. This is a new environment and everyone must feel confident that there will be checks and balances. I also note the independent Ombudsman position that has been announced by the minister to make sure that from an early stage complaints can be raised with a person who is independent of the department.

Before I finish I do have to comment on the position of some of the opposition. I remember they did this last time when we were passing stage 1 through the House. They were somehow giving the impression that they actually took any notice of the fact that the whole personalised transport environment was changing. During the Campbell Newman era it was as if nothing was happening. No-one did a thing. It was happening right around them, it was disrupting the entire environment and they did absolutely nothing—zero! They did nothing—zero, zero, zero! They come in here to this place and start criticising the government and saying that we were slow, that we should have moved more quickly when, in fact, they just ignored it. We all heard about the arguments that were happening inside that caucus. There were ministers who liked it. I think the member for Indooroopilly was in favour of Uber, others were not. They just ignored it. They wanted it to go away. It was only when the Palaszczuk Labor government came to power that we recognised that this was a very difficult issue and it had to be tackled. In showing my support for this bill, I cannot finish without saying what absolutely hypocritical comments those opposite are making.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Elmes): Order! The Minister for Education and the member for Glass House should maybe go outside and continue their conversation. I call the member for Bulimba.

**Ms FARMER:** No-one in this industry should be under any illusions that the LNP government did anything to progress this issue. Hard as it was, it was only when the Palaszczuk Labor government came to power that we addressed the really difficult issues. Anyone who says they are not difficult issues is ignoring the elephant in the room. We all acknowledge that. We were the ones who took the bull by the horns and we are progressing this to make sure we can get the best possible outcomes. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (8.04 pm): I rise to speak on the debate of the Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill. From the beginning Katter's Australian Party has been pushing for a fair and level playing field for the taxi industry. It was the KAP that introduced the first legislation around personalised transport. We have not dodged and weaved and hidden from our original position which is that we are 100 per cent for the Queensland taxi industry.

We have said from the beginning that we want to see Uber nailed to the coffin. What we are seeing now is a taxi industry that is on its knees as a result of letting a multinational company come into this country. I believe that this is an utter and absolute disgrace. These amendments might appear to be doing something positive to bring about a level playing field, but a level playing field would be the introduction of a \$250,000 licence fee, security cameras, insurance and every other regulation in the taxi industry. We can throw blame at each other, but from the beginning it was the KAP that introduced the legislation to impose four demerit points on Uber drivers, which was defeated by the House. The

reason we introduced that legislation is because Uber was making a fortune while paying no taxes or fees and operating under no regulations or GST. I have the figures here. It is up to \$90 billion that the taxi industry pays in GST to the Commonwealth. How much does Uber pay? Absolutely nothing!

We can introduce 'Claytons' legislation that might be perceived to help bring about a level playing field, but from the beginning we should have had the intestinal fortitude to say that there will be no Uber in this state. If we were going to let them in we needed to put in place legislation to ensure they were on exactly the same level playing field as the taxi industry. I will read a press release dated 15 September 2016 from the Taxi Council. It is titled 'Taxi Council welcomes KAP illegal taxi crackdown'—not the LNP, not Labor, but the KAP. As I said, we wanted to see Uber buried. It has gone past that point, but we still want to see them buried because they are a multinational corporation and these are Queensland small businesses that have already paid their superannuation hoping to get something in return but now are unlikely to get it. I hope and pray that they do get something in return. The regulations in this legislation do not go far enough. From the beginning there should have been a four-demerit point penalty to target those who are driving illegal taxis in this state. The media release from the Taxi Council states—

Queensland's Taxi Council has strongly endorsed a private members bill proposed yesterday by the Katter Australian Party that calls for greater penalties for illegal taxi services, saying it was time that the Government became serious about the law.

Taxi Council Queensland chief executive officer Benjamin Wash said uber has been defying the law for too long and laughing in the faces of regulators and governments.

...

He said 'enough is enough' and has called on both Labor and the LNP to pass the Katter bill with the greatest of urgency

...

'Uber are an illegal taxi service, and are spawning copycats across Queensland. Right now anyone, anywhere can start to drive their private cars and transport the public and the Government is letting it happen.'


They were transporting the public. There were no safety regulations or checks. There were no licences. There was no \$250,000 upfront fee. If anyone commits a crime we have law enforcement onto them straight away. With Uber, law enforcement was completely, absolutely invisible. What was our government doing about it? They were talking about doing something. What was the opposition doing about it? They were saying, 'We really care about the Queensland taxi industry'. In the end if they were fair dinkum they would say, 'We want Uber out of this state,' or, 'We want a proper level playing field. If they want to come into this state they need to pay the \$250,000 licence fee, the same insurance, and operate under the same regulations.' I table this media release from the Taxi Council that was encouraging the parliament to support our legislation, which did not happen.

*Tabled paper:* Media release from the Taxi Council Queensland, dated 15 September 2015, titled 'Taxi Council welcomes KAP illegal taxi crackdown' [782].

The purpose of this bill is to give effect to the second stage of the personalised transport reform program. The bill is meant to strengthen safety standards and establish a general duty relating to the management of fatigue and a requirement for a zero blood alcohol level for the drivers of all public passenger vehicles, and provide a specific power to make regulations relating to the use of security cameras in vehicles. That sounds good, but it does not go far enough. Making regulations relating to the use of security cameras will never happen. The bill may give the perception that it will happen, but it will not happen. We ask the House to support the KAP amendments tonight, because we want to make it happen.

One area of great concern for rural and regional areas relates to maxi taxi services. I use the example of Charters Towers, where the maxi taxi drivers use their wheelchair accessible vehicles to pick up disabled people, but there is no money at all to be made in the provision of that service. They could go broke from picking up and looking after disabled people in that township. However, they can just about break even or get a little ahead during the peak hours from five o'clock to seven o'clock. Wheelchair accessible maxi taxis are losing out by providing a service to disabled customers, but they can break even if they work the five o'clock to seven o'clock shift. However, who will take over that five o'clock to seven o'clock shift? Uber will, and the maxi taxi drivers who provide a service to the disabled in regional and rural towns will no longer be able to make a living. Another issue for rural and regional Queensland is the poor mobile phone coverage, meaning that many people will not be able to download the apps. In an emergency, some people will have no chance of tapping into Uber. However, we already have Queensland owned small businesses that run taxi services.

The KAP will be moving amendments to this bill. We are not too stimulated about this legislation, because from the beginning our wish was that there would be no need for legislation. From the beginning we had hoped that anyone driving an illegal taxi would receive four demerit points, which would be a disincentive to anyone providing an illegal taxi service, which is Uber. Our amendments provide a little bit of balance. I commend the minister, who at least is trying a little, but he does not go far enough and that is why we have moved these amendments. Our amendments are not supported by multinationals; they are supported by Queensland owned small business. Those business owners have paid the price, they have put up with the costs and, hopefully, they will get something back in terms of superannuation. Many of them bought taxi licences because they believed that five or 10 years down the track they would get a return and be able to retire. The way things are going at the moment that is not likely to happen, although I hope that that is not the case. I encourage everyone in the House tonight to support our amendments, because they provide a little more balance and support the Queensland owned small businesses that run taxi services.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (8.12 pm), in reply: I welcome the contributions of all members who have spoken on this bill today and I thank them. Earlier I spoke about the main objectives of the reforms. Ultimately they are about customers having more personalised transport choices and ensuring that those choices are safe. Technologies and consumer behaviours are changing rapidly and it is the responsibility of this House to come up with legislative solutions to respond to those changes. In particular, we need to be careful to ensure that there are appropriate protections in place for members of the public who use these services. In developing this bill another overarching objective we have strived for has been to provide consistency across the personalised transport industry.

However, we also need to acknowledge that the services provided by taxis and ride-booking services do differ and, as a result, it makes sense to treat those services differently in some ways. Because of the different nature of the services, the bill rightly provides that taxis will retain exclusive access to rank-and-hail services. We are serious about protecting taxis' exclusive access to this market, which is achieved through the bill in a number of different ways. Again, on this issue, we are leading the nation. We will see 14 enforcement officers working on the ground and two investigative officers who will look into particular complaints. There will be a strong level of enforcement of rank-and-hail services.

Any person who provides a taxi service in a vehicle other than a licensed taxi will commit an offence. That includes services such as rank-and-hail where a motor vehicle and driver are hired on the spot for a journey to start immediately or shortly after. Substantial penalties will apply to deter the provision of unauthorised services, including escalating financial penalties of up to \$365,000, as I outlined earlier in my second reading speech, and driver licence sanctions.

The bill allows only taxis to provide services requested through a fixed booking device. That closes a potential loophole that may have otherwise allowed ride-booking vehicles to set up an electronic pick-up zone that would effectively operate like a rank. Furthermore, to ensure that ride-booking operators only provide services that have been booked in advance, providers of services other than taxis must keep and produce booking records for inspection. As we have discussed today, there are a raft of other changes contained in the bill, most notably a new booked hire service licence and a new booked entity authorisation which will capture existing and new entrants into the personalised transport industry and will ensure all providers of services are held accountable.

When looking at this bill, let us be absolutely clear and up-front: this has been a very difficult issue for everyone involved in the industry. It has been a very sudden digital disruption in a way that many industries have not experienced. I have met with many taxidriviers in my constituency. There is no doubt whatsoever that it has been a very challenging time. It is absolutely correct that dealing with that level of change at such short notice will mean some people will suffer. It would be churlish of any of us to deny that that is the case. I think most members would have met with affected people from within the industry. However, we have to deal with the issues and ensure that we get as a fair an outcome as possible. We have listened to the concerns of the limousine industry and responded with a range of measures. Fees for the personalised transport industry have been issued at what I think is a reasonable level. It is higher than for taxis, but it is not prohibitive. It helps to pay for a range of regulatory measures and I think it is a reasonable and well-set fee.

When it comes to cameras, it is a simple fact that while, in some ways, taxis and personalised transport operators provide a comparable service they are not the same because of the key issue of anonymity. If I get into a personalised transport vehicle, I will have an account and there are things that identify me. Before I get into the vehicle I can see who the driver is and vice versa. There are various

ways that the provider can influence that. However, if I get into a taxi I could be anyone from anywhere in the world. No-one knows who I am. There are very different business models and there will be slightly different approaches taken, but the risk based approach is very much at the heart of this. People are making their own decisions about that and it is not a simple question, although some people would like to think it is. Of course, there are no guarantees that any form of transport is absolutely risk free, but obviously people believe there is safety in both personalised and taxi services. There is scope for differentiation in the marketplace for people who think it is a big issue. Of course, safety is a key part of this legislation.

While it might seem a small item to some people, we have been very clear about the need for greater visibility, which is also part of public safety. To be quite frank, the current provisions for personalised transport vehicles require very minimal marking on the cars. We have had various examples where people have got into what they thought was a personalised transport service, but they had innocently stopped another car at that particular time. Obviously, we have to minimise that. The marking on the car has to be clear, so that people do not get into situations that potentially could be unsafe. I am thinking of circumstances occurring late at night, but there could be all sorts of scenarios.

The clearer it is, the more obvious it is, the better. It makes sense. I know there has been a bit of criticism about this. I think it is reasonable. It is in the public interest. The regulatory requirement around ensuring there is a local office for accountability reasons and for local employment is an important part of this bill. It progresses things from where they have been in the past.

We have been very clear to bring in strong penalties. We want strong enforcement. We are dealing with the public. We have not mucked around in terms of making sure the penalties are strong and that we will have bodies on the ground to enforce the provisions. I think that will be welcome, particularly in the taxi industry, as it is concerned that the current provisions are not strong enough. We have certainly tried to respond to those concerns. Those 16 compliance officers will make a real difference. From very early on I think the industry will see a difference. It is very good to see that occur.

In terms of public safety there is a zero blood alcohol limit across-the-board. There is absolutely no tolerance when it comes to that. That is an important feature of the legislation. When it comes to this industry obviously fatigue is a very important issue. As the Minister for Road Safety, I point out that this is often one of the quietest of the fatal five when it comes to road safety. The others are obviously important too in terms of their impact on people in crashes. Fatigue is a real killer. We need to ensure that those provisions in this bill are strong. The way they cascade through the chain of responsibility is very strong and appropriate and in the interests of public safety.

We will be reviewing the fees for their appropriateness after 12 months. We are not saying that this is the law and this is how it is going to be. This is a very new area and it needs continued monitoring and scrutiny to ensure we finetune things as we go. We will continue to work with industry in that regard. There will be a 18-month review on a few other safety fronts.

The ombudsman provision has been adjusted over time. Once we looked at the original model with some real level of detail we found that it really was duplicating capacity and roles that already exist. We have taken a step back, had a look at that and come back with a model which I think is much better. This is a real contrast to the opposition's position. There are going to be complaints and referrals in this industry. There are still some very polarised views and friction. I think we need that ombudsman role in that regard. At the same time, the ombudsman needs to be genuinely independent so that they can look at the players in the industry, including the department. That is very important. The role needs to be separate so that we have that level of genuine scrutiny and are not beholden to the department. I think that is appropriate.

We have protected the travel subsidy scheme and access to disability market for the taxi industry to help them hopefully preserve and restore some value for a little while yet. We will come to that again next year. I think that is an important measure.

I believe we have brought in a reform that will be well received in the taxi industry—that is, to make it an offence to avoid compliance. That is an issue that plenty of members of the taxi industry referred to and one that the member for Mount Isa referred to. People felt that digital blocking to prevent compliance was not fair. I have sympathy for that view and the bill deals with that. That becomes an offence.

I now turn my attention to the opposition's position on the bill. The opposition has been very critical of us in any shape or form. After all that criticism, all that time, all that posturing, all those attacks, what have they got? They are voting for the bill. Are they moving—

**Mr Bennett** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Elmes): Order! Member for Burnett, you will refer to the minister by his correct title.

**Mr Bennett:** Minister Bailey.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr BAILEY:** The opposition has made it very clear that they will be voting for the bill. The member for Burnett seems to be upset with that point of view. Maybe he was on the losing side within the LNP on this one. If they want to wreak havoc on an industry that is their choice. I think the opposition's position is the correct one. I think it should be a bipartisan point of view. If those opposite think I am going to stand here and not point that out to the House when they have criticised us uphill and down dale for the last 18 months, then they are living in la-la land.

The opposition is proposing a policy position related to an independent commissioner and yet in their own policy it says that that commissioner will be within the department. That is a simple contradiction that makes no sense whatsoever. One cannot be genuinely independent if they are within the department. How does one conduct independent scrutiny, including of the department, if they are beholden to the department. It does not make any sense whatsoever. I say to the LNP, 'Good luck selling that one out there.' Any person with any knowledge of how society works is going to see right through that one.

There is also the issue of red tape. The opposition says that their views are very strong when it comes to red tape. When it comes to it, they love creating it in this instance. Good luck to them with their pro red-tape policy out on the hustings.

The opposition raised a point about limousines not being clearly identified as a separate class of service within the bill. It would seem they have completely missed the mark when understanding the provisions within the bill. In the new framework limousines are classified as a booked hire service, but the legislation clearly affords particular entitlements to limousines.

As I explained when I introduced the bill, limousines are the only personalised transport services that can display a distinct L-plate, serve alcohol through exemptions under the Liquor Act, access priority lanes as defined in the Queensland road rules and advertise themselves as limousine services. Luxury services can also operate under a booked hire service licence; however, these services will not be able to call themselves limousine services or be afforded the same privileges that limousines can access.

The member for Glass House said that amending a bill is difficult. I guess he would know that. The last time the opposition tried to amend a bill they made buses illegal. We had to come back and clean that up the next day. The simple point here is that when those opposite lack the confidence to engage in the policy process they lack the capacity to govern.

I will come to the contributions from the two members of the Katter party in a moment. The Katter party have two members in this House—two members out of 89. I will come to their amendments a little later. I have respect for the fact that they have given this a go. They have thought about this and will move amendments. They made a genuine contribution. Here we have an opposition with 41 members and they will not move any amendments despite all of their criticisms over a long period of time. It is a lazy effort. It would be remiss of me not to mention that tonight.

I acknowledge the contribution made by the Katter's Australian Party. While the Katter's Australian Party disagree on many of the policy areas with the government, they have nonetheless taken the time to develop amendments to support their position, and I respect that.

These are significant reforms and we need to make sure that we achieve what we have set out to achieve. We have always made it clear that there will be a third stage in the overall reform process that will focus on monitoring, evaluating and adjustment to ensure the outcomes achieve their intent and are fit for purpose. Following passage of this bill, we will actively monitor how the industry is responding and adjusting to the reforms, and we will be particularly vigilant on issues of safety.

In closing, this bill provides a significant but necessary reform of the personalised transport industry due to recent disruptions in this industry. I take this opportunity to thank all of those members who have contributed at the committee level, including the chair. I would like to thank the previous ministers—the Deputy Premier, the member for South Brisbane, and also the member for Sandgate,



the Leader of the House—for their contributions. I would also like to acknowledge and thank all of our Transport and Main Roads staff who have worked very hard on a very difficult issue for a lot of people including themselves.

I would also like to thank all of those industry participants who in challenging circumstances have still contributed and made that commitment to letting us know and working with us. It is a difficult process. I think it is important that that is acknowledged. We give that commitment to the industry. We will continue to work with them to finetune and make these reforms work. We will be reviewing things over the next 12 to 18 months. We give that commitment as a responsible government that we will continue to work with them. I commend the bill to the House.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Ms Farmer): Before we continue, I would like to welcome to the gallery tonight the Tamil Association of Queensland. Welcome.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

### Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—



**Mr KATTER** (8.31 pm): I move the following amendment—

**1 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 39 (Scope of service contracts))**

Page 13, lines 2 to 5—

*omit, insert—*

Section 39(b)—

*omit, insert—*

- (b) booking services for booked hire services provided by taxis, limousines or booked hire vehicles; and

I table my amendments.

*Tabled paper:* Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, amendments to be moved by Mr Rob Katter MP [\[783\]](#).

The amendment to clause 15 relates to the scope of service contracts. This is where the minister would have an arbitrary right or the ability to impact the way that these services are delivered through these service contracts—such as having a mandatory 24-hour service, which is a big thing, as the member for Dalrymple pointed out before. In places like Mount Isa and Charters Towers, if you do not have a mandatory 24-hour service and all the taxis have fallen over because Uber has come to town so they are no longer viable, then there will be times such as in rodeo week when no-one will be able to get a ride to the airport because everyone is having a fun time or having a nice party or too lazy to get out of bed. We do not have the critical mass of drivers and the fluidity in our market to react to a demand response at times such as that. In regional areas service contracts are absolutely critical.

Again, it is about having a level playing field. We need these other market participants to step up to the mark to provide all of the service standards that we have become accustomed to over the many years of enjoying a taxi service. Service contracts do not place an obligation on the minister to enforce those things. They do not place an obligation on the minister. They give the minister the ability to step in and say, 'It is not working in Mount Isa or Charters Towers or regional areas. We need to amend these service contracts.' There is some latitude there for the minister to operate as he or she sees fit in the marketplace.

We think that this is a vital part of maintaining some standards in this industry and not just letting it out to the market. This is essential for maintaining those standards that we have become accustomed to. This is a vital amendment, and for anyone interested in providing a level playing field they must vote for this amendment. It covers so many aspects of the industry. Insurance is another aspect that I forgot to mention. It is about ensuring that someone has the correct insurance and that they are covered in that way. All of those aspects of service standards are covered if you have the ability to control those service contracts. That is the purpose of this amendment.

**Mr BAILEY:** Amendment No. 1, as outlined by the member for Mount Isa, would have the effect of reinstating a requirement for service contracts in gazetted taxi service areas for all booking services and taxi services. The amendment appears to be designed to require all booking entities to hold a service contract with the department so that minimum service levels can be stipulated. A service contract can only be entered into for a public passenger service. A booking service is not a public passenger service. It is a service where someone arranges a booking for a booked hire service.

There are issues with this amendment as drafted. If passed, it will require further amendment to fix these anomalies. The retention of service contracts would result in unnecessary duplication of fees and obligations for industry under service contracts and the new booking entity authorisation which is intended to replace service contracts. Additional cost to industry may be passed on to customers. It is also worth noting that no other jurisdiction has service contracts. This provision could have unintended consequences that do not appear to have been considered in drafting these amendments. Therefore, I oppose the amendment.

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

**AYES, 5:**

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Dickson.

**INDEPENDENT, 2**—Gordon, Pyne.

**NOES, 81:**

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

**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, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.


Pair: Byrne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clause 16—

 **Mr KATTER** (8.42 pm): Clause 16 is consequential to amendment No. 1. That amendment being defeated, it does not require much explanation.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Member for Mount Isa, are you moving amendment No. 2?

**Mr KATTER:** I move the following amendment—

**2 Clause 16 (Omission of ch 6, pt 3 (Administration of taxi services))**

Page 13, lines 6 to 8—

*omit, insert—*

**16 Replacement of ch 6, pt 3 (Administration of taxi services)**

Chapter 6, part 3—

*omit, insert—*

**Part 3 Booking services**

**66 Regulation may declare service contracts are required**

A regulation may declare that, on and from a day to be fixed by the chief executive by gazette notice, booking services for booked hire services provided in an area must be performed under a service contract.

**67 Amendments of service contracts**

(1) The chief executive may amend the conditions of a service contract mentioned in section 66 if the chief executive is satisfied the amendment is necessary—

(a) to extend booked hire services, including services provided using taxis, into developing areas; or

(b) for improvement of services in the public interest.

(2) Before making a decision under this section, the chief executive must give the holder written notice of the intended action and allow the holder a reasonable opportunity to make written representations about the intended action within 10 working days.

**Mr BAILEY:** It is a consequential amendment, but just to be clear I and the government oppose the amendment.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negatived.

Clause 16, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



**Mr BAILEY** (8.44 pm): I move the following amendment—

**1 After clause 16**

Page 13, after line 8—

*insert—*

**16A Insertion of new s 80BA**

Chapter 7—

*insert—*

**80BA Security cameras**

(1) A regulation may provide for—

- (a) the use of security cameras in vehicles used to provide taxi services or booked hire services; and
- (b) access to, and the disclosure and use of, information (including sound and images) captured by the cameras for purposes related to—
  - (i) the safety and security of the services; and
  - (ii) generally, a police officer performing the officer's duties.

(2) In this section—

**booked hire service** means a public passenger service that, under a regulation, is a booked hire service.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendment.

*Tabled paper:* Transport and Other Legislation (Personalised Transport Reform) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mark Bailey's amendments [784].

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—



**Mr KATTER** (8.45 pm): I move the following amendments—

**3 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 14, lines 14 to 18—

*omit, insert—*

**hire on-the-spot**, in relation to a vehicle and its driver, means the hire of the vehicle and its driver, arranged in person or by a booking service, in either of the following circumstances—

- (a) the vehicle is standing in a public place (whether or not the place is a taxi rank or another place where members of the public might reasonably expect taxis or other vehicles to be available for immediate hire) and the passenger—
  - (i) walks to the vehicle; or
  - (ii) is picked up less than 500m from where the vehicle was standing;
- (b) the passenger, or a person acting of behalf of the passenger, hails the vehicle in a public place, whether or not the vehicle has a sign, marking, light or other thing on it that might reasonably indicate to members of the public it is a taxi or another vehicle available for immediate hire.

**4 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 15, lines 10 to 19—

*omit, insert—*

public.

These amendments strengthens the hire-on-the-spot definition to ensure that drivers cannot circumvent a regulated booking service including those provided by rideshare services. This can lead to things like drivers moving outside of whatever rideshare system they are in. They might be an Uber driver taking cash on the side or avoiding safety obligations. We think that is an important part of managing the industry going forward.

Passenger safety is maintained by ensuring that all passengers taking a trip by rank or hail or hiring on the spot are covered by the same safety and service standards as those that are booked through a booking service. I make reference to the minister's earlier comments in that there were some gaps in some of these amendments which require transitional provisions and time frames to be made through subordinate legislation or through execution of these provisions by the Public Service. I do acknowledge those comments that we have done the best we could with some of these, but we acknowledge that some transitional arrangements would be required if these were to get up. Again, we believe these amendments bring some balance into the industry for the established taxi service and the new rideshare services. We feel it is essential for the provision of those service standards and the level of safety that we have become accustomed to.

**Mr BAILEY:** I oppose the amendments which amend the definition of hire on the spot for the offence of providing a taxi service without a taxi service licence. In short, these amendments would have the effect of banning ride booking. That would have the effect of prohibiting booked hire services including ride-booking and limousine services whenever a person walks to where the vehicle is waiting.

This is a common situation with personalised transport when they wait for customers to arrive in a public place after the vehicle has been booked through the app—for example, in front of a church waiting for a bride and groom to walk to the vehicle after a wedding. It would also prevent any hail of a vehicle even where there was a prebooking and the hail is only intended to wave the vehicle over to where the person is specifically waiting. These amendments would also apply to limousines waiting in a public place for customers who have prebooked the service, so I will have to oppose them.

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

**AYES, 5:**

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Dickson.

**INDEPENDENT, 2**—Gordon, Pyne.

**NOES, 81:**

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

**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, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pair: Byrne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) negatived.

**Mr BAILEY:** I move the following amendments—

**2 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 16, after line 30—

*insert—*

*Example of a booking accepted in person—*

The driver of a motor vehicle accepts, in person, a booking from a person to drive the person for a journey to start in 2 days.

**3 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 30, line 9, 'convicted of'—

*omit, insert—*

proceeded against for, and convicted of,

Amendments agreed to.

**Mr KATTER:** I move the following amendment—

**5 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 38, after line 24—

*insert—*

(1A) The conditions of a licence must require the operator of a taxi service or booked hire service provided using the vehicle stated in the licence to—

- (a) for an operator of a booked hire service who does not arrange bookings for the service—have an arrangement with an authorised booking entity to provide booking services for the service and, under the arrangement—
  - (i) to cooperate with the entity in relation to the entity's obligations under this Act; and
  - (ii) to comply with all reasonable requests made by the entity in relation to the entity's obligations under this Act; and
  - (iii) to not act in a way likely to prevent the entity complying with its obligations under this Act; and
- (b) install and maintain in the vehicle—
  - (i) security cameras; and
  - (ii) a commercial-grade GPS device with anti-tamper features; and
  - (iii) a duress alarm, capable of contacting the entity and other vehicles nearby for which the entity provides booking services, for the use of the driver of the vehicle; and
- (c) maintain public liability insurance that is appropriate for providing the taxi service or booked hire service; and
- (d) display a number plate on the vehicle that distinguishes the vehicle as—
  - (i) for a taxi service licence—a taxi; or
  - (ii) for a limousine licence—a limousine; or
  - (iii) for a booked hire service licence—a booked hire vehicle; and
- (e) notify the chief executive if a person who drives the vehicle to provide a taxi service or booked hire service is disciplined or dismissed by the operator for reasons that are relevant to the person's suitability to be an authorised driver.

This amendment provides a standard set of conditions for a taxi service or booked hire service to ensure standards are maintained across the different types of personalised transport services. It ensures that key safety measures that are regulated on taxi services for very good reasons are also required by rideshare services. These include security cameras, a commercial grade GPS with antitamper features and a duress alarm capable of contacting the entity and other vehicles nearby for which the entity provides booking services for the use of the driver of the vehicle. Additionally, the licence requirements oblige a taxi service or booked hire service to maintain appropriate liability insurance and display a number plate that distinguishes the vehicle and type of service it is providing.

The use of a distinguishing number plate can stop those rogue elements. We have had instances in Cairns where people were not even operating under the Uber banner; they were just out there calling themselves Uber and taking cash and operating without any identity. This is creating uncertainty in the marketplace. This amendment would provide some formality to distinguish those operators.

The remaining elements have already been spoken about. The security cameras and duress alarms have saved who knows how many attacks, sexual assaults and perhaps even deaths in taxis over the years. We believe it is essential that those sorts of things are in there to protect the people who use these services in the future. Who knows how much good they have done; I would say they have done a lot of good, because I heard an honourable member mention some figures tonight on the number of assaults and they were pretty startling. This again tries to impose a level of standards that we are accustomed to. I commend this amendment to the House.

**Mr BAILEY:** I will have to oppose this amendment as well about the conditions of licences. The amendment would require the operator under a taxi, limousine or booked hire licence to enter into an affiliation agreement with a booked entity. It includes matters relating to the entity's and operator's obligations under the act. The amendment requires them to install and maintain security cameras, a commercial grade GPS device and a duress alarm. It would also require the operator to maintain public liability insurance, display a distinguishing number plate and notify the chief executive of any disciplinary action taken against an authorised driver.

The level of insurance which is appropriate in the amendment is unclear in terms of what the amount of the cover would be. Also, this would require most ride-booking drivers who are the operator under the booked hire licence to take out public liability insurance in addition to the booking entity. This would duplicate insurance coverage and be a significant barrier to entry. Notification of disciplinary action against, or dismissal of, the driver would only apply to action taken by the operator, not the booking entity, so it would not cover disaffiliation by the booking entity which is the whole point. I will have to oppose this amendment.

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

**AYES, 5:**

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Dickson.

**INDEPENDENT, 2**—Gordon, Pyne.

**NOES, 81:**

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

**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, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pair: Byrne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negatived.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, I understand there is agreement between the government and the opposition that for future divisions the bells will ring for one minute. Members of the crossbench, are you happy? Thank you.

**Mr BAILEY:** I move the following amendments—

**4 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 43, line 1, after ‘Granting’—  
*insert—*

, **renewing**

**5 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 43, lines 3 and 4, ‘or refusing to grant,’—  
*omit, insert—*

renewing, or refusing to grant or renew,

**6 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 43, line 16, after ‘authorisation’—  
*insert—*

or renew a person’s authorisation

**7 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 43, line 24, ‘(1)’—  
*omit.*

**8 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 43, lines 27 to 32 and page 44, lines 1 to 10—  
*omit.*

Amendments agreed to.

**Mr KATTER:** I move the following amendment—

**6 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 44, after line 14—  
*insert—*

- (1A) The conditions of a booking entity authorisation must require the authorised booking entity to—
- (a) enter into an arrangement with the operator of each booked hire service for which the entity provides booking services, other than the entity itself, that allows the entity—
    - (i) to require the operator to take the action and provide the information the entity reasonably requires to comply with its obligations under this Act; and

- (ii) to discipline or dismiss an operator, or require an operator to discipline or dismiss a driver—
  - (A) who fails to comply with the operator's or driver's obligations under this Act; or
  - (B) otherwise fails to provide an appropriate standard of service; and
- (b) notify the chief executive of any action mentioned in paragraph (a)(ii) taken by the entity; and
- (c) ensure a booked hire service, for which the entity provides a booking service, that is provided to a person using a wheelchair is of an appropriate standard; and
- (d) maintain public liability insurance that is appropriate for providing booking services under the authorisation.

This amendment creates an obligation on a booking entity to be responsible for the transport service that is ultimately provided to the customer through a booking entity authorisation. This protects customers by ensuring that the safety and service obligations that are imposed on the booking entity flow through to the person driving the vehicle and providing that service. The authorised booking entity is required to enter into an arrangement with the operator of each booked hire service for which the entity provides a booking service. This allows the booking entity to then, firstly, require the operator to take action and provide the information the entity reasonably requires to comply with its obligations under this act—and obviously they would want some records of how the drivers are going—and then to discipline or dismiss an operator who fails to comply with obligations under the act. Very importantly, this ensures that where a service is provided to people with special needs, that service is of an appropriate standard.

This is the last of our amendments that we will move tonight. These are amendments that have been recommended by the Taxi Council. This is the last opportunity for this House to have some buy-in on behalf of the taxidriviers of this state to provide some fairness. This vote on this amendment tonight is the last chance we have, so we are looking for support for this final amendment.

**Mr BAILEY:** The government will be opposing this amendment on the booking entity authorisation. Potentially there are significant fundamental legislative principle issues with this provision. It adversely affects existing rights in terms of natural justice. It could have the effect of requiring a booking entity to enter into an unfair contract under competition and consumer law. There is no exclusion from the Competition and Consumer Act (Cth) contained in the provision, so therefore it could be inconsistent and void under Commonwealth law. The requirement for all booking entities to make wheelchair accessible vehicles available will take work away from the existing taxi industry. It also does not require these vehicles to comply with Commonwealth disability standards for accessible transport, so we will have to oppose it.

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

**AYES, 5:**

**KAP, 2**—Katter, Knuth.

**PHON, 1**—Dickson.

**INDEPENDENT, 2**—Gordon, Pyne.

**NOES, 81:**

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

**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, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pair: Byrne, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negated.

**Mr BAILEY:** I move the following amendments—

**9 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 47, lines 26 and 27, 'and place of business'

*omit.*

**10 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 48, lines 4 to 6—

*omit.***11 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 50, lines 1 to 3—

*omit, insert—***Division 1 Driving sanctions for driver offences****91ZHA Application of division**

- (1) This division applies if a person has—
- (a) committed 3 or more relevant driver offences within a 3-year period; or
  - (b) if a driving sanction has previously been imposed on the person under section 91ZJ—committed a further 3 or more relevant driver offences within a later 3-year period.

*Note—*

See section 150C for when a person commits an offence for this section.

- (2) For subsection (1), if a person committed 2 or more relevant driver offences because of conduct the person engaged in at a particular time, the person is taken to have committed only 1 relevant driver offence at the time.
- (3) It does not matter whether a 3-year period mentioned in subsection (1)(b) started before, during or after the period the driving sanction mentioned in that subsection was in effect.
- (4) In this section—

**conduct** means an act or an omission to perform an act.**12 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 50, line 5, before 'An offence'—

*insert—*

(1)

**13 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 50, after line 14—

*insert—*

- (2) Also, an offence committed by the driver of a motor vehicle is a **relevant driver offence** if the offence is committed—
- (a) against a provision prescribed by regulation to be a provision to which this section applies; and
  - (b) while the driver is providing a taxi service or booked hire service.

**14 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 50, lines 15 to 30 and page 51, lines 1 to 16—

*omit, insert—***91ZJ Chief executive may impose driving sanction**

- (1) The chief executive may take the following action in relation to the person (each a **driving sanction**)—
- (a) if the person holds a Queensland driver licence—suspend the person's Queensland driver licence;
  - (b) if the person's authority to drive on a Queensland road is under a driver licence other than a Queensland driver licence—suspend the person's authority under the licence to drive on a Queensland road;
  - (c) if the person does not hold a driver licence—disqualify the person from holding or obtaining a driver licence.
- (2) A driving sanction imposed on a person under subsection (1) has effect for the following period—
- (a) for a first driving sanction—1 month;
  - (b) for a second or later driving sanction—3 months.
- (3) The chief executive imposes a driving sanction under subsection (1) by giving a person a written notice stating the following—
- (a) the nature of the driving sanction being imposed;



- (b) the day the sanction starts, which must be at least 7 days after the day the notice is given;
- (c) the day the sanction ends;
- (d) the reasons for the sanction;
- (e) that the person may not apply to the chief executive for reconsideration of the decision or to QCAT for a review of the decision.

**15 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 51, lines 19 to 30 and page 52, lines 1 to 16—

*omit, insert—*

- (1) This section applies if the chief executive suspends a person's Queensland driver licence under section 91ZJ.
- (2) While the person's driver licence is suspended, the person is not eligible to apply for a special hardship order under the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*.

*Note—*

A special hardship order under the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995* authorises a person whose driver licence has been suspended to continue to drive motor vehicles in stated circumstances. See section 150(1A) of that Act.

- (3) Subsection (2) applies despite the *Transport Operations (Road Use Management) Act 1995*.

**16 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 56, after line 9—

*insert—*

**91ZQA Avoiding detection or prosecution**

- (1) A person must not take steps to avoid detection of, or prosecution for, conduct that involves the commission of a chapter 7 offence by the person or another person.  
Maximum penalty—3000 penalty units.
- (2) A person may be convicted of an offence against subsection (1) in relation to a person's conduct even if no one has been proceeded against for, or convicted of, the offence involving the conduct.
- (3) In this section—

**chapter 7 offence** means an offence against a provision of this chapter.

**conduct** means an act or an omission to perform an act.

**take steps**, to do something, includes organise, plan, facilitate, support, engage in, or otherwise conspire to take steps in, doing the thing.

*Note—*

If a corporation commits an offence against this provision, an executive officer of the corporation may be taken, under section 91ZQB, to have also committed the offence.

**91ZQB Executive officer may be taken to have committed offence**

- (1) If a corporation commits an offence against section 91ZQA, an executive officer of the corporation is taken to have also committed the offence if—
  - (a) the officer authorised or permitted the corporation's conduct constituting the offence; or
  - (b) the officer was, directly or indirectly, knowingly concerned in the corporation's conduct constituting the offence.
- (2) The executive officer may be proceeded against for, and convicted of, an offence against section 91ZQA whether or not the corporation has been proceeded against for, or convicted of, the offence.
- (3) This section does not affect—
  - (a) the liability of the corporation for the offence against section 91ZQA; or
  - (b) the liability, under the Criminal Code, chapter 2, of any person, whether or not the person is an executive officer of the corporation, for the offence against section 91ZQA.

**17 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 63, line 8, 'provision'—

*omit, insert—*

**provisions**

**18 Clause 18 (Insertion of new ch 7)**

Page 63, after line 17—

*insert—***91ZZ Security cameras**

A regulation may provide for—

- (a) the use of security cameras in vehicles used to provide taxi services or booked hire services; and
- (b) access to, and the disclosure and use of, information (including sound and images) captured by the cameras for purposes related to—
  - (i) the safety and security of the services; and
  - (ii) generally, a police officer performing the officer's duties.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 37—

**Mr BAILEY** (9.12 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

**Mr BAILEY:** I move the following amendments—**19 After clause 22**

Page 64, after line 13—

*insert—***22A Amendment of s 148 (Inquiries about person's suitability to hold accreditation or authorisation)**

- (1) Section 148(1)(a), 'or driver authorisation'—  
*omit, insert—*  
, driver authorisation or booking entity authorisation
- (2) Section 148(1)(b) and (c), after 'operator accreditation'—  
*insert—*  
or booking entity authorisation
- (3) Section 148(1)—  
*insert—*  
(d) another person is a suitable person to hold, or continue to hold, booking entity authorisation if, under a regulation, the person's criminal history is relevant to the decision.
- (4) Section 148(3)(d), from 'or application'—  
*omit, insert—*  
, booking entity authorisation or application for operator accreditation, driver authorisation or booking entity authorisation.

**22B Amendment of s 148A (Notice of change in police information about a person)**

Section 148A(1)(a), 'or driver authorisation'—

*omit, insert—*

, driver authorisation or booking entity authorisation

**20 Clause 23 (Insertion of new ss 150B and 150C)**

Page 65, line 13, 'section 91ZJ'—

*omit, insert—*

section 91ZHA

**21 Clause 28 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 18)**

Page 70, line 4, 'forced'—

*omit, insert—*

force

**22 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 129A (Effect of suspension of licence under State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999))**

Page 80, line 2, 'section 91ZK(2)(c)'—

*omit, insert—*

section 91ZJ

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 19 to 37, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 1—



**Mr BAILEY** (9.12 pm): I seek leave to move amendments outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

**Mr BAILEY:** I move the following amendments—

**23 Schedule 1 (Acts amended)**

Page 81, after line 5—

*insert—*

**State Penalties Enforcement Amendment Act 2017**

**1 Schedule 1, entry for *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*, amendment 1, inserted paragraph (c)—**

*omit, insert—*

- (c) the respondent has applied, under section 23 of that Act, for the fine to be registered with SPER for the purpose of paying the fine under a payment plan;

*Editor's note—*

Legislation ultimately amended—

- *Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994*

**24 Schedule 1 (Acts amended)**

Page 81, after line 14—

*insert—*

**Transport Operations (Passenger Transport) Act 1994**

**1 Section 150C(3)(b)—**

*omit, insert—*

- (b) the person has applied, under section 23 of that Act, for the fine to be registered with SPER for the purpose of paying the fine under a payment plan;

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

### Third Reading



**Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (9.13 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

### Long Title



**Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (9.13 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

## TRADING (ALLOWABLE HOURS) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 1 March (see p. 386).

### Second Reading



**Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.13 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

It is with great pleasure that I rise to speak on the resumption of debate on the Trading (Allowable Hours) Amendment Bill 2017. The measures in this bill will modernise and simplify current trading hours in Queensland and support jobs, cut red tape and increase choice for consumers. If the bill is passed, a massive 99 specific trading hour provisions contained in over 40 pages of orders from the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission will be reduced to just seven standard trading hour provisions covering all large stores across the state. Based on previous independent studies, Queensland Treasury estimates that these changes have the potential to increase gross state product by up to \$79 million and support up to 1,000 additional full-time-equivalent jobs.

The first step in this reform was delivered in this parliament in February with the passing of amendments to establish Easter Sunday as an open trading day for all large shops in South-East Queensland in time for Easter 2017. I note that these amendments were supported by both sides of the House. This change proved to be a great boost for large and small businesses and consumers alike during the Easter trading period just gone. Resolving the trading status of the Easter Sunday public holiday also means that across Queensland we have standardised the remaining four public holidays that are to be treated as closed trading days to Good Friday, Christmas Day, Labour Day and Anzac Day. As I foreshadowed in February, this bill now delivers on the remainder of the government's trading hours reform package.

The key reforms contained in the bill include a sensible, balanced and modest extension to the current allowable trading hours for non-exempt shops under the act. In South-East Queensland the new hours will be from 7 am to 9 pm Monday to Saturday—in line with the decision of the QIRC in late 2016—and in regional Queensland from 7 am to 9 pm Monday to Friday and 7 am to 6 pm on Saturday. Trading hours for Sunday and public holiday trading will be standardised across Queensland from 9 am to 6 pm. Those regional towns that currently do not have Sunday and public holiday trading will continue to be able to opt in to these trading hours through an application to the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission, and that has always been the case.

Special tourist areas such as Port Douglas will have access to extended hours that meet the needs of domestic and international visitors. There will be a streamlined process for special trading hours applications to be made to allow for extended trading hours around major events such as the Commonwealth Games. Trading hour restrictions will be removed for butcher shops, special exhibitions and trade shows. All hardware stores will be able to open on Sunday from 6 am.

Extended trading hours will apply in the period leading up to Christmas for non-exempt shops in all areas of the state, with trading to close from 6 pm on Christmas Eve to allow retail workers to go home and be with their friends and family. The employment thresholds at which independent retail shops such as smaller grocery stores become subject to the same trading restrictions as larger non-exempt shops will be lifted from 20 to 30 employees on the floor in any one shop and from 60 to 100 employees where a number of related shops are operated. This will remove the current brake on employment and business expansion for these smaller retail businesses.

Importantly, the government recognises the impact that changes to trading hours can have on retail workers and their families. Therefore, the bill includes protections for retail workers and will make it an offence for an employer to require an employee to work the extended trading hours that have been introduced unless the employee has freely elected to work those hours. This agreement to work must be in writing and applies to all hours which are being extended by this amendment bill. This means that no worker will be made to work any of the additional hours allowed under the bill unless they voluntarily agree to do so. The bill also amends the act to include the impact on employees as a new criterion for the QIRC to consider in deciding trading hour applications.

The changes which I have outlined follow a comprehensive review of Queensland's retail trading hours by an independent reference group chaired by former Speaker and now QUT School of Justice Associate Professor John Mickel. I again place on record my thanks to John Mickel and his reference group for all their work and for the final report they delivered on what is a complex and contested area. I also thank the Finance and Administration Committee for its consideration of the Trading (Allowable Hours) Amendment Bill 2017 with special thanks to the member for Sunnybank as chair and all those who made submissions to the committee during its considerations.

I note that the committee tabled its report on 28 April 2017 and made three recommendations. The first is to include the Cairns CBD in the defined tourist area—basically this was an oversight—permitting trade to 10 pm Monday to Saturday and 9 pm Sundays and most public holidays.

The second recommendation was to refer to the appropriate street addresses for the Westfield Chermside and Westfield Garden City shopping centres to remove any doubt that the whole of the shopping complex is covered in the event of any expansion. It is a better way of clarifying that it is the whole centre. The third recommendation was to exclude the application of new extended hours to motor vehicle or caravan retailers—that is, maintain the existing trading hours.

While not a recommendation of the committee, it is considered appropriate to also include Pacific Fair Shopping Centre in the defined tourist area under the bill as it is directly adjacent to the Gold Coast coastal portion of the tourist area, sharing the common border of the Pacific Highway at Broadbeach. Without a doubt, it is one of the largest shopping centres in the tourist area of the Gold Coast, so we will be adding that into the tourist area.

The government has accepted all three recommendations of the committee. In particular, I acknowledge the many strongly held views we heard from those employers and employees working in motor vehicle and caravan retail shops who did not wish to see an introduction of Sunday trading for their industry. We have listened respectfully to their concerns and we have responded accordingly by maintaining the current trading hours arrangements for the industry.

I can report that Dr Brett Dale, CEO of MTA Queensland, has welcomed the government's decision to accept the committee's recommendations, saying—

We are extremely pleased with the announcement made by Minister Grace and her understanding of the significant issues raised by the automotive industry, where the pressures on businesses to be forced to open on Sunday and the impact on staffing are enormous.

We have listened to them, and trading hours for that industry will remain the same. I now table the government's response to the committee report.

*Tabled paper:* Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 37—Trading (Allowable Hours) Amendment Bill 2017, government response [785].

It is disappointing to note that the non-government members of the committee in their statement of reservation have indicated that the bill should not be passed. Whatever happened to the Liberal Party in this state? This appears to be based in part on unsubstantiated concerns that trading hours changes would have a negative impact on smaller retail traders. No evidence was provided by the non-government members to substantiate these concerns and they are not borne out by any evidence in the parliamentary committee report or the Mickel report.

The review by John Mickel considered the impact on small business and employment and found there was little evidence that trading hours restrictions have a material impact on the overall viability of small retail businesses. The review report found that evidence from previous significant changes in retail trading hours regulation suggests employment is in fact likely to increase. For example, the Productivity Commission reported that Coles added 450 jobs when Sunday trading was introduced in 2002 in the Brisbane and near metropolitan region, and ABS figures showed that retail employment overall in Queensland increased by 12.6 per cent—double that of New South Wales and Victoria at the time.

These matters were considered further by the parliamentary committee when it examined the legislation. It found that the evidence from other jurisdictions was that small businesses continued to thrive when trading hours were relaxed or totally deregulated, with consistently high small business participation rates of 90 per cent in both regulated and deregulated states.

I also note the evidence that extended trading hours for large retailers can have positive flow-on impacts for smaller retailers. For example, when a large retailer in a shopping centre is open it creates more foot traffic for nearby smaller businesses. The Shopping Centre Council of Australia has reported that for every large retailer in Queensland that is able to trade in a shopping centre there are at least an additional 30 to 42 smaller businesses—bakeries, pharmacies, newsagents, cafes—that can open and trade, depending on the size of the centre. These smaller retailers can benefit from large retailers opening due to their large catchment and the customer foot traffic they generate. In one large centre the Shopping Centre Council reported a 13 per cent increase in monthly customer foot traffic following the introduction of Sunday trading. Weekend customer traffic also increased from an average of 17 per cent of weekly traffic to 26 per cent of weekly traffic.

Under the bill, smaller retailers will also have the certainty of knowing there is a five-year moratorium on further trading hours applications to the QIRC. This will allow businesses to plan ahead and will remove uncertainty, knowing that the hours in the legislation are set for the next five years and they will not be tied up in expensive and time-consuming cases in the QIRC, as is currently the case.

In light of all this evidence, it would indeed be disappointing if the LNP did not support this bill, particularly in light of their professed concern about red-tape reduction. Just last week the LNP released a policy aiming for a 20 per cent reduction in red tape overall. As a first step, to demonstrate their credentials on this front, they have a chance to put their money where their mouth is and support a bill that cuts a swathe through red tape, with 99 specific trading hours provisions being replaced by seven specific trading hours provisions—a 93 per cent cut in red tape. Those opposite sit over there and profess to want to reduce red tape, but they mumble. It is absolutely unbelievable what has happened to the Liberal National Party in this state.

The LNP might also wish to take note of the comments made by Dominique Lamb, CEO of the National Retail Association, on this matter when she said—

Business owners are tired of politicians paying lip service to cutting red tape but failing to act when the opportunity was presented to them.

The proposed new laws would significantly streamline and simplify opening and closing times, and drastically reduce the red-tape burden on businesses that trade across various parts of the state.


These are very sensible reforms that will free up retailers to get on with business and job creation, and they are the low-hanging fruit in terms of eradicating red tape.

I say to the members for Clayfield and Kawana: the ball is in your court. These are the most significant changes to Queensland's retail trading hours in more than two decades. As the *Courier-Mail* editorialised in November last year—

Queensland's trading hours are an obvious area ripe for reform. Right now Queensland has a very real opportunity to make significant legislation and productivity gains in this area by removing some of the shackles that fetter one of our state's biggest employers.

However, for too long trading hours reforms were put in the too-hard basket by successive Queensland governments. By contrast, the Palaszczuk government has seized the chance to deliver this major piece of economic reform for an industry that employs 255,000 Queenslanders, or 11 per cent of all jobs across the state, paying about \$9.9 billion in wages and accounting for \$76 billion in sales.

We have brought together business and unions to develop a reform package that is good for jobs, cuts red tape and provides more choice for the Queensland public and visitors to the state. The standardisation of the hours by the recent Industrial Relations Commission decision changes the majority of trading hours throughout the state by a mere one to two hours, but it standardises those trading hours and cuts red tape. We still have opposition from those opposite, who have no plans, no idea and no policy. This bill is about more jobs, more choice and less red tape. That is what these reforms are about. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (9.29 pm): The Minister for Industrial Relations says that the ball is in our court. The Liberal National Party is the party of small business. Small business is the backbone of our economy. When we say that small business is the backbone of our economy, we mean it and it is not just rhetoric. That is why we will be opposing the legislation before the House this evening, because we back small business. From the top of Queensland to the south and from the eastern border to the western border, we will protect each and every small business in this state which the Labor Party is attacking this evening.

Members will know that over the last 2½ years the trading hours legislation has been a complete botched attempt by this Labor government to renew it, review it and reform it. We have seen piecemeal approaches put in the parliament dealing with little issues here and there. We have seen amendments to the Industrial Relations Act. Last year we saw amendments to declare Easter Sunday a public holiday. We saw the minister forget to declare it a public holiday though so businesses could trade. Last year the minister came in here and introduced legislation that would make Easter Sunday a public holiday. The business community then said, 'Yes, but you forgot to amend the allowable trading legislation to allow us to trade on a public holiday.' We then debated the IR Bill in here a few months ago. The minister slipped an amendment in there to fix that botched attempt from last year and then announced a review into trading hours and now we are debating this. This is the third or fourth attempt by this minister to try and reform—review—trading hours in this state.

Earlier the minister said that the motor traders industry does not wish to see trading on a Sunday. All she had to do was ask the motor traders industry before she introduced the bill. The reason the minister did not know about the motor traders not wanting to trade on a Sunday is that this highly independent review undertaken by former Labor member John Mickel—a highly independent review from former Labor industrial relations minister John Mickel—meant that the public did not have an

opportunity to have a say into that review. That review was dominated by unions. John Mickel released the review and then the government announced what it had accepted in terms of the recommendations of the review.

There was no consultation with the Queensland community. There was no consultation with the motor traders to say, 'This is the review of Queensland's Trading (Allowable Hours) Act released in December 2016. We will now let the business community have a say on these recommendations. Let the motor traders, the butchers, the candlestick makers and everyone else have a say on the recommendations.' No! The minister announced what the government was going to do and accepted all of these recommendations. The minister then comes in here and cries poor, saying, 'We didn't know the motor traders had such an issue with Sunday trading. It came through the committee process and we'll now amend that.' If she had done her job properly a year ago when looking at this issue and spoken to the motor traders and spoken to the small independent hardware operators in this state, she would know that there were major concerns.

We will not let the government forget that this has been a botched attempt of trading hours reform. The reason we are opposing this legislation is not that the Liberal National Party does not believe there is some modernisation or reform necessary in trading hours, because we do. Rather, we do not have confidence in the process that was undertaken in order to get to where we are with this review that was compiled by John Mickel. I question the statistics where it says it is going to create an extra 945 jobs. I dispute that. So, too, do other groups like Master Grocers, the Hardware Association and the Motor Trades Association of Queensland.

The first trading hours legislation was introduced under the Goss government in 1990 and the minister may want to or should have inquired with some Labor old guard with respect to the trading hours legislation, because the sole reason for the introduction of the trading hours legislation was to protect the small business operators in the state of Queensland from the big guys such as Coles and Woolies. When this legislation was introduced in 1990, the government then had the foresight to say that we have to protect our small to medium enterprises, including our IGAs and Spars and NightOwls across the state, by introducing this legislation which allowed the competition to take place but also protected the small to medium enterprises from the big guys. It is now 2017 and I have to say that the big guys in the duopoly are much bigger than they were back in 1990. That is why it is now more important than ever in 2017 to assist and protect our small and independent retailers, particularly in regional Queensland.

In the existing regime there are three types of retail shops that are captured under the existing regulatory framework. There are exempt shops which mean that these are exempted from being regulated by the legislation. Exempt shops have unrestricted trading hours. They may trade 24 hours a day, seven days a week, 365 days a year, including all public holidays, and are not required to limit the number of staff they employ. These are generally small businesses that are listed by category in the regulation and include shops such as newsagencies, chemists, ice-cream shops, fruit and veggie shops, service stations, souvenir shops and hairdressers. There are then non-exempt shops which are shops other than the exempt or independent retail shops and include shops selling wholly or partly wholesale products, shops selling motor vehicles or caravans, large retailers including supermarkets and departmental stores. These are shops like Woolworths, Coles and Bunnings and have restricted trading hours—that is, Monday to Saturday from 7 am to 9 pm in South-East Queensland. There are then independent retail stores, which is the third type of retail shop in Queensland.

If a shop is not listed in the exempt shops and meets all of the following criteria, it is classified as an independent retail shop in the act: the business is run by an individual, partnership or proprietary company and does not include a public company or related corporation; there are no more than 20 people, including the owner, engaged in the shop at any one time; there are no more than 60 people engaged by the owner in all shops throughout Queensland at any one time; and the business is not conducted within a non-exempt shop or part thereof. They have unrestricted trading hours except for Good Friday, Christmas Day and Anzac Day after 1 pm. They are generally what independent grocers like Spar, IGA and FoodWorks trade as.

The laws were originally, as I said, introduced into Queensland to assist and regulate trading hours but also to maintain competition in the industry by ensuring small to medium enterprise had an advantage over large retailers like Coles and Woolworths. If there were disputes with respect to trading hours or shops wanting to trade different hours, an application could be made to the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission. It was the LNP position in government that trading hours matters are best determined by an independent umpire, being the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission. Commencing on 1 December 2016, the QIRC determined that trading hours for all non-exempt shops

in South-East Queensland, except the Brisbane CBD, Hamilton Northshore, New Farm and the Gold Coast, would be standardised to 7 am to 9 pm Monday to Saturday and 9 am to 6 pm Sundays and public holidays. This was seen as a major win for large retailers at the time that had been campaigning for longer trading particularly on Saturday, which was previously 8 am to 5 pm. Sunday hours did not change.

As outlined in the explanatory notes by the minister, the government's bill before the House has the following objective: replacing the 99 specific trading hours provisions with six trading hours provisions covering all large stores across Queensland. Dealing with that with respect to what the minister was talking about in terms of regulation and red-tape reduction, the LNP in government had a target to reduce red-tape regulation right across Queensland. In the property sector in terms of buying and selling a property, we reduced the paperwork by 40 per cent. In terms of company directors' liabilities—personal liabilities for company directors—we reduced over 3,000 statutory company liabilities. In every space every minister reduced regulation and red tape. However, the Labor government and the minister cannot hide behind the fact that reducing red tape and regulation in the trading hours industry is going to create more jobs because it will not, because small to medium enterprises will go bust. They cannot compete with Coles and Woolies. People will be sacked and prices will go up because competition will be reduced under the Labor government's policies.

The minister has this guise that this legislation is all about red-tape reduction. When the Labor Party mentions 'red-tape reduction', it has to be taken with a grain of salt. There is nothing about red-tape reduction in this legislation. This legislation is a deal for the shoppies union. The more Coles and Woolies stores you have in Queensland, the more shoppies union members you have in Queensland. Across Australia, union membership is declining. Which is the one union that is increasing its membership? It just happens to be the shoppies union. The membership of every other union is on the decline. Every one of those members opposite sign up to these factional war lords in the union movement. Over the past 20 years in Queensland, union membership has been on the decline, but membership of the shoppies union is on the increase.

**Mr Cripps:** They're having a revival.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** They are having a revival, and that revival is taking place because Coles and Woolies are a duopoly in our retail trading sector. With respect to red-tape reduction, this legislation is a guise. There are better ways to achieve real red-tape reduction through better legislation.

This legislation also extends standard trading hours in South-East Queensland from 7 am to 9 pm Monday to Saturday. It extends trading hours from 7 am to 9 pm Monday to Friday and from 7 am to 6 pm on Saturday in regional Queensland. It standardises trading hours for Sundays and public holidays across Queensland from 9 am to 6 pm and extends trading hours in the lead-up to Christmas in all areas of the state, with shops to close at 6 pm on Christmas Eve. It removes trading hour restrictions on butchers and allows hardware stores to open on Sunday from 6 am. We have many small hardware stores that operate particularly in regional Queensland. The big guys like Bunnings come into these areas and these small operators close down. Therefore, competition is nonexistent. Who suffers? The consumers, because they end up paying higher prices because the competition is not there.

This legislation allows special tourist areas, such as Port Douglas, access to extended trading hours. In that regard, the minister is going to move an amendment because she said that there has been an oversight in relation to Cairns—that is, the minister forgot to include Cairns. This oversight is similar to when the minister forgot to include Easter Sunday, a public holiday, as a trading day. This is just another botched attempt by the minister. We expect that from this Minister for Industrial Relations.

This legislation also lifts employment thresholds for independent retail shops from 20 to 30. One would think that the independent retail sector, such as Master Grocers, would be very happy with those amendments. However, it has written to all the members of this House saying that not only the whole legislation should be opposed but also it should be ripped up and that the government should go back to the drawing board and start again with a proper independent review, not a review conducted by a former Labor industrial relations minister. This review was instigated last year. We are probably up to about 180 reviews by this Labor government.

**Mr Cripps:** The fastest growing industry in Queensland.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection from the honourable member for Hinchinbrook. In fact, I take that interjection even further: there are so many reviews happening in Queensland that they ought to have a department. There ought to be a director-general.



**Mr Cripps:** And a hotline.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. There should be a hotline and a director-general to oversee all of these reviews. We rarely see the results of all of these reviews, but when we see the results, such as with this review, we see that there has been no consultation with the Queensland public. This was a secret little review conducted behind closed doors. The majority of the members of the review panel were from unions. The result of the review was announced to the public. The cabinet had already considered it. I guess this is one review that the cabinet has seen.

Tonight, there are reports that the cabinet does not see much; it is the Premier and the Treasurer who see everything. Considering the story that has just appeared in the *Brisbane Times* about how the cabinet operates, I am not sure if this report did go to cabinet. This report could have been a captain's call. I say to my colleagues that it was interesting to see the Premier, the Treasurer, the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Environment racing in and out of the minister's room not looking very happy. I have been sidetracked by the circus of the Labor Party and its cabinet. We would appreciate it if the minister could advise whether this report did go to cabinet.

As I said, the review was not independent. It was conducted by a former Labor industrial relations minister. The time line is that on 31 August 2016, the government announced a review of trading hours to be headed by former Speaker and Labor transport and industrial relations minister, John Mickel. On 1 September 2016, the review was welcomed by industry groups. On 19 October, 2016, the issues paper was released with a deadline of 14 November. Then on 12 February 2017—a Sunday—the Mickel reference group released its recommendations. We were still in that post Christmas-New Year period. Two days later, on 14 February, the Palaszczuk government announced its response to the Mickel report recommendations. I have been a cabinet minister and we got our packs on a Friday afternoon. The cabinet sits on a Monday. The Mickel report was handed down on the Sunday. Two days later, which would be Tuesday, the government made a decision on it.

**Mr Cripps:** It may not have gone to cabinet.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. It may have gone to cabinet without the document because, under cabinet protocol, the document would have been released on Sunday. Who is running the show? The government is a mess; the cabinet is a mess. It is in chaos and crisis.

Last year, my son and I watched the sequel to *The First Avenger*. It is quite apt to talk about it, because it is called *Civil War*. All the characters could be the cabinet members sitting opposite.

**Mr CRIPPS:** None of them have superpowers, that's for sure.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection. I do not think any of the cabinet members opposite have any standard powers, let alone superpowers. As I said, the reference group was chaired by John Mickel and included representatives from the National Retail Association; the CCIQ; Master Grocers; the Queensland Tourism Industry Council; and the Shop, Distributive and Allied Employees' Association—the SDA, which is the shoppies union. How much money did that union give to the Labor Party while this review was taking place? Members might have a look on the ECQ website to find that out. The reference group also had representatives from the Australian Workers' Union, United Voice and the Queensland Council of Unions. Certainly, union representation dominated the committee.

This morning, this minister talked about an interim response to a workplace health and safety review in relation to industrial manslaughter. The guy who is doing the review is called Tim—I forget his surname. He is a former union official and he is reviewing workplace health and safety laws in Queensland. The government cannot keep saying that these reviews are independent; they are not. They are just jobs for their mates, jobs for former Labor MPs and jobs for union officials. That is all we are seeing.

As I said, we know that this review of trading hours was about appeasing the big retail unions, particularly the shoppies union. Last year, that union gave over \$70,000. They wrote the cheque and we get legislation introduced in the parliament. That is how they operate. As I have said in this place numerous times, serious questions have to be asked about the financial contributions of the union movement and the decisions of this government, just like when Labor questioned us when it was in opposition if business gave to the Liberal National Party.

**Mr Cripps:** It was off to the CMC.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** It was off to the CMC, as it was called at the time, and then the CCC. Of course, the Premier was elected on accountability, transparency and integrity and she was going to have this big CCC investigation into donations to political parties. When we asked, 'Will it include the unions?' all of a sudden this CCC inquiry into donations to political parties was kicked off into the long grass. We

know why, because every piece of legislation comes into this place either after a cheque has been given to the Queensland division of the Australian Labor Party or there has been a meeting with Michael Ravbar of the CFMEU or with the shoppies union. A cheque is handed over to the Labor Party and then positive legislation for the union movement is introduced into this House. It has been happening for 2½ years. Tonight, I am going to say that there ought to be an inquiry into the relationship between the unions giving cheques and donations and the meetings they are having with Labor ministers and the outcomes that this parliament is getting through legislation that is introduced by Labor ministers.

It may be easy for the Liberal National Party to take the populist view and say, 'We support this bill because consumers have the right to shop whenever they want 24/7.' That would be the populist view. If we asked people, 'Would you like to have the right to shop at midnight?' Most of them would say, 'We don't need to but, yes, okay, give me the right.' That would be the populist view. However, there are unintended consequences of that populist view for small to medium enterprises, which is the backbone of the Queensland economy. This bill will have that negative impact.

As I said, the Liberal National Party is the only party in Queensland for small business, of small business and by small business. The LNP values small business. When we in the LNP say, 'Small business is the backbone of our economy,' we mean it. The Minister for Small Business and the Minister for Industrial Relations and Employment talk about small business. They go to small businesses in marginal Labor electorates. They shake hands with small business operators and say, 'We are with you,' and then they come into this place and introduce legislation that is detrimental to small business.

They come in here and talk about employment. They go to Toowoomba and talk about employment in the electorates of the honourable members for Toowoomba South and Toowoomba North and then they do not have an employment package applicable to those constituents. They go to the electorate of their colleague, the member for Bundamba, and talk about employment but do not give the member for Bundamba an employment package for her constituents; do they, member for Bundamba? Shame on the Labor government. I take the nodding from the member for Bundamba as an interjection. Take offence if you like, member for Bundamba, I will not push it. They talk about employment, but they do not have an employment package in Ipswich, they do not have an employment package in Toowoomba and they do not have an employment package on the Sunshine Coast.

**Mr Watts** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take that interjection from the member for Toowoomba North. As the committee report indicated, the LNP and crossbench members of the committee will not be supporting these changes because we do not think the government has adequately made the case and there are significant concerns, particularly from independent grocers, small hardware stores and motor dealers about the impact on their industry and consumers from the changes that have been put forward. Even government members on the committee recommended that motor dealers be taken out of the bill. Because the Minister for Industrial Relations and Employment botched the process, bungled the process, there are amendments to this bill. I expected amendments to come from the Minister for Industrial Relations—not as many as the racing bill that she introduced where she moved 200 amendments.

**Mr Cripps:** It was an amendment festival!

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. It was an amendment festival in the racing bill that the minister introduced. There were 200 amendments and then she had to vote against half of them. I have to give her credit; there are some amendments that are not as drastic as that. Fundamentally, the Minister for Industrial Relations has introduced a bill into this parliament and said motor traders will trade on Sunday. If she had talked to the motor traders she would have worked out that they did not want it and they do not want it. The government had this fanciful idea that by forcing car dealers to open on Sunday they are going to make more money and sell more cars. Wrong! What will happen is the consumer like me who goes and looks for a car on Saturday will think about it overnight and come back on Sunday. The small business operator then has to pay employees over two full days rather than just the Saturday. If you cannot buy a car from Monday to Saturday—any day of the week other than Sunday—maybe you should not buy a car.

The Motor Trades Association were completely opposed to it and the Labor government committee members were opposed to it. I thank Tristan and the team at Coastline BMW in my electorate. When this bill first came out I thought a lot of the big motor traders who have successful operations would enjoy the opportunity to trade on Sunday. I was completely wrong. I thank Tristan and Coastline BMW in my electorate for the views they put forward opposing Sunday trading and the reasons why, which is, of course, backed up with the opposition meetings we had with the Motor Trades

Association of Queensland. I thank other motor traders from across all electorates who raised these issues with the LNP. The LNP were listening from day dot, not just tonight when the bill is brought in to fix a political issue that the minister has.

As I said from the start, we do not dispute the fact that the system can be modernised and simplified, but the way the government is proceeding is not the right way. It has been added to and added to as large businesses chip away at the existing regime and smaller industries add to what they have previously been granted by the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission in terms of retail hours regulation.

We are particularly concerned about the potential impact on regional Queenslanders and jobs in regional Queensland. The LNP is the party for Queensland small business and we will stand up for their interests and concerns about this legislation. What that translates to is being about pro competition which benefits consumers by keeping a lid on prices and creating jobs for all Queenslanders across all of Queensland.

As the Queensland Chamber of Commerce & Industry stated in its submission to the committee—

Queensland's shop trading laws were designed to protect small business and assist them when competing against major retailers.

...

CCIQ remains concerned about the impact of the majors' market dominance over small businesses because of the proposed reforms as contained in the Bill currently being considered by the Committee.

Queensland's 414,000 small businesses are concerned about the monopoly of major market players and their dominance of the home hardware market.

...

Overall, CCIQ believes the reforms as contained in the Bill could have been more carefully targeted to help ease the compliance burden and reduce regulatory inconsistencies, but ensure the objectives of the legislation are current and reflect the need to support small business competitiveness.

It is time to take a stand on behalf of small businesses in Queensland that have had it tough for many, many years. In a world where there is increased technology disruptions and the world marketplace is a daily reality with online shopping and increased global competitiveness, Queensland's small businesses need a friend right now more than ever they have before. That may seem like political rhetoric, but the reality is that without Queensland small business local jobs and consumer choice is put at significant risk. While our political opponents try to paint us as the friend of big business, the reverse is, in fact, true. The Liberal National Party is the party for small business owners. We believe in the spirit of enterprise and backing local mum-and-dad business operators who are the backbone of our economy.

Today the Queensland parliament is considering widespread changes to our retail trading hours regime that is another kick in the guts for our struggling small business sector in this state. If you listen to the rhetoric of the government, this is all about reducing red tape and creating jobs, but the reality is that experience in other jurisdictions means that just will not ring true. Following the decision of the independent umpire that commenced on 1 December 2016 for South-East Queensland, smaller retailers are already reporting a reduction in trade and market share, meaning that jobs are being lost and hours are already being reduced. It suits the shoppies union to have the market share centralised to the big end of town—Coles and Woolies—because it is easier for them to infiltrate these organisations and sign up more members, but mum-and-dad small businesses will not let the unions through the door because they know when they do it is going to cost them money and it will cost the employee money.

The effect of the changes made by the QIRC that commence in South-East Queensland from 1 December 2016 should have been let flow through and the effects should have been monitored before this legislation was brought to the parliament and extended across regional Queensland. But we know the fix with the shoppies union was already in, the cheque was already presented last year to the Labor Party, and the industrial relations minister, who was a union boss in another life, has done another secret deal with her union mates.

The legislation we are debating in this parliament is the result of the government's review into this issue led by John Mickel. Just two days after the report was made public the government announced its response to the recommendations. There was no time for proper consultation with key

stakeholders, no time for any form of real public debate about the issues and the recommendations and no time for this divided cabinet to go shaky on the issue and backtrack from the recommendations. That time line has led to what is a botched process.

The industrial relations minister has been caught out once again putting the interests of her union mates ahead of the interests of Queensland jobseekers. Even government members of the parliamentary committee did not agree with parts of the minister's bill and effectively rolled her on the proposed changes relating to motor dealers operating on Sundays. The minister should not take credit for that; the motor traders will take credit for the campaign it ran on that. That could have been avoided if the minister had done her job properly in the first place instead of trying to rush through these reforms because of a secret deal with the shoppies union.

We are pleased to see the backdown to proposed changes in relation to motor dealers, but the whole bill needs to go back to the drawing board. Even the National Retail Association, which the minister quoted earlier, who stood next to the minister when the review was announced, made a number of recommendations to improve the flawed bill put forward by the industrial relations minister. We will not be supporting it. It needs to go back to the drawing board to start again.

I will now take a little time to look at some of the stakeholders that have put in submissions but also issued press releases in the last 24 hours. I will make a political point with respect to Master Grocers Australia, and I thank them and all the members they have: the IGAs, the Spars, the NightOwls—the independent retailers right across Queensland. We all serve our communities as members of parliament. We attend school fetes and functions and we see the Rotary and Lions clubs doing their great sausage sizzles. Who is it that donates the produce: the sausages, the hamburgers? It is always our small business operators. In eight years I have never seen Coles and Woolies donate to one of the functions that I have been involved in with respect to our local community. I can guarantee that our local IGAs and our Spars do a lot more community service than the big guys right across Queensland. I will quote into *Hansard* what Master Grocers Australia, which represents the small guys in Queensland, states in its press release and then I will table a copy of it. The MGA states—

“Over the coming days the Queensland Government will be presenting a Bill to the parliament for debate to further liberalise trading hours in Queensland. “This is despite any consideration for the impact of this sudden change on the viability of family owned and privately run independent retailers,” according to MGA Independent Retailers.

Jos de Bruin, CEO of MGA said, “Small businesses have planned their investment in their business around being able to trade, without the overarching power of big businesses encroaching on a small window of opportunity they have to realise profits at either end of each trading day, on Saturday evenings and on Sundays”.

This group represents all of our IGAs and other small retailers. The press release continues—

He continued, ‘But the Palaszczuk Government has once again ignored the needs of small businesses. This is just another step in the radical trading hours’ changes promised by a Government determined to promote the interests of big businesses in Queensland ...

The Labor Party accuses us of being in bed with big business, but small business is saying that the Labor Party is in bed with big business. They continue—

The Government has already chosen, by promising to overhaul trading hours, to ignore the cries of small businesses who serve the community, provide jobs and who have for years contributed to the economic well-being of Queensland.”

Small retailers last year lost their fight in the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission against the growing power of the chains in South East Queensland. This decision has forced many independent retail businesses to assess their commercial viability and employment levels as this move did not create additional jobs and sales growth but instead supplanted sales from the Queensland independent retail sector to the large dominant chains.

I table a copy of that press release for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Media release titled ‘Queensland Government Supports extending trading hours despite risking the livelihoods of thousands of independent Queensland Retail Businesses’ [\[786\]](#).

I will also table the MGA Independent Retailers facts sheet for Queensland's trading hours liberalisation. The minister talked about the jobs that this will create, but, in a nutshell, the MGA states—

The facts are:

- Giving the green light to Coles and Woolworths to open longer hours makes it even harder for independent, community-based businesses to compete.
- Community-based family-owned businesses provide vital support to the heart of townships and if they're forced to scale down or close their doors a direct adverse impact ripples across the community.
- As local businesses close, consumers have less shopping choice.
- As local businesses close, there are fewer options for new market offers.

- More market dominance makes it easier for the majors to increase prices—history has shown this especially occurs with fresh produce.
- Queenslanders lose jobs because jobs lost in independent stores are replaced in major chains at half the rate.
- When you shop with your local community supermarket your money stays in the local economy, rather than off to the headquarters of the national chains. Keeping money local supports other local businesses and community ventures.

We have seen that right across Queensland. I note that a couple of members from rural and regional Queensland are in the House, so I will highlight this part of the facts sheet, which states—

Independent research\* in rural and regional Queensland shows that voters do not want more power to Coles and Woolworths:

- Voters are far more concerned about jobs and improving basics like transport: the question of extended hours for supermarket shopping is a non-issue.
- The vast majority of voters (85%) are satisfied with opening hours as they are.
- For 66% of voters it is “extremely” or “very” important that local independent supermarkets survive. 60% do not want to see more dominance for Coles/Woolworths.
- 71% agree that “allowing large nationally operated retail businesses the ability to determine their own trading hours will harm independently owned community stores and reduce consumer choice”.

That is from research conducted in rural and regional Queensland. I table a copy of that facts sheet for the benefit of the House.

*Tabled paper:* Document titled ‘Facts sheet for Qld trading hours liberalisation’ [\[787\]](#).

The minister talked about hardware stores. Hardware Australia opposes what the minister is doing. The minister stands in here and talks about how great this is for hardware stores, but I think she must only be talking about Bunnings, because the association that represents hardware stores put a submission to the commission opposing the legislation. The Motor Trades Association of Queensland opposes the legislation, the CCIQ expresses concerns about it, the Master Grocers Association opposes the legislation and Hardware Australia opposes it. A letter that I have received from Hardware Australia states—

Dear Hon Member,

We have been made aware of the impending vote in parliament over the proposed changes to trading hours.

We would seek your help in blocking the proposed amendments particularly as they relate to changes to larger Hardware stores. Attached is our original submission to the inquiry and our initial letter to you.

Opposing this amendment would demonstrate your support of the 1000 small independent, family run hardware businesses who are struggling against a market monopoly. The numbers in our submission whilst seemingly small in comparison to what big business will tell you, actually means the difference between viability or closure for small operators.

That letter is from Hardware Australia, which represents over 1,000 small independent family run hardware businesses in Australia.

I also table a copy of the letter that Hardware Australia sent to me on 14 February. I thank Clint Spence, the Queensland chair, and Ian Cornwell, the national chair of Hardware Australia for their letter, which includes their submission to the committee.

*Tabled paper:* Email, dated 10 May 2017, and attachment, from the Executive Officer of Hardware Australia to the member for Kawana, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP, regarding trading hours [\[788\]](#).

I do not have to table the submission from the Master Grocers Association, because it has been lodged with the Finance and Administration Committee. I point out the executive summary in the Master Grocers Association submission, which importantly states—

MGA would be supportive of amendments to the Act if the laws were likely to fully achieve the objectives that have been presented as the outcomes of these amendments.

However, MGA strongly disputes the claims by the Queensland Government that there will be advantages for Queensland in these amendments.

We strongly dispute that there will be an additional 945 equivalent full time positions gained by these amendments as the Government claims. The figure proposed is purely speculative. The likelihood of increased jobs cannot be justified on the basis of increasing the right of Coles and Woolworths (the Chains) to trade longer hours at the expense of smaller stores.

Item 12 of the summary states—

We query what will happen to the jobs of those employed in smaller shops. If those jobs disappear there may be some that will find work with the chains but certainly not all. The ability of Coles and Woolworths to utilise their self serve checkouts and maintain staff minimum levels at certain times during the day will prevent whole sale employment of new staff. The Queensland Government simply has not fully investigated the impact of store closure in regional Queensland. They have underestimated the need and support there exists for the local shop and therefore the needs and wishes of the Queensland people.

Item 13 states—

Whilst Queenslanders would support the reduction or elimination of bureaucratic red tape there can still be reorganisation of regulations without the drastic step of extending trading hours throughout Queensland.

They go on to talk about what I mentioned when the legislation was first introduced about helping small to medium enterprises. The MGA states—

As previously explained independent retailers in Queensland have a small window of opportunity to compete with the bigger retailers ... by holding the status of being exempt under the Act. This status has allowed them to trade at times when “non-exempt shops” or larger stores are not permitted to trade. To retain their status as “independent shops” these stores are not allowed to have any more than 20 employees on the shop floor at any one time.

The MGA goes on to talk about when the QIRC handed down the decision to extend trading hours for some larger retailers and the effect that that had across the 200 stores that they represent. They state that the average lost wholesale sales per week was \$800,000; converted to lost retail scan sales it was \$968,000; and annualised retail sales was \$50.3 million. Direct employment lost at 12 per cent employment as a ratio to sales was \$6 million; lost employment hours at \$22 per hour was 274,560 hours lost; and FTE based on 37.5 hours per week was down 7,322 employee weeks.

It is really interesting to look at the case study that the MGA put in their submission, which included Walters IGA at Mundingburra in the electorate of the minister. For the benefit of the member for Mundingburra, I quote that case study—

Mundingburra IGA is a 1000m<sup>2</sup> supermarket located 5 minutes for the CBD of Townsville. Its operating hours are 6am to 10pm, 7 days a week. It is owned and operated by Adam and Maree Westbury, who have owned the store since March 2013. Mundingburra IGA currently employs 26 staff. Adam and Maree advise that:

- In 2014, the tourist area of Townsville was granted extended trading hours on a Sunday morning from an 11am opening to an 8am opening for stores at:
  - Coles North Ward (was a Bi-Lo); and
  - Woolworths Townsville CBD
- The direct impact on their store was a loss of \$3,000 per Sunday in sales and \$5,000 loss for the week.
- As an already struggling business competing with 25 other full service supermarkets in the Townsville region including 6 Coles, 13 Woolworths and 6 IGAs and another 12 or more smaller stores ... in a population of around 200k people, they had to reduce costs by:
  - Making their 2IC redundant
  - Increasing their own hours by 40 hours to cover the 2IC who they could no longer afford;
  - Reducing their casual labour force by 3 hour per day to a total of 21 hours (School boys / girls);
  - Reducing store's cleaning contract by 2 days a week or 6 hours a week detrimentally affecting another local business; and
  - Reducing their donations to schools and sporting groups by \$3,000 per year.
- Adam and Maree are now both forced to work 6 days a week undertaking roughly 65 hours per week each.
- Prior to the 2014 decision, in 2007 the whole district of Townsville was granted Sunday trading hours of 11am to 5pm. Mundingburra IGA was trading at \$100k per and employed over 32 staff. Following the 2007 decision its sales dropped to \$60k per week due to the direct change in hours by Coles and Woolworths and staff numbers were slashed to 20.
- Prior to the 2007 decision, the only stores that operated were independent community supermarkets consisting of 4 Walters IGA stores (1 now operated by Woolworths) and one IGA on Magnetic Island. The 4 Walters IGA stores had a combined trading income of \$460k per Sunday. The impact of allowing Coles and Woolworths to trade on a Sunday saw a direct reduction of the following in sales:
  - \$370k loss of sales on a Sunday to \$90k
  - \$21k loss of sales on a Saturday
  - \$10k loss of sales on a Monday
  - \$401k per week loss of sales for the 4 stores

Adam and Maree Westbury report that it has taken nearly 9 years to recoup the lost sales for their store and the store is now barely breaking even after posting a financial loss in the last 9 years. Any changes in trading hours for any day of the week will have a detrimental impact on the store's immediate future and all of their remaining 26 staff.

That is a case study from Mundingburra where the minister—

**Mr Power:** It is not a case study.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** Sorry, it is not a case study. I take the ridiculous interjection from the member for Logan.

**Mr Power** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the ridiculous interjection. How out of touch is the member for Logan with respect to this issue? I talk about the Westberrys. I talk about their business going broke. I talk about the reduction in trading hours and the financial support—

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Miss Barton): Order! I call the member for Kawana.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I talk about the Westberrys' condition in Mundingburra. That area is represented by a Labor member of parliament—

**Mr Power:** You used the wrong terminology.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I used the wrong terminology. It is the terminology from the case study for the Mundingburra IGA. It is their story. You do not do their books, do you? It is their story. They are represented—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Direct your comments through the chair, please.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** They are represented by a Labor government member and the member sitting up the back has the hide to disbelieve the case study that has been put forward by the Westberrys in a submission that was in fact presented at the parliamentary inquiry into the legislation we are debating tonight.

Is he saying it is a lie? Is he saying the Westberrys are lying? Is he saying MGA have misrepresented this and are in breach and should be sent off to the Ethics Committee for being in contempt of parliament because they lied to a parliamentary committee? Is that what you are saying, member for Logan? Is that what the member for Logan is saying? Member for Logan, I suggest when you are off to these community cabinet meetings right around Queensland—you will not be there; you will never be in cabinet—but when you are represented by the employment minister—

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, direct your comments through the chair, please.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** When the member for Logan is represented by these fly-in fly-out cabinets on regional employment opportunities and the Westberrys sit down with the employment minister, I am going to make sure they know what you said about them tonight. When their business goes broke—and hopefully it does not; they foresee it is going to go broke because of the legislation the Labor Party has introduced tonight—you can look them in the eye and say that you did not care.

**Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kawana, direct your comments through the chair, please.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** He did not care. That is a case study. If the member for Logan wants any more case studies he only needs to look at the MGA report tabled in the parliamentary committee. There are other case studies in there. There are other case studies from other electorates with real stories of real people. Given the member for Logan wants to know about case studies, I am going to read him another one because I have another 18 minutes left on the clock. This case study is from Tin Can Bay.

**Mr Perrett** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** In the member for Gympie's electorate. It reads—

While numerous projections were made as to the benefits of extending trading hours for non-exempt stores in the Tin Can Bay area in 2009, MGA's member reports the following:

- Wages were reduced by 400 Hours per week following Woolworths opening in mid 2009 resulting in significant redundancies.
- Wages were reduced by a further \$960 a week following Woolworths commencement of Sunday trading. Once again redundancies were necessary.
- Our member experienced a loss of trade of 40% on Sunday with the introduction of Sunday trading for non-exempt stores.
- Due to the decrease in revenue our member was forced to cease their community support to a number of local organisations and charities.
- The IGA store is still open but only just and 20 other small business stores have closed in the immediate trading precinct.
- The adjacent shopping centre (Dolphin Shopping centre) had a 100% occupancy when our member purchased their store in 2005 but decreased to approximately 65% occupancy after the Woolworths opened 8 kms out of town—many small businesses closed their doors.
  - o MGA has attached this submission the academic document of Dr Robert Baker who highlights the association between the deregulation of trading hours and the decrease in shop occupancy.
- There was a massive disruption to the community centre and total fragmentation of the hub.
- The store was sold due to the consequences of the deregulation of trading hours in the area.

They conclude—

MGA submits that the proposals by the Queensland Government to make amendments to the Act are not—

I repeat: are not—

in the best interests of a significant sector of the retail industry. The impact on small businesses will be damaging and through their demise result in seriously affecting the Queensland economy. There will not be massive jobs growth, there will not be any significant benefits to the tourism industry and the beneficiaries of the changes will be those who are not Queensland based.

I repeat: the beneficiaries of these reforms tonight will be those who are not Queensland based. They continue—

MGA seeks that the Government reconsiders the proposed amendments to the Act so as to ensure the future of thousands of small business owners.

That is from Master Grocers Australia Ltd trading as MGA Independent Retailers that represent all the IGAs and small independent grocery stores right across Queensland. They speak on behalf of their members. The case studies are real stories of real people. These case studies are from real Queenslanders who have serious objections to this legislation.

Now members on this side of the House will have to help me. I assume the government has a minister for small business. I have never heard from them, but I assume they do.

**An opposition member:** There are rumours.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. There are rumours that the Labor government has a small business minister. If someone can find out for me who that is in the next 15 minutes that would be appreciated. Hypothetically, if they do have a small business minister, I would be keen to see what he or she says tonight.

If that minister is sitting in their ministerial office on \$330,000 a year and they are being briefed by their department from a small business perspective and they receive a submission from the MGA, Hardware Australia, CCIQ and the Motor Trades Association of Queensland, how could that minister representing small business come in here tonight and support this legislation? They could not justify—

**Mr Hart:** Over there.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I take the interjection. Do we have a minister for small business? Apparently, the member for Algeester is the Minister for Small Business. I am not sure whether the member for Algeester, the small business minister—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I am as surprised as the members at the back to know that there is a small business minister, but I am hopeful that the Minister for Small Business—

**Mr Cripps:** It might not have gone to cabinet.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I have to take the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook considering the *Brisbane Times* story that has gone online a couple of hours ago. Perhaps the minister did not know about this because it did not go to cabinet.

**Mr Cripps:** She didn't get a chance.

**Mr BLEIJIE:** She did not get a chance to talk about it in cabinet. The Premier and the Treasurer made a captain's call and away they go like the secret deal with Adani. Maybe the Minister for Small Business did not even know this was on the agenda and did not have the opportunity to talk about it. If that were the case that would be sad.

We have now worked out that there is a minister for small business. When I asked the House quite legitimately if there was a minister for small business she could have volunteered the fact that she was the Minister for Small Business on \$330,000 a year. It would have saved the member for Burleigh googling who the Queensland small business minister is or looking on the parliamentary website. She could have saved us all the hassle and me filibustering for another 15 minutes.

We have a small business minister in the Labor government. Is the minister going to speak tonight? Is the minister going to speak on the bill? If the minister is going to speak on the bill, I will ensure I am here and listen to how she tries to justify how she will vote for this legislation which will be detrimental to small business operators across the state. How will she justify supporting this bill having possibly received Hardware Australia correspondence, Master Grocers correspondence, CCIQ correspondence and Motor Trades Association correspondence?



As I said, the LNP will not be supporting this bill. It needs to go back to the drawing board. It was another botched attempt by the Minister for Industrial Relations to try to do something. I urge the crossbench—this is going to be important. When we either vote on this bill in the early hours of the morning or vote on this bill tomorrow, it is going to be important for the crossbench to look at their electorates and work out whether they can go into their local IGA or their local hardware store and tell them face to face that they did support or did not support their local IGA, their local independent grocery store, and their local hardware store—that they backed the small guys in this place or they backed the monopoly in Queensland in the hardware sector and the duopoly in the grocery sector. Where will the crossbench sit?

I urge the crossbench members to vote with the LNP and oppose this legislation—to stick up for small business and to work with the LNP so that we can develop proper legislation that reduces regulation and red tape but still enshrines and ensures our small businesses have a fighting chance in the state of Queensland and can keep employing some great young Queenslanders as their first job right across Queensland. I encourage the crossbench members to stand up for Queensland small businesses, to stand up for the small businesses in their electorate, because small business is the backbone of our communities. It is the backbone of our economy. We want to make sure that the money spent in Queensland stays in Queensland. The LNP will stand up for all small businesses and Queensland consumers and stand against secret deals with union bosses that are in Labor's self-interest and not in the interests of Queenslanders. I urge all members of parliament to vote against this job-destroying, destructive legislation.


Debate, on motion of Mr Bleijie, adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.21 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### **Ergon Energy, Mackays Bananas**

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (10.21 pm): As the shocking repercussions of the former Beattie and Bligh government's irresponsible power policies continue to savage Queensland's domestic and commercial electricity consumers, it is a disgrace to see these flawed policies, such as massive public subsidies for renewable energy projects and GOC dividend stripping, continued by the Palaszczuk government. As the consequences of Labor's failed electricity policies manifest themselves in higher power prices, the Palaszczuk government has desperately pursued a number of bandaid measures, using taxpayers' money, to try to minimise the political fallout from its addiction to energy GOC dividends and the catastrophic costs associated with the Solar Bonus Scheme.

The regional business customer support package was supposedly established to assist regional businesses, including farm businesses, on 'transitional and obsolete' tariffs to understand their electricity use, minimise their electricity costs and make informed choices about future tariff options. The Palaszczuk Labor government has stated that the regional business customer support package is part of its response to the Queensland Productivity Commission electricity pricing inquiry, which recommended that targeted assistance be provided to regional businesses to help them transition to standard cost-reflective tariffs.


Mackays Bananas, based in Tully, are Australia's largest producer of bananas and are a third-generation, family owned and diversified agribusiness in Queensland. Mackays Bananas directly employ several hundred Queenslanders. Over the last three months, Ergon has repeatedly contacted Mackays Bananas about participating in the agricultural tariff trial as part of the regional business customer support package. In good faith, Mackays Bananas engaged in numerous conversations with Ergon representatives leading up to the 2 May 2017 deadline to register for participation in the trial.

Mackays Bananas went through the very involved and costly internal process to nominate the appropriate electricity accounts to be involved in the tariff 33 and tariff 24 trials. Bizarrely, after successfully registering, Mackays Bananas were advised by Ergon that they were ineligible to participate in the trial because they were classified as a large business. To put it diplomatically, Mackays Bananas are absolutely filthy about this situation, given that Ergon actively pursued them to participate in this trial only to be told later that they were not eligible. In my view, Ergon owes Mackays Bananas an apology for its unprofessionalism.

This family owned farming business has been treated very poorly indeed. In view of the fact that the regional business customer support package is a Palaszczuk government initiative, I call on the energy minister to intervene immediately and rectify this embarrassing situation. If the energy minister will not do anything, the Minister for Agriculture should stand up for this Queensland farm business.

*(Time expired)*

### Creeks Restoration Works

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (10.24 pm): In recent weeks I have by invitation visited a number of cane farms. The reason I accepted those invitations was to see for myself the damage done to creeks and cane lands caused by the major flood event that came with Cyclone Debbie. As a result of a monsoon-like rain dump in a very narrow catchment area, we saw massive amounts of water coming down into the system and dispersing huge volumes into the nearby rivers and out to sea. What I learned from taking the time to go on farm to talk face to face with farmers was that there was an urgent need for creek restoration works to prevent further flood damage and to halt the cancer-like take of land that was happening as a result of the floodwaters expanding across the district.

I saw where heavy storm rains were changing the creek direction, where the creek bed was being built up to high levels due to dumping of silt, sand, gravel, rock and vegetation. There was just a massive build-up in the middle of the creek. The physical confine of the normal water flow is changing. You have to be out on the land to see and understand what I am saying. Creeks are changing because of the amount of water that is dumping rubbish in the middle of the creek and causing the creek to spread out across nearby country. The normal channel of the creek is disappearing, being dumped on by what the floodwaters carry downstream.


Tonight I want to make the House aware that I will be lobbying for the reintroduction or reinstatement of the River Improvement Trust. I want to find a proven means for responsible repairs and prevention of damage to creeks and rivers—a means for preventing and mitigating riverine flooding of land. I have raised this issue tonight because in the interest of canefarmers I want to see funding reinstated to creek and river stability programs. Farmers must have the ability and financial backup to take in machinery to dig up the creek bed to carry out restoration and clean-up works.

**Mr Cripps:** I'm proud of you, Jim.

**Mr PEARCE:** I am too. Farmers must have the ability and financial backup to put machinery in the creek bed to carry out restoration works and do what they know is best for their area. They understand it, so they should get the opportunity to be involved.

*(Time expired)*

### South West Hospital and Health Service Board

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (10.27 pm): I rise to advise the House how the state Labor government has taken the locals out of the local hospital boards in Queensland, particularly in south-west Queensland. I wish to thank the former members of the South West Hospital and Health Service Board. I particularly wish to thank the former board chair, Lindsay Godfrey, who lives locally in the Cunnamulla district with his family. Councillor Godfrey has brought great stability, care and dedication to the board and is well regarded by the over 800 staff who provide the front-line services across the south-west.

Local hospital boards were an initiative of the former LNP minister for health, Lawrence Springborg, during the LNP government. One of the reasons these local boards were implemented was that of the Dr Patel case. I have no doubt that the Dr Patel case and others would not have occurred if there were locals on local hospital boards at that time.

This Labor government has failed the south-west residents and the hardworking HHS staff by ignoring qualified local applicants and the Aboriginal community. Instead, the Labor government has appointed only three members who actually live in the board area, which is larger than the state of Victoria. The other five members including the chair are fly-in fly-out—a 62 per cent FIFO board.

This email I received from a member of the Aboriginal Community sums up the feeling of the south-west residents. It states—

I would like to express my disappointment of the new nominations to the SWHHS Board and the new Chair of the SWHHS.

I am bitterly disappointed at the lack of faith the Minister has in the people of the South West region and their ability to manage their own health service.

We do not need fly in, fly out Chairs or Directors sitting on our Boards determining our health needs of the south west.


We live in the region, we understand the health needs, we determine our priorities and how best to find the solutions as we are the grassroots people.

This Board has become so corporate focused that I believe it is not in the best interest of the South West region to be governed this way.

I strongly believe the policy for nominations to the relevant HHS Boards across Qld needs to be reviewed.

The Palaszczuk Labor government needs to explain to the people of the south-west why the locals who understand the challenges of delivering health services in regional and remote areas were overlooked for their FIFO Labor mates from Brisbane.

### Glancy, Ms S

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.30 pm): I wish to start by sending my love and support to Sam Glancy and her partner, Peter Kelly, who is also my brother. Sam was diagnosed with leukaemia a week ago. Sam faces a long journey to recovery, but she has many people who will be helping her to achieve full recovery.

I would like to pay tribute to the many people and organisations involved in Sam's care in the first week of diagnosis and treatment. First, their local GP did a great job and I pay tribute to all GPs and other staff involved in our primary care network. The care provided by the Sunshine Coast University Hospital and the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital has been outstanding. Coincidentally, I wear my RBWH 150th anniversary pin today. I have always been proud to have trained and worked at this fine institution, but you truly appreciate the care of staff when it is applied to someone you care for deeply.


I would also like to pay my respects and tribute to the staff at the Australian Red Cross Blood Service. My brother Peter is a regular donor, recently completing over 100 donations of plasma and platelets. As I said to him, it looks like the crows are coming home to roost for him in a good way. I admit to being previously a semiregular donor but have dropped away due to the demands of this place. I commit tonight to fixing that, and I call on all members and people in our community to consider giving blood. It does save lives.

I wish to record my deep thanks to the Leukaemia Foundation. Within 24 hours of diagnosis, my relatives were contacted and offered practical advice and support including accommodation for as long as was required. I worked as a nurse in the bone marrow transplant unit at the RBH 25 years ago and I was so impressed with the support of the Leukaemia Foundation for patients and families that I decided to help out with their annual doorknock, and I have done that regularly ever since. That appeal is coming up again in July, and I would encourage all members and people in the community to consider supporting this worthy organisation by giving a bit of time to collect or take some time to make a donation.

I would also like to pay tribute to the many researchers who continue to search for a cure for these blood cancers. In my 30 years in nursing I have seen progress, and I thank all those who dedicate themselves to life-saving research. I would also like to thank the members of the Coolum Beach prayer network.

Finally, I repeat my love and support for Sam and Pete as well as to all those people affected by leukaemia, lymphoma, myeloma and other blood cancers. It has been a very difficult week for me. I am sure all members have this feeling that this place keeps us away from those that we love at times, and so it is nice to be able to record my thanks to those people who have been able to support those people.

### Tropical Cyclone Debbie

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Albert—LNP) (10.33 pm): I, like the member for Mirani, rise tonight to speak about the devastating effects that Tropical Cyclone Debbie had in my region of the Albert electorate, the northern Gold Coast. We were heavily affected. We had multiple bridges fail. Their embankments washed away which caused enormous grief for local motorists and local businesses in my region.


Coomera River was heavily affected during the recent flooding events. The river height gauge at Clagiraba on the night of the flood was over two metres above the major flood level. That shows how much water was coming down the Coomera River that night. The next morning I met with Russell Lynch, the president of my local pony club, which is just up from the John Muntz Bridge. We were absolutely heartbroken when we saw that so much of the riverbank had washed away down the Coomera River. All of this erosion made its way down to John Muntz Bridge. About 26 metres of the riverbank had been

eaten away from the bridge. That bridge is a critical link for the southern parts of my electorate. About 15,000 cars a day would go over that bridge. At the moment cars have to detour through Upper Coomera and use exit 57 via Heathwood Drive, which is causing an enormous amount of congestion for motorists.

To the north, Alan Wilkie Bridge, which is a crucial link especially for trucks and B-doubles, also sustained significant damage during the flood event. I want to thank the Gold Coast City Council for the repair and restoration works to that critically important infrastructure. I also thank the department of main roads, which, with the support of the local community, got 1,600 signatures for a petition to get the John Muntz Bridge underway.

I want to thank many community groups and members of the community for helping our local businesses. When the Beenleigh RSL put the call out, we had hundreds and hundreds of people picking up memorabilia from the RSL, protecting all this history which was wonderful. I also want to thank my local rural fire brigades and the SES for its daring rescue of some of my constituents in Halls Road, an area in my electorate which was heavily affected by the recent flooding event. I want to thank all the people who came out to give up their time to help those in need.

### Ipswich Show

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (10.36 pm): I rise tonight to speak about the Ipswich Show. A little under a week ago Ipswich hosted its 144th show. For those not in the know, the Ipswich Show is hosted every year in the month of May and it is driven by the hard work of the Ipswich Show Society. This is a team of dedicated, passionate workers carrying on a legacy dating back to the first Ipswich Show, which was held on 13 May 1873, headed by Ipswich Show Society president Marcia Cruikshank—who I should mention celebrated her 10th year as president of the Ipswich Show Society—and her able deputy Darren Zanow.


It rained on the first day of the Ipswich Show this year, but it did nothing to dampen the enthusiasm and the spirit of the stall holders, show society workers and volunteers. Nor did it prevent many people from attending the show. The people who volunteer their valuable time to work at the show really do have commitment above and above expectations. I have seen this time after time every year and yet I have to share the story of a volunteer at this year's show who was knocked over by a horse float and had to be hospitalised and yet insisted on returning to the show on the same day because there was still work to be done. It seems the show really must go on rain, hail or shine, accident or injury.

The rain held off for the remaining two days of the show and people came through the gates in droves. I had a stall at the show and spoke to numerous showgoers over the three-day period, many of whom had come some distance to attend, like the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and the Commonwealth Games, the member for Ashgrove, the Hon. Kate Jones, who comes along each year to spend time with her extended family and who is always a delight to see.

People come to the Ipswich Show because there really is something for everyone—from the rides on sideshow alley, the flower arranging, the photography, the school entries, the cake-baking and decorating competitions, to the giant pumpkins—this year's winner weighed in at over 270 kilograms. I take this opportunity to commend all the store holders, all the volunteers and the Ipswich Show Society for giving us another great Ipswich Show.

We are so often caught up in the hustle and bustle of our daily lives, responding to emails, phone calls and other numerous demands. Going to a rural and agriculture show is like taking a step back in time. Very few things change at these shows from year to year, and there is something comforting about the pace and the familiarity of these annual events. In closing, I would like to add that the Ipswich Show Society and the community of Ipswich put on a show not to be missed. I hope to see you there in 2018 for the 145th Ipswich Show.

### Toowoomba, Rail

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (10.39 pm): Toowoomba recently celebrated the Toowoomba Festival of Rail. This festival was held to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the opening of the Toowoomba to Ipswich rail link. There were tours of the railway precinct, including the air-raid shelters. Two working steam trains arrived at the station, and the public enjoyed a range of railway themed tours and presentations. The festival was skilfully and thoughtfully organised by a number of volunteers, but I would like to pay special tribute to Paul Herbert. Paul had the audience in the palm of his hand during the gala dinner where he shared his encyclopedic knowledge of the railway and what


it helped Toowoomba and the Darling Downs achieve throughout the last 150 years. Community groups involved included: the National Trust Toowoomba branch—and I know Paul's wife, Stephanie, is currently preparing for Toowoomba Open House on 29 May; DownsSteam; the Australian Railway Historical Society; the Toowoomba Historical Society; and the Toowoomba Model Railway Club.

The early Queensland colony was dirt poor, and the new government was keen to enhance development and immigration. Not unlike today, improved transport to the fertile Darling Downs was the top priority, and the line from Roma Street to Toowoomba was the first narrow gauge main line constructed in the world. Narrow gauge was controversial, but the decision to proceed with it was largely based on the government's determination to construct the railway quickly and cheaply. It took wool from stations across the Darling Downs. It drove Queensland's economic growth in the early days of the colony, and I believe rail will drive Queensland's economic growth into the 22nd century.

Not long after the Ipswich-Toowoomba railway was opened 150 years ago, there was the first mention of the Melbourne to Brisbane inland rail. It has taken a long time but we are now closer than ever. On federal budget night, the Turnbull government committed an additional \$8.4 billion investment in ARTC to deliver the inland rail project. Regional Australia now needs ARTC to step up and deliver.

This project is nation building at its finest and, let us face it, could only have been delivered by a conservative government with a strong rural voice at its heart. It will create jobs, it will save time and it will open up our nation's interior to development, like the US and Canada before us. In Toowoomba, it will grant us the connectivity that has only ever been dreamt about. InterLinkSQ and the Brisbane West Wellcamp airport—and many others—stand ready to invest and contribute to this connectivity. Indeed, InterLinkSQ CEO, Michelle Reynolds, recently turned the first sod for their inland port on the western fringe of Toowoomba. The 'Steel Mississippi' is coming, and there is nothing that will stop it now. I pay tribute to all those involved in this extraordinary and much needed piece of national and international infrastructure being built right on the western fringe of Toowoomba.

### **Bundaberg Electorate, Indue Card Trial**


 **Ms DONALDSON** (Bundaberg—ALP) (10.43 pm): My electorate is a beautiful place. It is a hub of industry and manufacturing. We make and grow things and export them all over the world, but we also have our challenges. There has been a lot of media lately about our high unemployment rate and ways of tackling this. The differences between the federal member for Hinkler and I—between the LNP and Labor—could not be more stark.

For those who are not aware, the member for Hinkler has been calling for a trial of the cashless welfare card, the Indue card, in Bundaberg. I have made my opposition to this abundantly clear. There could not be a more lazy and dumb idea for Bundaberg. The member for Hinkler claims it will reduce unemployment, but he does not say how. That is because he does not know how. What the member for Hinkler is not telling people in my electorate is that it will not reduce unemployment. How do I know this? I know this because I have been looking into the detail of current trials in Ceduna and Kununurra and the impacts on these communities. Let us not forget that these trials have not been rigorously evaluated and the independent Orima report has a number of deficiencies. What he is not telling the people of Bundaberg is that this will be imposed upon more than those with drug or alcohol addictions; it will be imposed on all except for the aged and Department of Veterans' Affairs pension recipients.

I have read the Centrelink policy detail and the terms and conditions of the Indue card, which is the card for cashless welfare. It restricts 80 per cent of a participant's income to the card only for use at businesses that are approved merchants, and only 20 per cent of a recipient's income can be withdrawn in cash. For someone on Newstart, this is not much at all. Approved merchants are determined by Centrelink. Contrary to what the member for Hinkler is saying, many small businesses and second-hand sellers, like people who sell and buy things on eBay and Facebook, will not be approved merchants. The Indue card does not work like any other visa debit card, as the member for Hinkler claims. Trial participants cannot buy things online or transfer money to someone they may want to purchase something from. Every bit of information about their use of the card is given to Indue, a private company that can give it to a third party, such as governments, courts and others.

There is much, much more to this insidious policy dreamed up by people who have no idea how people doing it tough survive from week to week and day to day. That is more than I can share in a three-minute speech. What I can say is that tarnishing every person on a Centrelink payment in Bundaberg as being somehow in need of Big Brother to tell them who they can and cannot buy and sell goods from shows just how out of touch the member for Hinkler is.

### Gold Coast, Law and Order

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (10.46 pm): The LNP moved a motion tonight condemning the Labor Party for their weak stance on law and order. Unfortunately, each side is only allowed to have three speakers on these motions. I missed out on speaking about this tonight so I want to take the opportunity now to talk about law and order on the Gold Coast. While I am at it, I have to say that the Labor Party rolled out their big guns tonight, but they missed the mark when they rolled out the member for Stretton. The member for Stretton had the opportunity tonight—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. I think we have one more speaker after this. I have the option of inviting the member for Burleigh to start his speech again if you continue.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Members, I urge you to show some tolerance. It is getting late.

**Mr HART:** Rather than talking about what could have been the tough stance that the Labor Party takes on crime, the member for Stretton went all over the place. He attacked the member for Currumbin on her stance in her speech. He attacked the member for Everton over vague things. Not once in the five-minute speech that the member for Stretton rolled out did he ever mention crime. He did not talk about crime rates. He did not talk about the effects that crime is having on places like Townsville, as our member did. Instead of that, he danced all around the place and made personal attacks on members.

The member for Stretton has been described as a heavyweight of the Labor movement in Queensland. If he is a heavyweight of the Labor movement in Queensland, I would like to see who the lightweights are. I guess we only have to look over there because we just heard a speech from one of the lightweights, the member for Bundaberg. She could be classed as a lightweight. Who else over there is a lightweight? The member for Pumicestone is an absolute lightweight.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, I know you are provoking the government members.

**Mr Pegg:** You have no-one supporting you.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Logan. I can hear you loud and clear.


**Mr HART:** For the member for Stretton's benefit, I do not need that much support from my side. I can handle myself quite well.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr SPEAKER:** I thank the government backbench. It is almost over. The member for Burleigh has 29 seconds left. Give him the 29 seconds—now it is 28 seconds.

**Mr HART:** At a quarter to 11 at night, we have finally woken up the Labor Party. The backbench is awake. Crime is a very important issue to the electors in my area. The Gold Coast will remain LNP while ever these people on the other side of the chamber are weak on law and order. The people on the Gold Coast know that we will be tough on law and order. We drove the bikies out of the Gold Coast. They are not coming back.

### Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital; Body Corporate Governance

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.49 pm): Brisbane Central has long been home to Queensland's leading healthcare and medical research facilities. The Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital at Herston is undoubtedly the state's leading healthcare hub, providing world-class services to both local residents and patients from throughout the state.

The exciting new \$1.1 billion Herston Quarter project is set to transform the RBWH campus and surrounding precinct, taking it to a whole new level. The result will be an innovative, master planned, world-class health precinct unlike any other Queensland has ever seen. Iconic heritage buildings like the Lady Lamington building, the Lady Norman building and the Edith Cavell building will be

reinvigorated, preserving Brisbane's health heritage, while providing functional accommodation and space for business and commercial uses. Further community consultation will occur on the final master plan as it progresses to construction, and Australian Unity will be working closely with the community over the life of the project.

Last week I had the pleasure of meeting with a number of my constituents to discuss this exciting new project. The local community supports the Herston Quarter project, but they also want to ensure the redevelopment is properly managed. When completed, Herston Quarter will be a global benchmark in public and private medical facilities, putting Brisbane and Queensland at the forefront of international health and life sciences. I want to personally thank a number of my constituents for their passionate efforts to make sure the Herston Quarter becomes the outstanding success we all know it will be: Greg Picker, Angela White, Nadine Tallon, Elliot Duff, Edward Gilmour, Simon and Deb Davie, Belen Zapata and Davina Baird, to name just a few. I will continue to ensure local residents are meaningfully consulted as the exciting new Herston Quarter project progresses and Brisbane moves closer to housing yet another major world-class health facility.

It also gave me great pleasure earlier this month to host a morning tea at the Danish Club in Newstead to inform local residents about the proposed discussion paper surrounding body corporate governance for unit dwellers in Queensland. Brisbane Central is one of the most—if not the most—densely populated electorates in the state, meaning body corporate governance is a bread-and-butter issue for local residents. Well over 100 locals attended this morning tea, hearing expert analysis of proposed options for reform from Professor Sharon Christensen and Professor William Dixon. Many of my constituents want to help shape the future of body corporate governance in Queensland, and I look forward to working with them and informing them on this important issue in the future.

Newstead is probably the only suburb in Queensland that is entirely made up of units. There is one house, the beautiful Newstead House. Unfortunately, no-one lives there, but it is a great suburb nevertheless.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.53 pm.

## **ATTENDANCE**

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams