



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 11 October 2017

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	2999
National Amputee Awareness Week	2999
PETITION	2999
TABLED PAPER	2999
NOTICE OF MOTION	2999
Childhood Vaccination	2999
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3000
Pacific Motorway Upgrade, M1/M3/Gateway Merge	3000
Interstate Migration	3000
We Are Queensland Grants; Multiculturalism	3001
Fairer Fares	3001
First Home Owners' Grant	3002
Hospitals, Car Parking	3003
Renewable Energy	3003
Tree Clearing	3004
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 October 2017, from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, Hon. Dr Steven Miles, to the Federal Minister for the Environment and Energy, Hon. Josh Frydenberg, regarding the latest Statewide Landcover and Trees Study (SLATS) report.	3004
Logan Electorate, King's Christian College Campus; Watterston, Dr J	3005
Watterston, Dr J; TAFE Queensland East Coast, Fraser Coast Campus, Health Industry Training Centre	3005
Mineral Exploration	3006
Payday Lenders	3006
Seniors, Cost of Living	3007
World Homeless Day	3007

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 11 October 2017

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3008
Visitor to Public Gallery	3008
FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE	3008
Report	3008
NOTICE OF MOTION	3008
Energy Companies, Executive Bonuses	3008
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	3009
Electricity Prices	3009
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> , dated 10 October 2017, titled 'Home Sweat Home'.....	3009
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Townsville Bulletin</i> , dated 11 October 2017, titled 'Helter Swelter'.....	3009
Federal Member for Petrie	3009
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, undated, from the Facebook page of Mr Luke Howarth, regarding GST payments.....	3009
CFMEU	3010
Liberal National Party, One Nation	3011
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting Senator Pauline Hanson and others.....	3011
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting a cheque to Ipswich Show Society.....	3011
CFMEU	3011
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3012
CFMEU	3012
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'GLENCORE, Extract from security reports prepared for Glencore on verbal abuse observed from CFMEU members and officials on the picket line at Oaky North Mine'.....	3012
CFMEU	3013
Regional Queensland, Jobs	3013
CFMEU, Political Donations	3014
Gas Supply	3014
CFMEU	3015
Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order	3015
Gas Supply	3015
CFMEU	3016
Works for Queensland	3016
Energy Supply	3017
Distribution of GST	3018
Energy Supply	3018
Dental Services, Federal Funding	3019
Mount Isa-Townsville Rail Line	3019
STEM Education	3020
Government Procurement	3021
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents relating to LJ & BA Davies Constructions P/L and a tender notice.....	3021
Seniors, Cost of Living	3022
Nullinga Dam	3023
Housing, Indigenous Communities	3023
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 7 August 2017, from the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon Mark Furner, to the Federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Hon. Nigel Scullion, regarding the review of the remote housing strategy.....	3023
Urannah Dam	3023
Government Procurement	3024
WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3025
Second Reading	3025
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, undated, from the Facebook page of the member for Bundamba, Mrs Jo-Ann Miller MP.....	3028
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting a gathering of union members.....	3029
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph depicting the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, with members of the Electrical Trades Union.....	3029
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 October 2017, from AiGroup to the member for Kawana, Mr Bleijie MP, regarding the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017.....	3035
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 18 September 2017, from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Master Builders Queensland, Master Electricians Australia, Queensland Major Contractors Association, the Civil Contractors Federation, the Property Council of Australia, Australian Mines and Metals Association, and the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry to the member for Kawana, Mr Bleijie MP, regarding the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017.....	3035
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland: response to the Finance and Administration Committee regarding Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, 27 September 2017.....	3043
APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL (NO. 2); APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2)	3044
Cognate Debate	3044
SPEAKER'S RULING	3044
Notice of Motion, Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services	3044

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 11 October 2017

MOTION	3044
Energy Companies, Executive Bonuses	3044
<i>Tabled paper:</i> AEMO document titled 'Data Dashboard'	3045
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Why farmers are to blame for high electricity prices'	3047
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from Energy Council web page, dated 20 July 2017, titled 'Where do we need a new dispatchable power station?'	3050
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	3050
Resolved in the negative	3050
MOTION	3050
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	3050
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	3071
Resolved in the negative	3071
ADJOURNMENT	3071
Townsville, Crime	3071
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding tougher laws for juvenile offenders	3072
Boyne Tannum Hookup	3072
Beaudesert Electorate, Cedar Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant	3072
Member for Kawana	3073
Keebra Park State High School	3074
Greenslopes Electorate	3074
Mansfield Electorate, Mount Cotton Road	3075
Aveo Retirement Village, Newmarket	3076
Cleveland-Redland Bay Road	3076
Yeerongpilly Electorate	3077
ATTENDANCE	3078

WEDNESDAY, 11 OCTOBER 2017



The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

National Amputee Awareness Week



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I advise that today is the final day of National Amputee Awareness Week. Every day in Australia there are 28 surgical amputations performed. This campaign aims to build community knowledge of limb loss, minimise the stigma often experienced by amputees and educate the wider community on the prevalence of amputation in the hope that they better manage their health care. Limbs 4 Life has invited members to wear a green ribbon on their lapel this week to show their support for amputees.

PETITION

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

Russell Island, Rocky Point Boat Ramp Upgrade

Mr McEachan, from 6 petitioners, requesting the House to install an all tide boat ramp at Rocky Point, Russell Island [\[1985\]](#).

Petition received.

TABLED PAPER

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Gregory (Mr Millar)—

[1986](#) Nonconforming petition regarding the appointment of a full-time resident doctor to Alpha

NOTICE OF MOTION

Childhood Vaccination



Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.02 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

- affirms the vital importance of childhood vaccination in preventing disease and saving countless millions of lives;
- supports the right of parents to vaccinate their children without having to contend with unfounded fears;
- condemns Senator Pauline Hanson for her remarks reported online in the *Daily Mail* on 11 January 2016 in relation to vaccination that: 'I have had so many people who have brought it to my attention, that's why their kids are autistic', and who did not state unequivocally that there is no link between autism and vaccination;
- condemns the member for Currumbin for her remarks made in this House on 29 October 2015 when she said that 'In the rare cases of regressive autism, vaccination has been considered by some to be one of the triggers,' and who has also not stated unequivocally that there is no link between autism and vaccination; and
- urges Senator Hanson and the member for Currumbin to retract these remarks, to publicly support the vaccination of children, and to unequivocally state that there is no link between autism and vaccination.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Pacific Motorway Upgrade, M1/M3/Gateway Merge

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.04 pm): My government is getting on with the job of improving vital road infrastructure for Queenslanders. I am pleased to inform the House that this morning I joined the Minister for Main Roads, Mark Bailey, Minister Mick de Brenni, Minister Cameron Dick and the member for Stretton, Duncan Pegg, to announce that Lendlease has been awarded the contract for the design and construction of an upgrade of the Gateway merge worth up to \$196 million. This project is a joint initiative between the federal and state governments to complete the M1 and M3 upgrade between Eight Mile Plains and Rochedale South. Early works on the project, which will ease congestion and improve safety on one of Queensland's busiest sections of road, are already underway.

We are not talking about new and better roads for Queenslanders; we are getting on with the job of building them. Projects like this improve productivity for tradies and small and large businesses, and they enable more Queenslanders to spend more time with their families instead of being stuck in traffic. This project, which includes a new four-lane bridge over the Pacific Motorway on a realigned Underwood Road to improve east-west connectivity, will create over 110 jobs during construction. The end result will also connect dedicated bus lanes from Eight Mile Plains and Rochedale to the Springwood bus interchange and park-and-ride, leading to quicker, simpler travel for commuters.

I know that the members for Springwood, Stretton, Sunnybank and Woodridge are excited to see the completion of this project for their local constituents. They know that this is how you get the job done—not by talking about new road projects or by petitions but by getting on with the job and delivering more for Queenslanders.

Interstate Migration

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.06 pm): I am delighted to inform the House that the number of Australians making the move up in the world to Queensland to settle and live is the highest in eight years. In fact, we have had the best result since the disastrous interstate migration slump that occurred under former premier Campbell Newman.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, I mentioned his name: former premier Campbell Newman. In the 12 months to March this year 15,716 people moved to Queensland, with the greatest number of those inbound coming across the border from New South Wales. It is a resounding vote of confidence again as more and more people continue to find our state an attractive destination to live, work and raise their families. Queensland's interstate migration numbers fell away sharply, hitting a low of 5,753 over the year to June 2014 when the Newman government's jobs and services cuts—driven with so much zeal by the then treasurer and now opposition leader, Tim Nicholls—hit the state's economy hard.

With our economy returning to growth of 3.9 per cent, compared with 1.2 per cent for the rest of the nation, I am confident that more and more people will keep moving on up to Queensland. With inflated proceeds from selling their houses in cold capitals, they can head beyond the Tweed to the warmth and find competitively priced, quality homes and units here in Queensland. RP Data for the August quarter records that the Brisbane median dwelling price is under \$489,000. In Melbourne it is more than \$695,000 and in Sydney it is more than \$909,000 for a family home. On average, Queenslanders also pay less in taxes and charges than other states and territories.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gaven, I can hear you loud and clear, and I think it is your sparring partner beside you.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Chatsworth.

Mr SPEAKER: No, I do not think it is the member for Chatsworth. Member for Gaven, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you continue I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Macquarie Bank reported, 'The latest wave of interstate migration to Queensland is on the rise.'

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Kawana is so rude. He has not learned anything.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I think everyone is getting a bit precious, and we have only just started.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Macquarie estimates that the migration shift could inject \$8.1 billion into the Brisbane and South-East Queensland markets, equivalent to 25 per cent of current turnover. An exodus to the Sunshine State will also significantly boost consumer spending. While my government's priority is for Queenslanders, particularly young Queenslanders, to get into the property market, we are making our pitch to the south too. A media campaign 'Queensland—Move Up in the World' is highlighting our many great advantages. By aggressively promoting our climate, lifestyle, education and incentives like the \$20,000 First Home Owners' Grant, plus our growth and potential, I am confident that interstate migration will continue to grow.

We Are Queensland Grants; Multiculturalism

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.10 pm): I am pleased to announce today that more than \$1 million in funding has been awarded to successful applicants of the We Are Queensland small grants program. These grants will give so many Queenslanders the boost they need to help link families to local community services and neighbourhood activities. The program, which will continue towards building a stronger Queensland, was announced in July of this year. There has been an overwhelming response of high-quality applications, with more than 270 people and groups seeking individual grants of up to \$20,000. It is proof once again that so many Queenslanders are keen to better their communities, not just for themselves but also for others.

The We Are Queensland grants will support a wide range of projects from all over our state, from Lockhart River to the Scenic Rim and west to Julia Creek. I know that the members for Mermaid Beach, Bonney and Currumbin will join me in congratulating Compassionate Gold Coast Ltd on its funding of \$19,900 for the higher education project—a community-wide initiative that aims to build on skills for emerging young community leaders. The member for Logan will present \$20,000 to the We Are Logan community choir to bring stronger cultural bonds through music. The member for Warrego will be pleased that the Dalby Welcoming Community has been successful in funding of more than \$19,000 for its series of four 'connecting neighbours' challenges. The member for Bulimba will be excited that the Camp Hill Community & Sporting Club will receive \$14,500 towards a community cultural event on Neighbour Day next year.

These grants will encourage a Queensland where everyone is respected and welcome to make positive and valued contributions to their community. I take pride in promoting programs that will contribute to Queensland's ongoing multicultural success story. I am proud that parliament passed my government's landmark Multicultural Recognition Act—laws which recognise Queensland as a multicultural society—and the measures and programs we have promoted as part of our all-embracing Cohesive Communities Action Plan. This evening here at Parliament House I will host a multicultural community reception to mark these achievements and recommit my government to furthering Queensland's multicultural success story.

Fairer Fares

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.12 pm): The Palaszczuk government's Fairer Fares is delivering real cost-of-living savings and is boosting the convenience and appeal of public transport. I am delighted to update the House that this package has helped save more than \$48 million for South-East Queensland commuters since its introduction up until last month. More than 114 million trips across the South-East Queensland public transport network were made during this time and were eligible for savings.

Commuters are not only saving money; they are also far more satisfied with public transport affordability. TransLink's customer satisfaction rating for affordability is at its highest level since 2010-11, when reporting began, tracking at close to 60 per cent since February. This shows that passengers continue to appreciate the cost-of-living benefits we have delivered by reducing public transport fares.

Under Fairer Fares we not only cut the fares but also simplified the network, reducing the number of zones from 23 to eight.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are now warned under standing order 253A. If you continue I will take the appropriate action.

Ms TRAD: We also introduced new concessions. From 3 April 2017 this government introduced concession fares for jobseekers receiving Newstart Allowance or Youth Allowance as well as for asylum seekers who reside in Queensland. Almost 5,000 jobseekers and about 5,000 asylum seekers have been approved for concession fares, each saving on average \$1.21 for each trip taken. These groups have saved more than \$352,000 and have made more than 291,000 trips.

Fairer Fares also introduced free weekend travel for children aged under 15 years travelling on a child go card. This has been popular, with 493,000 trips and \$700,000 worth of savings. Customers have also embraced the government's decision to extend the 20 per cent off-peak discount period. This group of customers saved over \$1 million, with more than 1.54 million eligible weekday off-peak trips being made. Some 1.5 million more journeys will have qualified for 'eight and 50 per cent off' than would be benefited from the previous LNP government's 'nine and free' policy.

The Palaszczuk government has made public transport cheaper and easier to use than ever before. Fairer Fares is putting money back into the pockets of South-East Queenslanders. I look forward to its continued success.

First Home Owners' Grant

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.15 pm): Our housing sector is a significant component of our national, state and regional economies. The supply chain for housing construction stretches across a range of sectors and supports jobs throughout the state. More importantly, housing affordability is a major issue for Queenslanders. That is, of course, what the Palaszczuk government has done something about.

In the 2016-17 budget I was pleased to introduce a \$20,000 First Home Owners' Grant boost. This was a \$5,000 boost to the existing grant of \$15,000. The boosted grant was continued in the 2017-18 budget and is available until the end of December. Anyone wanting to take advantage should act now. The \$20,000 grant is available for people buying a newly constructed house, unit or townhouse valued at up to \$750,000. It not only helps people into the housing market; it also supports jobs in our building industry and related sectors.

Since July 2016, when the \$20,000 boosted grant became available, almost 8,100 grants, worth more than \$162 million, have been approved. If every one of those grants was applied to a dwelling worth \$750,000, those grants could have leveraged new dwelling construction worth more than \$6 billion. Whilst not all grants are used for dwellings of the maximum value, it does give some idea of the significant potential boost the grant delivers to construction activity and to jobs.

In many of our regional centres the average cost of a newly built dwelling can be much lower than the \$750,000 ceiling for the grant. That means that first home buyers in regional communities can secure even greater value for money. We are seeing more grants in regional centres than in Brisbane. Of more than 8,000 grants approved, 80 per cent have been in regional centres.

Recently I joined the member for Kallangur to officially mark the start of the new Amity residential development at Narangba. The project is being developed in a joint venture between local company Pointcorp and global developer the Dahua Group. Dahua was granted relief from our additional foreign acquirer duty because the Amity project represents such a significant addition to the supply of housing stock in the region. We welcome mutually beneficial foreign investment, which is why we maintain sufficient flexibility when it comes to the additional duty charge to foreign entities. I am sure that members of the House will remember the debate that said the world would end if that duty were included in the budget. We can stimulate development and boost building jobs while making it easier for Queenslanders to buy their own home. The Amity project's first stage includes 93 house-and-land packages ranging in price from \$398,000 to \$600,000. The Queensland First Home Owners' Grant is ideal for anyone considering that price range.

Housing affordability is a motivating factor in many people's decision to move to Queensland from southern states. We have heard the Premier update the House on the Move Up in the World campaign, which is all about attracting new residents and business operators to our state. With more than 15,000 moving into the state in the 12 months to March, mainly from New South Wales—it is probably because they want a better football team—the government is acting to support those seeking to buy their first home while backing jobs in our building industry. We see no similar commitment from the Turnbull government at the federal level. The federal Labor Party has proposed changes to negative gearing and capital gains tax arrangements which would help address affordability, but these have been rejected outright by the Turnbull government, despite its own policy vacuum.

Hospitals, Car Parking

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.18 pm): The Palaszczuk government continues its work on behalf of all Queenslanders to reduce pressure on the family budget, particularly when it comes to the cost of accessing our state's world-class health system. In July I announced that the government would provide up to \$7.5 million over four years to double the availability of car-parking concessions provided at Queensland Health facilities with paid parking. Those additional concessions became available on Sunday, 1 October, when hospital and health services published new concessional arrangements consistent with the government's four-point hospital parking action plan.

Parking is free at all but 12 of Queensland Health's 123 hospitals and 33 multipurpose clinics. The new concession framework will apply at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, the Prince Charles Hospital, the Princess Alexandra Hospital, the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital, the Gold Coast University Hospital, Robina Hospital, the Sunshine Coast University Hospital, Nambour General Hospital, Toowoomba Hospital, Ipswich Hospital, Townsville Hospital and Cairns Hospital.

The Palaszczuk government is very aware that the cost of car parking is a real concern for many patients, carers and their families. Increasing the number of concessional car-parking spaces means that many more people and families in need will have access to accessible and affordable car parking. This will not solve all problems with hospital car parking, but it will ease some of the issues facing patients, families and carers. While the government's focus must remain on funding front-line healthcare and medical services, we understand the financial stress that car-parking costs can cause for some people. Patients and carers experiencing financial hardship, who require assistance, are visiting frequently or who are in hospitals for extended periods of time will have increased access to free or discounted car parks. Increasing the number of concessional car-parking spaces means that many more people and families in need will have access to accessible and affordable car parking.

The government will continue to be involved in the development of future public hospital car parks. On 24 August I was pleased to visit Redcliffe Hospital with the Attorney-General and member for Redcliffe to announce the construction of a new multistorey car park that will commence next year. We are also in the process of delivering expanded car-parking availability at Logan and Caboolture hospitals. We are conducting a preliminary evaluation to consider options to improve availability and affordability of parking for patients and carers visiting the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. By working to ensure staff, patients, carers and their families have better access to safe and affordable parking, the Palaszczuk Labor government is providing a helping hand to Queenslanders.

Renewable Energy

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.20 pm): A clean energy boom is underway in Queensland under the Palaszczuk government, and that includes our Renewables 400 program—a key initiative of the \$1.1 billion Powering Queensland Plan. The EOI for the 400-megawatt large-scale renewable energy reverse auction, with 100 megawatts of storage, recently closed on 25 September. We have received strong interest and it is clear investors are excited about the renewable energy boom in Queensland. Renewable energy—now the cheapest form of new energy infrastructure—and storage technology will play an important role in our transition to a lower carbon future, addressing climate change, establishing this new industry in Queensland and is ensuring new investment flow into the Queensland economy, which is good for jobs and better for bills.

The proposals received include renewable energy projects with a wide range of technologies and energy storage projects that are either stand alone or integrated with a renewable energy project. These opportunities are across Queensland—mostly in regional Queensland, creating thousands of jobs. Those who oppose renewables oppose jobs in regional Queensland. The renewable energy project proposals have a combined capacity of over 9,000 megawatts. This is greater than the current 8,200 megawatts generated by our current coal-fired power stations and is further proof that Queensland does not need a ninth coal-fired power station under the LNP, which would see the return of double-digit price increases just like the Newman government.

The mix of clean energy proposals in the EIO is 2,200 megawatts of wind energy, more than 6,400 megawatts of solar and around 500 megawatts of other renewable energy technologies such as biomass. A number of these projects could be a first in Queensland, including concentrated solar thermal technology—the technology which powers Las Vegas past midnight. The integration of storage with renewable to enable dispatchable renewable energies is the future. In addition to supporting the

deployment of renewable energy, storage technologies provide a range of services that will help to enhance the security and the reliability of Queensland's electricity power grid—already the most robust in our nation.

By encouraging investment in Queensland we are also diversifying energy generation and bolstering our future energy security. The Palaszczuk government is proud of our renewable energy boom in our state after the renewable energy blackout under the LNP and the member for Clayfield. A real leader and a real government has a real energy policy. In contrast, Queensland has an energy illiterate in the opposition leader, who, in his speech in parliament yesterday, ignored an entire industry—the gas industry—when he suggested that 96 per cent of Queensland's energy generation was coal. The mix of course is seven per cent renewables, including all our domestic solar PV, and it is in fact 12 per cent gas—not zero but 12 per cent. No wonder electricity prices surged 43 per cent under the opposition leader as treasurer—an energy illiterate when, to this day, he lacks basic facts about Queensland's energy industry.

Tree Clearing

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.24 pm): Each year Queensland government scientists prepare a report detailing land clearing in Queensland. They use satellite data and ground truth suspected clearing to rule out other causes of forest loss. The previous LNP government refused to release those reports.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Dr MILES: That is after it promised not to change tree-clearing laws but went ahead and took an axe to them anyway. The report for 2015-16 released last week shows land clearing in Queensland has skyrocketed to 395,000 hectares per year. In Great Barrier Reef catchments the rate has soared by almost 50 per cent. Excessive clearing has quadrupled since Tim Nicholls and the LNP tore up Labor's sensible laws.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Dr MILES: Clearing in Queensland is now at a rate of 1,000 football fields every day thanks to the LNP. This will drive native wildlife to extinction, risk the tens of thousands of jobs—

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Member for Hinchinbrook, your interjections are not being taken. You are warned under standing order 253A. I find that you are trying to talk over the top of the minister in his statement. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Dr MILES: This will drive native wildlife to extinction, risk the tens of thousands of jobs reliant on the Great Barrier Reef and drive up Australia's greenhouse gas emissions. According to the scientific review of impacts of land clearing, land clearing is putting pressure on many of the 739 threatened flora species and 210 threatened fauna species in Queensland. In 2015-16, 35 per cent of clearing was of remnant vegetation—that is, pristine vegetation that has never been cleared before and is vital habitat for native wildlife. Clearing at these rates leaves animals with nowhere to live and nowhere to go. When you rip trees out of the ground in reef catchments, it means the soil and run-off from erosion flows straight on to the reef, smothering and suffocating the coral. A key commitment of the Australian and Queensland governments in the Reef 2050 Plan—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I would prefer not to put you under a warning but if you persist I will, and that applies to members on the government side who are responding to those comments.

Dr MILES: A key commitment of the Australian and Queensland governments in the Reef 2050 Plan is to reduce land clearing. That is the same plan the LNP has, in the past, claimed credit for. This is the plan that stopped UNESCO putting the reef on the in-danger list. In this year's report the World Heritage Committee singled out the lack of progress on delivering important laws to reduce clearing and called for greater effort to implement this commitment. Today I have written to the Turnbull government asking it to reassure the global community that both governments remain committed to the plan, and I table a copy of that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 10 October 2017, from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, Hon. Dr Steven Miles, to the Federal Minister for the Environment and Energy, Hon. Josh Frydenberg, regarding the latest Statewide Landcover and Trees Study (SLATS) report [\[1987\]](#).

I have also asked Minister Frydenberg to explain to the World Heritage Committee how the Australian government would implement its reef plan if an LNP-One Nation government was elected in Queensland, because we know that only the Palaszczuk government will keep the reef off the in-danger list. An LNP-One Nation government would risk putting it back in danger—just like the last time the LNP was in charge.

Logan Electorate, King's Christian College Campus; Watterston, Dr J

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (2.28 pm): I am pleased to announce that I have approved the designation for a new independent school at Chambers Flat in the Logan electorate. King's Christian College will expand to open a new campus in addition to its existing schools at Reedy Creek and Pimpama. King's Christian College Chambers Flat will be the first prep to year 12 non-state school to be delivered through an infrastructure designation in Queensland in more than 15 years. I want to thank and acknowledge the work of the member for Logan, who is a member of the local community. We are determined to ensure that parents have choice—

Mr Stevens interjected.

Ms JONES: I thought they liked independent schools

Mr SPEAKER: I think that is the member for Mermaid Beach. I might give the member for Mermaid Beach a warning.

Ms JONES: We are determined to ensure that parents have choice when it comes to the education of their children. That is why our government listened to the strong representations by Independent Schools Queensland. Now, under our government's changes, when it comes to infrastructure we are treating non-state schools and state schools the same. We are very proud of that. In this regard, I want to thank the Deputy Premier for her assistance as well.

We are committed to ensuring that all Queensland students have access to the best possible schools, particularly in high-growth areas such as those in the electorate of the member for Logan. Today, I can also announce the naming of the new \$46 million state school at Mount Low in Townsville. I know that the member for Townsville is very passionate about getting this additional resource in his electorate. The community in that area has decided to name the school North Shore State School.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms JONES: You could have built it and you did not, mate. Principal Patrick McDonnell will welcome around 200 students on the first day of school in 2018. Local communities have also named three new primary schools in South-East Queensland that are due to welcome their first students on the first day of school in 2018: Yarrabilba State School—in the Logan electorate—Picnic Creek State School at Coomera East, and Baringa State School at Caloundra South.

Today I can also announce that the Director-General of the Department of Education and Training, Dr Jim Watterston, has accepted the role of Dean of Education at the University of Melbourne. I congratulate Jim on this prestigious appointment. Jim has been the director-general of the department since 2013. During that time, his strong focus on improving educational outcomes has benefited children and young people across Queensland. During Jim's time as director-general we have also seen a continuous improvement in our NAPLAN results and in kindy participation. I would like to thank Jim for his commitment to the education of Queensland students. Jim will continue to lead the department until the end of this year.

Watterston, Dr J; TAFE Queensland East Coast, Fraser Coast Campus, Health Industry Training Centre

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.32 pm): I also acknowledge the words of the Minister for Education in relation to the Director-General of the Department of Education and Training, Dr Jim Watterston. I congratulate him on his appointment. I note that it has been a real pleasure to work with him while we have been in government. We certainly wish him well in the years ahead in his new position.

On Thursday 14 September, during the Palaszczuk government's Governing from the Regions week, I had the pleasure of visiting Hervey Bay TAFE's new Health Industry Training Centre and talk with many of the students and teachers. This centre was once the English language block and it has been refurbished into a purpose-built facility to allow the local TAFE East Coast to run more health related courses. The centre opened in January this year and now allows Hervey Bay locals to study

nursing and allied health courses without having to leave their community. Before this health training hub was established, Fraser Coast students would have to travel to other regions to study a Diploma of Nursing but not anymore.

During my visit to Hervey Bay I met with a number of students and witnessed firsthand the hands-on skills that they are being taught, with demonstrations of checking blood pressure and blood sugar levels. Given the increasing need for skilled workers in the health profession in the Fraser Coast region, it is also quite possible that these students will be able to find work locally once they complete their studies.

This new health training hub was made possible through a \$250,000 investment from the Palaszczuk government. It allows Hervey Bay TAFE to offer a number of courses for the first time, including a Diploma of Nursing, a Diploma of Remedial Massage and a Certificate III in Individual Support (Disability). The new medical training facility is equipped with all the necessary medical gear, hospital beds and mannequins, which allows students to practise their skills.

Currently, about 150 students are enrolled in these new courses and TAFE expects this number to grow. In fact, TAFE enrolments in the Fraser Coast region have increased by 30 per cent compared to the same period last year. Part of that increase can be attributed to the new health training hub. I am pleased to inform the House that, since opening, student numbers have increased so quickly that TAFE is now investigating timetabling options to allow even more students to enrol to study in 2018.

The Palaszczuk government is passionate about creating jobs and providing people with the necessary skills and training to get into the workforce and build careers. It is the Labor Party that is committed to a strong future for TAFE right across Queensland.

Mineral Exploration

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.34 pm): More than 19,000 square kilometres of Queensland will be released for exploration in 2017-18. This area includes almost 18,000 square kilometres of land for petroleum and gas exploration for gas to power local manufacturing and generate LNG royalties. There is also more than 1,100 square kilometres for mineral exploration in the north-west minerals province, including the new-age minerals that are needed for the next technology and renewables boom. The details are laid out in the *Annual exploration program* for 2017-18, which is now available online.

Knowing what is under the ground through exploration gives Queensland a front row seat in delivering the next generation of projects and for the energy needs of the future. This government's initiative to release this annual program of competitive tenders for the coming year helps resource companies plan their exploration programs and, most importantly, gives landholders, traditional owners and local governments notice of potential resource activity in their areas.

The 2017-18 program includes almost 18,000 square kilometres of land for petroleum and gas exploration in the Surat, Bowen, Eromanga and Adavale basins. That is good news for the local manufacturing and electricity consumers, as more gas supply means downward pressure on energy prices. Once again, it is Queensland that is doing the heavy lifting on gas supply and policy.

Many of the petroleum and gas blocks are greenfield sites. I encourage new and local players, as well as junior explorers, to enter the Queensland market. There was nothing better than that last tender being won by Queensland companies to supply gas to the domestic market.

We also have more than 1,100 square kilometres for mineral exploration in the north-west minerals province between Mount Isa and Doomadgee. This area has the potential for copper, gold, lead and zinc, as well as the rare earth elements that are used in advanced technologies—from hybrid vehicle batteries to superconducting magnets. We have more than 540 square kilometres for coal exploration in the Bowen Basin and the Galilee Basin in the central west.

Two sets of competitive tenders will be called: for petroleum and gas and minerals in the current quarter and for coal between April and June next year. This forward program ensures that Queensland remains on the path to long-term economic growth.

Payday Lenders

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (2.37 pm): The Palaszczuk Labor government has taken decisive action to relieve the burden from Queenslanders who are doing it tough because of payday lenders. Good Money stores in Cairns and Southport are places where people can get access to the No Interest Loan Scheme and affordable insurance and savings

programs and can also speak directly with a financial counsellor when things get tough. The stores will be a lifeline for cash-strapped Queenslanders who now have a real alternative to shonky payday lenders and a source of support for people who are wanting a bit of help with controlling their finances and managing the cost of living.

We know that 31 per cent of households in Australia are experiencing financial stress and that right now 14.8 per cent of Queenslanders are at risk of poverty. Good Money stores deliver real alternatives to unscrupulous payday lenders and rent-to-buy schemes to make sure that people do not spiral into debt, especially women, who are the fastest growing demographic who are accessing payday loans. Reducing the financial stress being felt by vulnerable people is also a way of growing the Queensland economy.

These Good Money stores help people like Brett, whom I met at the Southport Good Money store. He sought help to get back on his feet after having some trouble with payday lenders. He told an all-too-familiar story. A payday lender had charged exorbitant—and, I might add, illegal—fees for a loan to Brett so that he could pay some of his bills. The Good Money store was able to help Brett with a financial counsellor who could advocate on his behalf and secure a refund of these illegal fees.

Since the opening of the Good Money store in Cairns on 10 April, that store has had almost 577 inquiries for assistance and approved almost 100 no-interest loans valued at \$77,000. That Good Money store has also made nine referrals to other agencies to enable people experiencing specific vulnerabilities to obtain further assistance. The Good Money store at Southport has already received more than 500 inquiries and assisted dozens of people to reach a more stable financial position.

The Palaszczuk Labor government is giving struggling Queenslanders a chance at getting back on top of their finances and taking control of their lives. While we are fighting to ensure that ordinary Queenslanders have access to fair lending and responsible financial advice, the LNP in Canberra continues to drag its heels, making it easier for shonky lenders to lock more people into spiralling debt. I find it appalling that the federal government will stand by and let Queenslanders facing cost-of-living pressures fall victim to unscrupulous payday lenders.

Seniors, Cost of Living

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.40 pm): We know that for seniors the cost of living is a big issue. In this year's budget we have increased the total for energy, rates and water concessions funding to \$290 million, an increase of \$27.9 million from last financial year. The key concessions that eligible seniors receive include up to \$341 per year through the Electricity Rebate Scheme and up to \$200 per year through the Pensioner Rate Subsidy Scheme. In addition to these concessions, our government is working hard to ease the cost-of-living pressures through our Seniors Business Discount Card scheme and through the carer's card scheme and companion card scheme. Since 2015 the number of these cardholders has increased by 121,000.

We care about the ability of seniors to get out and about in the community. We are making transport for our seniors cheaper. As well as offering concessional fares for seniors, our One, Two, Free ticketing policy has saved seniors over \$970,000 on more than 500,000 trips in 2016-17.

The Palaszczuk government has also delivered a record health budget that has greatly reduced waiting lists and expanded safe, quality care in public health. The better our public health system is the more seniors will be able to access it and spend their money on other things. We also believe that seniors need opportunities to learn more about technology. This helps them to manage their finances as well as to find out what is going on around them. In 2016-17 more than 9,500 seniors participated in free Tech Savvy Seniors training sessions.

Finally, we have also acknowledged that sometimes our seniors do not have the finances to access legal advice. We have stepped in as a government and committed \$2.6 million for free legal support services for seniors. We are delivering for seniors and defending their back pocket in as many ways as possible, from their transport to their bills to free legal advice and health care. They deserve every ounce of what we can do for them. Queensland would not be where it is today without their efforts.

World Homeless Day

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (2.42 pm): This week sees the passing of World Homeless Day for 2017, a day when we all reflect on the importance of safe, secure and affordable housing. Recently the Department of Housing and Public Works released its annual report. The report is a timely reminder of why we are all in this place. Fundamentally government is about people. On this side of the House—the Labor government—

we put people first. We do not shy away from that. In 2016-17 I can report to the House that 71,992 households were assisted through social housing in Queensland. This includes 7,197 households assisted for the first time.

In Queensland we have the most highly targeted housing assistance system in the country. We allocate housing according to need, with women and children escaping domestic violence, seniors, people living with a disability and those Queenslanders who are experiencing homelessness or are on the edge of homelessness given a priority. Just under 92 per cent of people who entered our homes this year were in a high-need or a very high need cohort, which is a tremendous result and a testament to the hardworking men and women of the Department of Housing and Public Works in our housing service centres right across the state.

I am also pleased to inform the House that for those high-need and very high need categories we have seen people on the housing register placed into suitable accommodation six weeks faster than when those opposite were last in government. That means six weeks less time facing the indignity of homelessness, six weeks less time in a home that might not be suitable or accessible for someone with a disability and six weeks less time that someone has to spend facing the desperation of trying to escape a situation of domestic or family violence.

The Palaszczuk government is putting people first. It is why Queensland rates the best in the nation when it comes to the delivery of housing services according to the recent report on government services. We can claim an 85.8 per cent satisfaction rate—13 per cent higher than the national average. Unfortunately, the Turnbull government does not share the same commitment to housing that the Palaszczuk government does. The Prime Minister has failed to act to do anything to restore the massive distortions that exist in the housing market that are cooking it for working people. What is worse, the massive pay cuts that Prime Minister Turnbull has delivered when it comes to penalty rates will see Queenslanders lose significant income—essential income that in many cases goes to the payment of rent. That is a punishment for working Australians being handed out by the LNP Prime Minister.

Over the last 12 months the Queensland Labor government has provided private market rental assistance through bond loans and rental grants to 28,400 Queensland families. That is a record. I congratulate each and every one of the staff of the Department of Housing and Public Works on this significant achievement.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitor to Public Gallery

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Before I go to the next item of business, I am informed that a recent former member of our parliament, Carolyn Male, is observing our proceedings in the public gallery. Welcome.

FINANCE AND ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE

Report

 **Mr RUSSO** (Sunnybank—ALP) (2.46 pm): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 48 of the Finance and Administration Committee titled *Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2) 2017 and Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2017*.

The report presents a summary of the committee's examination of the bills. The committee recommended that the bills be passed. I thank my fellow committee members for their bipartisan approach to the bills and commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 48, 55th Parliament—Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2) 2017 and Appropriation Bill (No. 2) 2017 [[1988](#)].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Energy Companies, Executive Bonuses

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (2.46 pm): I give notice that I shall move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk government to adopt the LNP's policy to freeze energy company executive bonuses until electricity prices decrease.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will all have a chance to talk about it this afternoon.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Electricity Prices

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.47 pm): Yesterday we saw the Palaszczuk government's Summer Preparedness Plan; and boy was it a red hot stinker! In yet another Labor failure we saw Queenslanders being warned of power system failure, blackouts and load shedding and calls for families, businesses and industry who are currently paying record prices for electricity to use less of it, set air conditioning at 26 degrees or above, turn off lights and turn off applications and equipment. The reaction was swift, with widespread condemnation from Queenslanders. For the benefit of Hansard I table the front page of yesterday's *Courier-Mail* with the headline 'Home sweat home: power crisis—households face being told to fix air-con on 26C'. I also table the front page of today's *Townsville Bulletin* with the headline 'Helter swelter: power-saving plan rejected in the north'.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 10 October 2017, titled 'Home Sweat Home'[\[1989\]](#).

Tabled paper: Article from the *Townsville Bulletin*, dated 11 October 2017, titled 'Helter Swelter'[\[1990\]](#).

Yesterday, instead of Labor owning this stinker of a plan put out by the energy security task force that Labor established, they tried desperately to spin their way out of it and even blame the opposition. The facts are Labor's plan states—

If the demand for electricity is greater than the available supply, there is no choice but to reduce demand or else the entire system can fail.

Let me say that again: 'or else the entire system can fail'. That is what Labor's energy security task force has warned. Further, and I quote again from Labor's own plan for the benefit of those opposite—

During a heatwave, residents may be asked to manage electricity network stress by changing air conditioners to 26 degrees or above and using cooling only in occupied rooms during peak hours. This helps us manage demand and mitigate the risk of load-shedding occurring.

Finally, the Labor plan states—

Workplaces may be asked to use air conditioning at 26 degrees only in occupied spaces, avoid using advertising lights and other non-essential lighting, and turn off non-essential electrical equipment.

Queenslanders are not wasting electricity. They have never paid more for electricity than under the current government. They cannot afford to waste electricity under this government as we have record high prices, yet Labor thinks that Queenslanders are using too much power. It is ridiculous, it is out of touch and it has been condemned by Queenslanders. After less than three years, this do-nothing Labor government has trashed Queensland's energy security and put us at risk of blackouts and power rationing. Only the LNP has an energy policy that focuses on affordability and security of supply.

Federal Member for Petrie

 **Hon. CW PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.50 pm): As I said yesterday in response to a contribution of the member for Indooroopilly, saying it over and over again does not make it true. The federal LNP government—their side of politics—has just implemented a very similar scheme, so obviously they are the ones who are out of touch as they do not even know what their mob are doing. Speaking of their federal counterparts, members can imagine my surprise when, following our big debate about the GST yesterday, I saw what LNP federal member for Petrie, Luke Howarth, said via Facebook. I table a copy of his Facebook post.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Facebook page of Mr Luke Howarth, regarding GST payments [\[1991\]](#).

Mr Howarth did not come into the debate to back Queensland. No, of course not. He said that the current system rewards 'poor performance'. He went on to ask, 'What do you think?' Plenty of people told him what they think. I think he has backed One Nation's plan for a per capita share, which puts us out of pocket by about \$2.4 billion. Mr Howarth should think about joining One Nation or moving to Western Australia, because he will not be very popular in his seat of Petrie, which will be well and truly in play at the next federal election after that performance. He is not standing up for Queensland and that is for sure. We know that the Productivity Commission report says that we would be up to \$1.59 billion worse off under one of their allocations, but Mr Howarth has gone further. Essentially, he is saying that the current system rewards poor performance. Essentially, he is backing the \$2.4 billion loss that we would see under the proposal of the member for Buderim, the leader of One Nation in this House. Under the existing system, the independent Commonwealth Grants Commission takes account of these factors and gives a fair share of the GST pool to deliver our services. By saying that getting our fair share reflects poor performance, essentially Mr Howarth is saying that that poor performance

would send \$2.4 billion out the door; that it would be taken away from Queensland. What services would Mr Howarth want to cut? What would he want to cut? What hospitals would he want to see closed? What schools would he like to be shut down? What roads would not be built? Will he tell the voters of Petrie that they would need to share that pain?

The member for Petrie has sold out Queensland. There is no other way to say it. He has done exactly the same thing that Queensland senator Matt Canavan did when he became a senator for Western Australia by advocating that half a billion dollars in roads funding be given to the Western Australian government. We know that Pauline Hanson was happy to sell out Queensland before the WA election. She was asked whether she would be willing to see the GST share of her home state of Queensland reduced, so that WA could get a better of deal. She said, 'Of course I will, no problem.'

That prompts the inevitable question: please explain. It is Luke Howarth who has to explain to the voters of Petrie and all Queenslanders why he is selling out Queensland. It is the Leader of the Opposition who has to explain if he agrees with Luke Howarth, next to whom he stood when the member for Petrie swore when the Prime Minister was asked a question about the lack of women in the Turnbull government. They have to get on with the job of supporting Queensland.

(Time expired)

CFMEU

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (2.53 pm): With continual breaches of the law, bullying, royal commissions, corruption, the illegal shredding of documents, assaults, threats, fines and hundreds of officials before the courts, one could be forgiven for thinking I was talking about a criminal organisation, but I am not. I am talking about the CFMEU and its ties to the Labor Party, particularly Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk. The more policy decisions that are made, the more money the Labor Party gets. The more the CFMEU gives to the Labor Party, the more influence it gets from the government. Under Premier Palaszczuk, the Labor Party is owned lock, stock and barrel by the union movement. We know that she knows that her job depends on the union supporting the state.

I have long been disgusted by the scandals, the bullying and the intimidation by the union movement. However, as a father, nothing makes me more disgusted and sick to the guts than reading the comments from CFMEU members reported in the paper today. The CFMEU and its militant leaders operate like a criminal organisation. When things do not go their way, they threaten physical violence. They strike fear and intimidation into the hearts of decent hardworking Queenslanders who just want to keep their jobs and put food on the table for their families.

If you cross the picket line, you are called a scab. You are threatened with violence against yourself and your family—and not only your family; it is now your children. Just when we thought it could not get any worse or lower, it does. Today they threatened to rape the kids of workers. In the paper today we read that hardworking workers who crossed the line to work were yelled the abuse that their kids were going to get raped. In a video of the scene, someone says, 'I hope you hit a tree on your way home from work.' That is disgusting. That is the organisation that funds the Labor Party. That is the organisation that funds the Premier and gives the Premier her job.

Despite all the ministerial statements that she gave this morning, the Premier did not condemn the union movement. The Premier could not stand in this place and condemn the union movement's comments that kids were going to be raped. We did not hear one word. This morning the Premier held a press conference—

Mr Mander: She is laughing.

Mr BLEIJIE: The Premier is laughing about it. We have heard not one word of leadership. This is a test of leadership. Earlier today the Premier held a press conference and her response was, 'It's unacceptable.' She comes in here and says about members of this place things such as she is furious; she has eyeballed someone; she is really upset; she is sick and tired of it; it is a serious issue. However, we have heard no such words uttered about the CFMEU members who want to rape the children of workers. The Premier should be ashamed. The Minister for Women and Kate Jones, one the biggest haters in this place, have not condemned those words from the union movement. Peter Beattie had the leadership and the fortitude to say that the Labor Party should dissociate from the union movement. This Premier is weak.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I now call the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Thank you, members. I am on my feet.

Mr Pearce interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mirani, you are aware that when I am on my feet members should be quiet. You are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Liberal National Party, One Nation

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.57 pm): The worst kept secret in Queensland politics is now out in the open. The tawdry relationship between the LNP and the One Nation party has been dragged out of the shadows and into the light. An extraordinary story has been published in today's *Queensland Times* about Senator Hanson handing over a cheque for \$8.9 million on behalf of the Liberal National Party coalition government. I table that photo.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting Senator Pauline Hanson and others [\[1992\]](#).

Senator Hanson now has her own set of keys to the federal Treasury. The cheque that she carries has on it her own signature, as if One Nation had funded that project itself. I table that.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a cheque to Ipswich Show Society [\[1993\]](#).

I encourage the show society to bank the cheque as soon as possible, because one of the names on the cheque is that of Senator Malcolm Roberts, whom they might find out has never been able to sit in the Senate at all, so the cheque might bounce.

This is not a Liberal National coalition; it is a Liberal National One Nation coalition for all the world to see. We know that because of the voting record of One Nation. What has One Nation done? It has betrayed Queensland workers by supporting the ABCC and attacking penalty rates. One Nation betrayed Queensland farmers by ratcheting up the backpacker tax by 50 per cent. One Nation betrayed every single Queenslanders by supporting a GST model that would rip \$2.4 billion out of Queensland.

One Nation is about one person—Hanson first and Queensland nowhere. Today, I call on the Leader of the Opposition to once and for all rule out a preference deal with One Nation, including on a seat-by-seat basis. One Nation, by their words and actions, have demonstrated how dangerous their policy agenda is for Queensland. There is only one way for the Leader of the Opposition—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock! Members!

Mr DICK: There is only one way for the Leader of the Opposition to restore the broken integrity of his party and that is to follow the lead of the Premier and put One Nation last. It is time for the Leader of the Opposition to get off the fence, to put away the weasel words, to dump the shady preference deals, to find an ounce of political and moral courage and to demonstrate, finally in the clearest possible terms, that he puts Queensland first and he puts One Nation last.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We might all just take a breath for a moment.

CFMEU

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (3.00 pm): When will this Premier grow a spine and stand up to the thuggery, intimidation and lawlessness of the unions and their downright disgusting and morally corrupt behaviour exposed for all to see in media reports today? Queenslanders would have been sickened today to learn that a bunch of CFMEU grubs in Central Queensland had threatened to rape children, to bash people with crowbars and to physically harm others because they did not bow to the CFMEU demands.

What type of state are we living in where this despicable behaviour is tacitly condoned and accepted by a union-beholden government led by this Premier? There is, of course, a saying: the conduct you walk past is the conduct you accept. That certainly rings true with this Premier. This Premier is a see-nothing, know-nothing, do-nothing Premier when it comes to the unlawful thuggish behaviour of the union movement.

Once again, today, this Premier has failed the leadership 101 test. Instead of standing up against these lawless and despicable thugs, what did she do? What did she do when she was asked? She merely said that their behaviour was 'unacceptable'. Here is the quote: 'It is not acceptable.' That is it.

What did the Minister for Women say? Nothing. What did the Minister for Health say? Nothing. What did the Minister for Education say? Nothing. We have a Premier who should have said so much more but effectively said nothing.

Why is that? It all comes down to money. This Premier is reliant on the tainted cash of the CFMEU and others to bankroll her campaign. She says she finds the CFMEU's disgusting and sickening behaviour unacceptable, but she obviously does not believe that taking their tainted money is unacceptable. We are only here this week, from all reports, because this government wants to push through union legislation—a thank you very much to the union movement for their cash. The Premier says, 'I kept my end of the bargain; you keep the cash flowing to my coffers.'

This Premier has allowed the CFMEU law-breakers to become Queensland lawmakers. At least Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh had the good sense to dissociate themselves, but this Premier does not have the moral fortitude, the spine, the backbone or the leadership to take the CFMEU out of her organisation. I challenge the Premier today to grow a spine, show some leadership, rule out taking money and hand it back.

(Time expired)

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

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

CFMEU

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (3.04 pm): My first question without notice is to the Premier. I table part of a security report with 51 entries showing that members of the CFMEU have used language that any decent Queenslanders would have found vile and reprehensible.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'GLENCORE, Extract from security reports prepared for Glencore on verbal abuse observed from CFMEU members and officials on the picket line at Oaky North Mine' [\[1994\]](#).

It includes threats to attack workers with a crowbar and even a threat to rape the children of another worker. Given that Palaszczuk cabinet ministers have hosted the CFMEU 58 times over this term, will the Premier now cut off the CFMEU, instruct her ministers to stop their open-door access and direct her caucus members to resign their membership of this vile bunch of thugs?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As I said very clearly today at a press conference, where I was questioned by members of the press gallery, I do not find their behaviour acceptable at all, nor do—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock! Member for Ipswich, if you persist you will be warned under standing order 253A. The question has been asked and the Premier is answering the question. It is relevant.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The other thing I said is that if there is a police investigation that will continue and it will go through the normal processes, as it should, that would apply for anyone else in the same position. Nobody in this state is above the law.

I will not be lectured by the Leader of the Opposition when his own party undertakes its own internal investigations using intimidatory behaviour and tactics. We only have to go back through the Barry O'Sullivan tapes to see that same sort of behaviour. Did I hear anything from them? Was there anything said by the LNP then? They got elevated.

Ms Trad: He got promoted.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the Deputy Premier's interjection. He got promoted to the Senate. Did I see the Leader of the Opposition talk about his LNP candidate for Redcliffe? What did the LNP candidate do? Absolute racism—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, it is not an opportunity to become unruly.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Did we hear the Leader of the Opposition say anything about that? Has that LNP candidate been disendorsed? No, they have not. They thought it was funny. They posted it on Facebook.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mount Ommaney and member for Callide, you are both warned under standing order 253A. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, if you persist you will be warned. I find your interjections designed to disrupt the Premier in her answer and repetitive. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have made it incredibly clear, not just to this House but also to the people of this state, that any type of behaviour like that is not acceptable. The police will investigate—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana and Minister for Education, you are both warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will take the appropriate action. I will continue naming members if I find their behaviour unacceptable.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The police will investigate. If it is deemed that it should go further, it will go further and it will be dealt with through a court of law. That is the right course of action. That is absolutely the right course of action.

CFMEU

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question without notice is also to the Premier. Again, I refer to the tabled list of insults and other outrageous comments made by CFMEU thugs.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for Health, you are warned under standing order 253A. You are aware of the ruling in relation to silence while the member is asking a question.

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question without notice is also to the Premier. Again, I refer to the extract in the security report that I tabled. CFMEU thugs on the Oaky North picket line are also alleged to have hurled insults and disability slurs at workers who were attempting to do their job. Why is this outrageous and discriminatory language acceptable in Queensland workplaces under this Premier's leadership?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have answered this question. I have made it very clear that it is not acceptable full stop.

Regional Queensland, Jobs

Mr SAUNDERS: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on what the state government is doing to support skilled jobs in regional Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maryborough for that question. My government was absolutely delighted to be governing from the Wide Bay district and to have a lovely reception in Maryborough. Whilst we were in Wide Bay, the Minister for Health and I also had the great opportunity to go to the electorate of Hervey Bay and look at the plans for the brand-new expansion—\$44 million invested by this government into the seat of Hervey Bay—

Mr Dick: A new ambulance station as well.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—and a new ambulance station as well. I thank the member for Maryborough for all of his hard work. It was an absolute pleasure for me, the Deputy Premier and also the member for Gladstone to join the member for Maryborough at EDI Downer, where we announced \$70 million worth of works for people working there.

I want to talk for a moment about how important jobs are for the region. As we know, Queenslanders want to be able, where possible, to work close to where they live. Once we announced this extra money for EDI Downer they were able to put on more workers and more apprentices. I met a couple of people in the street of Maryborough. They came up to me and said, 'Annastacia, you don't understand what this actually means for our family.'

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is not funny. This is a very serious issue. The members can laugh about it.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members.

Ms PALASZCZUK: What this announcement meant to those families is that their husbands will now be able to be home to see their children in the morning before they go to school—

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Glass House, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action. That applies to other members as well.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—and be home with them for dinner once they finish work and their children get home from school. The work that we are doing in regional Queensland is fundamentally changing people's lives for the better. It is those heartfelt words that reassure my government that everything that we are doing to grow jobs and services in the regions is working and will have a long-term impact on families for many, many years to come.

We had a great visit not just to Maryborough but also to Bundaberg. We were able to announce the expansion of the biofuels refinery at the Bundaberg Rum Distillery. I know the member for Bundaberg and Dr Anthony—

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I can hear you, member for Lockyer. I will give you the benefit of the doubt.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I look forward to taking my cabinet to the regions in the very near future.

CFMEU, Political Donations

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. While the Premier has been leader, the CFMEU has donated over \$180,000 to the Labor Party, all while infecting Queensland workplaces with its outrageous and unacceptable language and threats. Will the Premier now amend the Electoral Act to ban the CFMEU from donating to political parties in Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. The answer is no. What I will say is that I would like to see the \$100,000 of secret donations. With real-time disclosure, you know who is donating.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition can say that figure because through real-time disclosure the public knows. Everybody knows because of real-time disclosure and the actions that my government has taken. Under the former government, they were secret—no-one knew. There was no real-time disclosure. We still do not know where the \$100,000 of secret donations is and who donated. Do not come in here and lecture me about donations until you produce your list of \$100,000 of secret donations.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I think the Premier has answered the question. We will move on.

Gas Supply

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on how the government is developing further gas reserves to increase supply and put downward pressure on power prices?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mackay for that question because on this side of the House we are very committed to opening up our gas fields to ensure that more supply comes on to the domestic market. We saw the recent awarding of the tender, which Dr Anthony Lynham spoke about in this House this morning, to a Queensland company—solely opened for use in the domestic market in Australia. My government has that commitment and we will continue to follow that commitment for many years to come.

However, once again what we see in Canberra is a policy vacuum when it comes to opening up gas reserves. We know the Finkel report said that gas is a vital transition element of a national energy plan. In New South Wales and Victoria, as I said yesterday and I will say it again, the gate has been closed. The door has been shut on opening up additional gas reserves in other parts of their states.

We know that there is one thing that those opposite support, and that is a new coal-fired power station. I find that at odds and somewhat hypocritical when five years ago today they shut down half of Tarong. Five years ago this week, they shut down Tarong and they shut down the jobs that went with it. Not only that, they shut down Swanbank E. Rather than increasing supply and having capacity, they reduced supply. My government is building supply and adding renewables on top of that. Queensland is the energy powerhouse of the nation. What we have seen—

Mr Boothman interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am not sure if that was—

An honourable member: It was.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you—if that was the member for Gaven.

Mr Boothman: No.

Mr SPEAKER: I just remind members that warnings will continue until after the six o'clock debate. I calculate that I currently have 11 members on their first warning. I will have no hesitation in taking the next step and asking those members to leave. I am in your hands. The Premier has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: In relation to the latest gas tender that was awarded by my government, we are expecting about a \$200 million investment over the life of that project and the creation of an extra 150 jobs. If we open up more supply, we are going to see downward pressure on prices, because that is exactly what my government is committed to doing.

On that side of the House, all we are seeing is hypocrisy when it comes to energy policy. In their last term of government they shut down half of Tarong. They shut down Swanbank E. Now they want to build a new coal-fired power station, which is not going to be ready for seven years, when we have the most efficient fleet in the nation. We know that they only have one policy when it comes to energy in this state, and that is to sell the energy assets. We will honour our commitment and the trust that Queenslanders put in us and we will never sell our energy assets in this state.

CFMEU

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. Premier, if you are not willing to hand back the money from the CFMEU, will you at least today condemn their vile behaviour—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There have been rulings on many occasions, including by you, in this House which make it clear that members should not use 'you' and direct their questions directly to other members but should direct them through you as the chair.

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: I rule your question out of order.

Gas Supply

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Will the minister please advise the House how the Palaszczuk government is contributing to increased gas supply for domestic markets and whether the minister is aware of any alternative policies?

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, the reason I ruled that question out of order is that the member did use the word 'you' and my intention is to try to settle down the atmosphere in this chamber at the moment.

Dr LYNHAM: I know that the member for Lytton knows the importance of a reliable, accessible and economic gas supply for the people of Queensland, and I know how important it is in the member's electorate—a big gas user that employs hundreds of people in her electorate.

We know that gas supply is critical for industry and critical for jobs and job creation. We know that gas supply and prices are directly linked to electricity prices. We have not been idle. We have been very proactive in this state. I personally went to Darwin to make sure that a gas pipeline came from the Northern Territory to Mount Isa to give Mount Isa a secure gas supply. I also made sure that we are releasing gas for domestic use only. We have three production areas opened up—two are out for tender and one is already let. As I said before, we are opening up more land for exploration in this state.

We have also heard the Prime Minister and the federal energy minister say that Queensland is a heavy lifter, but where is the Prime Minister in supporting Queensland with some common user infrastructure for some sensible solutions like getting gas from Australian producers? They are lining up to produce gas. Get gas from places like the Bowen Basin into the east coast supply. Where is the Prime Minister on this?

A government member: Nowhere.

Dr LYNHAM: He is nowhere. The solution, as the Premier said, is more supply, but what a thought bubble we had last week from the member for Buderim, the leader of One Nation in this House. What a stunning policy to shut down Queensland's gas supply—absolutely shut it off. Fifty years of supplying gas to this state—50 years of job creation and economic growth from gas supply from Queensland's fields—and the leader of One Nation wants to shut them down. It will cause a ramping up of electricity prices. It will cause a decimation of jobs in this state. It was a ridiculous thought bubble.

We heard the Minister for Health talk about it before. The LNP is proposing a seat-by-seat preference deal with One Nation. What will that do? Supporting their dodgy policies on energy supply in Queensland? Higher electricity prices? Jobs will go with the dodgy deals that the Leader of the Opposition is doing with One Nation. It cannot be allowed. I call on the Leader of the Opposition to stand up and rule out any deals with the dodgy One Nation and their dodgy energy supply policy.

CFMEU

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. If the Premier is not willing to hand back the CFMEU money, will the Premier at least today condemn their vile behaviour?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I said that the behaviour is completely unacceptable full stop.

Works for Queensland

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker—

An opposition member: Here we go.

Mr PEARCE: Here it goes all right.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I would urge you not to provoke the member for Mirani. I urge the member for Mirani not to provoke other members as well.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. It is fair to assume that the member for Mirani was making some comment towards the opposition that could possibly have been a threat.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Speaker, on the point of order: you have made rulings even in recent days about people interjecting on members as they are rising to their feet or are in the middle of asking questions. There were clearly interjections on the member for Mirani as he was rising to his feet and preparing to ask his question. I would encourage you to make sure that he is given the opportunity to ask his question without provocation.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the member for Mirani to ask his question with no preamble or we will move on.

Mr PEARCE: My question is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the Works for Queensland program is supporting jobs in Central Queensland and whether the Deputy Premier is aware of any alternative policies?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Mirani for the question. The member for Mirani, like all members on this side of the House, supports Works for Queensland because it means jobs, it means backing regional councils and it means that local regional economies have activity and are providing the type of infrastructure and the types of jobs that these communities need.

I was very honoured to join with Central Queensland councils last month to announce round 2 of the Works for Queensland program. We know in Central Queensland that Mount Morgan, in the member's own electorate, is seeing some rejuvenation in terms of the streetscape. In Rockhampton there are works underway and also in Yeppoon. This is an outstanding project. Through round 2 more than 400 local jobs will be supported, sustained or created through Works for Queensland. That is what Labor does. Labor backs workers. Labor makes sure that regional communities have investment from the state government to build the infrastructure they need.

This has been such a resounding success that at the LGAQ conference next week I understand there is a motion calling on the state government to provide an additional round—a third round—of Works for Queensland because it has been a resounding success. At that conference I understand there will be a lot of talk from local councils wanting to know where the LNP stands on this issue because they know that only one side of politics has been trash talking this project and running it into the ground, and it is those opposite. Local councils want to know that this program is going to continue because of the resounding success it has had in delivering infrastructure and creating jobs.

It is time that the LNP came clean about whether or not they support Works for Queensland, whether or not they support regional Queensland councils and whether or not they are going to axe this program. While they should come clean on Works for Queensland, they should also come clean on \$100,000 worth of secret donations. It has been 50 days since this parliament passed a motion calling on the LNP to disclose their list of secret donors. They want to come in here and talk about law-breakers. We are lawmakers and they are law-breakers.

There is only one side of politics that is in the Supreme Court because they are not abiding by the laws of this state and it is those opposite. They should come clean on who has funded \$100,000 worth of secret donations, and they should abide by the motion in this House as well as the laws of this state. Do not come in here and talk about law-breakers when you are law-breakers yourselves.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, you are aware that when I am on my feet members are required to be quiet. You are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Energy Supply

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Premier. The Premier has said, 'We will not introduce measures on others that we do not apply to ourselves.' Will the Premier now order the air conditioning in 1 William Street to be set to 26 degrees or higher for the Queensland summer?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Burleigh for the question. If he wants to talk about 1 William Street, let us talk about 1 William Street. Let us bring it on. In fact, I think I talked about that for three years. For three years in opposition, we talked about it because the one infrastructure project built—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the interjection because the former premier had dinner with the CFMEU about 1 William Street. That is a home run there, member for Burleigh.

Mr Pitt: Worst financial deal in Queensland.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. There was no business case. We are still waiting to see the business case for 1 William Street because the former treasurer talked about how the private sector was going to be moving in and taking in certain floors—'We're offering a great deal'—but we do not even own the building. It was such a good deal but no-one from the private sector would move in. That is the legacy of the former treasurer—1 William Street, with absolutely no business case at all.

Ms Trad interjected.

Ms Grace interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do not think so.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, can you please return to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I was saying, I spent three years in opposition talking about 1 William Street as every level was coming out of the ground. While they were sacking staff and cutting services, they were building a building for themselves. Under my government, we have completed the second stage of the light rail, we have opened the Sunshine Coast University Hospital—and I should take the cabinet up there to see that hospital—we have said that we have committed to building Cross River Rail and we have opened the new health service at Wynnum. There is so much more that we have planned for this state because we have a clear vision for Queensland. The only vision that those opposite had for three years was to build 1 William Street. That is all they did—that is it; nothing else.

They sacked 14,000 public servants. They built a building for themselves that they never moved into. They did not have a business case and they were not able to get the private sector to move in. That is their legacy—a complete and utter disaster.

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

Distribution of GST

Ms LINARD: My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. I refer to the Productivity Commission's draft report on GST allocations. Will the Treasurer outline what steps the government will be taking in the wake of the report's release to ensure Queensland retains its fair share of GST funds?

Mr PITT: I thank the member for Nudgee for her question. It is quite appropriate that she asked me this question here today because her seat of Nudgee is just to the south of the federal seat of Petrie where we have the scene of the crime with Luke Howarth absolutely abandoning Queensland and not standing up for his home state, just like those opposite. The Productivity Commission report was released on Monday of this week. As we have said, we will be doing all we can to ensure we do not lose our fair share of GST funding through these arrangements.

We on this side of the House lodged a submission to the Productivity Commission to make sure that our views were clear and well known. We know that the member for Clayfield, who is a strong advocate of trickle-down economics, has been labelled as being very, very lazy. That laziness has also trickled down because the opposition could not bring it upon themselves to put in a submission to the Productivity Commission. One Nation are obviously far less lazy because they lodged a submission. They advocated that every state should receive an equal per capita share of the GST revenue. This is from the party that brought us some of the great economic flat-earth policies, such as a two per cent flat tax that would replace all other taxes, but that is another story.

It is clear that the LNP cannot even muster the strength to make themselves and their position known on this very, very important issue because the Leader of the Opposition is very, very lazy. They are more content to do deals. We had a debate in this House yesterday about this very issue. That debate talked by and large about the options that were presented by the Productivity Commission. In that debate, the LNP were very critical of this government for a number of different reasons, but they could not bring themselves to vote against the motion. They just went silent and let it pass on the voices. They squibbed it. The only reason they let it go to the voices was that they did not want a division. Maybe they had done a deal with One Nation in this place to not have a division, just like they are continuing to try to do deals with One Nation outside of the House. This side of the House has put its point of view and made its position clear about our relationship with One Nation, and it cannot be any clearer. The Premier has signed a statutory declaration ruling out a preference deal with One Nation.

Just like the LNP squibbed it in the House yesterday, the Leader of the Opposition has squibbed it again. If they are trying to do deals with One Nation on a seat-by-seat basis, maybe they will start doing deals on a motion-by-motion basis, or legislation-by-legislation basis. This says that the LNP are in bed with One Nation and that a vote for the LNP will equal a vote for One Nation and vice versa. There is no other way around it. One thing is clear: this government will continue to stand up for Queenslanders, even if the LNP in this House or the member for Petrie will not.

Energy Supply

Ms DAVIS: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier please reconsider her 26 degrees or higher plan for air conditioning in Queensland and give a special dispensation to elderly Queenslanders and pregnant women to save them from the insufferable heat under Labor's heartless energy plan?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. One of the things that my government did during the budget is we expanded the concessions for pensioners. An extra 147,000 people now have the extra rebate, thanks to my government. Once again, we are putting people front and centre when it comes to the pressures that they experience.

Let us make it very clear that the summer readiness plan that Minister Bailey announced the other day is a voluntary program. In fact, it is interesting that in the papers today we see that the Prime Minister of our country announced almost an identical program in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia. In fact, Josh Frydenberg talked up the program about what to do when there is strain on peak

demand. If anyone cares to read the document, they will see that it is very clear that Queensland has large capacity. The back of the document says very clearly that the issue of heatwaves very rarely happens, but this is about preparing in case it happens.

Once again, this is voluntary, it is not compulsory, so their little scare campaign is not working. Whilst they are at it, they had better pick up the phone and call Malcolm Turnbull and tell him that they do not support what he is doing in the other states. He is giving the concessions in the other states because they have a peak base load problem. In Queensland we do not, but we are giving people the voluntary option to sign up.

Dental Services, Federal Funding

Mr RUSSO: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister please advise the House of the cost-of-living impact of the Commonwealth cuts to dental care?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Sunnybank for his advocacy for effective and accessible public health care to all Queenslanders. It seems nothing will divert the LNP from their commitment lock, stock and barrel to going down the path of Trumpian alternative facts.

I was surprised to read in the press today reports involving the member for Burnett and the LNP candidate for Bundaberg complaining about dental waiting lists in the Wide Bay region. What is the truth? What happened in the Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service last year? There were 89,000 dental appointments—a record 89,000. How many more was that than in the previous year? It was 10,000 additional appointments in the Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service. What does that mean? There were no patients waiting longer than clinically recommended for a general dental appointment in the Wide Bay region or any other part of Queensland.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr DICK: There is the foghorn from Southern Downs again sounding off, patting himself on the back incessantly. How did the LNP deal with dental waiting lists? They did it through a national partnership agreement funded by federal Labor.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr DICK: The member for Southern Downs should be quiet and apologise to the Barrett families. That is what he should do.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the minister, I prefer not to warn the member for Southern Downs, so I urge you to be careful.

Mr DICK: What did we get out of the federal coalition government in the 2014 budget? They projected then that they would spend \$78 million in Queensland this year on dental lists. What did we get in the federal budget this year? A total of \$21 million—a cut of 72 per cent. What does that mean? It means 94½ thousand Queenslanders who will not get a dental appointment because the federal government has cut funding.

Where is the Leader of the Opposition on this? He spent his time in government doing a shady deal with the CFMEU for 1 William Street. What did he do for public dental waiting lists? Nothing! He rode on the back of federal Labor and now 94½ thousand Queenslanders will be left waiting because of Malcolm Turnbull, Scott Morrison and Greg Hunt.

It is about time the Leader of the Opposition did something for Queensland. We know he is lazy. We know he has his feet up on the back deck. We know the polling shows nobody knows who he is. He does not stand for anything and he does not want to do anything for Queensland. That is not the way to gain government in this state. The way people gain government is by standing up for something, going to the people of Queensland and saying, 'We believe in this,' just like this government believes in public health care, public dental waiting lists, cutting those lists and reducing the number of those people waiting for a specialist outpatient appointment by 60 per cent. That is what we have done. That is our record. Queenslanders will get nothing out of the LNP except the misery of a Liberal National Party-One Nation coalition.

Mount Isa-Townsville Rail Line

Mr KATTER: My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. The viability of industry in Townsville is currently compromised by prohibitive rail access charges and arrangements for the Mount Isa-Townsville line administered by Queensland Rail and

regulated by the Queensland Competition Authority. Will the Treasurer commit to directing the QCA and QR to amend access arrangements so there is increased utilisation of the line to stimulate economic activity in the north?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for Mount Isa for his question. As the member has clearly spelt out, there is a role for the state's independent economic regulator, the Queensland Competition Authority, to play when it comes to having the third-party access regime administered in this state. That relates to Queensland Rail's rail network on the Mount Isa line. The member has raised this issue on previous occasions. In fact, if I am not mistaken, I believe I will be having a meeting this week with the member on this particular issue.

There is nothing simple about this. Of course we want to ensure that we have every opportunity to provide the best possible outcome when it comes to economic benefit. We note that Queensland Rail, as an operator, has a big responsibility but, as a statutory authority in this state, it is still governed by the people of Queensland. I am very happy to sit down with the member and talk to him. I know of the north-west minerals province infrastructure user group, the IUG, and I know that the member has been a keen driver of that group. We are very keen to see outcomes that can be delivered which will benefit local people and that broader region.

This gives me the opportunity to talk about some of those key elements that have happened with that particular line. We know there are concerns that relate to the number of trucks on the road and the most affordable and effective way to move freight and that includes by rail. Those are the challenges that need to be faced but that needs to be done in a very fair and equitable way to ensure the market can still have a role in determining price outcomes.

What we have seen in Mount Isa has been a bit of a turnaround in recent times, and I hope the member would agree. It is part of a story we are seeing across regional Queensland where they are now starting to catch up a little bit in terms of the economic growth story we are seeing across the state. Key to that has been a very strong commitment by this government to be fair in terms of managing environmental outcomes and ensuring not only the existing investments are maintained in the resources sector but gaining extra opportunities to get bigger and better things happening with new projects. The member has been a key advocate for that.

I am happy to meet with him tomorrow to discuss this matter. We will be able to go through those issues. I will not be making any direction in this response to that question. It would not be prudent of me to do that before meeting with the member and other members of the IUG to discuss this issue. I am very happy to meet with the member.

STEM Education

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister advise how the Palaszczuk government is advancing STEM education in Queensland state schools?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question and her genuine interest in STEM and the future jobs and industry for young people in Queensland. We know that 75 per cent of jobs into the future have seen the fastest growth in these disciplines and we need to ensure that our young people have these skills. That is why as minister I have provided for the very first time STEM specialists in our primary schools. We know that these are skills that our people will need into the future. In providing this additional support we can create those STEM skills in our young people in those early years of learning. We want to engage them in this learning and understanding that will give them the best chance of getting a job into the future.

That is not all. We have also been working with our teachers. In the past I have spoken in the parliament about the work that we have done with our universities to provide our teachers with an opportunity in their own time—and thousands of them by their own volition have taken it up—to do short courses at university in key areas of STEM. I want to acknowledge and thank those teachers who continue to engage in professional development to ensure that we are providing the most up-to-date and important information for our young people.

This investment in professional development, this investment in additional teachers working in our schools, stands in stark contrast to what happened when the Leader of the Opposition was treasurer in Queensland. We know that, under their watch, they cut 500 teachers from Queensland. Not only did they do that, they also took an axe to the IT department of the education department.

Mr Dick: Shame!

Ms JONES: It was absolutely shameful. At a time when we are expanding IT in our schools, when schools are doing more with young people to ensure that they are digital ready, we saw the Leader of the Opposition with his long list from his old mate. He is too lazy to do his own work; he outsourced that as well as everything else to his mate Peter Costello. In that long list of cuts that he worked his way through he managed to cut IT jobs from the education department. In actual fact, 270 IT staff were cut from the education department. He did not have the guts to eyeball them and tell them it was their job that was going; that was the job of other people who had to do his dirty work for him. That is exactly how he hopes to get into office. He wants to get into office on the back of the dirty work of One Nation, and that is shameful. It is no wonder that he has not condemned his candidate for Redcliffe for doing the 'black face'. The Leader of the Opposition is happy to get into a party that endorses candidates who mow swastikas into their backyard lawn. Is that the future for Queensland that we want?

Tonight we will be welcoming the multicultural community into Queensland parliament. Our government will be welcoming them. I dare the member opposite to crawl in there and defend the 'black face' candidate that he continues to stand by. It is shameful that he has not sacked his candidate for such racist behaviour.

(Time expired)

Government Procurement

Mr BENNETT: My question is to the Premier. I table documents showing that, after the start of the government's hyped procurement policy, Minister de Brenni awarded a \$2 million fencing contract and 12 jobs to a Tamworth company over a local Gladstone business desperate for work. Will the Premier now explain why she has utterly failed the people of Central Queensland by favouring a New South Wales company?

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents relating to LJ & BA Davies Constructions P/L and a tender notice [\[1995\]](#).

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to have a look at the policy, which came in during September.

Mr BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. Can I make sure that the question is put on notice under standing order 113?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The Premier barely had a chance to start answering the question before the member for Burnett began to follow the sheet that instructs opposition shadow ministers what to say if they do not think they are getting the right answer. I believe that the shadow minister's point of order was frivolous and that the member for Burnett should allow the Premier to answer the question before he jumps in to make protestations.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The document mentions June. I am happy to look into this, but the policy came in in September.

Ms Trad interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right, so I hope this question is not deliberately misleading. I will find out in more detail and get back to the member. I make no apologies for backing Queensland jobs in regional Queensland. Since the turning of the first sod for the Townsville stadium, over 80 per cent of the contracts have been awarded locally in Townsville, and we are going to see that happen right across our state. I do not care if the New Zealand trade minister attacks me. I do not care if the Australian trade minister attacks my government for putting Queensland—

Ms Trad: Or the New Zealand Deputy Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Is he Deputy Premier now?

Ms Trad: Deputy Prime Minister.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Deputy Prime Minister?

Ms Trad: From New Zealand.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Oh, that is right. I take that interjection. We will find out very soon about him, will we not? We make no apology for putting Queensland jobs first, because at the end of the day that is what Queenslanders want. They want to be able to work near the areas they live in.

Mr Emerson interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am glad that the member for Indooroopilly is talking, because we know about his contracts of the past: the NGR contract. Table the documents for us, because I am told that it is signed under him. Produce those documents and show the whole parliament and the people of Queensland that he took the easy way out.

Mr Emerson interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member offshored the jobs. We are awarding contracts from Maryborough—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Indooroopilly, I find that you are debating the point with the Premier. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am more than happy to debate the member for Indooroopilly, because I understand that he signed the contracts and he signed the Cab sub. If he disputes this, produce—

Mr Emerson: Did Downer drop out under you? Is that the case, Premier?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Produce the documents so that we can all see.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, I am about to find that you have answered the question. Is there anything that you wish to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No, Mr Speaker, that is fine.

Mr SPEAKER: We will move on. There is still time on the clock. I call the member for Pumicestone. Member for Indooroopilly and Premier, if you persist you will both be warned.

Seniors, Cost of Living

Mr WILLIAMS: My question is to Minister O'Rourke, Minister for Disability Services. Will the minister please advise the House what the Palaszczuk government has done to support seniors with cost-of-living issues?

Mrs O'ROURKE: I thank the member for Pumicestone for his question. I know that, like him, all members on this side of the House are proud that the Palaszczuk government is supporting seniors to remain in their own homes and drive down their cost of living through a range of concessions. As a government we value our seniors because we know that they have worked hard, they have paid their taxes and they have made invaluable contributions to our community.

Unfortunately, the same cannot be said for those opposite and the previous LNP government. You only need to look back to the 2014 budget when the Leader of the Opposition, as treasurer, took aim at Queensland seniors. They threatened to slash concessions and repeatedly said that they had no other choice. However, can we remind everyone that they did choose to prioritise a \$70 million Strong Choices advertising campaign over some of our most vulnerable Queenslanders.

It did not take long for the public backlash. Seniors and senior advocacy groups did not appreciate the way that seniors were being treated when the opposition leader was treasurer at a time when all the LNP could do was cut, sack and sell. Two days after the announcement the LNP backflipped and suddenly found the money they apparently did not have. The Palaszczuk government will never disrespect seniors in this way. We will ensure that seniors can spend time enjoying an ongoing active life—

Ms Davis interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Thank you, member for Aspley. I can hear you; I think that other members can too. You are also warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will take the appropriate action. Minister, you have the call.

Mrs O'ROURKE: The Palaszczuk government will never disrespect seniors in the way that the previous government did. We will make sure that our seniors can continue to enjoy an active life and spend time with their families out and about in the community. We do not want them to worry about bills. We do not want them to feel like they are not welcome. We want them to be able to get out and about and participate in the community. We have increased important household concessions.

We have taken action on the cost of living through the Seniors Card, Seniors Business Discount Card and Seniors Card +go. This year we increased concessions by \$27.9 million to a total of \$290 million. We have also supported more than 42,000 seniors to remain in their homes by providing

support for critical home maintenance and safety. We will never threaten their concessions and leave them in doubt. The Palaszczuk government will always strive to work with seniors to help them stay in their homes and drive down the cost of living.

Nullinga Dam

Mr CRIPPS: My question without notice is to the Premier. It has been five months since Building Queensland completed the business case on the proposed Nullinga Dam. Why is the government keeping the business case secret, given the Nullinga Dam is critical to improving urban and agricultural water security in Cairns and the Far North Queensland region?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. These matters are currently before cabinet. I am not going to go into details here today.

Housing, Indigenous Communities

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Will the minister advise the House what the Palaszczuk government is doing to secure affordable and appropriate housing in Indigenous communities?

Mr FURNER: I thank the member for Barron River for his question. I know that the member is very passionate about the need for affordable housing for our first nations people, particularly up in the cape.

This is a crucial issue in our remote and discrete Indigenous communities, which are among the most disadvantaged in this country. That is why the National Partnership Agreement on Remote and Indigenous Housing is so important. Under this agreement, Queensland is delivering better outcomes for remote Indigenous communities with more affordable housing options and supporting local jobs. I have seen this firsthand during my time as minister. Through the agreement more than 800 houses were delivered in Queensland between 2009 and 2016. In the last financial year, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander apprentices and trainees worked more than 125,000 hours on housing projects in remote Indigenous communities.

This agreement is due to expire this financial year, and the Commonwealth Government has done nothing but drag its feet. On 7 August this year I wrote to the federal Indigenous affairs minister, Nigel Scullion, about this matter and urged him to give us some answers. I table that correspondence.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 7 August 2017, from the Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon Mark Furner, to the Federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Hon. Nigel Scullion, regarding the review of the remote housing strategy [\[1996\]](#).

It has been months since I delivered this correspondence to the minister and I have heard not a peep out of this senator. The agreement has made significant gains towards closing the gap, reducing overcrowding and increasing local jobs and training opportunities. Several months ago I, along with the member for Townsville, Mr Scott Stewart, travelled to Palm Island and saw firsthand the benefit of NPARIH in respect of apprentices being trained and skilled up in this area. We simply cannot afford to have this uncertainty from the federal LNP government.

We know that those opposite are silent on this matter. We have heard nothing but silence from the opposition leader and the shadow minister, Steve Minnikin. They are silent on not just this issue. It is appalling to hear nothing but silence from those on the other side of the chamber in respect of the LNP candidate for Redcliffe. Posing on social media with a person dressed in blackface is just plain racism. There is no place in this country for that disgusting behaviour in this day and age on any side of politics. The day they sack this atrocious candidate and apologise for her offence will be the day they stand up for the rights of Indigenous people in this state and this country.

(Time expired)

Urannah Dam

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Premier. It has been 503 days since the coalition announced \$3 million for a feasibility study for Urannah Dam. Why has the Palaszczuk government not distributed the funding for this feasibility study?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. There are a number of feasibility studies looking at dams at the moment. We are continuing to have discussions with the federal government. We will continue to work with the federal government in relation to these important matters for the people of regional Queensland.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you are now warned under standing order 253A.

Mr Cripps: No, it was me.

Mr Mander: I'll take it.

Mr SPEAKER: All right. Thank you.

Government Procurement

Mr STEWART: My question is of the Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport. Will the minister update the House on the rollout of the government's new procurement strategy and how it compares to other purchasing models?

Mr de BRENNI: What a timely question. I thank the member for Townsville for the question and acknowledge that he is an absolute fighter for Queensland jobs. The member for Burnett well knows that our procurement policy commenced on 1 September this year. The paper he tabled clearly states that this issue was raised on 8 June 2017—three months before the policy started. I will be writing to you, Mr Speaker, in respect of the member for Burnett's deliberate attempt to mislead the House.

I want to respond to the useful question asked by the member for Townsville. I have been asked to update the House on the rollout of the Palaszczuk government's Buy Queensland strategy. It has been going absolute gangbusters right across the state. I advise the House that 2,151 businesses have attended the Buy Queensland Roadshow information sessions. They have been clamouring to hear how they can be a part of a new process of delivering for Queenslanders.

We on this side of the House will be making sure we actively back local businesses. That is why we have decided that they are worth a weighting of up to 30 per cent. People at these sessions are saying that they are relieved that there is a government backing Queensland businesses and backing Queensland jobs—unlike the opposition, which is prepared to cut to the bone. They are saying that they are happy there is a government that supports business growth and does not slash their customer base by putting people out of work, like the LNP did in government. I have been asked about the alternatives.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, you have given notice of a motion to be moved this evening. You have not stopped interjecting all day. You are fortunate that it is almost the end of question time; otherwise you would be on the list as well. You are exhausting my tolerance.

Mr de BRENNI: They do not want to hear it because they are embarrassed and ashamed by the pathetic policy they have rolled out. I have been asked about the alternatives. What is the LNP's plan for Queensland businesses? What we have seen from those opposite is nothing more than an open invitation for overseas firms and companies based in Sydney, Melbourne and Perth to come to Queensland and start a race to the bottom. The message from the opposition to Queensland businesses is: cut your apprentices, cut investment into your own business, cut safety and cut quality—an absolute race to the bottom.

The LNP's purchasing policy is not only lazy policy; it is also destructive policy. In the view of many people, this policy is the most lazy and destructive policy ever rolled out by an opposition in Australian political history—the most lazy and dangerous policy. It is the same lowest price attitude that led to those opposite being slammed by the Queensland Auditor-General. The Queensland Auditor-General said of the policy of those opposite that delivered this outcome that it was a shambles that could not manage the cut-price savings they envisaged. Everyone knows that if you buy cheap junk you hide the real costs of constantly having to repair and replace. That is what you get with Tim Nicholls and his price-match guarantee.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I have now included the member for Everton—and if he is not careful I will include the member for Southern Downs as well. The member for Everton has now joined the list of those with a warning under standing order 253A. This is a first warning. I find that your interjections were designed to try to disrupt the minister in his answer to the question.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Earlier today the Minister for Health gave notice that he would move a motion. Part 4 of that motion begins 'condemns the member for Currumbin'. The member for Currumbin is paired with the member for Algester this week. Both members are undergoing treatment for serious medical conditions. I think it is appalling that the Minister for Health should seek to condemn a member who is paired for a week for medical reasons.

Mr DICK: On the point of order, Mr Speaker, I had no knowledge or understanding of the health condition or otherwise of the member for Currumbin and the motion stands in my name.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I now—

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker—

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

Mr SEENEY: In continuing my point of order—I was interrupted: given that the Minister for Health has indicated that he is not going to withdraw the appalling motion that he gave notice of—one of the most gutless acts I have seen in this place in a long time—

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment. That is not an appropriate word to use in the chamber.

Mr DICK: Mr Speaker, I take personal offence at those words and ask the member for Callide to withdraw to me personally.

Mr SEENEY: I withdraw. To finalise my point of order, Mr Speaker, a few minutes ago I spoke to the member for Currumbin, who is in the final stages of preparation for a serious medical procedure. She has provided me with a statement, which I table for the benefit of the House. The statement is in regard to the accusations that are made by the Minister for Health.

Mr SPEAKER: As I understand it, the minister today gave notice of a motion to be moved at a future date. Nothing has been moved today for the debate to happen today while the member, I understand, is not here. It is important that members do not anticipate debate. I am happy to look at the material the member has tabled. I will read it and make a decision.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 22 August (see p. 2295).

Second Reading

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (4.09 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Every single Queensland worker deserves to return home safely after a day's work. That is what the community expects and that is what this bill seeks to achieve. Over the last 12 months the public has been shocked by a series of high-profile workplace tragedies that resulted in multiple fatalities. Just over a year ago two workers at Eagle Farm lost their lives on the job and weeks later a terrible tragedy at Dreamworld cost four visitors their lives. While these are not the only deaths to have occurred in Queensland workplaces, they resonated deeply with Queenslanders and the nation, who have rightly demanded action to prevent a repeat of these devastating losses. We owe it to the victims of these tragedies and their loved ones to ensure that Queensland has strong industrial manslaughter laws to protect people on the job backed by strong penalties for employers proven to be negligent. This is once again nation-leading legislation.

One of the great virtues of this bill is that it sends a clear message to corporations that negligence on their part will attract serious consequences. Some larger businesses are using complex corporate structures to evade their responsibilities, but this bill will plug this gap. Small, medium and big businesses should all be on the same footing when it comes to providing a safe work environment. No-one should be above the law. That is what this bill seeks to achieve. This is not about favouring unions, as those opposite claim; it is about saving lives and holding negligent employers to account. I take this opportunity to congratulate the union movement for its untiring work and advocacy in ensuring the health and safety of workers throughout this state.

This bill is part of our strategy to build a more effective deterrent to noncompliance with workplace health and safety laws. It aims to encourage a culture of safety, driven by all parties at the workplace. A credible and effective compliance and enforcement strategy requires support for voluntary compliance, along with a range of strong deterrent measures for serious offences.

One of the key elements in the bill is the introduction of the offence of industrial manslaughter. The general manslaughter offence in the Criminal Code applies to anyone who causes the death of another person. This includes an employer, senior officers of a corporation, or a worker and so on.

However, with the changing industrial landscape and the emergence of increasingly elaborate corporate structures, it is exceedingly difficult to prosecute an employer for manslaughter given the difficulty of attaching criminal liability to the employer. Our intent is clear: if a work related fatality occurs and that fatality can be attributed to the negligence of a person conducting a business or undertaking or their senior officers, then the PCBU or senior officer should be able to be punished to the full extent of the law.

It is simply not good enough that a company and its senior officers can negligently cause the death of a worker and evade justice due to the veil of corporate anonymity. This failing in the current system is the reason the government has taken this initiative and why we are determined to make sure that these laws are implemented as soon as possible.

A fatality in a workplace is an extremely serious and devastating event, the impact of which extends far and wide—from the loved ones left behind to co-workers and the broader industry and community. It is not a minor transgression against health and safety duties that the industrial manslaughter provisions deal with; it is negligence that results in the loss of a worker's life. Through this bill the government will ensure that PCBUs and their senior officers can be held accountable for fatalities where their negligence causes the death of a worker and enables a more effective application of the law to corporate employers.

There is also of course an educative purpose in having a specific offence for industrial manslaughter. The offence sends a clear message about community expectations around safety in the workplace, saying that companies and the senior officers working for them must do all they can to ensure the safety of workers at their workplace. This awareness will encourage work health and safety to be managed as a cultural priority by persons conducting a business or undertaking, which is a proven strategy for improving health and safety outcomes.

There have been some concerns and criticisms raised by the industry about the impact of this new offence. In fact, I have met many of them about those concerns. However, it should be noted that these offences do not impose any new duties on employers or senior officers. Duty holders who adhere to their current responsibilities have nothing to fear from this legislation. The bill does not apply to circumstances beyond the control of a PCBU or senior officers but rather applies to negligent actions or omissions that contribute directly to the fatality of a worker. The creation of the offence ensures that corporations and their senior officers can be effectively prosecuted and held accountable for the worst examples of negligence.

The bill also prohibits the ability to accept enforceable undertakings in circumstances involving a fatality. While enforceable undertakings are undoubtedly an effective enforcement tool in achieving long-term sustainable health and safety outcomes in the workplace, when it comes to a fatality there is a community expectation that the regulator move to prosecute the offending party. Unfortunately, during my career I have encountered far too many families who have experienced the trauma of losing a loved one to a workplace incident. Dealing with this trauma is hard enough, but the thought that there be no prosecution for those responsible is often unthinkable. The regulator has already adopted a policy generally of not allowing enforceable undertakings in cases of fatalities and this now cements this practice in law. This reform is long overdue and I am proud to be introducing it this afternoon.

From a broader compliance and enforcement perspective, the changes in the bill also ensure greater independence and transparency in the dispute resolution and prosecutions processes in Queensland by providing the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission with additional powers and establishing an independent statutory office for work health and safety prosecutions. The establishment of an independent statutory office for work health and safety prosecutions will strengthen the governance arrangements for prosecution decision-making and boost public confidence in the independence and robustness of the prosecutions system.

Additionally, the expansion of the functions and jurisdiction of the QIRC will ensure that work health and safety disputes can be heard and resolved by an independent umpire when other avenues to achieve a resolution are unsuccessful. Enabling the QIRC to hear disputes under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 ensures that issues can be resolved by a specialist workplace tribunal with an existing role in determining work health and safety matters. This will improve confidence in the dispute resolution process as well as the quality of dispute resolution decisions. This reform will empower the inspectorate in the decisions it makes and provide a clear determination for future decisions. These reforms will undoubtedly result in disputes being better resolved and in turn keep our workplaces safe.

The enforceability of workplace health and safety laws will also be enhanced by restoring provisions that require codes of practice to be complied with as a minimum standard. These amendments provide that codes of practice outline the minimum standards for managing work health and safety risks. Importantly, PCBU's will still be able to adopt alternative safety measures that provide the same or a higher level of protection against a risk. This ensures that technological advances and business innovations can be taken into account when determining compliance with health and safety duties. I thoroughly believe that restoring the codes of practice will give businesses certainty, because if businesses are prosecuted for an offence under the Work Health and Safety Act they can use the fact that they complied with the code as a defence in their prosecution. That provides certainty for a PCBU in its duty to provide a safe workplace for their employees. Additionally, to ensure that current industry best practice is reflected in codes of practice, the bill requires codes of practice to be re-approved every five years. This ensures that the minimum standards in each code of practice are responsive to industry needs and continue to reflect best practice.

In addition to enhancing compliance and enforcement of work health and safety laws, the bill also seeks to improve work health and safety at the grassroots level by increasing the competency of and support for health and safety representatives and reintroducing the role of work health and safety officers. There is considerable evidence that the effective participation of workers is an essential element in improving health and safety performance at the workplace. Worker representation provides a means for facilitating consultation, involving workers and giving them a voice in health and safety matters. Mandatory training will support the role of HSRs in improving health and safety outcomes at the workplace by ensuring that they have the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively perform all of their functions. In particular, the ability to issue provisional improvement notices and direct unsafe work to cease are considered critical functions to assist HSRs in securing compliance at the workplace. The availability of a comprehensive list of HSRs will also enable the regulator to communicate directly with HSRs and provide relevant support and information.

The reintroduction of the workplace health and safety officer role, which is an employer assisting role, is also intended to encourage PCBU's to have a designated safety resource to support management in improving work health and safety performance across the organisation. Previously, the experience in Queensland was that the presence of work health and safety officers provided organisations with on-site awareness, expertise and advocacy for improved work health and safety outcomes and facilitated and assisted employers in ensuring legislative compliance. It is these benefits that have encouraged the government to reintroduce this vital role.

I would like to thank the Finance and Administration Committee for its report tabled on 5 October 2017 regarding the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 and, in particular, the chair of that committee, the member for Sunnybank. I would also like to thank other members of the committee and those who made submissions to the committee about the bill and those who appeared as witnesses as part of the committee's inquiry. Their input is much valued. The committee was unable to reach a consensus on the bill and did not make any recommendations regarding the bill.

In conclusion, I acknowledge that there will be many other speakers in this debate. However, I would like to take this moment to reflect on and recognise what we are debating today. At its core, this debate is about the lives of workers and ensuring that we do all that we can to prevent fatalities in Queensland workplaces. Although affected families will never get their loved ones back, they can take heart that, under these new laws, individuals or companies negligently responsible for their loved one's death will be held accountable and will not be able to avoid responsibility through elaborate corporate structures. I acknowledge some of the affected families in the gallery, in particular, Michael Garrels and Kevin Fuller.

The bill makes it clear that, as a society in Queensland, we do not believe that large corporations should be able to avoid responsibility and that we are prepared to meet our obligations to ensure the health and safety of all Queenslanders at work. This is the commitment that this government demonstrates through the introduction of this legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (4.24 pm): The minister has just given her second reading speech. She would have us believe that this bill is all about workplace health and safety and the safety of those on worksites. Yes, the bill introduces a new law called industrial manslaughter as a punishment for particular offences committed. Let us not kid ourselves. This issue was not on the government's radar. This issue was not on the government's agenda. This issue was not in the government's review. This issue was not in the terms of reference that the government had when it was reviewing workplace health

and safety. At the last election, the offence of industrial manslaughter was never promised by the Labor government. With all due respect, what this bill is about is highlighted by the member for Bundamba's Facebook post today. For the benefit of those opposite, I table a copy of the Facebook post of the member for Bundamba.

Tabled paper: Extract, undated, from the Facebook page of the member for Bundamba, Mrs Jo-Ann Miller MP [1997].

In that Facebook post the member stated—

The ALP is the political wing of the Union movement, it was formed to represent the interests of working people and their representative unions.

Today, we see in the *Courier-Mail* an article about CFMEU members threatening to rape workers' children, about CFMEU members saying that, hopefully, workers will run into a tree on their way home. It is the absolute right of the union movement to protest. But it is also the right of the workers to go to work and not expect that sort of fear and intimidation. It is the worker's right to go to work and earn a dollar so that they can put food on the table for their family without having the vile abuse directed at them like we see reported today. It is the right of every worker to go to work without their colleagues saying to their face, 'I hope your children get raped.' It is the right of every worker to go to work and not have their colleagues say, 'I hope you hit a tree on your way home and never see your family again.'

The member for Bundamba says in her Facebook post, 'The ALP is the political wing of the Union movement.' The member for Bundamba is not saying that the union is the political arm of the Labor Party; she is saying that the Labor government is at the behest of the union movement. The union movement tells the Labor Party what to do. It is not that the union is a part of the Labor Party; it is that the Labor Party is a part of the union. The member for Bundamba is saying that the puppetmasters are the faceless men of the union movement. These people who sit opposite are like lemmings heading off a cliff. They just do what they are told.

This morning in this parliament when we asked questions about children being threatened with rape by CFMEU members we saw the aggression shown by the member for Mirani. Because we had the hide to ask questions or raise these issues in parliament, he got so offended.

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order. The member for Kawana has been talking about my Facebook post. That is a matter of fact. I take offence at his comments in relation to my post and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Member for Kawana, will you withdraw?

Mr BLEIJIE: May I ask how one takes offence at their own words?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, it would help if you withdrew.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. For the benefit of the House, I tabled the Facebook post from the member for Bundamba.

Let us not make any mistake about it. The minister came in here and would have everyone believe that this issue is so important that we need legislation relating to industrial manslaughter. It was not raised. The review—

Ms Grace: People are dying.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection. I say to the minister that, currently, people are being prosecuted. The current laws are working. Industrial manslaughter was not in the terms of reference of the review that was undertaken. The minister announced through executive council that the review was going to be headed by an independent person. This independent person turned out to be Mr Tim Lyons, a former ACTU official. That is how independent the review that was undertaken was. Was it any wonder where this review was going to end up? Was it any wonder that halfway through the review Mr Tim Lyons said, out of the blue, 'I think we need to introduce industrial manslaughter'? Hence we have a report from the independent review panel suggesting the government introduce industrial manslaughter. The terms of reference were changed halfway through the review being undertaken to include industrial manslaughter.

Make no mistake: this is a union payback. The members opposite will tweet this afternoon that the LNP opposition, in opposing this legislation, did not stick up for working families, particularly those families that have suffered fatalities. I worked with the families in the gallery, the Garrels family and the Fuller family, when I was the minister responsible for industrial relations. We worked on some common-sense laws and we saw, working together, the rates of fatalities in workplaces decrease

across Queensland. I am not going to be pushed by politics into supporting legislation that is a payback to the union movement. Everything we have seen from this Minister for Industrial Relations, with her background in the union movement, indicates that the legislation is a pay-off to the union movement.

We see the comments in the *Courier-Mail* today by those on the picket line about raping children and hoping they have car crashes and we could not get one condemnation from the Labor government. We heard the word 'unacceptable'. I tell my kids it is unacceptable to do this and to do that, but to tell an organisation who has threatened to rape children that it is just unacceptable is the—

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading the House. The CFMEU did not tell anyone, not its members, to say those words, if in fact those words were said. I believe that the record should show that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! There is no point of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: Let me refer to an article tabled by the Leader of the Opposition this morning with direct quotes from some of these individuals at the picket line. I say to the member for Bundamba that there is so much blacked out on this tabled document because it would be totally unparliamentary to utter the words.

Mr Pearce: It proves nothing!

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Mirani. It proves nothing, he says. He has no regard for the comments that were made. Workers trying to go to work are called 'parasites', 'vermin', 'shame', 'stinking scum', 'go back to the kennel, you dog', 'you coward', 'get out of here'. This is the culture of the union movement; it is the culture of the Labor Party. As the member for Bundamba has said on her Facebook post, the Labor Party is the political arm of the CFMEU.

Mrs Miller: No! Of the union movement. Read it properly.

Mr BLEIJIE: My apologies. The Labor Party is the political arm of the union movement—of all the unions! The Leader of the Opposition tabled that document this morning. Every week we now see officials of the union movement in court for breaking the law. At the moment there are 100 officials before courts throughout Australia for flouting Queensland's laws, but we see donation after donation, cheque after cheque and meeting after meeting between CFMEU officials and the minister opposite, the Premier, the Deputy Premier and members of the government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, it might be advisable if we came back to the substance of the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: If one was to look at the submissions through the committee process, the majority were issued by the union movement. The minister in her second reading speech congratulated the union movement for its advocacy for these laws. I am not only referring and responding to the minister's second reading debate; I am referring to the submissions made by the committee members throughout the process. It is clear that the only reason we are debating these laws today is because of the relationship between the union movement and the Labor Party. The only reason we have to debate and rush these laws through the parliament is because of the imminent election and to make sure that the unions have their boxes ticked on their industrial relations legislation going through. Labour hire went through the other day and now we have the industrial manslaughter legislation.

Talking about the relationship between the Labor Party and the union movement and why these laws are coming through the parliament, I table a copy of a picture of the minister attending the CFMEU and BLF march.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting a gathering of union members [\[1998\]](#).

Ms Grace: I have better ones if you want them.

Mr BLEIJIE: Ordinarily one could call a group of people gentlemen, but these are not gentlemen; these are thugs. The minister says she has better pictures than the one I tabled. I ask her to send them to me.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Any time, she says. Send them to me! Here is another one. This is the Premier meeting with the ETU thugs. I table a copy of that.

Tabled paper: Photograph depicting the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, with members of the Electrical Trades Union [\[1999\]](#).

Ms GRACE: I rise to a point of order. With all due respect to the member for Kawana and with all due respect to this House, I really fail to see how photographs of people attending union rallies, as great as those photographs are and I am more than willing to provide more, has any relevance to this bill. Tabling photo after photo only demonstrates the lack of depth of understanding of this bill by the member for Kawana. I ask that you bring the member for Kawana back to the details of the bill on relevance, please.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will be listening with great interest to the member for Kawana and his debate on the bill.

Mr BLEIJIE: In relation to the linkage between the workplace health and safety laws, the union movement and the Labor government and this bill, which, if I can read from the long title of the bill, is to amend the Electrical Safety Act, the Safety in Recreational Water Activities Act, the Work Health and Safety Act and the Work Health and Safety Regulation for particular purposes, and the other elements I mentioned before, the committee submissions and the minister's own speech, there is a direct linkage between what the Labor government introduced into this parliament, the support the unions have given the government for this particular bill being passed in the parliament and the outcomes of this particular bill.

Workplace health and safety is a shared responsibility between everyone—employers, workers and the safety advocates. The LNP believes in the dignity of work and the right for all workers to go to work each day and come home safely to their families at the end of every shift.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I have worked, I work now and I have children of my own. No-one in their right mind, other than the CFMEU condemning their own workers with what is in the paper today, and no sensible Queenslander would ever have any other view than that everyone should be able to go home from work safe. I had the honour of serving as the minister for industrial relations which has oversight of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland. As I outlined, in 2014 under the LNP workplaces were safer. In the first two years of our government, workplace fatalities reduced by 21.3 per cent, general injuries were down by 8.2 per cent and injuries were reduced by 6.1 per cent. It was under an LNP government that we saw an over 20 per cent reduction in workplace fatalities without this sort of legislation in place.

We increased investment in injury prevention programs and the government inspectors increased their inspection rate on worksites by 15.2 per cent. We appointed Shane Webcke as our workplace health and safety ambassador and worked with people such as Trevor Gillmeister to promote asbestos awareness. We launched education and awareness campaigns dealing with electrical safety in ceiling spaces following the pink batts disaster and quad bike safety in regional communities, and launched the statewide strategic plan for the safe management of asbestos in Queensland in partnership with the local governments. Since 2003, the number of workplace fatalities has reduced, as well as the rate of injury and death. The system is not perfect, but things have dramatically improved and work places are now safer than they were a decade ago.

As I indicated earlier, the bill gives effect to the recommendations contained in the *Best practice review of workplace health and safety in Queensland* report. I will not go through all of the elements of it, as the minister has already done so today. Under the terms of reference, the review specifically considered the appropriateness of Workplace Health and Safety's compliance and enforcement policy; the effectiveness of WHSQ's compliance regime, enforcement activities and dispute resolution processes; WHSQ's effectiveness in relation to providing compliance information and providing work health and safety awareness and education; the appropriateness and effectiveness of the administration of public safety matters by WHSQ; and any further measures that can be taken to discourage unsafe work practices, including the introduction of the new offence of gross negligence causing death, as well as increasing existing penalties for work related deaths and serious injuries.

The review did not look into any issues in the resource sector or consider issues relating to mine safety. We have heard rumours. We know the mining industry has been given indications from the government that they were going to be contracted to form part of this legislation. Interestingly, in the past 24 hours we have not seen any amendments come through the parliament to deal with that, so I suspect the government has now swiftly taken that off the agenda to ensure that they obtain crossbench support to get the legislation through the parliament this week.

It is obvious where these laws come from: the mining division of the CFMEU. The amendments that have been flagged through the media and through the Queensland Resources Council were not subject to the review, were not subject to any committee analysis and were simply an afterthought

following a closed-door discussion with union bosses as Dr Anthony Lynham tried to get back in the good books with the CFMEU after they called for his resignation in May this year. I have spoken to the honourable member for Hinchinbrook, our shadow minister with respect to natural resources. I know of the concern he will express if the mining sector is included in industrial manslaughter laws applicable to the mining sector. However, as I indicated, thus far the minister has put forward no amendments dealing with the mining sector.

The bill introduces to the Work Health and Safety Act a new offence of industrial manslaughter that includes both a senior officer offence and an employer offence where conduct negligently causes the death of a worker. The existing standard of proof in Queensland for criminal negligence will be applied to both offences. The maximum custodial sentence for an individual will be 20 years and the maximum penalty for a body corporate will be \$10 million. The bill makes equivalent amendments to include industrial manslaughter offences in the Electrical Safety Act 2002 and the Safety in Recreational Water Activities Act 2011.

The proposed offences seek to make it a criminal offence punishable by a maximum penalty of 20 years imprisonment for an individual or 100,000 penalty units for a body corporate, equalling \$12,615,000, where the conduct of a person conducting business or an undertaking—the PCBU—or a senior officer causes the death of a worker in the course of carrying out work for the business or undertaking; and the PCBU or senior officer is negligent about causing the death of the worker. Except for the Australian Capital Territory, no other Australian jurisdiction has an equivalent provision to the proposed offences.

The submissions on this issue were the most pointed remarks through the committee review of the proposed legislation. Master Builders Queensland states—

We believe that one of the outcomes of this Bill will be a decline in competitiveness, productivity and profitability of businesses, as well as an increase in unnecessary paperwork, policies and involvement of lawyers, which will only increase the internal business compliance measures for health and safety without any real impact on practical safety solutions.

The Government already has the ability to penalize all of those people who do not take safety seriously and whose workplaces are unsafe. These proposals do not add to these powers, but rather shift the focus of safety improvement from practical safety solutions and education to one of punitive action, fear and retribution. In an era where improving safety culture is proven to be the key to safer workplaces, and where industries are seeing the benefits of better safety leadership, we cannot understand why the Government is so intent on stifling this progress.

It further outlines in its submission—

In the early 2000s there was a substantial shift across all jurisdictions' regulators towards an educative and advisory approach to safety compliance rather than taking hard punitive actions. Since this shift there has been substantially improved safety culture across all industries which has resulted in a decline in workplace incidents. More specifically, the Best Practice Review, highlighted that Queensland had one of the highest decreases in traumatic injury fatalities between 2010 and 2015.

That means that the current laws are working and are having an impact. The submission continues—

Further to this, the worker fatality rates nationally have dropped substantially over the last 15 years, as highlighted in the table below from the Safe Work Australia Comparative Monitoring Report (18th Edition)—Worker Fatalities 2003-2015.

The Master Builders strongly opposes the new proposed offence of industrial manslaughter. It believes that the introduction of such an offence fails on the following grounds: that the current offences under the Work Health and Safety Act and the Criminal Code are sufficient; that a failure to prosecute or unsuccessful prosecutions do not justify legislative change; that there are consequences for all industries, not just priority industries, that must be considered; that the definitions of 'officer', 'senior officer' and 'executive officer' are not consistent; and that changing the enforcement framework will undermine national consistency.

The Chamber of Commerce & Industry, the CCIQ, lodged a submission to the committee and I understand that it has also contacted every individual member of parliament. Its detailed submission outlines its concerns with this legislation and specifically the new offence of industrial manslaughter. As the CCIQ indicates in its submission—

Legal experts have said that there is no legal gap, nor is there any injustice in the system. In other words, the current laws are both adequate and effective from a strict legal perspective.

It continues—

Similar industrial manslaughter legislation, which this Bill has been modelled on, is in place in the Australian Capital Territory (ACT) under the Crimes Act 2011. To date, no prosecution has been successfully brought under the ACT legislation further reinforcing both the practical and legal irrelevance of such a law.

It further states—

This additional offence will create an artificial delineation between senior management and officers and create a culture where only a select few will be viewed as responsible for the safety of workers. Work health and safety works best when all members work collectively to take responsibility for the safety of themselves and others, creating a safety culture.

The CCIQ, as well as other submitters, raises concerns about the provisions relating to the codes of practice. The CCIQ states—

The reinstatement of Codes of Practices to legislative status will see a return to the superseded Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995 (QLD) code system. CCIQ opposes this amendment as the provisions do not have the same effect as the 1995 provisions and impose a reverse onus of proof on the employer.

We see no reason why these changes should be reversed and go against the changes made by Labor in 2011 as part of adopting the national model laws. The CCIQ further states—

The mandatory nature of the provision will create the need for Codes of Practice to be extremely prescriptive which will reduce innovation and could result in a decrease of businesses striving to improve their safety practices. Extensively detailed, mandatory codes will stifle innovation and processes which could benefit safety and business practice. This is a disincentive for evolving a business and developing market led best practice.

In its submission to the committee, the CCIQ also expresses its support for the creation of a statutory prosecution business unit, removing prosecution decisions from policy directives.

The other submissions I want to raise in the debate deal with the legal aspect of the new offences and their interrelationship with the existing criminal laws. The Law Society considers that the introduction of a separate industrial manslaughter offence is not warranted. It states—

Offences addressing fatalities occurring at or in the course of work already exist in section 31 of the *Work Health and Safety Act 2011* and in the *Criminal Code*. Those who are responsible for the fatalities are capable of prosecution under these laws and we submit it is the responsibility of WHSQ to ensure that such prosecutions are being pursued or referred to the DPP.

The Law Society further outlines—

The creation of these new offences will not prevent these tragedies from occurring, especially where there are existing applicable offences. As stated above, and in previous submissions, WHSQ needs to be sufficiently resourced to engage with and educate employers and workplaces and, when needed prosecute those who breach the existing law.

The Queensland Law Society consider that it is unwise to overcomplicate the statute book with offences that cover the same acts and omissions. They submit that if there is evidence to suggest that there are those within a business who are culpable but are unable to be prosecuted then a review of duty holders and duties should be undertaken.

The Bar Association of Queensland submit that the proposed Queensland industrial manslaughter provisions do not refer to 'reckless'. Perhaps that is because the act already legislates against reckless conduct by a category 1 offence. Notably sections 49C and 490 of the ACT Crimes Act carry a maximum penalty of 2,000 penalty units for a body corporate, equating to \$1.5 million. Such a maximum is significantly less than the maximum penalty imposed by the Queensland bill. The Queensland bill proposes a maximum fine more than 10 times the present maximum penalty in the ACT Crimes Act. At the conclusion of their submission they outline their concerns as follows—

The Association has concerns with the proposed industrial manslaughter offences.

Criminal negligence is founded upon a breach of a duty.

Pursuant to the Criminal Code, to establish that the defendant is guilty of manslaughter through criminal negligence, the prosecution must therefore prove, beyond reasonable doubt, that the defendant owed the prescribed duty of care.

The Act also make it very clear that the existing offences are based upon persons having a health and safety duty imposed under the Act.

The industrial manslaughter offence in the Australian Capital Territory has reference to a duty.

However, this new offence makes no reference to any prescribed health and safety duty.

The review states that a new offence is considered necessary and appropriate to deal with the worst examples of failure causing fatalities, the expectations of the public and affected families where a fatality occurs and to provide a deterrent effect. It is clear that corporations can presently be held responsible for failures causing fatalities at workplaces in Queensland. The worst examples of failures causing fatalities could be prosecuted as a reckless conduct category 1 offence pursuant to section 31 of the act.

The reviewer, Mr Tim Lyons, as I indicated earlier to members, was appointed by the minister to undertake the best practice review and to consider and report on any potential measures, both operational and legislative, that could be taken to address the matters raised in the terms of reference. The reviewer was supported by a tripartite reference group which provided commentary and advice on the matters to be considered as part of the review.

As I indicated earlier, for the context of this debate, Mr Lyons is a former senior ACTU official. He quit in 2015 as assistant secretary after failing to replace general secretary Dave Oliver. Is it any wonder that employer organisations that were part of this review and reference committee thought this whole review was a stitch-up from the start? Just a cursory glance on the Twitter account of Mr Lyons indicates his partisan political bias and inherent views on these vexed policy issues, which need to strike a common-sense balance between the interests of workers and employers.

We should be striving and working where we can to achieve national consistency, particularly for many employers who operate across state boundaries. Improving workplace health and safety works when everyone works together to improve education, awareness and the safety culture throughout workplaces. As I indicated, this bill is not about improving safety; it is about keeping the CFMEU happy and getting their donations and support for the imminent state election campaign.

In 2011 the Labor government passed legislation harmonising workplace health and safety laws—nationally consistent laws. Cameron Dick was the minister for industrial relations at the time. I remember the debate. We were at regional parliament in Mackay at the time. Nationally consistent harmonised laws were passed. These laws passed the responsibility to the federal government. Some years later, because the CFMEU cannot convince the other jurisdictions in Australia to pass industrial manslaughter laws, this Labor government want to go it alone. We asked the question—

Dr Rowan interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Moggill. It is an absolute backflip.

An opposition member: Unacceptable.

Mr BLEIJIE: It is unacceptable. I take that interjection. To be more blunt about what this bill and this minister are about, I have to refer to media reports in July this year. Those reports in the media in July told the story about how the CFMEU was conducting a letterbox drop in the Minister for Industrial Relations electorate, as well as in the electorates of other cabinet ministers, referring to Labor's appalling record. I think the flyer was actually titled 'Health and safety neglected under Grace Grace's watch'. That was a CFMEU flyer being letterbox dropped in the member for Brisbane Central's electorate.

The minister responsible for IR, representing the Labor government, stands up in here and says Labor always does the right thing on workplace health and safety. Apparently the body that funds them, the CFMEU, does not think so. All of a sudden, when we had this letterbox drop from the CFMEU in the minister's electorate the terms of reference change and industrial manslaughter is put on the table, and now we are debating it today. I bet the next flyer from the CFMEU will be to thank the Minister for Industrial Relations for introducing industrial manslaughter laws in the state of Queensland. That is what this is about. Make no mistake.

I had a look at the ECQ donations register this morning. One just has to type in 'CFMEU' and I can guarantee people that there is no CFMEU donation to the Liberal National Party but there are plenty of CFMEU donations to the Labor Party. Week after week after week the CFMEU is donating to the Labor Party.

We can talk about perceptions of donations, perceptions of developer donations to councils and the state, but there is more than a perception of what unions get from this Labor government by legislation. Their preselections depend on it. Labor Party members are bullied by the CFMEU—'You will do this or we will oppose you in your preselection campaign.'

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. The member for Kawana is misleading the House. The CFMEU does not and never has bullied members of the Labor caucus.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): There is no point of order. I would remind the member for Bundamba about frivolous points of order.

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for Bundamba is making my point today. She is a member of parliament representing Bundamba, but she has defended the CFMEU more today than her constituents.

Mrs Miller: My union.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. She does not represent the people of Bundamba on behalf of her union. We are not beholden to associations that we might be a member of. I am a member of the Kawana Surf Club, but the Kawana Surf Club does not tell me what to do in this place. I will represent them, but I am not the sole spokesperson for them.

It is the right of any individual member of parliament to raise these concerns. It is clear that the member for Bundamba sees her responsibility in this place as defending what we would normally call the integrity of an organisation. I submit that there is no integrity in the CFMEU. There is no honour in the CFMEU. They are grubs. They are thugs. They put fear into workers and they intimidate workers. They have no place on workplaces. That behaviour has no place in Queensland and no place on Queensland construction sites.

We had the letterbox campaign from the CFMEU in the member for Brisbane Central's electorate. We all of a sudden have legislation dealing with industrial manslaughter. We saw earlier in the year the shoppies union cut a big cheque to the Labor Party. Then we saw legislation for Easter Sunday being a public holiday.

Mr Stevens: No union donations to you.

Mr BLEIJIE: No, the shoppies union have not given to the Liberal National Party either. We saw the shoppies union cut a big cheque to the Labor Party and then we had retail trading hours legislation debated.

Mr Stevens: The Katter party got one. The Katter party got a CFMEU cheque.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take that interjection from the member for Mermaid Beach. The only other political party in Queensland that is funded by the CFMEU is the Katter party. The Katter party receives CFMEU donations.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Member for Mermaid Beach, I remind you that you are under a warning.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I submit to you that, if we are talking about the perception of political influence, if the Katter party vote for these laws then the Katter party are voting for these laws because they received donations from the CFMEU. That is why they will vote for these laws, if they do, because of the CFMEU donations—just like the Labor Party. The flyer which was distributed in the member for Brisbane Central's electorate, blaming the minister for not doing her job, says—

- Industrial Manslaughter laws not implemented
- Foreign employers allowed to ignore health and safety laws
- Soft regulator continuously fails to enforce health and safety laws in Queensland
- WHSQ Best Practice Health and Safety review corrupted by biased terms of reference

This is a union saying that a former ACTU union official is corrupted by bias. Well, I agree. It was corrupted by bias from the start but not in the way that the CFMEU think. It was corrupted by bias from the start with Mr Lyons, who was the former ACTU official conducting this review. I do not even think that the minister issued a press release at the time. I think it quietly went through executive council at the time. She was then asked about it in the media and she used the word 'independent'. You cannot have a former ACTU official conduct a best practice review of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland and call it 'independent'. Who is the minister trying to kid?

Queenslanders have woken up to the fact of not only the perception but also the reality. What the union wants the union gets from the Labor Party. When a cheque is cut, when cash is given, the Labor Party give the union movement what they want. They cannot even condemn the comments from the union movement in the paper today. They do not condemn the actions or the comments by CFMEU members about raping children, about hoping someone hits a tree on their way home from work. They cannot use the word 'condemn' because they know that if Annastacia Palaszczuk gets up and says, 'I condemn the CFMEU for their vile behaviour,' the money stops. The money dries up. If Annastacia Palaszczuk condemns the vile, thuggish, intimidatory behaviour of the CFMEU, the money dries up—like a drought in Queensland. The money stops flowing. That is why the Premier, Annastacia Palaszczuk, cannot condemn the CFMEU.

The review conducted by the former ACTU official has led to these laws. That is not my view; that is the view of the CFMEU coincidentally. Is it any wonder the Premier was keen to sit this week and neutralise the CFMEU on this issue. We also heard in the estimates hearing that the budget for

Workplace Health and Safety Queensland under Labor has reduced from \$63.6 million in 2015-16 to \$62 million in 2016-17 and has an estimated budget of \$63.4 million in 2017-18. As I said in my private members' statement yesterday, Labor are controlled by the union puppetmasters and, like in the case of Bill Shorten, they sell out the rights of the low-paid workers in the grubby backroom deals that only serve to line the pockets of the union and increase the power at the Labor Party conference of the faceless men of the Labor Party movement.

Workplace health and safety laws are important and need to be taken very seriously. As I said at the outset, no-one should be killed in a workplace. Workers have a right to go to work and do their job in a safe environment so they can return home to their families after every shift. The current Queensland laws apply. The current Queensland laws are being used to prosecute those who do the wrong thing. Unfortunately, these laws are another example of poorly drafted laws from a minister who has a reputation of sloppy work and a record number of amendments to fix things up along the way.

As I indicated earlier, there was all this speculation—and I think it was more than speculation—that the mining sector was now going to be thrown in without any consultation, and rightfully so the Queensland Resources Council were quite concerned that there would be an amendment rushed into parliament in consideration in detail by the minister to apply the industrial manslaughter laws to the mining sector as well. That is what they were told—that these laws would apply. The minister has not indicated whether those amendments are going to be made.

I call on the minister in her response this afternoon to tell us what the plan was. Was the mining the sector going to be included in these laws today? Were amendments drafted? If not—because, as yet, an amendment has not been made—is it for one of two reasons (1) the amendment is coming this afternoon or (2) the minister has put that on the backburner to have a little more consultation because she did not do the consultation in the first place? There has been no consultation. I call on the minister to explain what the story was behind that. The Queensland Resources Council were certainly told that it was happening. I think the minister owes an explanation to the resource industry today. What was planned? Why was there no consultation? Who thought up this idea to all of a sudden include the resource industry? I have a pretty good idea who it was—the mining division of the CFMEU. The mining division of the CFMEU thought this might be their last opportunity to have a crack at the resource industry and get what they want from this Labor government. I call on the minister to explain what that was all about.

I want to table a couple of documents that I have received in the last few days. One is a letter from the Ai Group, dated 10 October, from Mark Goodsell, Acting Head—Queensland, Ai Group. This letter goes to the heart of the Ai Group's opposition to the amendments. As I indicated earlier, through the committee process the union movement particularly supported these laws but everyone else opposed them. We are seeing a pattern develop. Unions support all of the government's legislation through the committee process, because I suspect it is drafted by the union movement anyway—it is what they wanted. I table a copy of the letter from the Ai Group.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 10 October 2017, from AiGroup to the member for Kawana, Mr Bleijie MP, regarding the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 [\[2000\]](#).

I also table a copy of a letter that I received on 18 September 2017 from Kate Whittle, General Manager of Advocacy at the CCIQ, which expressed all of their concerns.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 September 2017, from the Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Master Builders Queensland, Master Electricians Australia, Queensland Major Contractors Association, the Civil Contractors Federation, the Property Council of Australia, Australian Mines and Metals Association, and the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry to the member for Kawana, Mr Bleijie MP, regarding the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017 [\[2001\]](#).

When Labor were in opposition, Labor members stood in here many a time and referred to why legislation should not be passed. They stood in here many a time and either said that the CCIQ may have had issues with it or, more importantly, said, 'The Law Society of Queensland think that this is such fundamentally flawed legislation and such poorly drafted legislation, and there are sufficient laws in Queensland to deal with this. Therefore, it should not pass the parliament.' The Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, who was the opposition leader at that time, was quoted many a time saying, 'These laws should not pass the parliament because the Law Society says so.' Not only that, on a good day she would also drop in a letter from the Bar Association of Queensland saying they thought the laws were so fundamentally flawed and should not pass.

As I have indicated in my speech today, not only does the Law Society think that these laws are poorly drafted but so too does the Bar Association. What will the minister say in her response this afternoon, when they are on record giving the Law Society and the Bar Association all credit for

opposing LNP laws at the time to now not having the same level of concern with the Bar Association and Law Society's opposing Labor laws? Where is the difference? Is Labor saying it is okay for the Law Society and the Bar Association to attack LNP laws because they are worthy of attack but our laws are not worthy of attack?

As I said, at the heart of this is what the CFMEU want and how much money the CFMEU is giving to the Labor Party. The more money the CFMEU give to the Labor Party the more relentless the Labor Party will be in their legislative agenda in Queensland. We saw it early on with this Palaszczuk Labor government when they deprived hardworking public servants their privacy, when they let the unions waltz through workplaces and gave them access to the private details of public servants—over 200,000 public servants. Unions have unfettered access to their details. Why? They have access to their details because union movement membership numbers are on the decline and the only way they can change that is by intimidation and putting fear and concern into people's lives to force them to become members of the union movement. We saw it a few weeks ago with the passing of the labour hire legislation. What will happen now? We will have a public register of labour hire companies in Queensland which the union movement will have complete access to so that they can start, unfortunately, the bullying behaviour, which we currently see in workplaces, in the labour hire industry. That is exactly what will happen here.

The union movement have already picked out people whom they are going to complain about under this legislation. They already know whom they want to see prosecuted. It may be under the current laws there is no evidence to prosecute someone because they might not have necessarily done anything wrong, but the union movement think they have so this is a way for the union movement to prosecute business owners or employers whom they cannot otherwise prosecute at the moment. This is a get square at people, business and employers across the state.

We cannot support these poorly drafted laws. We back the Law Society submission. We back the Bar Association submission. We back the CCIQ submission. We back the Ai Group submission. We back the Master Builders submission. We back the Master Electricians submission. All industry groups representing hundreds of thousands of workers across the state of Queensland are opposed to this legislation on the basis that it is not needed and in recognition that workplace fatalities have reduced under an LNP government by over 20 per cent, because we encouraged, consulted, cooperated, and worked with businesses to reduce workplace injuries and workplace fatalities. The way to do that is to create an environment whereby businesses have a safe place to work. If we encourage that, if we educate businesses to take safety seriously, then we have fewer fatalities and fewer workplace injuries. That is what we were seeing under the LNP's leadership in 2012 to 2015.

I note that the CCIQ made submissions to the committee in this regard. I want to again highlight the concerns that the CCIQ have on behalf of their members. As I have said, I have tabled their submission. We cannot support these laws. They are poorly drafted, particularly the rushed amendments that were going to rope in the resource sector. It looks like those amendments are not likely to happen now, which is a good thing. I would encourage the crossbench to look beyond CFMEU donations to political parties, realise that the current laws work, the current laws are fair, and this bill is nothing more than an 'I scratch your back, you scratch mine' for the CFMEU and the Labor government, particularly under the leadership of Anastacia Palaszczuk.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Sunnybank—ALP) (5.12 pm): There was strong agreement in the committee that workers should be able to go to work and return safely to their families. This sentiment was also shared by submitters and witnesses who assisted the committee during its inquiry. I speak today to support the passing of the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. The bill was introduced following recommendations from the independent best practice review of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland undertaken by Tim Lyons. Mr Lyons' review made 58 recommendations to strengthen work health and safety in Queensland and keep Queensland workers safe.

It is therefore with regret that I note the committee was unable to reach consensus on this important bill. The government members of the committee support the introduction of a new offence of industrial manslaughter in Queensland and the bill's strengthening of work health and safety in Queensland through, for example, the introduction of a separate work health and safety prosecutor.

The department clearly spelt out the issues with respect to large corporations avoiding responsibility for workplace death by hiding behind complex corporate structures. We consider this legislation will stop that and will see those responsible for high-level decisions around unsafe work practices being held accountable.

The department advised that recent tragedies highlighted the need to ensure that the current work health and safety framework is robust, operates as an effective deterrent to noncompliance and is responsive to emerging issues. I believe that the penalties in the bill will act as a strong deterrent for businesses and senior officers to ensure their workplace practices are safe.

Representatives of unions also strongly support the provisions in the bill as they provide practical and workable solutions which recognise and address the serious issues around negligence in the workplace causing death. They consider that the introduction of industrial manslaughter will encourage businesses with poor practices to improve.

The importance of work health and safety was brought into sharp focus for members of the committee when it heard from families who had lost loved ones in workplace incidents. These families fully support the introduction of the measures contained in this bill, particularly the industrial manslaughter provisions. One of the witnesses noted that the business community may consider the creation of the industrial manslaughter offence as punitive. However, it will be punitive only if employers fall below the standards we as a community expect of them.

There is a range of reasons provided by stakeholders as to why the bill should not pass. We have carefully considered each and strongly reject the notion that the health and safety of workers—of spouses and partners, parents, children, brothers and sisters—should play second fiddle to economic considerations. These measures are well overdue, and I urge the House to pass this important legislation to support Queensland workers and their families.

Keeping Queensland workplaces safe from injury or death is of paramount importance for the people of Queensland, and I commend the minister for presenting this bill to the House. The Work Health and Safety Act 2011 establishes a clear duty on the person conducting the business or undertaking to provide a safe workplace. The amendments contained in this bill move to strengthen this position and will ensure that organisations have in the front of their minds the safety of their workers in carrying out their business efficiently.

While the committee received a number of submissions, some of which were supportive and some of which were less supportive, and although the committee cannot agree that the bill be passed, it is important that government members outline the importance of this reform and why parliament should allow its passage. The best practice review of Workplace Health and Safety Queensland identified the need for the creation of an offence of industrial manslaughter. The elements of the offence as defined in the bill will ensure that the complex contractual relationships that exist through employment practices will not exclude the principal contractor from liability for the death of workers on their work site if they are found to be negligent.

The amendments will make significant inroads into the attitudes of senior executives of corporations to ensure they make safety a priority on their work sites. If this bill is passed, Queensland will be the first jurisdiction in Australia to have industrial manslaughter as an offence in their occupational safety legislation. The decision to locate this offence in the WHS Act, instead of in the Criminal Code, was one that was made with due consideration. In this respect, the reviewer found that the WHS Act is a more appropriate location for the offence because the act includes provisions allowing for a person's conduct to be imputed to a corporate entity, thereby reducing the barriers to attributing criminal liability to a corporation in instances involving the most serious health and safety breaches.

The other reforms presented in this bill will provide clarity to both workers and employers in their day-to-day operations. The ability to take workplace health and safety disputes to the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission will ensure that disputes are not drawn out, allow the QIRC to make a decision on the matter and expedite the dispute process. The provision to allow 24 hours after an inspector is called before the dispute can be taken to the commission will allow both companies and workers a cooling-off period to resolve the dispute and, if this cannot be done, have the dispute heard by the QIRC.

In relation to enforceable undertakings, I believe that the public perceptions around incidents that involve a fatality have shifted quite significantly. The public expect that if an incident involves a fatality there ought to be a prosecution or punishment. An enforceable undertaking does not reflect the seriousness of the incident. I believe that this is a timely reform and reflects the sentiment that exists in the community around incidents involving a fatality.

Finally, I turn to the reform restoring the codes of practice as a required minimum standard. Although some employer organisations submitted concerns around this, we find that making codes of practice the minimum standard provides a benchmark to ensure there is no confusion on work sites for workers or employers. That being said, if an employer exceeds their obligations under a code of

practice, this could be used as evidence that they have complied with their duty to provide a safe workplace where an incident has occurred. Although there were alternative positions taken in the submissions, I also believe that the codes of practice will provide clarity for workers, employers and the regulator when issuing notices on a work site.

One death on a work site is a death too many. The recent tragedies which led to the review by Workplace Health and Safety Queensland, and the consequent reforms presented by the Palaszczuk government, will ensure that Queensland workplaces are safer. The Palaszczuk government has presented these reforms to be debated by this House, and I firmly believe that the standards set by this bill will ensure that workers can be confident of having safer workplaces.

The non-government members rejected the legislation in their statement of reservation. The reference to the bill being union-building legislation is very disappointing and is a complete rejection of the sad stories and tragic loss we heard about during the committee's hearings. The loss of lives could have been prevented under a more focused, safe work culture. If non-government members were serious in their concern about workers losing their lives, they would have come up with an alternative solution to this complex problem.

Sometimes in taking submissions on a bill, we will hear from a submitter with their own barrow to push who is against the reforms. However, even the most negative submitter will offer improvements to the bill. The non-government members did nothing of the sort. Changing work safety culture is necessary for the safety of our workers. Changing culture is often difficult, but changing legislation often lays the groundwork for a cultural change.

There are many high-risk work places and industries in our vast state of Queensland. CFMEU Construction and CFMEU Mining are not the only unions whose members are involved in high-risk industries and put their lives at risk when going to work to earn a living for themselves and their families. There was evidence before the committee that unionised sites are safer than non-unionised sites, and still the unions have lost members despite their best efforts under the current legislative regime to ensure their members have a safe place to work. More is needed, and therefore there is a need for this legislation.

If non-government members truly believe, as they assert, that workplace health and safety is a shared responsibility between everyone, and if they believe in the dignity of work and the right for all workers to go to work each day and come home to their families, they will support the passing of this bill, or at the very least come up with a viable alternative. Yet they do neither. This government has seen and heard the tragedies that have occurred in Queensland and we are taking action. In closing, I would like to acknowledge Mr Garrels and Mr Fuller for their commitment. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (5.22 pm): Before I start, I would like to say how well you suit the Speaker's chair, Mr Deputy Speaker Elmes. I look forward to your generous rulings in relation to my speech. It should come as little surprise that I rise to speak against this blatantly self-serving, union-building legislation which has come about following abysmal circumstances in October 2016. Let me begin by stating that I and all of the other LNP members of the committee agree that workplace health and safety is a shared responsibility between everyone. We further share a belief in the dignity of work and the right of all workers to go to work each day and come home safely to their families at the end of every shift. That position is not negotiable.

What the non-government members of the committee believe—contrary to the suggestions by the chairman of the committee—is that this legislation will not help to stop in any way whatsoever industrial deaths in the workplace. We are saying clearly that this legislation is for one purpose only and that one purpose is to put more union muscle into the negotiations between employers and employees. The legislation in the proposed bill does not address workers safety in a practical manner. Instead, it delivers another patently union-serving piece of legislation designed to appease the Palaszczuk Labor government's union support base prior to the upcoming and yet to be announced election. Members can take it from the horse's mouth right here and now that the election will be on 2 December. All members of the House should get ready and get their running shoes on. The Leader of the House offered me 10 to one on that, and I am happy to take that up.

I am astounded that this faulty legislation has been presented without major revisions. Submissions received during the consultation period from the Queensland Law Society and the Bar Association of Queensland registered serious concerns with the proposed industrial manslaughter offences. Specifically, the Queensland Law Society noted—

The Society is extremely concerned that the proposed provisions ... do not provide any defences to the charge. This is a serious defect in the drafting of these provisions.

I might add, as the minister referred to, that because of the sub judice laws we cannot talk about the prosecutions that are currently going on through the law courts and the appropriate channels. Both the Law Society and the Bar Association agree that that is the best way to address these serious fractions of workplace health and safety.

When we consider the above concerns in conjunction with additional submissions that highlight the existence of a sufficient existing legislative framework, such as the manslaughter provisions in the Criminal Code and the offences and penalties regime contained in the Work Health and Safety Act 2011—and the shadow minister referred to just about every other submitter other than the union representatives who were there en masse to present to the committee—we are left with the understanding that the Palaszczuk Labor government's development and delivery of this bill is yet another lemming-like adherence to the marching orders of their union overlords to the detriment of everyday Queenslanders. We have heard the shadow minister talk before about the debt that is owed by members opposite to the union members who campaigned physically on their behalf at their booths. We have all seen that on many occasions, and we have seen the register of large donations from the union movement so that they could take their place in—

Mr Harper interjected.

Mr STEVENS: I have plenty and they are all on the register. I take the interjection from the member for what is that place in Townsville that One Nation is campaigning in? I think it is Thuringowa, yes.

The reality is that all of the members on that side of the House owe their existence in this parliament to these union people who are promoting this legislation as a Trojan Horse answer to the horrible problem of industrial deaths. It is not the answer at all and it will not assist in any way, shape or form to address deaths in the workplace. Unfortunately, they are using the sentiment, the sadness and the grief of people who have been affected by that horrible thing of a death in the workplace to promote themselves. It is a disgusting practice to use that sort of *raison d'être* to promote their own interests, increase union pressure in the workplace and make sure that more union representatives are appointed through the employer organisations and that union members get preference over non-union members in the workplace.

We all know that union numbers are falling, but they are the tactics they are resorting to in order to keep the union movement relevant, powerful and stocked up with a lot of money so they can support these little lemmings in the House here every three years, and soon to be four years. They want to make sure they have their power in the workplace to enforce their wonderfully well-paid positions in the union movement. For everyday Queenslanders—

Mr Power interjected.

Mr STEVENS: I take the interjection from the member for Logan. It is not about the workers. It is about the executives of the union movement who are living it up on the fees from union members. In many cases they are short-changing them a la the Bill Shorten method: making sure they get paid less on Sundays than other workers did previously.

For everyday Queenslanders who have already suffered a terrible, devastating loss of a family member, partner or friend due to a workplace incident, this bill will provide no real or tangible answers. This was admitted by the union representatives present at the hearing and the proponents of this bill's introduction. They admit that industrial deaths will not be prevented by the introduction of this ham-fisted regulation. I suggest that it is more likely that the Palaszczuk Labor government's union mates would find opportunities to threaten and coerce employers through union instigated prosecutions to force more union representatives and union affiliated employees onto employers. It is clear in my mind that the Palaszczuk Labor government is adopting this 'sledgehammer to crack a walnut' approach to ensconce union affiliation and union power in the workplace despite the likely job-threatening additional business costs.

I asked representatives from the Chamber of Commerce & Industry Queensland, the CCIQ, who represent about 60,000 employer groups and about 250,000 employees, to quantify that. The departmental officers could not quantify any costs in relation to the implementation of this legislation, so I asked the CCIQ: what will be the economic impact of this bill? The answer came back from the CCIQ, an independent body that the Labor Party referred to on many occasions when in opposition, as the shadow minister referred to. The CCIQ estimates that this bill will cost all businesses \$1.125 billion in the first year of implementation with ongoing costs of \$540 million. That is \$1,125 million in costs associated with this bill and the regulation and the red tape that will go with it. The CCIQ, an independent body, has advised what this will cost Queensland. In other words, this is job-killing legislation again

from the Labor Party and the minister is overseeing this terrible legislation that has come into the House. The CCIQ have estimated the economic damage that will be caused by this bill and the red tape and all the associated matters that will be put in place to deal with this industrial manslaughter legislation will be equivalent to half the damage caused by Tropical Cyclone Debbie. That is the economic effect of this bill on Queensland.

Indeed, during the consultation period the vast majority of submitters not only deplored the need and efficaciousness of this bill but also noted at length less costly outcomes such as improvements to areas including the training and education of workplace health and safety inspectors and the delivery of more education, safety and compliance campaigns which the minister could implement out of her budget. Further, I note for the benefit of the House that a similar law—this is not new—was introduced in the ACT in 2004 with the same intent, the same Labor rule. It is yet to see a single successful prosecution. Therefore, the successful utilisation of the felony of industrial manslaughter is a jurisprudence concept that is pure conjecture and speculation in its practical implementation in Queensland. I note the presence of one of the eminent barristers of Queensland: the Clerk of the Parliament. The fact is that the Queensland Bar Association said that any prosecutions under this particular legislation will be very, very difficult to implement.

I remind the House that the current Work Health and Safety Act 2011 was implemented as part of a national harmonisation process, a process in which all jurisdictions in Australia, except Western Australia and Victoria, have implemented the model workplace health and safety legislation with only minor variations to allow for consistency with jurisdictional requirements. That means this is a complete walk away from that national accord, if you like, in terms of making workplace health and safety a national issue to be addressed for all of those companies that work right across the nation and that come into Queensland to do business. Queensland's own WHS Act specifically references that a balanced and nationally consistent framework securing the health and safety of workers is its main objective. This is not a national piece of legislation. This is a thought bubble by this particular union owned Palaszczuk government just to appease the unions coming into a very, very tight election period. Implementing this legislation would therefore break with the harmonisation, likely negatively impacting Queensland enterprises. I again reference the CCIQ's submission, which states—

Creating disharmony about obligations, entrenching a clear delineation between employers and everyone else moves away from the goal of shared responsibility for safety, risks creating a blame culture and is very unlikely to improve occupational health and safety outcomes ...

It is fair to say that the best practice review undertaken by the so-called independent Mr Tim Lyons would likely have a pro-union basis as he is a former ACTU vice secretary of many years. Saying that he is an independent reviewer is like Dracula saying he was only a nurse at the blood bank. It is unbelievable that a serious government and a serious minister can stand up and say that a former ACTU representative, lobbyist and mover and shaker in the movement can be classed as an independent reviewer and make these recommendations for this legislation to have effect in Queensland but not in all of the other states.

The 21 legislation based recommendations, 19 of which are undertaken in the proposed bill before us today, are not only in favour of the unions but bludgeon through a union agenda to the detriment of good legislature, and this becomes more obvious when considering the amendments within the bill. These amendments are not limited to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 or the industrial manslaughter offence but also include suggestions for mirror amendments to the Electrical Safety Act and Safety in Recreational Water Activities Act 2011 through establishing an unnecessary independent statutory office for work health and safety prosecutions—another job for a union mate I am sure. This is unnecessary as the existing Workplace Health and Safety Queensland office could simply establish a separate prosecution division within its bounds now rather than providing another example of the Palaszczuk Labor government's typical fiscal ineptitude, not to mention the concerns surrounding the proposed workplace health and safety prosecutor's powers, which are unlimited and unfettered with inadequate checks and balances. They are not subject to the same checks and balances as other prosecuting bodies. A further superfluous and, as described in a submission, irrational amendment to remove the current internal review process for workplace health and safety disputes, contained within the issue resolution amendments, showcases yet again that the proposed changes by the Palaszczuk Labor government in this unpalatable bill will only undermine good workplace health and safety practices.

In short, this bill is nothing more than a further attempt by the Palaszczuk Labor government and its lemming-like ministers to shore up union power in the face of falling membership while creating more burdens for Queensland businesses and their hardworking employees.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (5.40 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017. I would like to thank the committee, the minister and the department for their work on this bill. This is a very important bill for all Queensland workers. In the progressive and modern workplaces that we have in Queensland, every worker should have the confidence that when they begin their shift everything has been done to ensure that the duties they carry out will not put them in danger. The objectives of the review which was undertaken by the government in October 2016 were to ensure best practice and robust administration, effective deterrents to deal with noncompliance and the ability to respond to emerging issues in the workplace. There is no excuse for unsafe work practices in the workplace.

This bill introduces the offence of industrial manslaughter, which will hopefully see the end of tragic and avoidable deaths on worksites. Safe Work Australia's work related traumatic injury fatalities data collection provides statistics about deaths from injuries caused by work related activities. It includes fatalities that relate to injuries sustained in the course of a work activity and as a result of somebody else's work activity. In the 13 years from 2003 to 2015, 3,270 workers lost their lives in work related incidents in Australia. In 2015, 195 fatalities were recorded in Queensland. This is nothing to be proud of. The member for Kawana said that the number of fatalities in the workplace is going down, but this is still too high. One death is one too many.

When you look at those numbers, 3,207 families' lives have been traumatised due to workplace fatalities across Australia. Some of these deaths have taken place in my region. The whole community feels the shock when there is a workplace death in the community. These people are not just numbers and statistics; they are all people from our communities. They are mums and dads, kids, friends, partners, husbands and wives. It was only in early August this year that the Mackay community was rocked by the workplace fatality of young Daniel Springer. He was only 31 years old, the father of a little baby and a husband. Daniel should be with his family and baby today but, despite all the noise about the CFMEU and worksites, Daniel lost his life on a mine site.

The new offence of industrial manslaughter includes provisions relating to senior officers and employers where negligent conduct causes the death of a worker. The maximum custodial penalty of 20 years for an individual and \$10 million for a corporation will support workplace safety. The member for Mermaid Beach said that this bill will not stop workplace deaths, but if those responsible are made to pay for their negligence in the workplace that might send a message to those who are irresponsible regarding their responsibilities to workers.

At different times I have been invited to worksites around my electorate, and you can tell where workplace health and safety is provided in safe workplaces for workers. There are supervisors in place who know their workers. They know what is happening in their workplace, and they make sure that everybody on the worksite has proper industrial protection equipment and is following regulations. An independent statutory office for work health and safety prosecutions will put the focus on behaviour at unsafe workplaces so that cases will not slip through the cracks and employees and companies will be held responsible for shonky, unsafe practices. On a worksite there is no room to cut corners on safety. This position will be held for five years and is renewable.

There have been times when access to a worksite following a workplace incident has been denied. The new right-of-entry amendments will resolve disputes where there is a valid right of entry without the need for escalation to a tribunal. Transparency and a thorough investigation is needed when there is an incident. This bill is good for workers and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (5.46 pm): Like all of my colleagues tonight I will register my disagreement with the Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. In September 2000 the then Beattie Labor government released a *Dangerous industrial conduct* discussion paper which canvassed a range of issues. This discussion paper sought public input into a proposed new offence for the Queensland Criminal Code called dangerous industrial conduct to cover both individuals and corporations. As it turned out, no industrial manslaughter legislation was introduced at the time. That particular issue was brought to a conclusion by the dissolution of the parliament and the 2001 state election.

There was no chance that this government and this parliament would be dissolved before industrial manslaughter is legislated. This government had one last final debt to repay to the CFMEU, because this government in this election will need the CFMEU like it has never needed it before. This government has taken this last opportunity to expand the reach and scope of union influence not just into workplaces but right through middle management and boardrooms across Queensland business.

Today the member for Kawana and the Leader of the Opposition have spoken about some of the outrageous language used by CFMEU officials. They stand condemned by their own words, but I thought that I would turn not to the words of the CFMEU this evening but to the words of the judiciary regarding some of the conduct that the CFMEU has displayed over the years. I reflect on the words of Justice Jessup, who said—

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

...

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

He also said—

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

He added—

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

As a result of union policies banning anyone other than licensed plumbers from installing water meters and labour hire bills—whatever it may be—time and time again in Queensland and right around Australia we have seen the lawlessness of the CFMEU rewarded in spite of their continual disregard for the laws of the land.

As legislators we are duty bound to legislate for the protection and good governance of the citizens of the state of Queensland. This bill was never about the health and safety of workers. Tragedies have been cynically used for political purposes. Today, again, this Labor government fails this test. To see that this is the case we need only look at the report and in particular the opposition members' statement of reservation. No-one is backing this legislation except the union movement. We should have called off the committee process because, as the deputy chair has so colourfully described, there is a lemming-like adherence to union-building legislation so obvious among those opposite that attempts to reason or persuade them otherwise would be a chasing after the wind.

There have been a range of contributions already in relation to union influence and control over this government, so I want to turn my attention to the legal and commercial implications of this legislation for Queensland businesses. The ACT is the only Australian jurisdiction to have enacted a specific offence of industrial manslaughter. It has never been used or tested. Other jurisdictions rely on general manslaughter provisions in their criminal legislation or common law. Queensland has also done so and, as the QLS has commented, it is 'unwise to overcomplicate statute book offences that cover the same acts and omissions'. There are also currently workplace related proceedings on foot founded on the manslaughter provisions in the Queensland Criminal Code.

Under the proposed bill, a person conducting a business or undertaking commits the offence of industrial manslaughter where a worker dies either whilst carrying out work or after sustaining an injury while performing work and the business's conduct causes the worker's death and the business is negligent in engaging in the conduct that causes that death. The bill states that a business causes a worker's death where the business's conduct substantially contributes to the fatality. The new offence will replace the existing category 1 offence for recklessly exposing an individual to a risk of serious illness or injury or death as the most serious contravention of the Work Health and Safety Act a person can commit. The bill provides that industrial manslaughter will be a criminal offence provision, meaning that the relevant standard for a successful prosecution is beyond reasonable doubt.

As is so often the case, the devil is in the detail. As it was with the labour hire bill in the last sittings, so it is with this bill. It again comes down to the definition. What we see in this bill are some serious complications around the definition of 'senior officer' of a business. The first point to make is that the definition of 'senior officer' contained in the bill is wider than the definition of 'officer' in the existing Work Health and Safety Act. Under the bill, a senior officer of a corporation includes any person who is concerned with, or takes part in, the corporation's management, whether or not the person is a director or the person's position is given the name of executive officer. This means that those exposed to potential prosecution are not just those individuals with organisational control of the business but any person who is part of the company's management team. To add to the uncertainty, the definition of 'senior officer' for an unincorporated entity is narrower and is limited to a person whose position requires them to make, or take part in making, decisions that affect all or a substantial part of the business. What is clear, however, is that any senior manager within a business could be prosecuted for an industrial manslaughter offence and other lower level managers may also be caught.

When considering the implications of this definition, it is relevant to compare the ACT definition. It appears that the Queensland definition goes much further than the ACT definition of 'senior officer', which is limited for an officer of a corporation to section 9 of the Corporations Act definition, which is a director, a secretary or any person that makes decisions which will impact the business of the corporation.

If you unpack the law in the United Kingdom, their equivalent corporate manslaughter provisions are concerned entirely with corporate liability and do not apply to senior officers of an organisation. Again, in contrast to this government's bill, liability for the offence in the United Kingdom is subject to a higher standard—a finding of gross negligence in the way in which an organisation conducts its activities. That is a step up from the normal standard of negligence, which is a mere failure to exercise reasonable care, and it is expanded and extended to a conscious or voluntary failure to exercise reasonable care.

Although the provisions in the ACT have failed to be used or even tested, there has been some jurisprudential consideration of the implications, and some alarming ones. A *New Zealand Universities Law Review* article from December 2016 examined how corporate culture can be taken into account in respect of industrial manslaughter. This means that the attitudes, policies, rules, course of conduct or practice will be taken into account—indeed, so, too, in the case of negligence that the actions of employees, officers or agents of an organisation can be aggregated so that the company's conduct might be viewed as a whole.

While the opposition has a range of questions as to why and how union influence is so endemic, so entrenched, when it relates to this particular government, I would say that every business in Queensland has far more pressing questions. The questions they will be asking are: what is our liability following a workplace death; will we be exposed to imprisonment if charged and convicted; how far down the management chain could the legislation reach; and will our current work health and safety systems be sufficient protection?

It is a significant cost on business. As the member for Mermaid Beach has just described, CCIQ has in fact undertaken some analysis of the cost to business of additional red tape, of duplicating laws that already exist in other provisions. I table the analysis.

Tabled paper: Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland: response to the Finance and Administration Committee regarding Work Health and Safety and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2017, 27 September 2017 [\[2002\]](#).

The CCIQ asserts that it will cost businesses across Queensland in the order of \$1.125 billion in the first year of implementation. We know the considerable impost on business of these laws, which are unnecessary and will not effect any change whatsoever to the work health and safety environment in workplaces around Queensland.

In defence of business, from my experience in advising them—small and large—on the far-reaching consequences of complying with workplace health and safety law, I can say that businesses will always go beyond what is required. I saw that when businesses sought to comply with the 2011 Work Health and Safety Act, which saw executive officers of a business being responsible and legally liable for the health and safety of every employee, contractor and subcontractor in their workplace. They comply with the law in good faith because, unlike the CFMEU and unlike union officials like Sally McManus, they care and they believe in the rule of law, in meeting their obligations and in abiding by the law of the land.

I have posed some of the questions that businesses will be asking. They will also be asking other questions. Why does this government not properly resource appropriate numbers of inspectors, investigators and prosecutors to perform their obligations to supervise workplace health and safety compliance around existing workplaces in Queensland? Why is there a new, costly independent statutory office being set up that will facilitate the overlapping of the workplace health and safety prosecutor and the DPP which in turn will allow prosecutors a couple of bites at the cherry to try to secure a prosecution? Why will this law place Queensland out of step with every other state and territory in the country when it was a prescribed Labor idea in 2011 that uniformity across workplace health and safety laws in Australia was a worthwhile pursuit. These are the questions that cannot be answered, and the government will not even attempt to answer them.

An amendment that has escaped significant comment relates to the reinstatement of the legislative status of codes of practice to their previous standing under the Workplace Health and Safety Act 1995.

Debate, on motion of Mr Janetzki, adjourned.

APPROPRIATION (PARLIAMENT) BILL (NO. 2)

APPROPRIATION BILL (NO. 2)

Cognate Debate

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (5.58 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with standing order 172, the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill (No. 2) and the Appropriation Bill (No. 2) be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:

- (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
- (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
- (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

SPEAKER'S RULING

Notice of Motion, Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I refer to the notice of motion given by the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services earlier this afternoon and the point of order taken by the Leader of Opposition Business immediately after question time. During this point of order the Leader of Opposition Business tabled a statement from the member for Currumbin. I have now examined the statement and it is clear that the content of the statement anticipates the notice of motion. Therefore, the attempt to table that statement is out of order and the statement is not tabled. The contents can be argued if and when the motion is moved and debated. I have, however, considered the content of the statement and note one of the long established rules for a notice of motion is that members must be able to authenticate the facts stated in the notice of motion, and I refer members to Speaker Mickel's statements on 27 October 2010 at page 3869 of the *Record of Proceedings*. I have therefore asked the minister to authenticate the facts as stated in the notice of motion and the minister has provided me with information.

MOTION

Energy Companies, Executive Bonuses

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk government to adopt the LNP's policy to freeze energy company executive bonuses until electricity prices decrease.

Tonight the motion is a simple choice: backing families and small businesses with lower electricity bills or backing bonuses for fat cat energy executives. The LNP is saying enough is enough. Executive bonuses should be frozen until such time as electricity prices decrease. We will end Labor's secret tax through electricity. We will change the incentives and remove the rewards for executives to gold plate the network, jack up prices and rip off families and small businesses. Enough is enough! Queenslanders are struggling under the record high electricity prices delivered by Labor. It is clear that the member for Yeerongpilly has learnt nothing from his recent stint on the backbench because of a reasonable suspicion of corrupt conduct. Yesterday this 'foolish minister'—that is how the head of the CCC described him—released a stinker of an electricity plan for summer condemned by most Queenslanders, yet he has been criticising the LNP for taking real action and promising to freeze executive bonuses. He even tried at one stage to blame farmers for high electricity prices and I am sure the other—

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order. That is clearly a misrepresentation. I take personal offence to that comment with regard to farmers and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister has asked for a withdrawal. Member.

Mr HART: I withdraw. This minister has a habit of misleading the parliament, of misleading—

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order. I find that deeply offensive and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr HART: I withdraw. The minister has a habit of misleading the people of Queensland. He misleads the people of Queensland every time he talks about electricity prices and the people of Queensland do not believe him. Yesterday during an answer to a question without notice the minister said that our policy—and it is a pretty straightforward policy—to freeze electricity executive bonuses would save one cent per week—one cent per week! The minister has completely misinterpreted this policy. He has not even bothered to read it. This is not about saving executive bonuses; this is about putting downward pressure on electricity prices, and I say that slowly so the minister can possibly absorb it. This is all about putting downward pressure on electricity prices. This is about changing the culture inside our energy companies such as Powerlink, Energex, Ergon, Energy Queensland, Stanwell, CS Energy—all of them. This is about changing the culture.

These executives earn \$70,000, \$80,000 or \$90,000 a year in bonuses. That would be very similar to what most Queenslanders would actually earn in an entire year. That is why we need to put pressure on executives to put downward pressure on electricity prices. The minister will jump up in a minute and tell us that there has been no problem with electricity prices. If we look at the AEMO data board we will see that the minister has been telling the people of Queensland that we have had the cheapest prices in Australia since March. That is not true. If we look at the AEMO website we will see that every day this month except for the first of this month we have had the highest prices in the NEM, the National Energy Market. Unlike what the minister has been telling the people of Queensland, we have had the highest prices. In fact, on the same page—and I will table this for the benefit of the House—it shows that in September we had the second highest prices in Australia.

Tabled paper: AEMO document titled 'Data Dashboard' [\[2003\]](#).

This government has done nothing to put downward pressure on electricity prices. This should be supported by all members of the House. This policy will put downward pressure on electricity prices by putting our executives under pressure for that downward pressure.

(Time expired)

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (6.06 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. The LNP's plan to freeze executive bonuses at Queensland government energy businesses shows that the LNP has a complete absence of any understanding of energy policy. This is hardly surprising given its embarrassing display on energy in the House over the last couple of days, which has been nothing more than a distraction from its own incompetence on the issue of electricity. The irony is that the current framework for government owned executive bonuses was set up by the member for Clayfield as the former treasurer and also the shareholding minister under the previous government. Even if this motion had any impact on prices, there are over two million electricity accounts in Queensland. This would give the average householder a one cent a week discount. This is nothing more than a cheap political stunt.

The recent power price increases which have been experienced right across the nation under the National Electricity Market have been caused by a number of different factors including heatwaves and the closing of ageing coal-fired power stations. The biggest factor underlying all of this is the failure of the dysfunctional federal coalition government to deliver coherent and integrated climate and energy policies in this country. The single biggest problem regarding energy in our country today is the toxic extreme right of the federal LNP government and the weak leadership of Malcolm Turnbull to implement the Finkel review and the recommendations in full of a clean energy target in Australia. Finkel modelling clearly shows that a CET would deliver more investment, lower emissions and householders would be \$90 better off per year over the next decade, not one cent a week.

None of the issues in relation to the National Energy Market are things under the control of power company executives. They do not control the weather, they cannot make the southern states plan for the orderly exit of ageing coal-fired power stations and it certainly is beyond them to force a divided and coal-power obsessed federal government to deliver coherent energy policy. The CEO of Energy Queensland could not have kept Hazelwood open. The CEO of CS Energy could not have stopped the heatwaves Queensland experienced earlier this year. This policy would have no impact on electricity bills other than the one cent a week. Make no mistake: what we need to bring order and lower prices to the National Energy Market in Australia is a clear set of rules set at the national level to provide industry with the clear certainty it needs to invest in new power generation.

After years of policy chaos from the Abbott-Turnbull federal government, this week we saw yet another change in direction as a divided government backed away from the recommendations of its own Finkel review. Where is the state LNP on this issue? Is it calling on its federal colleagues to sort out this mess? The state LNP is where it usually is: nowhere. Not once has the state LNP stood up to its Canberra colleagues on behalf of Queenslanders.

While the LNP is offering Queenslanders nothing but pointless, populist gestures and its federal colleagues are offering chaos, in Queensland the Palaszczuk government has already delivered a comprehensive plan to stabilise power prices and provide the policy certainty that will deliver new clean power generation that will place downward pressure on power prices without sacrificing our Great Barrier Reef. We own our energy assets, which is in stark contrast to the LNP, which planned to sell them off at the last election. We have been able to use the levers we have to shield consumers from the increases in power prices that the other states have experienced: \$770 million of our \$1.6 billion Powering Queensland Plan halved this year's average household bill increases from 7.7 per cent to 3.3 per cent.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock for one moment. Member for Gladstone, I am listening intently to your contribution. I am listening intently to the comments made by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and you will have a chance to speak.

Mr BUTCHER: Mr Speaker, thank you for your protection. This is in stark contrast to the 43 per cent increases that Queensland householders experienced over the term of the previous LNP government, which was fattening our state owned power companies in readiness to sell them. We have used our public ownership of our electricity assets to bring more supply into the market to reduce volatility and put downward pressure on wholesale power prices. That would not have been possible if the LNP had sold off these assets. The Powering Queensland Plan—

Mr McEachan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock for one moment. Member for Redlands, I find you are trying to disrupt the member in his contribution. You are trying to speak over the top of the member. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action. Bearing in mind that I have now just warned you at 10 minutes past six, this warning will last until whatever time parliament rises tonight.

Mr BUTCHER: It is like being hit with a wet lettuce leaf. These tangible benefits are being delivered under our Powering Queensland Plan to bring about an affordable, secure and sustainable electricity supply in Queensland. Threats to power company executive bonuses will deliver precisely nothing.

(Time expired)

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (6.12 pm): I am looking forward to hearing the contribution of the member for Nanango, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, because electricity prices is one of the biggest issues that we face in regional Queensland. Right now, regional Queensland is being hugely affected by electricity prices. Labor's latest thought bubble on the electricity crisis in Queensland shows how out of touch this government really is. While the Palaszczuk Labor government refuses to budge on its unrealistic 50 per cent renewable energy target, Queenslanders are being asked to switch their air conditioners to 26 degrees during the peak summer months. I have never heard anything more ridiculous. Have the members opposite ever been out to Stonehenge, Jundah, or Boulia in the middle of summer?

Miss Barton: They think Stonehenge is in England.

Mr MILLAR: I take that interjection. They probably do. During summer, regional towns such as Stonehenge, Jundah, Jericho, Emerald and Clermont can experience temperatures of up to 44 and 45 degrees. Those temperatures are consistent over January and February. It is so hot that it is unbearable. We are going through probably one of the hottest periods in a long time, yet the Labor Party refuses to budge on its unrealistic 50 per cent renewable energy targets and says, 'Queenslanders, we have a solution. How about you switch your air conditioners to 26 degrees during the summer months.' That is fantastic!

Miss Barton: On the hottest day.

Mr MILLAR: On the hottest day. Today, I noticed in the paper an article stating that the temperature in the ministers' offices was set at 23 degrees, but the government is saying to Queenslanders, 'No, we need to turn your air conditioners up to 26 degrees.' We live in one of the

hottest states in Australia, yet this government is asking people to turn up the temperature on their air conditioners. Perhaps the Premier, the ministers and the member for Gladstone should try sitting out at Longreach for a week when there are 45-degree days with an air conditioner set at 26 degrees. It is an absolute joke.

The Palaszczuk government has ruled out a new high-efficiency, low-emissions coal-fired power station for North Queensland and it is threatening to ration Queensland's energy use. We need a reliable, accessible energy source with baseload power, not a government that continues to push electricity prices through the roof and secretly imposes energy taxes.

Who could forget the Treasurer's great plan of taking the dividends from both Ergon and Energex—billions of dollars—which gives them no room to help people cope with electricity prices in regional Queensland? Who could forget—and we could not forget this—the deal the government did with a Western Australian company to give a huge discount to South-East Queenslanders while people in the bush continue to pay high electricity prices? I will never forget Roly, who operates the Commercial Hotel in Longreach, telling me that his electricity bill for the quarter was \$19,000. He cannot afford to pay that. That is a lot of pots of beer for him to sell.

Mrs Frecklington: It will be hot beer anyway.

Mr MILLAR: It probably will be hot beer—and off prawns over Christmas. Regional Queenslanders deserve better than that. On top of that, the Minister for Energy, Mark Bailey, attacks the agricultural sector. We see articles such as this one with the headline, 'Why farmers are to blame for high electricity bills'.

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order. I find the member's comments about me personally offensive and inaccurate and I ask that—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members. I am trying to hear the point of order. You have asked for it to be withdrawn?

Mr BAILEY: The member is misrepresenting my words. I find it personally—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I can stay here all night if they like.

Mr SPEAKER: Just for clarification, do you find the matter offensive and ask that it be withdrawn?

Mr BAILEY: I find the matter personally offensive. The member is verbally abusing me and I ask that it be withdrawn.

Mr MILLAR: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Is that a prop or is that to be tabled?

Mr MILLAR: That is to be tabled. I will table it.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'Why farmers are to blame for high electricity prices' [\[2004\]](#).

This is why farmers and graziers across Queensland are sick and tired of this Labor government. They are sick and tired of being demonised. They are sick and tired of being taken advantage of. The agricultural sector is one of the most profitable sectors in the Queensland economy. The number of jobs it creates in Queensland is amazing. When it comes to Queensland's economy, the agricultural sector is an unsung economic hero. We had a mining downturn, but what was there? Agriculture. Agriculture is a profitable business, but it is not profitable when we continue to see skyrocketing electricity prices.

People in the regions also need more investment in electricity infrastructure. If the electricity infrastructure fails they go without power not for two hours, not for 12 hours, but for 24 or 48 hours. That is unfair. The people in the regions are being treated wrongly. I call on the Labor government to start fixing this problem.

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (6.18 pm): It is a pleasure to rise to oppose this motion. It is also a pleasure to hear the thrust of this motion: downward pressure on prices one cent at a time. It is the slow march of the snails. The members opposite claim that they are standing up for Queensland, but it is a saving of one cent a week.

It is also interesting to hear the LNP condemning this so-called air-conditioning plan, which I believe came from them.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, I have been giving you messages all afternoon since we resumed. You are now warned under standing order 253A.

Mr WHITING: I find it interesting that the plan of attack this week is to attack a plan that originated from those opposite themselves. What a great strategy! The Palaszczuk government is doing everything it can to put downward pressure on power prices. We have a \$1.16 billion plan which is in stark contrast to the LNP's hollow policy on executive bonuses which will do nothing to reduce Queenslanders' electricity bills.

The LNP's record on energy is crystal clear. Under the LNP, power prices increased by 43 per cent compared to just 1.9 per cent per year under the Palaszczuk government. Those are the facts. Those opposite were fattening up our assets for sale before they were kicked out of government with a history making defeat. If they were sold Queenslanders' power bills would have been far higher today because we would have no control over our energy assets.

Here is another fact: executive bonus payments were much higher under the LNP than they are now. This policy is nothing more than a headline that will have no impact on customers' bills. The last full financial year of the Newman-Nicholls government saw power company executives paid bonuses totalling \$1.3 million. Last financial year under the Palaszczuk government power company executives' bonuses totalled only \$1.043 million. That is a decrease of almost 20 per cent. It is also a fact that with the merging of Energex and Ergon as Energy Queensland we can slash the cost of senior executives by \$3.7 million. When Tim Nicholls was the treasurer and a shareholding minister for Energex and Ergon the total remuneration cost for senior management of these GOCs was \$7.9 million. In 2016-17 we have reduced those remuneration costs down to \$4.2 million.

If the LNP had sold off our assets they would have had no control over executive bonuses. In fact, under the member for Clayfield's plan they would have been even higher. For example, the CEO bonuses of privately owned power businesses ranged from over \$1 million to \$3 million per year. At Spark Infrastructure the CEO has a bonus of more than \$1.2 million with a total pay of \$2.1 million. At Origin the CEO has a bonus or at-risk payments of \$1.9 million with a total pay of \$3.7 million. At AGL the CEO receives long-term and short-term incentive payments of more than \$4.3 million with a total pay of \$6.9 million. These are the types of bonuses Queensland electricity consumers would have to pay under the LNP's former plan or current plan to sell our assets.

Queenslanders are sick of the spin. They are sick of the lack of policy and the lack of direction on energy from both the federal and the state LNP. They want action. They want to know that governments are doing all they can to help reduce prices. The Palaszczuk government, despite the energy mess created by the Abbott and Turnbull governments, is acting. As I said, we have a \$1.16 billion Powering Queensland Plan that is delivering real benefits for Queenslanders.

If those opposite want to direct GOCs to alter their practices why did they not take action to take control of the 45 per cent of revenue that the AER does not control? That is something they did not do in previous years. They just sat on their hands. All they did was blame the previous Labor government. They could have taken action to do that. We have done that. Do not worry about that 45 per cent, let us blame someone else. I therefore oppose this motion.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (6.23 pm): I rise in the House today to support the member for Burleigh's sensible motion. Every day we sit here listening to these motions and hope that some form of common sense is going to come into the heads of those opposite in the Palaszczuk government.

An opposition member: You'll be waiting a while.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. We will be waiting a while. We have just had to sit through a couple of speakers who are out of touch with anything outside of Brisbane. I am disappointed that the member for Gladstone, who should know better, spoke on this issue today saying do not worry about \$1.3 million. I apologise. That may have come from the member for Murrumba. He said something like it is only \$1.3 million. What sort of Laboromics is that? \$1.3 million means a lot to people who are struggling. It means a lot to the mums and dads of the Nanango electorate, the Callide electorate and out in Longreach at the pub that the member for Gregory was talking about. \$1.3 million is a lot of money to small or large businesses and farmers across our great state who are struggling to pay their electricity prices.

What is this government's plan? Put your air conditioner up to 26 degrees! Isn't that rocket science? The member for Murrumba and the member for Gladstone obviously think that it is okay to say to people in Western Queensland and outside of the centre of Brisbane, where, I might add, it actually gets very hot over Christmas as well, 'It's okay, mums and dads, just turn your air conditioner up to 26 degrees.' Let me tell those opposite that half of those people are not even turning on their air conditioner because they cannot afford the increase in power bills under this Labor government.

Under this Palaszczuk Labor government and the Minister for Energy we have seen a 70 per cent increase in wholesale energy prices. Why not give those energy executives an incentive to put downward pressure on energy prices? It is not that difficult. It has worked before. When the LNP was in government we put an executive bonus freeze on the executives at QR. Guess what? Under the LNP the trains ran on time. Under this government—

An opposition member: They don't run at all!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: They do not run at all. I will take that interjection. On Christmas Day they did not run. This year we will have no trains turning up, hot beer, raw turkey and sweaty sheets. The Palaszczuk government has decided to take the LNP's policy. Who in the government decided to do that? That would be the Deputy Premier, the member for South Brisbane, who came out the other day saying, 'We are going to make the trains run on time by freezing executive bonuses.'

An opposition member: Bingo!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Bingo! I wonder whose suggestion that was. That is right, that would be the suggestion of the LNP. One of the ways the LNP successfully got the trains to run on time was by freezing executive bonuses. We heard from the member for Murrumba that it means nothing to freeze executive bonuses. Coming from a business background, I understand that to make your business work you need to meet your KPIs. Only the LNP has a plan to put downward pressure on electricity prices. We will get rid of the unrealistic 50 per cent renewable energy target. We are only at four per cent at the moment and those opposite are already telling us we have to put our air conditioners up to 26 degrees. The LNP will pave the way to build a low-emission, high-efficiency coal-fired power station in North Queensland because the people of North Queensland deserve to have baseload power just like the people in the bottom of the state.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (6.29 pm): We hear the opposition members express their vehement opposition to executive bonuses. I have a letter. It is a cracker. I will read it out to members. It is dated 11 February 2014 and it is from the 'Office of the Treasurer and Minister for Trade'. It states—

Dear Premier/Campbell,

I am writing in relation to the government owned corporation governance arrangements for chief and senior executives. Government arrangements issued in its current form to government owned corporations in February 2019. These arrangements have now been comprehensively reviewed having regard to current market practice and the government's desire to increase autonomy for boards of government owned corporations.

I come to the best point—

Please note employment terms and conditions for government owned corporation chief and senior executives are at the discretion of the boards of the government owned corporations. I have issued this policy to the government owned corporations.

Yours sincerely,

Tim Nicholls.

That was Tim Nicholls's policy. It gets better. His postscript to Campbell Newman states—

PS: These settle after extensive discussions with relevant agencies and after advice you have reviewed them from Jon Grayson, Tim.

Good on him! The policy that the opposition is complaining about is their policy. Do members see a consistent theme here? They have also banged on about an aspect of the Summer Preparedness Plan, which their own party did at a federal level.

This is a lazy opposition that does not do the policy grunt work required to form government. In fact, their arguments are not even factual. Let us compare executive bonuses under the Newman government, of which the member for Clayfield was treasurer, and the current government. Let us compare the year 2013-14, the first year of the Newman government, to our most recent complete year. There were \$257,000 less in bonuses under the Palaszczuk government than under the Newman

government. What capital-H hypocrites are the opposition! They paid executives more than we do. It gets worse. I have been advised that there actually has been a decrease of 6.9 per cent of total pay and bonuses under the Palaszczuk government in 2016-17 compared to 2013-14. They are not being truthful. They are not being factual about this.

In this debate, at no time has an opposition speaker talked about the federal government. This is a national electricity market, but it is a broken national electricity market. Has the opposition once stood up for Queensland against their colleagues in Canberra? They never do. They are weak. They are capital-W weak, particularly the member for Clayfield. You cannot be weak and be premier of this state.

The opposition policy is a fraud and a fantasy. It is not even factual. As I outlined, under Labor bonuses and remuneration have decreased, yet their policy states that those things have increased by nearly as much as electricity prices. This is fraudulent. It is a fantasy. This is all the opposition has. It is a one-page document that is full of inaccuracies and lies. I compare that to the Powering Queensland Plan, which contains 22 pages of reform and contemporary energy policy that backs the cheapest form of energy infrastructure. They are backing expensive old technology, that is, a coal-fired power station. I table a submission from the Australian Energy Council that outlines that there is no market demand for a coal-fired power station because it would send bills through the roof.

Tabled paper: Article from Energy Council web page, dated 20 July 2017, titled 'Where do we need a new dispatchable power station?' [2005].

The opposition has not done the work. If you cannot run an energy policy—indeed, if you do not have an energy policy that makes any sense—you cannot run the state. At energy conferences the Queensland LNP are laughed at when people hear their positions and it is not hard to work out why. Their policy on executive salaries would save Queenslanders one cent per week or 50 cents per year. That is their policy. It is lazy, it is pathetic and it is not befitting any political party with integrity. I urge members to vote down this motion.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 38—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seene, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

NOES, 40:

ALP, 39—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pairs: Byrne, Costigan; Enoch, Stuckey; Lauga, Nicholls.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.39 pm to 7.45 pm.

MOTION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument



Mr KATTER (Mount Isa—KAP) (7.45 pm): I move—

That the Weapons Legislation (Lever Action Shotguns) Amendment Regulation 2017, subordinate legislation No. 212 of 2017, tabled in the House on 10 October 2017, be disallowed.

I expect in the debate on this motion tonight that there will be some mudslinging. What is paramount in this debate tonight and what Queenslanders expect when this House deals with the issue of firearms is that the outcomes are significant and genuinely contribute to community safety around firearms. It is paramount that whatever we do here contributes significantly to community safety and is not window-dressing, is not a political stunt and is evidence based.

Secondly, the debate cannot be emotionally driven. These are very serious issues and there are very serious expectations around this in the community. We need to keep to the facts and evidence based data. That is very important in the context of this debate. I believe that firearm owners are very

much demonised in the mainstream media, particularly in metropolitan areas where there is not as much interaction and use of firearms. It is quite easy to judge and misunderstand the culture that surrounds these firearms and the people who use them when people are not used to them and do not interact with them.

The issue and reason we are debating this motion tonight is pretty simple. There has been a lot of media hype and obscure media hype around lever action shotguns. The Labor government has decided to attack licensed firearm owners by directing this at lever action shotguns. We have been aware for a long time that this was coming. We gave notice of the disallowance motion last night so that we could debate this tonight. We believe the regulation should be stopped.

I firmly believe that the KAP and other crossbenchers could stand beside antifirearm people in a debate on firearms and agree on a lot more than they disagree on. If people really want to address community safety and firearms then there are some meaningful things we could do. This is not one of them. This is rubbish.

I would like to go back to where this started. There was a YouTube clip of an imported lever action shotgun. I remind members in the House that it is misleading and quite frankly a lie for people to say that this is new technology. I could have acquired one of these legally in Queensland over the last 30 years.

Some politicians down south got hold of the YouTube clip. In the context of the National Firearms Agreement people were looking for something to make an issue out of. The National Firearms Agreement is a very meaningful document which has been worked on for 20 years. People were looking for some meaningful outcomes to address safety issues. This was the firearm plucked out by Minister Keenan. He decided to make a stand on this firearm.

Most firearm owners, particularly in western and regional areas where lever action shotguns are predominantly used, are quite bemused about this. It is such an obscure category of firearm to pick on. Everyone is quite confused about why it has attracted all the attention.

The heart of the issue is that too many people who do not know what they are talking about have jumped on the bandwagon in terms of this issue and made a political football out of it. That is why we are here tonight debating this. The real issue here is that we are failing to recognise where the real effort should be put in and instead changing a category of shotgun.

The National Firearms Agreement is a very meaningful document. The antigun lobby could come together with others and do something meaningful. Let me go through some of the things that could be done. Unfortunately these things are a bit difficult for government and costly so they have been sidelined in this debate. Instead we are talking about one obscure reference in one particular category.

The things we could be doing include the following. We could have a permanent amnesty on firearms. We just finished an amnesty. That was a great idea. I am totally in favour of it. It should be permanent.

The next thing we could do is have an instant licence verification system. At the moment we are still using an antiquated paper based system. I could have a gun licence and I could be radicalised or could have a domestic violence order against me and I would not be found out for six months. It is an antiquated paper based system that does not catch up with people. That should be digitalised so that we have an instant licence verification system. That is real safety. That is what we should be debating tonight. Unfortunately, we have a political football on our hands. There will be an illusion of public safety for the people of Queensland, which is a lie.

The next thing we should be doing is lobbying the federal government for customs to have more resources to track what is coming into the country in the post. I am sure that members who are going to engage in the debate tonight will have educated themselves by watching the *Four Corners* program a few months ago. It did not focus on licensed shooters or an Adler. It looked at all of the guns that come in illegally. That is where the problem is. People are bringing Glock pistols into the country by mail order. Customs are not checking 75 per cent of our mail coming into the country; only 25 per cent is being checked. I can log onto the internet tonight and order a Glock pistol to come in the post and I have a 75 per cent chance of getting it. We are told, 'That is not a problem. We will not put any resources into that. We will not be lobbying for that. What we are going to talk about is a lever action rifle that a small fraction of shooters use. That is the big problem. That is going to contribute to community safety.' That is rubbish.

The next thing I would like to talk about is the way this is being used. This goes to the heart of how lever action weapons are used. When politicians were scrambling for some meaningful evidence as to why this gun should be recategorised, they said it has a similar action to a pump action. I challenge you to go and talk to someone who uses firearms—I do not use them a lot—and say that to them and they will laugh at you. It is silly. The police in New South Wales finally came up with this idea to tell politicians that. This did not come from a study of weapons, analytically looking at what is a risk and what is not, looking at crimes and where the big risks are and pulling those firearms out. This came from media hype, from politicians trying to grandstand on the issue of firearms. It is sad that we have lowered the level of debate once again in this country. We have lowered the expectations of Queenslanders by using this as a political football and grandstanding on these issues, pretending that we are making them safer. If we want to have an argument about making Queensland safer, I am all for it—let us have it. Let us have a proper debate on meaningful action, but do not bring this rubbish into the House and say that this is going to solve the problem because it will not.

Anyone who has spent any time looking at the evidence and the data would know that the problems do not come from the licensing part of the industry. That is not where the problems come from. The problems do not predominantly come from stolen weapons or licensed gun owners. They come from criminals acquiring weapons. When it comes to the tragedy in Martin Place, that shotgun was never registered in Australia and it was used by a deranged person. The licensing regime has no impact on those sorts of tragedies. If there is a reference to the tragic event in the United States tonight, if you try to pull that into this debate, shame on you because it has nothing to do with this. If you are talking about bringing into parliament changes to the categorisation of a lever action shotgun as a response to that tragedy, that is poor government at best. We should be talking about making meaningful changes to our laws that will provide a safer environment for the community. We have a lot of common ground there with the antigun people.

Like I said, the main priorities of the firearms industry include having a permanent amnesty for people to hand in their firearms. That is what the firearms industry want. They want permanent amnesty. They also want an instant verification system. This is top of the pile of priorities for them. It is not about expanding the use of guns or including more guns in the easier-to-acquire categories. These are the priorities. The other priority is lobbying the federal government for more scrutiny by customs of items coming through the post. That is where the real change can happen.

Once again, it is very easy in parliament to pick on the licensed firearm owners. Changing the licensing regime seems like a good idea. If you follow through with this regulation tonight, it is cynical at best and misleading to say the least to the Queensland public. I think there are some really good things we can do in the Queensland parliament to increase community safety around firearm legislation. There are some good things we can work together on. If you want to throw in changes to the licensing of lever action firearms, you are going to inflame people, you are not going to make any difference and it is not evidence based. If there is a tragedy or if there are crimes linked with this type of weapon or if there is new technology being brought in, fair enough. Let the umpire decide. Do not create a story once you have decided that this is going to be used as a political football. I think that is the reason why people lose faith in politicians. They want to know that there is substance behind what we do in this House.

The issue of community safety around firearms is very serious. I think there is a lot of common ground in this House on that issue, despite our different ideologies around that. There are a lot of good things that we can do. This is not one of them. This is a smokescreen. This is low-hanging fruit. I think the timing of this is appalling. It is very much reflective of the continued attitude towards licensed firearm owners in this state, trying to make out that they are the problem. They never have been. All the evidence backs that up. All of the effort that goes into licensing and increasing the licensing regime is tearing up police resources. They should be chasing criminals. I plead with the House tonight to consider the way it is going to vote. Please consider the community safety issues that should be pursued. This will not make a difference there.

I want to make one other point before I finish—that is, the grandfather clause that is offered in this regulation is inoperable. If you dig down through the detail, there have been changes made to the definition of modifications of firearms. Modifications are commonplace in the industry—people will change a stock on a rifle and do a lot of things themselves. Changing the definition of modifications has the ability to make every modified licensed firearm out there unlicensed. It has the potential to make everyone who has modified a rifle a criminal—which would be a very big proportion of firearm owners.

This regulation has been poorly put together and put together with a political agenda. Members better think very carefully about how they vote on this tonight. This regulation will have some unintended consequences that will not reflect well on this parliament if it gets through.

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (7.59 pm): I rise in opposition to the disallowance motion put forward by members of the Katter's Australian Party in this House. It has been more than 20 years since Australia's tough gun laws were introduced in the wake of the tragedy at Port Arthur where 35 Australians lost their lives—the worst gun massacre in Australia's history. In this time these laws have proven to be very effective and are often internationally acclaimed as an example of comprehensive, effective public policy making. In fact, former prime minister John Howard once said that his changes to Australia's gun laws were his greatest achievement in office. I did not agree with John Howard on much, but on this issue and on his reflection I absolutely agree.

I was proud of Australia as a nation when we adopted these laws after the Port Arthur massacre. It was not just the right thing to do; it was the only thing to do. Protecting the integrity of these laws—and that is what we are talking about tonight—is the right thing to do and, again, it is the only thing to do, particularly after we saw the incredibly horrific massacre in Las Vegas.

The Palaszczuk government will always fight to protect our gun laws because we know that these laws are keeping Queenslanders safe. Last year at COAG all states agreed to implement a number of measures aimed at keeping Australia's gun laws strong and contemporary. That includes reclassifying lever action shotguns like the high-capacity Adler shotgun into a more restrictive category, which is what this amendment will do. We are acting on our obligations under the agreement reached at COAG by all jurisdictions across all party lines to respond to the changes in technology since the introduction of the National Firearms Agreement.

Let us be clear: through technological advancement these guns are able to shoot seven or more cartridges in just seven seconds. That is similar to pump action shotguns which were banned after Port Arthur. Through our regulations these guns will be reclassified as category D firearms, the highest level of classification. While Tim Nicholls and the LNP have said that they will not vote against these regulations, by their absence of vocal support here in the chamber tonight during this debate and by looking at their firearms policy it is clear that these laws will never be safe under a Liberal National Party government. I would not be surprised if this regulation was reversed under an LNP-One Nation government in Queensland.

We know that in an effort to secure preferences from their secret coalition partners in One Nation the LNP will undercut community safety by taking an axe to internationally acclaimed gun laws. We already know that the LNP-One Nation coalition would see the automatic renewal of category H licences with just a fit and proper person test. That is their own policy. That is the policy they are out talking up in the bush, but they come in here and they do not stand in their place and defend that policy position.

Under the current laws, gun owners must reapply and, as well as showing they are a fit and proper person, they must have a genuine reason to hold a concealable handgun—not just because of the job they do but for a genuine reason. The LNP's proposal would effectively give a class of people in Queensland an unfettered right to bear arms for no tangible reason. Let us be clear about that: these are rules that would apply to concealable weapons. This is the LNP's official policy position on guns—to allow concealable weapons for no good reason.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Members, we are not debating this across the chamber.

Ms TRAD: Twenty years on from our groundbreaking gun reforms the LNP do not even mention the National Firearms Agreement anywhere in their policy. It is not a cornerstone or a significant foundational reference for their guns policy. There is not one mention of the National Firearms Agreement. Given the chance, they will turn their back on the bipartisan, proven National Firearms Agreement to appease One Nation.

Ms Jones: Anything to do a deal with One Nation they will sign up to.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection—anything to do a deal with One Nation. Is there anything that Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield and opposition leader, will not do to try to become premier? I stand here today to confirm that I will never grow complacent on this issue. This is an issue that I feel incredibly passionate about.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms TRAD: Everywhere. I take that interjection. I feel passionately about this everywhere I go, because community safety, gun ownership and gun control are issues for every single Australian and every single Queensland. It is time that those opposite stop their hypocrisy and stand in their place and articulate their position. The Australian Labor Party will not let us go backwards. We will not forget the victims of Port Arthur. We will not forget the victims of the Monash University tragedy or Hoddle Street or any of the other tragic mass shootings that occurred before Australia had our strong gun laws. We realise that keeping our community safe is more important than doing deals with One Nation and Pauline Hanson.

Mr Emerson: Why don't you say that to the CFMEU which is threatening kids tonight? What do you say about the CFMEU?

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I am not taking the interjection from the member for Indooroopilly.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Burleigh, I have called order. You need to come to order. Member for Indooroopilly, your interjections are not being taken. Neither are yours, member for Burleigh, and neither are yours, member for Burnett.

Ms TRAD: Like a coward, the member for Indooroopilly comes in here and heckles, but will he stand in his place and make it clear to the people of Indooroopilly what he thinks about—

Mr WATTS: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If the Deputy Premier is going to attack us, then we are entitled to defend ourselves and it is certainly—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister for Education, there is a point of order. The member is on his feet.

Mr WATTS: If members are going to be named by the Speaker and criticised by the Speaker, surely we are allowed to retaliate and defend ourselves to the Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! One moment, please.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms TRAD: Absolutely. I am calling you cowards because you are. Stand in your place. You want to talk big out there. Come in here and talk—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Deputy Premier, while I am taking counsel I ask the House to remain in silence. I have taken counsel from the Clerk. There is no point of order. I also warn the opposition whip about challenging the authority of the chair.

Ms TRAD: The Labor Party will always put community safety and strong gun controls above any dirty deal with One Nation and Pauline Hanson. What the LNP are doing on this issue is reprehensible. They say one thing outside this chamber, but in this chamber they will not stand in their place and declare their position. I think the people of Queensland ought rightly reflect on this and come to the conclusion that these people are not fit to govern this fine state.

The member for Clayfield and the Liberal National Party will do absolutely anything for One Nation's preferences and that is pretty clear—including coming into this chamber and remaining silent on this critical and very important issue that their colleagues at a national level and in other jurisdictions are at one on in terms of reclassifying the Adler lever action shotgun. They will soften our gun laws and make it easier for people to carry concealable weapons. On this side of the chamber, we are not going to stand back and see our gun laws weakened in Queensland. To do that would not only put at risk the safety of Queenslanders, which is paramount; it would also undo and weaken what has been internationally acclaimed public policy in the area of gun ownership and gun control. Quite frankly, I think it is worth fighting for and I will always fight for it.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (8.10 pm): I am so pleased to follow the Deputy Premier and follow her bits and pieces of logic. I have not quite got through all of that yet. She spoke ad nauseam about One Nation and the great fear that the Labor Party and the LNP have, and I need to respond to those accusations that were made. I need to let the Deputy Premier know very clearly that we are not interested in making a deal with either party. She can continue to say it until she goes black and blue in the face, but again she is wrong. It is a bit like the \$5.4 billion she wants to waste for the people of Queensland. She is also wrong.

Let me talk about the regulation, which is what we should be doing at the moment. The ALP will always demonise shooters. It does not matter where they are; they have a record and a consistency of doing just that. Tonight, we will find out whether or not the LNP will do that. That is a decision they will make later tonight when they vote.

This motion tonight is to do with the National Firearms Agreement, but we need to go right to the heart of what this is about. We are talking about an Adler seven-shot pump action shotgun. Shotguns have been around for a very long time. They do not fire a great distance. Anybody who understands weapons knows that. We have what is called a 30-30. It is a lever action weapon and it shoots a few more rounds than the seven shot. It shoots a lot further and with a lot more accuracy over a lot greater distance. If the Labor Party were concerned, they would probably ban them tomorrow, but 200,000 people in Queensland have licences and they legally own firearms.

The laws that were put in place by Prime Minister Howard a number of years ago have worked very efficiently and very effectively. We have some of the toughest gun laws in the country, but the ALP have this lefty attitude about them where they want to implement silly rules. Today this is a silly rule and I will go straight to the heart of this silly rule. The silly rule relates to an issue of lawful modification. Crown law's advice was that all modifications require a licensed armourer to do those modifications. If people do it themselves, as those 200,000 people will do, they will be breaking the law and hence be put in prison. We would need bigger prisons in Queensland to hold the 200,000 registered shooters. That is what the ALP are pushing tonight. They do not want to tell anybody that, or they just do not understand that that is part of the legislation that is going through. That information was given to me by the Shooters Union and they have crown law advice from the Queensland police on this particular issue. I urge members to dig in deep before they vote tonight.

I would like to ask the minister a question tonight. How many people have been shot or injured by an Adler seven-shot lever action weapon? I am waiting with great anticipation to find out the number of people who have been shot or killed here in Queensland. Minister, I very much look forward to the answer to that.

Let me dig down into some of the things we need to jump into tonight. John Howard did a great job. This country has been in good hands with many good governments but I have not seen one for a little while. To ostracise these legal firearm owners in this state would be a great travesty, and that is where the Labor Party is going tonight. We all know that the Labor Party wants to ostracise gun owners. That is why the gun owners and the gun lobbyists across the state have started to erect signs. I can see many more signs going up across Queensland because these people are being victimised, and people in Queensland should not be victimised.

Sometimes when I wake up in the morning in Queensland I feel like I am living in the twilight zone. The cost of energy has gone through the roof. That did not happen by accident; it happened because bad governments let that happen. The basic thing we should do in this state is deliver services and look after the state, as we should be doing with the licenced firearm holders in this state. Tonight is a symbol about destroying democracy in the state of Queensland because that is what the Labor Party are leading with. I am waiting to see what the LNP do. I have a couple of quotes that have been made over a period of time.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Minister for Education, that was unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw and please do not interject. Your interjections are not being taken.

Ms Jones: I withdraw.

Mr DICKSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I know how rough the people in the Labor Party can get. When they cannot win by fair play, they play dirty. I heard about the unions today—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, those comments were not necessary. I now call you back to order.

Mr DICKSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, what I heard in the news today was something about unions saying, 'If you don't do it our way, we'll rape your children.' Where did that come from? Who says that? I was disgusted to hear that. I am sure that must have come from those opposite. They are their friends. I will return to the regulation and a quote from an ABC News report relating to the Adler shotgun in Queensland.

Government members interjected.

Mr DICKSON: If you want to talk about the Labor paedophiles, we can go there too but you should save that for later. This news article is titled 'Adler shotgun: Queensland LNP threatens to block PM's Adler restriction'.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DICKSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I cannot hear. It is very difficult to hear with these people.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on both sides of the House, there is too much audible talk within the chamber. I am having difficulty hearing the member for Buderim. I ask you to please stop; otherwise you will need to take your conversations outside.

Mr DICKSON: Thank you for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am a shooter but I feel scared of those people over there. They are dangerous.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, you do not need to reflect on the chair. Please resume your debate.

Mr DICKSON: The ABC News published an article called 'Adler shotgun: Queensland LNP threatens to block PM's Adler restriction' on 13 December 2016. It stated—

Queensland's Opposition Leader says he does not take "riding instructions from Canberra" and could block the Prime Minister's proposed restrictions on the Adler shotgun.

Malcolm Turnbull and state and territory leaders have agreed to put the seven-shot lever action Adler gun into the most restrictive ownership category, meaning it would only be available to professional shooters in certain conditions.

...

LNP leader Tim Nicholls has not ruled out blocking the restrictions, and says there has not been enough consultation with gun owners.

...

"We already have strong laws in Queensland that protect people and make sure only the right people can get those sorts of weapons.

"We want to understand exactly why it is that it's thought necessary to ban it.

"We don't think you should just ban these outright, you should understand exactly what the need for them is."

Another article is titled "'In danger and in the dark": Perrett on Adler gun laws'. It states—

The LNP is under extreme political pressure to back its Gympie MP Tony Perrett in his defence of the controversial Adler lever action shotgun.

They should back him because there is nothing unlawful about these weapons. There never has been and there never will be, except under Labor's rule, but that is what we are seeing happen here tonight.

Another article is titled 'LNP to renew category H licences for Gympie farmers'. I thought the LNP were going to back gun owners. I am sure we will see that when the division is called later this evening. Otherwise, are the National Party dead and buried? Are they gone forever? I really hope not because they were protectors of the land, protectors of the farmer and protectors of those things we believed were good and honest and those things that were fought for over many wars in this country. Our ancestors fought in two world wars. They were pretty brave men and women who did a whole lot of good. You would not believe it but they used guns and they used them in defence of this country. They came home and they owned guns. I grew up on a farm where there was a gun above every door but nobody got killed and nobody got hurt. That is in the past. We have moved forward after Port Arthur and we have the most restrictive gun laws in the world here in Queensland.

Tonight is about destroying democracy in this state. As I said earlier, when there is an election coming up, it means talking about the reef and talking about firearms. The ALP do not want to talk about anything like baseload energy or people burning candles in Queensland; they talk about firearms. They do not want to talk about things that really matter. They want to talk about Safe Schools. That program has to be the worst possible program in this country, and that was brought to us by the Labor Party.

Ms JONES: I rise to a point of order. I do not know what relevance this has to the gun laws, but I ask that the member gets back to the debate that is before the House tonight.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Thank you, Minister for Education.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, please, members of the House. Member for Buderim, before I ask you to resume your speech, I ask you to make sure that you speak to the motion at hand, please.

Mr DICKSON: I am very happy to do that. I was led astray by those in the Labor Party who want to talk about One Nation and all these different things. I will not do that because that is what they do. I will not do that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Buderim, I have just counselled you that you need to speak to the motion. Otherwise I will ask you to sit down and we will move to the next speaker.

Mr DICKSON: Let us go back to the demonising of gun owners in Queensland. There are 200,000 gun owners in Queensland, who would love to be able to get on with their lives without having the Labor Party interfering with them on a daily basis. The Adler shotgun is not going to hurt anybody. We know what is hurting people in Queensland, and that is the Labor Party. They are interfering in shooters' lives. There are 200,000 licence holders in Queensland; hence, there are probably 200,000 families. They probably have four people in each family. That is a whole lot of votes. I hope and pray that they vote against this party that demonises shooters. We will stand up for them.

I know that after the next election there will be a balance of power; that is what the maths tells us. One Nation is not going to get into bed with either party. We will make sure that Queenslanders are put first because the two tied parties have lost their way. We will always put people before politics. These gun laws that we are debating in this House tonight are a demonstration to the people of Queensland that this parliament is getting it wrong.

 **Ms BOYD** (Pine Rivers—ALP) (8.21 pm): If that is the calibre of the candidates of the One Nation party in Queensland at the next election, we can probably all rest easy. During my time in this place it has no doubt been a surprise for some to find out that I have been an advocate on behalf of the licensed shooting community. It is something that I have spoken about with my colleagues across this House and it is something about which I am passionate. In comparison with our friends in the United States, we are fortunate in Australia that gun ownership is not a political wedge issue; it is a public policy question. However, the fundamental framework is broadly agreed upon and settled. This is in large part due to the sensible approach taken on this issue by most sides in the debate over the past 20 years. It is a credit to former prime minister John Howard and his government that in response to the horrendous massacre at Port Arthur he and his ministers acted with such speed to address the issue of the future of gun ownership in a way that has dramatically reduced firearm deaths. It is a credit to the former Borbidge government that in the lead-up to a state election and in the face of community opposition they supported this important reform through to completion.

I will not accept fringe arguments that we need guns for our national security or for personal property defence. That is the role of our professional army and our professional police force respectively. However, we live in a free society and there are legitimate recreational and agricultural uses for firearms, so we must regulate our access to firearms accordingly to ensure that they end up in responsible hands and for legitimate reasons. It is easy to lose perspective in this debate and move to a position of hyperbole. I have worked hard to ensure that the licensed shooters in my community and, indeed, across Queensland have an extra voice in this place.

The politicisation of this group in our community is not positive for them and it is not conducive to good policy outcomes. It achieves nothing positive at all. One of the reasons I have been a vocal advocate on this issue is that there has been unfair demonisation of licensed shooters in the media and in our political process. I have had numerous meetings with individuals, advocates and stakeholders in my community and beyond. I am disappointed that the hard-won gun reform legacy of John Howard was so carelessly abused, first by Tony Abbott and then by Malcolm Turnbull in their horsetrading with crossbench Senator David Leyonhjelm.

This trading on gun laws was part of a shameful exercise to strip away workplace rights and reinstate the illegitimate Australian Building and Construction Commission. This, of course, backfired horribly on Senator Leyonhjelm when Malcolm Turnbull reconnected with his dormant climate-change-believing, leather-jacket-wearing former self and did the right thing on gun laws at long last. It was either the ghost of progressive Malcolm Turnbull or the ghost of the Howard prime ministership that haunted the Prime Minister. In any case, Senator Xenophon summed up the situation well when he stated, 'The problem with horsetrading is sometimes you end up with a donkey or, worse still, you end up making an ass of yourself.'

To be clear, the Palaszczuk government will never support a weakening of our gun laws. Under the Palaszczuk government, Queensland will remain part of John Howard's internationally lauded National Firearms Agreement, NFA. At the December 2016 meeting of COAG, all states and territories agreed to reclassify lever action shotguns. At the meeting it was determined that lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of five shots or under would be categorised as category B weapons and those with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds would be categorised as category D weapons—one of the most restrictive categories. In the 20 years since the Howard reforms it must be noted that we have seen technology and weapons advancements, so we need legislation that is reflective of that. As I have said to many, including the member for Mount Isa and also Rob Nioa, someone cannot market a lever action firearm as shooting off eight shots in eight seconds and not expect that to result in community concern.

Mr Katter interjected.

Ms BOYD: It is not new technology; I take that interjection from the member for Mount Isa. It is a rapid firearm. It can shoot off bullets at a rapid rate and there is legitimate community concern around that. The laws that we make in this place need to reflect technological advancements. While the lever technology is old, the fire rate is new.

Lever action shotguns with a capacity of five or fewer rounds will be transferred from weapons category A to category B, and those able to hold more than five rounds will move to category D. The reclassification of low-capacity lever action shotguns to category B will have a negligible impact on existing owners. All current owners possess a firearms licence permitting them to own either a category A or B weapon. This will enable retention of the lever action shotgun under the conditions of their current licence after its reclassification from category A to B.

Reclassifying lever action shotguns as category B weapons will, however, affect new acquisitions by requiring a person, for the first time, to state a 'genuine need' to possess it. This is not a requirement for category A weapons. Reclassifying high-capacity lever action shotguns to category D will significantly restrict community access to them as the authority to possess a category D weapon is granted only for specific reasons, such as agricultural culling.

However, there is no intention to adversely impact the rights of law-abiding gun owners who possessed a high-capacity lever action shotgun prior to their reclassification. That is why the Weapons Legislation (Lever Action Shotguns) Amendment Regulation 2017 includes appropriate transitional provisions to enable continued ownership rights for existing licensees. The amendment regulation will grandfather the affected weapons by adding an endorsement to the licence of registered owners. The QPS will add an endorsement to the licence of all owners of high-capacity lever action shotguns if, immediately prior to the notification of this amendment regulation on 10 October, the shotgun's magazine capacity recorded in the commissioner's firearms register was more than five rounds, or is more than five rounds because of a lawful modification of the gun. The endorsement will state that they must retain possession of the shotgun even though it is a category D weapon.

The provisions will also allow for a person inheriting such a weapon to be granted a similar endorsement enabling them to possess the weapon under the conditions of a category B licence, provided that the inheritor already holds a firearms licence. Having had extensive consultation and conversations in this policy space, I absolutely understand that not all firearms owners will agree with this decision. That said, once the changes are implemented, most weapons licence holders in Queensland will continue to be able to own lever action shotguns, including the five-shot Adler shotgun.

I want to be very clear in this debate: this is not about demonising licensed firearm owners. All of the evidence backs in that our licensed firearm owners are doing the right thing. Very rarely, if at all, do we see crimes committed by licensed shooters with registered firearms. It is just not prevalent in our country. Our role in government is to keep the community safe, and part of that is limiting access to high-powered weapons that can, if in the wrong hands, cause the kind of devastation that we saw in Las Vegas in recent weeks. At the beginning of the Adler debate I did not see myself making a speech like this, but I am very confident that as a government we will continue to work closely with all stakeholders. We will continue to carefully balance the interests of those with a genuine need to access firearms with the safety and security of the broader community.

We are a government committed to implementing strong gun protection laws. The reclassification of the Adler lever action shotgun needs to happen to comply with the NFA. All other states and territories are making this change in order to comply with the NFA that was set down by John Howard. We need to make that change too, and ultimately we will keep Queensland safe from those who would do us harm. It is for these reasons that I cannot support the member for Mount Isa's disallowance motion.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (8.30 pm): I fully support the disallowance motion moved by the member for Mount Isa. Madam Deputy Speaker, the Labor Party has tabled a regulation calling for tighter gun control in this House. The KAP has moved a disallowance motion to remove the regulation for tighter gun control, so the disallowance motion that we have moved in this House keeps the status quo. By moving this disallowance motion we do not add to or weaken gun control laws. Everything stays the same. The reason why everything stays the same is that John Howard introduced the toughest gun control laws in the world, so members cannot say that the disallowance motion that we have moved is badly worded or a stunt. We have basically moved this disallowance motion to maintain the status quo. Everyone, including the media and the Labor Party, has said that John Howard introduced some of the toughest gun control laws in the world, so we do not need this regulation.

We are keeping the status quo but, because we are a tight parliament, a hung parliament, we need the support of the opposition and the crossbenchers and we are hoping to receive the support of the Labor Party. Their support is vital, because if governments constantly change gun laws year in, year out we will lose the foundations that we have fought for right from the beginning. It is important that we block this motion, and I hope that we have the support of the opposition and the crossbenchers. This ABC article states—

Adler shotgun: Queensland LNP threatens to block PM's Adler restriction

Queensland's Opposition Leader says he does not take "riding instructions from Canberra" and could block the Prime Minister's proposed restrictions on the Adler shotgun.

...

LNP leader Tim Nicholls has ruled out blocking the restrictions, and says there has not been enough consultation with gun owners.

...

"We already have strong laws in Queensland that protect people and make sure only the right people can get those sorts of weapons."

These are not the Prime Minister's tougher gun control laws: these are the member for South Brisbane's tougher gun controls. The KAP has moved the disallowance motion to maintain the status quo. I will read you another article from the *Gympie Times* which says—

'In danger and in the dark': Perrett on Adler gun laws

The LNP is under extreme political pressure to back Gympie MP—

it is good that he is going to support us—

Tony Perrett in his defence of the controversial Adler lever action shotgun.

The Government reportedly plans to introduce new legislation to reclassify the seven-shot firearm, but will need the support of the Opposition or at least three out of five cross-benchers to pass the changes.

Katter's Australian Party MPs, Robbie Katter and Shane Knuth say they will block the laws and need only one more cross-bench vote, or Opposition support, to succeed.

That is all we need. We need one more crossbench vote and the opposition to succeed and we will block this regulation. What will happen if we block it? It will keep the status quo of the toughest gun laws in the world. That is all it does, so that is all you are supporting. The article continues—

Although the LNP is still attempting to gauge public opinion before formulating its policy, Mr Perrett has already said the state government has no facts on which to base a reasonable decision.

...

"I've seen no evidence by any authority which supports the reclassification of the Adler.

"As a weapons licence holder, gun owner and primary producer, I support practical, evidence based gun classification.

"I support the rights of law abiding gun owners and not those who use emotional grandstanding to demonise guns and their users," Mr Perrett told *The Gympie Times*.

We believe that we have Mr Perrett on our side. He does not believe in emotional grandstanding because there was a shooting in America. We do not believe that because there was a shooting over there we have to change things very quickly, because there is no evidence that shows this with regard to the Adler. There is no evidence to justify the restriction. There have been no incidents to justify the banning or restriction of the Adler. There is no evidence at all to support restrictions being placed on the Adler. This ABC article is quite good and we like it. It states—

Adler shotgun: Nationals senator Bridget McKenzie says heavy restrictions are irrational

Nationals senator Bridget McKenzie has been scathing of the heavy restrictions on the Adler shotgun, saying they are not based on evidence.

She is right: there is no evidence, and you will back us, won't you, because you have been spruiking about it? The LNP—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Dalrymple, please resume your seat for one moment. This is a passionate debate, but there is far too much conversation going on around the chamber and far too many ferocious interjections. Please allow the member to speak. I call the member for Dalrymple.

Mr KNUTH: I would like to remind everyone that this has been put into the same category as the AK45, so this is going a bit overboard. All of the reports, newspapers and everything that we have read suggest that the LNP is for law-abiding firearm owners and they are there to back them. 'Day in, day out we're with you.' The article goes on to quote Nationals senator Bridget McKenzie, a great woman—

"There's no evidence to suggest that this is a rational decision based in evidence, in common sense," she said.

"Look, I think it is incredibly disappointing that today we saw Labor and Liberal premiers turn their back on evidence based policy making."

This is not an evidence based policy decision. Moving this disallowance motion is not a stunt; it is removing Labor's regulation for tighter gun control. What is disappointing is that, when there is a shooting, they always target the law-abiding firearm owner who has been through police checks.

An honourable member: Demonise them.

Mr KNUTH: They demonise them, and these are members of gun clubs and primary producers. Why don't they target the tens of thousands of illegal guns that are trafficked through this country every year? Why don't they check the 75 per cent of parcels that come through the post into this country unchecked? These are the big issues that we should be worried about. There is no evidence to support tougher gun controls in this state. We need the support of the opposition to block this, because we are here to ensure that Queenslanders get a fair go and they are not disadvantaged by governments that bring in emotive policies, particularly close to election time. I fully support the disallowance motion moved by the KAP.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Nudgee, I ask members to keep their conversations to a minimum. The volume of conversation is getting quite high and it is quite hard to hear members.

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (8.39 pm): I rise to speak against the disallowance motion. I am no stranger to firearms. My father was a rifle champion in his youth and his family rural property owners. I grew up around firearms and I grew up with a healthy respect for the valid role they play in certain circumstances and a healthy respect for the dangers they pose. This government will never be against responsible gun ownership, but we will also never forget that the paramount principle in responsible firearms policy is to protect the community. This regulation demonstrates that commitment to protecting the community with strong gun laws while continuing to support responsible gun owners.

The National Firearms Agreement, which, as we all know, had its genesis in 1996 following the tragic events at Port Arthur, has formed the basis of successful gun control in this country for over 20 years. It has formed the basis of Queensland's regulatory framework for the control of firearms which has indisputably served to prevent the types of tragic mass shootings observed overseas. The community—certainly my community—does not want to see this changed. Since 1996 over one million weapons nationally have been handed in and destroyed through gun buyback schemes or weapons amnesties. Nationally, mass shootings have reduced from 11 in the decade prior to 1996 to zero in the 21 years since. Evidence shows that the rate of firearms related deaths, both suicides and homicides, has also greatly reduced since 1996. These are indisputable facts.

This amendment regulation will bring the treatment of lever action shotguns, currently classified as a category A weapon, into line with other types of shotgun such as pump action or self-loading weapons. This reclassification brings Queensland into line with the 2016 COAG decision to strengthen the National Firearms Agreement. New South Wales has legislated to classify lever action shotguns, Western Australia has done it and the ACT has done likewise. It is time Queensland followed suit.

Lever action shotguns with a capacity of five or fewer rounds will be transferred from weapons category A to category B, and those able to hold more than five rounds will move to category D in respect of the potential threat they pose. The reclassification of low-capacity lever action shotguns to category B will have negligible impact on existing owners. The reclassification of lever action shotguns that hold more than five rounds to category D is warranted. High-capacity lever action shotguns do not by their nature require reloading as frequently as low-capacity shotguns. They have the potential to cause maximum harm in minimum time. Marketing for the Adler shotgun claims that the Adler A110

12-gauge lever action shotgun 20-inch model is 'tailor made for fast and furious pig shooting ... This new technology lever action shotgun is a game changer for the Australian market, and must-have'. That may not be a problem when such a powerful weapon is in the hands of a fit and proper person with a genuine reason for possessing such a firearm, but it is absolutely incumbent on any responsible government to put appropriate safeguards around such possession in the broader community interest.

I appreciate that not all firearm owners will be in agreement with this decision—some will vehemently oppose it—but it is vital that Queensland, and indeed Australia, continues to comply with the spirit of the National Firearms Agreement to keep Queenslanders safe. It is vital that we remain vigilant and committed to that decision 21 years ago to set a policy course in regard to firearms that seeks to achieve the best balance between the needs of people such as sporting shooters and primary producers who require genuine access to firearms and the interests of the broader community. The community expects it.

While I am talking about gun control, I want to talk for just a moment about category H licences and the capacity to carry a concealed handgun. To use the words of Tim Fischer, Australia's deputy prime minister in the mid-1990s when Australia radically changed its gun laws, the suburban person with a gun in the drawer next to their bed—something, I gather, still common in the United States—has never been part of normal Australian life. Under our current laws, that handy bedside gun would also be illegal, unless the bedside table was a gun safe bolted to the wall with a key kept separately and the ammunition stored elsewhere. This is what the community expects. It is certainly what the families across my electorate expect.

The Palaszczuk government will never support a weakening of our gun laws. Under the Palaszczuk government, Queensland will remain part of John Howard's world renowned National Firearms Agreement. The LNP's election policy on firearms regulation does not, however, give this same commitment. The LNP's proposed removal of the genuine reasons criteria for reapplications for category H licence holders to hold concealable handguns is a blatant watering down of gun laws and a deviation from the National Firearms Agreement. Under the current laws gun owners must reapply and, as well as showing that they are a fit and proper person, they must have a genuine reason to hold a concealable handgun. The LNP wants that test gone and has vowed to renew all existing category H gun licences. This is absolutely out of step with the expectations of much of the Queensland community.

The strong gun controls in this country have worked for 21 years. They are to be respected and not deviated from without extreme caution. Allowing the continued possession of a concealed handgun without, in changed circumstances, a genuine reason is appalling but predictable LNP policy, but it is a policy that I know people in my electorate will reject strongly. As I said in my opening remarks, this government will never be against responsible gun ownership, but we will also never forget that the paramount principle in responsible firearms policy is to protect the community.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (8.45 pm): The LNP believes that the fundamental role of any government is to keep its citizens safe. As we have demonstrated to the people of Queensland time and time again, the LNP will always put community safety first. One of the ways this is achieved is by ensuring we have firearms laws that limit the possibility of the tragic events that we have recently witnessed overseas but that, at the same time, do not limit the legitimate rights of our primary producers to have appropriate tools of trade and the rights of those who enjoy shooting as a sport.

The overwhelming majority of Queenslanders support the National Firearms Agreement introduced by then prime minister John Howard in 1996. It is heartening to continue to hear members of the Labor government fetter this great prime minister. For this reason the LNP cannot support tonight's motion to disallow Labor's new regulations because it is important that we have national consistency on weapons categories. We also believe that there are important protections that allow firearms owners who legally own lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity greater than five rounds to apply for an exemption under the new laws.

There is another consequence to supporting this disallowance motion that the Katter's Australian Party have failed to realise. A temporary import ban on lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity greater than five rounds was put in place by the Commonwealth government in 2015. That ban remains in place today. That ban will only be lifted once every state and territory has moved to reclassify that weapon from category B to category D. If this disallowance motion is defeated tonight, we will be the fifth jurisdiction to do that, with three to go. Let me say again what this unintended consequence is. If this regulation is disallowed tonight, the temporary import ban will remain in place and none of these weapons will be allowed into the country for any reason. A successful disallowance motion by Katter's Australian Party will backfire on the mover.

I acknowledge that many law-abiding firearms owners see Labor's new regulations as an attack on their rights and an attack on their integrity. This is totally understandable when you look at Labor's track record in this area. Law-abiding firearms owners are unfairly demonised—and we have seen it tonight once again—by left-wing political parties and treated like criminals when all they try to do is the right thing and comply with the law.

It is hard for them to swallow Labor's rationale of watering down tough laws that make it easier for organised crime gangs to get weapons yet treats them with utter contempt and disdain. It is hard for them to swallow the media reports that we see yet again today which sees the CFMEU get away with its ongoing lawlessness and treating construction workers with fear and intimidation, yet law-abiding firearm owners get demonised for trying to comply with the law and have increased red tape and regulations.

It is important to understand how we have come to this debate tonight. Last night we clearly saw the Labor Party and Katter's Australian Party cook up a deal to create a wedge on an important community safety issue which should never be trivialised. It is not often that you see the Governor rushed to parliament on a Tuesday night to sign off on an Executive Council minute. I am sure that Queenslanders would like to know what deal was made in exchange for the events that took place last night. Last night's political stunt was clearly choreographed, and the blame for that lies at the feet of the Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad, who continues to peddle misinformation and use emotional rhetoric that the firearm community are sick and tired of. That was clear from the Deputy Premier's comments on radio this morning on the ABC and her contribution here tonight.

There is no doubt Labor's election platform is skewed in favour of left-wing ideological policies to help salvage the Deputy Premier's political hide in South Brisbane rather than governing for all of Queensland. It is about fighting the Greens on issues that matter to people in South Brisbane rather than across the state. While Labor's policies lurch to the left, Queenslanders will suffer from that skewed policy agenda that they will reject at the next state election. I would encourage Queenslanders to completely disregard the emotional rhetoric and misinformation that comes out of the mouth of the Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad. It is clear that she is deliberately scaremongering. We understand that some people in the firearm community will be disappointed with our position this evening. However, we believe that we have made a balanced decision—one that takes into account the interests of the whole state—and it will not lessen our resolve to ensure fairer gun laws for law-abiding citizens.

Ms Jones: What does that mean?

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection; I will explain it now. It is our plan to respect the rights of law-abiding firearm owners—the people who do the right thing—with a focus on getting back to basics, and that is the centre of our policy, Fairer Gun Laws. We will do this by the following: we will restore proper consultation through a properly constituted ministerial weapons advisory panel as a standing body that will meet every three months and there will be genuine consultation—not being told what will happen as currently happens—and we will ensure that policy decisions are informed by evidence and expert advice, not misinformation and media spin.

We will improve the screening processes with real-time background checks by reforming the application and compliance process so that police can ensure there is a more rigorous system with a focus on compliance, not bureaucracy. This will be done by implementing a licensed instant verification system, with the reforms to be led by the ministerial weapons advisory panel as a priority. We will increase penalties for gun crime and reinforce our approach to cracking down on criminal behaviour, not Queenslanders who are doing the right thing. We do respect the right of primary producers and landholders in this state and the fact that they need firearms as a tool of trade, and those who have had category H weapons licences for years and years and years will be grandfathered.

The current approach by the Weapons Licensing branch has provided great uncertainty and needs to change. The LNP has continued to raise examples of this issue in the media and in the parliament where law-abiding owners have had licences denied for no good reason. Unlike Labor, we will not treat law-abiding firearm owners like criminals. The LNP will continue to respect law-abiding firearm owners and ensure that their rights are protected. We cannot support this disallowance motion tonight which would put Queensland out of step with every other state on a fundamentally important community safety issue.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (8.54 pm): I start by saying that clearly the member for Everton has just let the cat out of the bag. The staffers who work for the LNP have been working really hard at the moment briefing the Brisbane media that, 'We support it. No, we're not watering down gun laws.' Even

though very few of those opposite want to talk about it tonight, the LNP is going to vote with the government in ensuring that we have nationally consistent laws when it comes to firearms in this country. This is in stark contrast to what those opposite are saying out in the bush. We just heard the member for Everton say, 'If we get into government we're going to have fairer gun laws. We're going to get back to basics. We're going to restore public consultation for policy decisions on gun laws.' Those opposite should come clean about the policy decisions on gun laws that they hope to introduce if they get back on this side of the House.

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Mudgeeraba, please allow the minister to speak.

Ms JONES: What I do know is that as a mother I am very happy that there are safe gun laws in Queensland. It does make me sleep better at night and I can say to my child that he lives in a state with the toughest gun laws in the country. I have had that conversation with him, and unfortunately I have had to have that conversation with him in the last couple of weeks.

Ms Bates interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, I ask you to please cease your interjections.

Ms JONES: Gun laws are not a fickle thing; they are a real thing. We know that gun laws save lives. That is why tonight no-one on the Labor Party side of politics got up and demonised farmers. No-one criticised law-abiding gun owners. No-one made any of those comments whatsoever—not one of us—and none of us will because we absolutely understand that the tools of the trade for farmers do involve gun laws. We understand that. We have always understood that. That has always been Labor Party policy, and I do know that, member for Mudgeeraba. I worked for a minister who had a gun licence thank you very much.

Tonight we saw the LNP briefing the Brisbane media to say, 'No, we're not voting against this. That's just crazy Jackie Trad.' That is what those opposite have been saying, but we know what they are saying in the bush and the Katter party knows what they are saying in the bush. The LNP says that it is time to rethink the rights of farmers on gun laws. Who is saying that in Kingaroy? The member for Nanango. Andrew Cripps, the member for Hinchinbrook, said that the LNP is going to be—

... focusing on compliance not bureaucracy, by rolling out a Licensed Instant Verification System.

We know what that means: that those opposite are watering down the criteria of genuine reasons.

Mr Cripps: No, it doesn't mean that.

Ms JONES: Yes, it does. The member for Gympie in his local paper said—

Last week we heard calls for fixes to gun laws despite the big difference between fully automatic guns and farmers using guns as a tool of the trade.

That is what they say in the bush, but they are briefing the media upstairs to the opposite effect. There is then the headline 'Fairer gun laws with proper consultation: Millar'. Lachlan Millar, the member for Gregory, is saying that under the LNP we will get fairer gun laws with proper consultation. The member for Everton appeals to the voters in his community, but he said in his own words that they are going to set up this new weapons advisory panel to look at the policy decisions on gun laws in this state. They should come clean about what those policy decisions are going to be if they do their dirty deal with One Nation to form government.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hinchinbrook, your interjections are not being taken. Please cease.

Ms JONES: Unfortunately, we know that, when a party like the LNP does a deal with One Nation, this is exactly what we are going to see in Queensland: the watering down of laws, including gun laws, in our state because it has to pander to the ultra right wing of its own party.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Hinchinbrook, if you do not cease your interjections I will warn you under standing order 253A.

Ms JONES: Those opposite say one thing in the bush and then brief the media in Brisbane with another. We know that the LNP's policy waters down Queensland's laws and the laws introduced by John Howard. The LNP's policy changes the category. I know that the police minister has made this very clear in his reply to all of the letters the members opposite have been writing. They are all a bit scared of those One Nation voters. They are pandering to them in their local communities.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hinchinbrook, I warn you under standing order 253A. You understand the consequences if I need to warn you again.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. When the previous speaker on this side of the House was speaking, government members screeched incessantly throughout his speech. I think this House deserves a consistency of ruling in terms of interjections.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms JONES: We know why the honourable member for Callide had to do that. They are getting called out here tonight. They know that, despite the letters they are writing to people in their communities, under the current laws gun owners must reapply as well as show that they are a fit and proper person. In addition, gun owners must be able to demonstrate a genuine reason to hold a concealable handgun. That is the law. It is consistent with what happens elsewhere in the country. The LNP has a policy saying that there will be only one test and people do not need to have a genuine reason to have a concealable weapon. As the member for Ashgrove, that concerns me. As the Minister for Education, that concerns me. As the mother of two children, that concerns me.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms JONES: What did the member say? I would like to take that interjection. Would the member like to say that again? No, I did not think so. That is what we are seeing here tonight. The LNP members are running scared. They know they are copping it in the bush. They have to pander to their One Nation mates, who are eating into their vote. They are also scared about their vote in Brisbane, because they know that Australians want tough gun laws. We are proud of our gun laws. We know that our gun laws make a difference to safety in our country.

Tonight, the members opposite have been caught out. I know that they will vote with us, but they will go back home to their electorates and tell their mates that they do not support these laws, exactly like they have done in their letters. It is shameful. They should stand up and be honest about their true position.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (9.02 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion to disallow the Weapons Legislation (Lever Action Shotguns) Amendment Regulation 2017.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Ms JONES: I rise to a point of order. I heard that. I take offence to being called 'crazy'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you asking the member to withdraw?

Ms JONES: I am asking the member for Chatsworth to withdraw that comment, because it is offensive to people with mental illness.

Mr Minnikin: I withdraw.

Mr PERRETT: I have and always will support practical evidence based decisions about gun licensing and classification. I back data and facts against the emotional grandstanding and political pointscoring of the Labor Party any day.

This regulation is blatantly nothing more than the Labor Party playing politics. It is cloaking it in some spurious argument about being concerned about the welfare of Queenslanders by demonising law-abiding farmers, graziers and sporting shooters. The government has sat on this issue for 10 months, because it wanted nothing more than to wait for some incident, some event, to give it a chance to have a go at weapon owners.

In December last year at COAG, the government made a commitment without proper consultation with Queenslanders. On issue after issue this government fails to consult those who are most affected by its decisions. It makes empty promises about embracing consultation. When it comes to gun owners, the government pays lip-service to consultation. When it comes to the way in which the government addresses gun licensing, gun ownership or gun classification, it significantly undermines the rights of law-abiding firearm owners in our state.

We have to ask: why is the government now proposing this regulation to punish our law-abiding firearm owners who do the right thing and comply with the law? Because it is no longer running a government. It is in full election mode as the Labor Party, not as the Queensland government. Of course, that means that every decision will be made and every discussion will be held with its eyes on vote chasing. The government is seeking to secure support from anti-gun activists at the expense of gun owners, because it is scrambling to shore up votes in anticipation of a state election.

The Premier and the Labor Party continually pander to inner-city zealots who use hysterical and shallow arguments to demonise gun owners and users. These zealots want to close down any activity in regional and rural Queensland. We already have effective gun control laws in Queensland that protect people and ensure that only the most responsible people can access guns. The government should be focusing its attention on criminality and noncompliance. Let me be very clear: this regulation is not about making Australia any safer, because it is criminals who access illegal firearms, not law-abiding gun owners. Jumping to conclusions based on innuendo, speculation and false comparison is plainly dishonest. Farmers use guns. Guns are a tool of trade. Farmers need guns for the safe management of their farms and properties to control feral animals. The Labor Party has treated farmers as if they are members of criminal gangs. Instead of being treated like criminals, they deserve a fair go.

Over and over again I have listened to the arguments put forward by the government—arguments that are full of emotive words, contemptible arguments that are purely blatant vote garnering. All this week we have heard the government raise issue after issue that is solely designed to play to an audience of wealthy, unproductive inner-city zealots who think the whole world revolves around their concrete enclaves. It is an audience that is obsessed with the lifestyle, the pastimes and the work practices of the workers who live outside a few square kilometres of Brisbane. It is an audience that demonises our rural and regional industries, our lifestyles and our workers.

Last year, the minister advised me that the state government body in control of weapons licensing does not even know how many weapons licence holders there are in each regional area. That means that the government is making decisions about the reclassification of weapons and weapons licences when it does not have any adequate knowledge and data on the use of weapons in Queensland. Obviously, the government is jumping to conclusions based on innuendo and speculation. I back data and facts against that any day. It means that this regulation about the reclassification of the Adler lever action shotgun has been based on reasons other than hard facts.

As I have said, I support practical evidence based decision-making regarding guns. I have seen no evidence by any authority that supports the reclassification of the Adler. There could be no other conclusion than that the government wants to make it harder for firearm owners, licensed dealers and sporting shooters.

I am committed to ensuring that we have a weapons licensing system that protects the community and respects the rights of law-abiding firearm users who try to do the right thing and comply with the law of the day. As a weapons licence holder, gun owner and primary producer, I will fight to protect primary producers and the firearms community's rights against the continual attacks from the Labor Party. I support the rights of law-abiding gun owners.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (9.07 pm): I rise to oppose this disallowance motion on gun regulation. The Palaszczuk government will not allow our gun laws to be weakened in this state. Under the Palaszczuk government, Queensland will remain part of John Howard's National Firearms Agreement.

The action that was taken following the Port Arthur massacre 20 years ago was the right thing to do. Our nation is safer and Queensland is safer. I will proudly put up my hand to brag about the Palaszczuk government's refusal to weaken weapons laws in Queensland, because there is nothing more important to our government than the safety of all Queenslanders. Unlike the LNP, we will never risk the safety of Queenslanders for a cheap political grab at votes.

The Palaszczuk government will always take advice from those on the front line who have the most to lose from any weakening of our gun laws: our brave police. I know that Minister Ryan has met with many groups about this issue. To hear from the opposition that the minister has not consulted with anyone is totally wrong. As the brother of a policeman, I am seriously concerned about any relaxation in gun laws. In the 18 years between 1979 and 1996, there were 13 fatal mass shooting incidents in Australia. These incidents resulted in a total of 104 deaths with at least another 52 people injured. With the number of serious deaths because of guns I am concerned about the safety of my brother and his colleagues when they have to turn up to any sort of altercation where a weapon is involved.

There have been no fatal mass shooting incidents in Australia since the introduction of the National Firearms Agreement and the initial gun buyback in 1996-97. In December last year at COAG every state agreed to reclassify lever action shotguns. The joint Commonwealth and New South Wales review of the Martin Place siege made a number of recommendations regarding firearms, including that the Commonwealth, states and territories should simplify the regulation of the national firearm market through an update of the technical elements of the National Firearms Agreement. The report included an acknowledgement that there had been significant technological advancement and departures from the NFA since 1996 which should be addressed in this new review, which we have done. Thirty-eight recommendations for changes to the NFA were put to the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council. The majority of the NFA recommendations were supported; however, there are five areas where Queensland legislation does not comply with the agreement.

Lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of up to five rounds will be classified as a category B weapon and those with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds will be classified as the more restrictive category D weapon in Queensland. The federal government's ban on imported lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds will continue until the COAG agreement is implemented by all jurisdictions.

The minister established a firearms advisory forum and its members are working constructively with stakeholders about a range of firearm matters, including how best to implement the changes agreed by COAG. Queenslanders deserve the same protections as every other Australian. When it comes to gun laws I take advice from our police and from my brother, not from members of the crossbench. I stand for the safety of our community and for our police.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (9.11 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to tonight's debate. Let me make it clear from the start that the LNP supports primary producers and their right to access firearms. We consider them a tool of the trade. Where I come from in the seat of Gregory one of the biggest issues we face at the moment is access to category H licences. Category H licences are a tool of the trade for primary producers who cover properties from 25,000 to 80,000 acres. The category H licence is something that I regard as an important tool of the trade for primary producers. It is an animal welfare issue. If there is a beast that needs to be put down it can be put down quite easily and quickly. The last thing we want to see is primary producers running around with longarms on the back of four wheelers going through grids and fences.

We have seen a hold up in the access to category H licences. People who want to renew their category H licence have been unable to renew it. A couple of weeks ago a person who has had his category H licence since 1970 received news that his category H licence will not be renewed. He has had a pistol since 1970. He uses that in the same way one would use a pair of pliers to fix a fence or a shifter to fix a pump. It is there to be used as a tool of the trade. If he sees a beast that needs to be put down or he sees some dogs who are attacking some ewes, he is able to use that weapon very quickly and effectively to protect livestock on his place. He has had his category H licence for well over 30 to 40 years. He is a law-abiding person and a good member of the community. For him to be refused this licence is a real concern.

I call on the Labor government to make sure that primary producers have access to those licences because they are very important. Those primary producers feel alienated and demonised when they are refused licences they have held for a very long time. These are people who are on 30,000, 40,000, 50,000, 80,000-acre properties who travel from water point to water point, from bore to bore, from trough to trough to check water and to check on stock. They need to have access to that type of weapon.

I continue to get calls into my office with people saying, 'I have had access to this licence for well over 40 to 50 years. It was handed down by my grandfather. We are not lone cowboys.' At one stage a former agriculture minister labelled them lone cowboys. It was absolutely insulting to those hardworking graziers to say that they were lone cowboys. They are responsible, law-abiding people. It is important to recognise that these people need to be treated fairly. I note that AgForce has come out today and expressed its concern about this being the thin end of the wedge. I will be looking at this very carefully and making sure that primary producers have access to the weapons they need to be able to carry out their day-to-day operations. They are not criminals. If the government wants to get rid of criminals or the issue of access to guns then maybe it should have a look at the watering down of bikie legislation. That is where we see access to those sorts of weapons.

Primary producers are law-abiding people who are sick of being demonised. If they are not being demonised through vegetation management they are being demonised through this issue. These are the people who are putting food and on our table and fibre on our back. They are the unsung heroes of

the economic renaissance we will hopefully have soon in Queensland. We have critical opportunities to access key markets in Asia, certainly with our beef industry with the growing demand for protein. For us to access that market we need to get rid of more red tape and allow primary producers to conduct their businesses the way that they need to.

As the son of a primary producer, the grandson of a grazier and great-grandson of a grazier, I could not be more passionate about agriculture because it is something I believe in. I know members here are very passionate about it. We do not need to be demonised. We do not need to be used as political capital. When it comes to election time the same card seems to be rolled out.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr MILLAR: I will take that interjection from the member for Logan and ask why are we seeing the Deputy Premier introduce vegetation management laws that will stop people in their tracks and stop agricultural production? When was the last time high-value agricultural land was approved by the Labor government? Never! You have to approve high-value agricultural land to grow increased opportunities. We have India waiting for more chickpeas. We need to give producers the opportunity to run their businesses the way they see fit.

One of the issues is access to the firearms that they need. One of the biggest issues I have in Western Queensland is access to category H licences and the continual denial of their applications given that they have had them for 30 to 40 years. It is shocking—in fact, it is depressing—when one sees this happening to law-abiding men in their 70s and 80s who have paid their taxes and played a huge part in their community. They have been involved in growing agriculture, whether it is increasing wool production or increasing beef production, and providing jobs and associated opportunities for the towns where they spend money with the local tyre fitter or the auto electrician. Agricultural production is the most important thing and to be demonised and used as political capital on these sorts of issues is wrong.

I will always stand up for agriculture and primary producers. I hope that we would all do that. I will be keeping a very close eye on this issue and making sure that primary producers have access to the weapons that they need. It is not a luxury. They are not, as a former agriculture minister said, lone cowboys. They use these firearms in the proper way. They have been taught from a very young age how to properly handle a firearm. I remember my father teaching me from a very young age how to handle a firearm. He was very strict and stringent in the way that we handled them. We have gun safes. We are law-abiding people, but we seem to get caught up in this issue all the time.

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (9.19 pm): I wish to speak very briefly against this disallowance motion. I simply say no. We cannot in any way allow any weakening of our gun control laws. Every time we hear of a tragic event such as occurred in Las Vegas recently, we shake our heads and people all over Australia ask why US politicians are not doing something about gun control. How can they keep allowing such things to happen?

Tonight I have heard members from the other side describe people in my electorate as inner-city zealots, urban elitists and left-wingers. I have even heard them called unproductive inner-city zealots. I have heard people talk about destroying democracy, demonising gun owners and the right to bear arms. I say to the House that those are my people and they are Queenslanders. They deserve to know that their government is in charge and that we are going to retain the strict gun laws that have made us a lighthouse all over the world. There is nothing wrong with that.

I ask people opposite to think about saying what they have said tonight to an inner-city person who has lost their child in one of those massacres. Would they call such a person a left-wing zealot or an unproductive left-winger? How can they defend what they have said tonight? I do not know how the LNP is going to vote, because there seems to be a little bit of difference over there. They need to tell me what is wrong with farmers having to establish a need to renew their licence once every five years. If they say that to the parent of someone killed in a massacre, I will tell them why no-one will vote for them.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.21 pm): My government opposes this disallowance motion because this regulation is about one issue: keeping Queenslanders safe. Whilst most Queenslanders have never fired a gun and never will, for a number of Queenslanders, such as graziers, it is part of their work and they are licensed to own and operate a firearm. Through this regulation we do not seek to impinge on the ability of farmers to do their jobs; rather, we seek to protect all Queenslanders from the risk of firearms being used against others.

Before the Port Arthur massacre in 1996, this country was far from immune to mass shootings. Among others, we had endured the Strathfield massacre in Sydney and the Queen Street and Hoddle Street shootings in Melbourne. Here in Queensland, months before Port Arthur, at Hillcrest in Logan a man shot dead six members of his own family before killing himself. It was a horrific example of the domestic shootings that claim so many lives and it was committed with a lever action shotgun.

Port Arthur changed Australia. John Howard deserves enormous credit for the decision he took in the wake of that tragedy. John Howard delivered strong national firearms laws. The member for Buderim acknowledged John Howard had taken strong action, but he claims that this measure is somehow a Labor assault on primary producers. The fact is that this measure was agreed to at COAG, headed by Malcolm Turnbull and made up of state and territory leaders, Labor and Liberal. COAG agreed to strengthen the National Firearms Agreement by reclassifying lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of no greater than five rounds to category B and those with a magazine capacity of greater than five rounds to category D; and to task COAG's Law, Crime and Community Safety Council to finalise and implement the updated NFA as soon as practicable.

My government is restricting access to high-capacity lever action shotguns in a move that will strengthen the National Firearms Agreement for Queenslanders' safety. Lever action shotguns are currently classified in the least restrictive weapons category, category A. The regulation means that lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of five rounds or less, low capacity, will be reclassified as category B weapons. This will require new applicants for such weapons or licences to demonstrate a legitimate need to possess a category B lever action shotgun. At the same time, lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds, high capacity, will become category D weapons. Access to category D lever action shotguns will only be granted to licensed applicants with an occupational requirement, such as professional animal cullers. We want to bring the treatment of these guns into line with other types of shotguns, such as pump action or self-loading weapons. This will not prevent primary producers from eradicating vermin, but it will ensure that all high-capacity lethal firearms can only be possessed by the very small number of people who have a legitimate reason to do so.

I was at the COAG meeting. On behalf of the people of Queensland, I agreed to strong uniform national gun laws. Queenslanders deserve the same protections as every other Australian. We do not seek to diminish the rights of the vast majority of law-abiding Queensland gun owners. We ask for their understanding of our determination to ensure that this state and this nation need never again be put at risk from the kind of events that have sadly become so common in the United States. That is why the government will be voting against this disallowance motion.

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.25 pm): I oppose the disallowance motion. Australians will never forget where they were in April 1996 when 35 people were slaughtered and 23 people were injured by a lone shooter at Port Arthur. The loss of life was staggering and tragic. It followed a number of other shootings that had stunned our nation. However, thankfully, Port Arthur was the turning point. It was a proud but bittersweet moment in Australia's history when we stood as one to say enough was enough.

To give credit where credit is due, John Howard, a Liberal Party prime minister who was by no means popular on my side of politics, showed remarkable leadership to unite and protect this nation by forging the National Firearms Agreement. That was not an easy thing to do politically for Mr Howard or the conservative state leaders who had to sell the agreement to their rural constituencies and took much political pain as a result. We have heard Rob Borbidge, a former premier of Queensland, make that very point. However, those leaders were resolute and, as a result, the National Firearms Agreement and the legislation that the states introduced stopped the mass shootings we had begun to get used to.

In the 18 years between 1979 and 1996, there were 13 fatal mass shooting incidents in Australia. Those incidents resulted in a total of 104 deaths, with at least another 52 people injured. There have been no fatal mass shooting incidents in Australia since the introduction of the National Firearms Agreement and the initial gun buyback in 1996 and 1997. I repeat: there have been no fatal mass shootings in Australia since the NFA was introduced. It was unequivocally the right thing to do. Our nation is safer and Queensland is safer. In fact, Australia's gun laws have become the gold standard internationally, cited each time a tragedy happens in the United States.

The National Firearms Agreement placed tighter controls on firearms possession. Our Weapons Act and weapons regulations are based on the National Firearms Agreement and include the underlying principles that weapon possession and use are subordinate to the need to ensure public and individual safety and that that safety is improved by imposing strict controls on the possession of firearms. The

weapons category regulation categorises those weapons in line with the National Firearms Agreement. Those categories generally had regard to the potential danger posed by the weapon, with lever action shotguns classified as category A weapons.

In December 2014, the unthinkable happened. A lone gunman, a terrorist and mad man, held 18 people hostage in the Lindt cafe in Sydney's Martin Place. Two hostages died and three hostages and a police officer were injured. Again it was time to review our firearms laws. A report by the joint Commonwealth and New South Wales review into the Martin Place siege was considered by the Council of Australian Governments' Law, Crime and Community Safety Council. The report included an acknowledgement that there had been significant technological advancement and departures from the National Firearms Agreement since 1996 that should be addressed. As a result, the Law, Crime and Community Safety Council agreed to implement a number of the review's recommendations, including simplifying the regulation of the legal firearms market through an update of the technical elements of the National Firearms Agreement.

There had already been concerns articulated over the proposed importation of a large number of Adler A110 lever action shotguns with high-capacity magazines of seven rounds or more as opposed to the more commonly available three or four round shotguns. In August 2015 the Australian government banned the importation of lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds based on concerns that their continued importation may undermine the public safety intent of the National Firearms Agreement.

The reclassification of lever action shotguns was subsequently incorporated into the National Firearms Agreement review. Lever action shotguns with a magazine capacity of up to five rounds will now be classified as category B weapons and those with a magazine capacity of more than five rounds will be classified as the more restricted category D weapons. On this very point, this year I met with John Howard in Sydney and discussed this matter with him. Mr Howard told me that he remains resolute about gun controls in Australia.

The Palaszczuk government will never water down our tough gun laws. In light of last week's tragedy in Las Vegas, the debate about gun control has again been reignited around the world, and it is a debate worth having. In fact, it is a debate that must be ongoing and untainted by base political motives. This issue is too important to shy away from, particularly in the aftermath of the deadliest mass shooting in United States modern history, with 58 dead and almost 500 people injured—mothers, fathers, sons, daughters, brothers, sisters and friends slaughtered by a mad lone gunman. Hundreds more were maimed and thousands more had their lives changed forever.

The Queensland government has an added responsibility to ensure the safety of everyone who lives and visits our state in the lead-up to the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games next year. Nothing must mar our reputation as a safe place to visit. The Palaszczuk government has always acknowledged that the vast majority of firearm owners in Queensland are decent, law-abiding citizens.

I established a firearms advisory forum to ensure they all had a voice at the table. It includes representatives from the firearms industry, the dealer network, the agricultural sector, sporting and recreational shooters, victims of crime groups, the police and Police Union and the Queensland Law Society. We have worked constructively with stakeholders on a range of firearm matters, including how best to implement the changes agreed by COAG. They do not all agree with all of the changes, but they are changes that must be made. Queenslanders deserve the same protections as every other Australian, as we agreed at COAG. Our community and our police need to know they are protected by the toughest firearm laws possible and that their government will stand up for them and not allow any weakening of those laws. Allowing one crack to appear in the armour we have created with our laws will weaken our entire shield. It may also lead to more and more deviations from the National Firearm Agreement and the protections that it affords.

I will not apologise and I will not, unlike the LNP, retreat under the pressure. Under the Palaszczuk government Queensland will remain part of John Howard's National Firearms Agreement. I am surprised and wary to hear the LNP will support the Labor government on this issue. I surprised because both the LNP leader and his police spokesman have been touring Queensland's regions in recent months saying quite the opposite. Unfortunately it appears the LNP members are saying one thing in front of the cameras here in Brisbane and another thing completely different out there in apparent fear of the threat of One Nation. Earlier today—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, I would urge you to make your interjections relevant.

Mr RYAN: Earlier today the Leader of the Opposition said—

We support John Howard's gun laws. We believe that they provide the appropriate level of security. We put community safety and security at the forefront of our considerations and we support those laws that were brought in in 1996 and we won't be supporting the disallowance motion.

Yet his police spokesman, the member for Everton, has been saying something quite different to gun lobbyists. Earlier this year the member for Everton told the Shooters Union Australia that this reclassification that we are considering tonight had nothing to do with the Lindt cafe incident and refusing to reclassify lever action shotguns would not undermine the National Firearms Agreement. In fact, he went on to add that this particular reclassification was an attack on the integrity of Queensland shooters and their rights to have firearms.

It appears that we have a case of good cop, bad cop on the LNP side, but it is mostly bad cop. The LNP's recently released firearms election policy goes on to further water down aspects of our strong gun laws—for example, by removing the genuine reasons criteria for reapplications for category H concealable handguns for rural use. Worryingly, nowhere in the LNP's election policy do they mention a commitment to John Howard's National Firearms Agreement. In fact, they do not mention it at all.

I also found it interesting that their policy is called fairer gun laws. Why would they not say safer gun laws or tighter gun laws? Could the LNP perhaps explain who their gun laws will be fairer to? Could it be Ron Owen from Gympie because the member for Everton has admitted that he has been talking with the president of the Firearm Owners Association of Australia who, just last week, just days after the Las Vegas shooting massacre, had the gross insensitivity to describe all gun laws as irrelevant and demand the unregulated ownership of firearms. In that interview that the member for Everton did with the Shooters Union Australia he mentions how he drops into Ron Owen's place when he is in Gympie to consult with him and also mentions how he is now more informed on gun laws. The Shooters Union Australia is an international affiliate of the US pro-gun lobby, the National Rifle Association, and has the stated aim of stopping the National Firearms Agreement.

Perhaps even more alarmingly the member for Everton has repeated his attack on the Queensland Police Service's Weapons Licensing Branch. He has told the Shooters Union that the Queensland Police Service's Weapons Licensing Branch was dictating policy by refusing some applicants licences and that any minister who allowed that to happen was gutless. He said a police minister was obligated to intervene and order police to stop interfering with a person's right to own firearms. I make no apology for taking advice from those on the front line—those who have the most experience and who are impacted the most by weapons legislation, our brave police.

The offensive attack on our police by the member for Everton is not new. He has made numerous allegations against the Weapons Licensing Branch and has even accused them of not complying with the law. In their just released policy, the LNP state that they would stop the Weapons Licensing Branch from rejecting applications for licences. 'The current approach by the Weapons Licensing Branch has provided great uncertainty and needs to change,' the policy says.

Last month the member for Everton also told *Queensland Country Life* that a Tim Nicholls led government would be ordering the Weapons Licensing Branch to toe the line. 'The government can't abrogate its responsibility to public servants, which is what Labor has done,' the member for Everton has said.

People who have had their licence renewal refused will be able to reapply under the new policy they say. In other words, a Nicholls led LNP government will order the Queensland Police Service's Weapons Licensing Branch to issue licences to people who have previously been rejected. They will be telling our police how to do their job. Operational decisions should always be made by the police in accordance with law, not by politicians. The Liberal National Party have made no secret of their opportunistic plan to grab votes by watering down our tough gun laws. In April this year, amid a worrying outbreak of gun violence on the Gold Coast, a gaggle of local LNP MPs joined pro-gun lobbyists at a Gold Coast shooting range to open fire on John Howard's firearms laws. The *Gold Coast Bulletin* reported that the Shooters Union Australia and joint host, the Shooting Industry Foundation of Australia, used the event as a platform to criticise existing gun laws.

What we see time and time again from this LNP opposition is a persistence to mix policing with politics. It got them into trouble in the dark old days of the Bjelke-Petersen era and it will get them back in trouble again. They have learned nothing from the past. The Leader of the Opposition now has to come clean. Is he weakening our gun laws as part of a preference deal he has done with One Nation or is holding on to the leadership of the LNP—

Mr DICKSON: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think One Nation has too much to do with the debate, and we are still waiting for the minister to answer the question: how many people have been shot by Adlers since June 2015?

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr RYAN: The Leader of the Opposition now has to come clean. Is he weakening our gun laws as part of a preference deal he has done with One Nation or is holding on to the leadership of the LNP so important that he is willing to betray his constituents in Clayfield and around Queensland who will no doubt be appalled by any weakening of our gun laws?

Our government stands for strong gun controls. Our government will not step back from the National Firearms Agreement. We oppose the disallowance motion and we support keeping Queenslanders safe through a robust, responsible, strong gun control regime here in Queensland.

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

AYES, 5:

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

CONTRARY VOTE, 1—Perrett.

NOES, 76:

ALP, 39—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

LNP, 37—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Blejje, Boothman, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pairs: Byrne, Costigan; Enoch, Stuckey; Lauga, McArdle.

Resolved in the negative.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (9.47 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Townsville, Crime

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (9.47 pm): The ineffective policies of the Palaszczuk government in relation to crime, and in particular youth crime, are hurting communities in Townsville and North Queensland. The Labor MPs for Townsville, Mundingburra and Thuringowa have all ignored their constituents and voted in favour of overturning the strong juvenile justice reforms of the previous LNP government.

Labor has offered us the infamous 'strike force' and traded the LNP's boot camps for the comically named 'culturally appropriate adventure based learning programs'. The people of North Queensland know these policies are a joke and they have had enough. They are not swallowing the bulldust that they are getting from Townsville's three Labor MPs. A fed up resident in Burdell, in the Hinchinbrook electorate, Wendy Ambrose, started an online petition and, as of today, it has attracted more than 16,500 signatures. I will now read the petition preamble into the record. These are not my words but those of the people of Townsville and North Queensland. The preamble reads—

The people of Townsville and other North Queensland communities have had enough of being held hostage in our own homes by gangs of juvenile offenders that have no respect for the law or property of law abiding citizens. Repeat juvenile offenders are fronting court and being let back out on our streets by inadequate laws that allow them to repeatedly terrorise the community. The current Labour Government continues to take a soft approach on juvenile crime and ignore the rights of the citizens who live in these communities. Their latest announcement of supervised bail houses to be established in 7 communities across the state is another example of their arrogance and how out of touch they are with the people they were elected to represent. There was no community consultation and Ms D'Ath has wrongly assumed that we would all be happy and not feel threatened by the establishment of this facility in our town.

Our city currently has stolen cars, (one stolen at knife point) terrorising our streets, ramming other road users and running other vehicles off the road and police are powerless to stop the madness because the current laws don't allow them to use force to do so. As law abiding citizens we should be able to defend our family and our property without fear of prosecution.

We want to feel safe on our streets and in our own homes. It is clear that the soft approach isn't working and that harsher penalties are needed. This government must start protecting the rights of the community as a whole and stop protecting and enabling juvenile criminals to repeatedly reoffend. We demand that tougher juvenile crime laws are enacted and that our police are given more powers to apprehend them.

Those are the words in the preamble signed by 16½ thousand people in Townsville and across North Queensland, and I table that nonconforming petition.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding tougher laws for juvenile offenders [\[2006\]](#).

In contrast, the LNP has a strong youth justice policy. The LNP will bring back those tough and effective measures that were overturned by the Palaszczuk government, and we will implement further initiatives due to the terrible mess that Labor has made in Townsville and North Queensland because the members for Townsville, Mundingburra and Thuringowa have not listened to their constituents.

Boyne Tannum Hookup

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (9.51 pm): I rise tonight to speak about an awesome event that is held in my electorate every year, the Boyne Tannum Hookup. The Boyne Tannum Hookup is Australia's biggest family fishing competition, with both adult and junior categories. This year the three-day event was held on the Labour Day long weekend on our beautiful Boyne Island.

The Boyne Tannum Hookup is held annually with the aim of bringing together friends, families, businesses, supporters and sponsors from all parts of Australia to enjoy this wonderful community event. With a prize pool of over a quarter of a million dollars this year, the event attracted just under 3,000 senior entries and over 700 junior entries, with huge crowds of around 30,000 people visiting Bray Park over the three days. Even better is that 35 per cent of these people are visitors from outside the Gladstone region. Fishing weigh-ins, family entertainment and delicious food brings Bray Park to life for the three-day event.

There is no doubt that the Boyne Tannum Hookup is one of the Gladstone region's most professional and prestigious events. The Hookup is a not-for-profit organisation and acts as a platform for a number of charities to raise money and also to promote the Boyne Tannum area. The Hookup has run annually for the past 22 years and hopes to continue as an event for families to enjoy all that the Gladstone region has to offer as a premier fishing location.

To this end, I was thrilled to be able to tell the 10,000-strong crowd on the Sunday evening that next year's Hookup would be even safer for competitors in the competition with the Boyne River set to receive much needed maintenance dredging. With dredging on the current channel to commence very shortly, 15,000 cubic metres of sediment will be removed to allow for safer passage of vessels in and out of the river mouth.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to a few people involved with the Hookup without whom this event would not have become what it is nor been possible. The Boyne Tannum Hookup committee, led by President Jen McGuire, worked tirelessly over the three days of the event to ensure the success of this wonderful fishing competition. These guys are volunteers and their efforts are valued beyond measure. The youth committee this year brought together a new perspective to the event and found new ways to engage our younger generations, even creating a Snapchat filter for this year's event.

Finally, I would like to pay tribute to foundation member Darryl Branthwaite. Darryl was involved in the Hookup for many years and was the host of the weekend's festivities. After spruiking the region for so long, Darryl is now the CEO of the Gladstone Area Promotion and Development Ltd. It was great to share the stage with 'Dags', presenting awards and having a laugh. He is a real champion for tourism in our region and is dogged in his pursuit to ensure the natural beauty of our region is on everyone's agenda. If anyone is keen to come along, we would love to see you in the Gladstone area next year.

Beaudesert Electorate, Cedar Grove Wastewater Treatment Plant

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (9.54 pm): I call on the Logan City Council to stop construction of the Cedar Grove wastewater treatment plant in the electorate of Beaudesert. The construction of this wastewater treatment plant was planned to deal with wastewater from the Flagstone priority development area, a state development area declared by the Bligh government in 2010. Instead of the wastewater treatment plant being located in Flagstone, where most of the residents are and where development will occur, it is planned to be placed in the rural residential area of Cedar Grove.

This proposal has raised a lot of concerns for residents. I call on the Logan City Council to stop the process of approval, to conduct an independent assessment of all of the options for the placement of this wastewater treatment plant and to look to the Flagstone area—the Flagstone priority

development area—for that wastewater treatment plant to be located. Flagstone PDA as well as Yarrabilba PDA were two priority development areas—state development areas as they then were—foisted on our area by the Bligh government in 2010. It has led to hugely dense residential developments being placed in largely rural areas without any planning for infrastructure, particularly in the way of roads. It is simply not right that a wastewater treatment plant should be placed in a rural residential area to benefit a developer in a priority development area of high residential development.

I have also been fighting very hard for additional funding for the Mount Lindesay Highway. One of the things I have been doing recently is asking residents to have their say about where the priority should be in terms of improvements to the Mount Lindesay Highway. A lot of it needs upgrades but we cannot do it all at once, and I call on residents to please let me know where we should start those improvements. There are obviously more pressures in some places than others. I will be advocating for improvements that improve the overall amenity of that highway.

In relation to the Beaudesert Rifle Club, the land on which it has sat since 1965 is owned by the Queensland government. Sadly, that land is now being sold by the government and the Beaudesert Rifle Club, a volunteer not-for-profit club, is being asked to come up with over \$1 million to buy that land. It is outrageous to think that a volunteer non-profit club like the Beaudesert Rifle Club, which has produced world champion sporting shooters, could come up with \$1 million to buy that land. They should come back to the table with a fairer deal to recognise the benefit that club brings to the community in terms of dealing with firearms licensing issues and producing world champion shooters.

(Time expired)

Member for Kawana

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (9.57 pm): This afternoon I had to sit in this place and again listen to the disgusting ranting of the member for Kawana. The member for Kawana lacks integrity, he lacks decency and he lacks the principles of the Christian man that he purports to be. The member for Kawana has stooped to the lowest act of any member I have shared this place with over the last 23 years. Today the member for Kawana, under the protection of this House, has accused workers of having the intent to rape children.

Miss Barton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Broadwater, please take your seat if you want to interject.

Mr PEARCE: We find out this afternoon that most of the information has come from the office of the Minister for Employment, Senator Michaelia Cash, who is of the same making as the member for Kawana. The mineworkers attending the Oaky North protest line are decent men and women. Almost every man at the location is a father who wants only to work, earn a wage and look after their families. To suggest that there is an intent by these men to rape a child is nothing more than a low, disgusting and hurtful rant. Every member sitting on that side of this parliament has acted like a mob and followed the member for Kawana. You are all guilty—

Mr Langbroek: Don't say 'you'.

Mr PEARCE: All members on that side of the House are guilty of slandering these people.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I would urge all members to address their comments through the chair.

Mr PEARCE: Not one of the members sitting on the other side of the House showed any sign of displeasure with regard to the behaviour of the member for Kawana. You are all guilty of accusing young dads, older fathers and granddads of being rapers of children. How sick are you.

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Mirani, I would urge you to address your comments through the chair. In other words, do not keep using the word 'you'.

Mr PEARCE: I understand. Members sitting on that side of the House should realise that these guys are fathers and grandfathers and they are feeling the hurt that has come out of this House this afternoon. A place where decent—

Miss Barton interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Broadwater, can you sit in your correct seat or be quiet while sitting in that chair? The member for Mirani has the call.

Mr PEARCE: A threat to rape suggests that there is an intent to rape. The loose language around the comments are hurtful and lots of families across Central Queensland tonight are feeling the pain. I can tell that by the response that we are getting. The member for Kawana and members on that side of the House have stooped to a new low. I am very disappointed in a lot of people over there who I thought were really decent men and women but who did not have the courage to pull the member for Kawana into line. If you continue to go down this line—

Mr Langbroek: 'You'.

Mr PEARCE: Well—

Mr Langbroek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Surfers Paradise! Member for Mirani, please address your comments through the chair and desist from using the word 'you'.

Mr PEARCE: Mr Speaker, I understand where you are coming from. I think I have run out of time anyway.

Keebra Park State High School

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (10.01 pm): I rise to fulfil a promise to one of the coaching staff from Keebra Park, Darren Hart. Keebra Park State High School is one of the great schools of the Gold Coast. It is fantastic not only because I was a foundation student there; more importantly, it is fantastic because people like the deputy chief of the Navy, Michael Noonan, went there and, more recently, because of their continued outstanding performance at the national schoolboys rugby league finals. Under the guidance of Greg Lenton, Glen Campbell and the coaching staff—James Chapman, Peter Norman, Pete Stevens, Will Pei and Darren Hart—the boys of Keebra Park State High School were crowned national schoolboy champions for 2017 after defeating Westfields Sports High School in the national final on Wednesday, 6 September. This year was Keebra's eighth finals appearance. For a school of just 700 students, they are definitely punching above their weight.

As Keebra grows, there is a great need for a new amenities block near the sports ovals. The sports ovals are a significant distance from the main school area. As the local member, this is one issue that I will be fighting for in the future and beyond the next election if I am re-elected because the school desperately needs new facilities not just to cater for growth but also to cater for the increase in participation of girls in sport within the school.

Keebra, however, does not just punch above their weight in sports; they are also seeing outstanding results in their academic and cultural performances. They have a nationally renowned science excellence program. Under the leadership of their new principal, Adam Brandis, they are working towards becoming a flagship school for the national curriculum. Keebra Park State High School is a great school. It has absolutely gone from strength to strength in recent years and is producing excellent young adults through its core values of respect, responsibility and commitment.

I want to bring to the attention of the House the fact that Keebra, like many other schools in my electorate, is experiencing significant growth pressures as a result of infill development on the Gold Coast. Once the Commonwealth Games village is redeployed sometime next year, there will be another 3,000 or 4,000 people living within the precinct putting additional pressure on schools like Ashmore State School, Benowa State School, Southport State School, Southport State High School—which is already flourishing as a flagship school on the coast—Musgrave Hill State School and Bellevue Park State School.

I am particularly proud of my old school, Keebra Park. It has been a great pleasure to go back there on many occasions. The multicultural festival this year was an absolute highlight. It was great to be there with the Premier earlier this year when she announced Patty Mills, an Australian basketballer, as an official ambassador for the Commonwealth Games.

Greenslopes Electorate

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.04 pm): At the last election, I went to the people of Greenslopes and I asked them to give me a chance to work with them to build our community. My community had endured the disastrous Newman government—with 14,000 sacked public servants; community members shut out of consultation; people who live in social housing targeted in so many

cruel ways; the closure of the Barrett Adolescent Mental Health Centre; community groups gagged and de-funded; the hall promised at Cavendish Road State High School stolen and taken to Ashgrove; attempts to shut down the Coorparoo Secondary College; fights with doctors, lawyers and firefighters; unemployment rising; the absolute gutting of courses and students at the Mount Gravatt TAFE; and the stupidity of walking away from federal funding for the Cross River Rail. While all of this was happening, the former LNP member for Greenslopes sat by and said nothing, not standing up to defend our community.

People told me that they wanted to build our community not destroy it. I felt the way forward was to listen to the community, to respect the people in our community and to work with each of them to build our community. Our community has worked together to prevent domestic violence, to protect greenspace, to improve infrastructure in our local schools and sporting clubs, to get back our rights to have a say on development issues, to improve our public transport services, to recruit volunteers and fundraise for community groups, to provide health education on stroke and CPR, to support local businesses, to save historical buildings, to grow local jobs and to back our local schools.

Building community through backing local schools and growing local jobs came together this week. I am really proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government that has created over 115,000 jobs. Each of these jobs is important. However, one of these jobs is particularly special. Recently, I was contacted by the Holland Park P&C. Due to oval improvements delivered by the Palaszczuk government, the entrance on Victor Street was now being used by more students and the crossing was no longer safe. I spent a morning and an afternoon at the entrance talking to parents and observing the situation. I then met with the minister and worked with public servants from his department. I was pleased that this term our community saw the commencement of a school crossing supervisor.

While I was out doorknocking recently, I was tracked down in the street by a lady named Gabrielle after leaving my calling card. I knew Gabrielle through her volunteer work with the Australian Pain Management Association. Gabrielle told me of her struggles to find paid work. When I was advised that the school would be getting a new crossing supervisor, I rang Gabrielle and encouraged her to apply. She did and she got the job on merit. Now Gabrielle welcomes the students and their families each day, keeping them safe.

Mr Speaker, this is how you build community. You make yourself available in the community. You listen to people's concerns. You look for opportunities to connect people and organisations. You stand up for your community. You work constructively with local people, businesses, public servants and community organisations. Mr Speaker, I make a commitment that I will continue to create local jobs, back local schools and work hard to build our community.

Mansfield Electorate, Mount Cotton Road

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (10.07 pm): I want to draw to the attention of the House a situation involving Mount Cotton Road in my electorate of Mansfield. For those who do not know that road in so far as it affects my electorate, it runs from inside Redland city from Sheldon through the suburb of Burbank before it connects with Mount Gravatt Capalaba Road. It is a road which has been severely neglected in recent times, much to the detriment of my constituents.

In preparation for this speech, I looked at incidents on Mount Cotton Road in the last few years and I came across two particularly significant issues. In one incident, a truck rollover closed Mount Cotton Road for some time on 22 April 2016. The other incident involved an even sadder situation when an 80-year-old man died in a crash in May 2016. Some equipment that was on the back of a vehicle that was travelling along that road swung out and hit this man's vehicle which was going in the opposite direction. It is a highly trafficked road, it is a narrow road and there are significant quarry trucks on the road, yet there is no plan to deal with the state of that road.

Members on this side of the House have been trying for some time to adduce from the government what they intend to do about Mount Cotton Road. We asked a question in September 2015 about the funding to attend to Mount Cotton Road—to duplicate it, to resurface it. The answer we got from the minister was pretty clear: funding is not currently available for the duplication of Mount Cotton Road from Mount Gravatt-Capalaba Road to Broadwater Road.

I then tabled a petition, also in June 2015, about a particular intersection, the Upfield Street intersection. It meets Mount Cotton Road at two places. It services the Czech Club, a popular club within the electorate. It would not take a major item of expenditure to fix this particular intersection.

However, again, the answer from the minister in a letter to the Clerk on 2 June 2015 states, 'TMR will not be altering the existing intersection arrangement at either Mount Cotton Road and Upfield Street intersections.'

Others have been working hard to solve this problem. I give credit to the Redland City Council in relation to the Redland-Brisbane cross-boundary discussions that are happening. That is an attempt to look at all solutions in relation to transport servicing the Redlands and in particular the ability to relieve some of the congestion and pressure on Mount Cotton Road, which would be an important thing for me and for my constituents. This is an area that the government has ignored for far too long: in particular the Upfield Street intersection but, more particularly, the need to duplicate and improve Mount Cotton Road for the safety and the convenience of the residents of my electorate.

Aveo Retirement Village, Newmarket

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (10.10 pm): I was just explaining that good things come in small packages, too, although I did have to stand up with a six-foot-three woman today.

I rise on a matter of interest to my local community. I am very proud to be part of a government that has a proud record of protecting and supporting seniors in Queensland. Today I want to bring to the attention of the House an issue affecting local residents in my community who are having a long and protracted battle with Aveo retirement village in Free Street, Newmarket. Last year or earlier this year I went to a meeting with the member for Mount Coot-tha. We met with local residents from Free Street and the surrounding streets as well as representatives from St Ambrose's Catholic School in the local community. More than 100 residents from the local community attended to talk about how inappropriate Aveo's development for Free Street is given the size of the street and the scale of the project they want to deliver. Worse than that, when we look at what Aveo is actually proposing, it is terrible in the sense that they are saying this development could take up to seven years. It involves demolishing 74 low-set retirement villas to make way for 260 retirement units in multilevel apartment complexes.

When we talk to some of the elderly residents what is so upsetting is that when they purchased their residence they did so thinking they would spend their retirement years in low-set, open villa retirement living. Instead they are now being forced into a high-rise complex. They are losing their garden and all those things. I can see the member for Mount Coot-tha nodding, because it is distressing. One local resident, a 78-year-old woman, is refusing to sell up, so Aveo's proposal is to build around her for seven years. In her elderly years she will have to put up with almost a decade worth of construction around her. It is shameful. If that is not bad enough, she will also lose her garden, her fence and her neighbours. They are signing people up to confidentiality agreements. People are scared to talk about what is happening in their own homes.

Tonight I am calling on Aveo to have the guts and the courage to meet with Save Our Space and the coordinators Doug Scott and Cassandra Chadwick and also to meet with representatives of the St Ambrose's Primary School community. The only way people can get to Free Street is through either Davidson Street or Thurlow Street. That means that all this extra traffic is going to go directly past the local Catholic school. It is very distressing for parents and the P&F there.

Tonight I am calling on Aveo to listen to their residents, listen to the local community and scale back a development that clearly is not suitable for this local community. As the member for Mount Coot-tha pointed out to me, Aveo's annual report talks about their profits on the basis of turnover events. They need to show a heart and start listening to our local community.

Cleveland-Redland Bay Road

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (10.14 pm): I rise tonight to again call on this Labor government to immediately start work on fixing Cleveland-Redland Bay Road. The people of Redlands do not accept that this project has to wait because of Cross River Rail. The community in areas of Redland Bay, Point Talburpin, Victoria Point, Point Halloran and Thornlands have had enough of the congestion. We have had enough of the congestion, the accidents and the excuses.

Earlier this year I organised a meeting here at parliament with the main roads minister. Attending were Redlands Mayor, Karen Williams, and local resident Rebecca Griffiths. Rebecca's children were on a school bus that collided with a sedan at the intersection of Giles Road and Cleveland-Redland Bay Road. Her children witnessed an elderly gentleman die that day and she wanted to personally tell the main roads minister of the devastating impact on her children. She wanted to implore the minister to

urgently fix this intersection. She wanted to question why the government had done nothing for more than a year since declaring the intersection dangerous and allocating some money to fix it. Ms Griffiths wanted to say these things to the minister, but he did not show up. The weak-kneed minister sent advisers in his place. He is quick to play politics but is short on respect.

I am committed to fight to fix this road and I am pleased to let Redlands locals know that this intersection will be fixed. We will see dozers, road engineers and work trucks at the Giles Road intersection in a matter of weeks with work due to be finished mid next year. However, we cannot thank the minister for that. No, this work has been brought forward by local business Shoreline long before their contract requires them to. I want to acknowledge their commitment to the local area and I especially want to acknowledge Ms Griffiths, who passionately argued for this intersection to be urgently upgraded.

In spite of this positive step, there are no plans from Labor to fix the rest of the road. It is pure luck that we have not had fatalities at the Double Jump Road and Anita Street intersections. I am reminded of the Deputy Premier saying, 'Don't worry about the road, Redlands. You're getting Cross River Rail.' I have news for this do-nothing Labor government. Cleveland-Redland Bay Road is our transport priority, not Cross River Rail. More than 2,000 people have joined my community campaign to fight for funding and more people sign up every day. Only an LNP government will build the roads we need and I am determined to win the fight to fix this vital road.

Yeerongpilly Electorate

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Minister for Main Roads, I observe the member for Noosa in the gallery. I think I saw his wife up there. I welcome him and his guests to our sitting this evening. I now call my neighbouring colleague the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety, Biofuels et cetera.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (10.17 pm): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I accept the addition of 'et cetera' to my title.

It is an honour to be the member for Yeerongpilly in my first term in state parliament and to represent the people of fantastic suburbs like Tarragindi, Annerley, Yeronga, Fairfield, Moorooka, Yeerongpilly, Rocklea and Tennyson. Our first job in this place is to deliver to our electorates. In my electorate it has been a very active term. We have supported, for instance, the Tarragindi community with \$185,000 for the hall upgrade in 2015. We have had a \$150,000 grant recently to the Tarragindi Tigers in Minister de Brenni's area to build a clubhouse which they have been trying to do for many, many years. That is very well appreciated in the community. We have been able to put in the 40 kilometre per hour flashing lights at Cracknell Road near St Elizabeth's Primary School. We are nearly finished Veloway from Tarragindi to Buranda, which will be a bicycle freeway, cutting 10 minutes off cycling into the CBD. That is great for commuters and great for recreational cyclists.

I have also been very supportive of our community's opposition to high-density development at the Tarragindi Bowls Club. We are on the way to achieving that victory and keeping the low-density nature of Tarragindi in place. I am also advocating for a 40 kilometre an hour flashing light set in Weller Road outside Wellers Hill State School. Of course, the Palaszczuk government has also delivered \$720,000 for an upgrade at the 'Marymac' school at Annerley as part of their centenary celebrations. The PA Hospital at Annerley is the first digital large hospital in Australia.

In Yeronga we have invested more than \$2 million in the Yeronga State School's music block, a great asset for the local primary school kids at Yeronga. We are improving their road safety on School Road with a 40 kilometre an hour flashing light zone this financial year. I have been proud to stand up for Mojgan Shamsalipoor, the Yeronga State High School graduate who still faces having to be forcibly removed from this country, which is an outrage. I have been happy to have the second oval returned at Yeronga State High School from the Yeronga TAFE site. The permanent home for the Yeronga Community Centre will be on the old TAFE site as part of a future redevelopment with which we are genuinely engaging the community for good community outcomes.

We have also delivered \$80,000-odd to the Souths Rugby club to upgrade their field, something I am very proud of as well. In Yeerongpilly we are adding to open space in the Yeerongpilly Green and we are retaining heritage buildings there. I will continue to advocate for my community as the member for Yeerongpilly after having achieved a considerable amount already.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.20 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams