



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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 17 October 2018

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	2867
School Group Tour.....	2867
LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION	2867
Division: Question put—That leave be granted.	2867
Resolved in the negative.	2867
TABLED PAPERS	2867
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2868
Adolescent Mental Health Centre.....	2868
St George Cemetery, Chinese Memorial.....	2868
Storms, Bravery Award Recommendation	2869
Governing from the Regions, Toowoomba; South-East Queensland City Deal.....	2869
Get Ready Queensland Week.....	2870
Gold Coast 600.....	2870
Education.....	2870
Toowoomba Hospital.....	2871
Toowoomba Second Range Crossing.....	2872
National Disability Insurance Scheme.....	2873
Highfields Police Station	2873
Anti-Poverty Week	2874
Sexual Violence Awareness Month.....	2874
PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE	2875
Reports	2875
<i>Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 and 2016-17 Annual Reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on authorities for assumed identities for corruption offences pursuant to section 146ZQ of the Crime and Corruption Act 2001.....</i>	<i>2875</i>

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 October 2018

	<i>Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 and 2016-17 Annual Reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on authorities for assumed identities relating to criminal activity pursuant to section 314 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000.</i>	2875
	<i>Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on controlled operations applications for corruption offences.</i>	2875
	<i>Table paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2016-17 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on controlled operations applications for corruption offences.</i>	2875
	<i>Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on aspects of surveillance device warrants pursuant to section 358 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000.</i>	2875
	<i>Tabled paper: Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner: Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, September 2018.</i>	2876
EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE		2876
Report		2876
	<i>Tabled paper: Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 7, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 June 2018 and 21 August 2018.</i>	2876
HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE		2876
Report		2876
	<i>Tabled paper: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 13, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 2 May and 12 June 2018.</i>	2876
NOTICE OF MOTION		2876
Queensland Rail; No Confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads		2876
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE		2877
Lady Cilento Children’s Hospital		2877
Lady Cilento Children’s Hospital		2877
Toowoomba Region, Qantas Pilot Training Academy		2878
Crime and Corruption Commission, Chair		2879
Drought Appeal; Wild Dog Fencing Program		2879
Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board		2880
South-East Queensland City Deal		2881
Crime and Corruption Commission, Chair		2882
Population Growth		2882
Ex-HMAS <i>Tobruk</i>		2882
Tourism Industry, Major Events		2883
Container Refund Scheme		2884
Electoral Laws		2885
Drive It NQ		2885
Sheep Industry		2886
Container Refund Scheme, Collection Points		2887
	<i>Tabled paper: Map, undated, titled ‘Container Refund Points, as at 5 October 2018’.</i>	2887
Moreton Bay Healthcare Services		2887
Container Refund Scheme		2888
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT		2889
Further Answer to Question, Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board		2889
TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL		2889
Second Reading		2889
WORKING WITH CHILDREN LEGISLATION (INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL		2901
Introduction		2901
	<i>Tabled paper: Working with Children Legislation (Indigenous Communities) Amendment Bill 2018.</i>	2901
	<i>Tabled paper: Working with Children Legislation (Indigenous Communities) Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes.</i>	2901
First Reading		2904
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee		2904
TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL		2904
Second Reading		2904
	<i>Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition opposing the late-term abortion bill.</i>	2933
	<i>Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 3 September 2018, from Mrs Kerry Barham to the Chair of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.</i>	2933
MOTION		2936
Queensland Rail; No Confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads		2936
	Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2947
	Resolved in the negative.	2947
TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL		2947
Second Reading		2947
	Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.	2949
	Resolved in the affirmative.	2949
Consideration in Detail		2949
	Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.	2949

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 17 October 2018

Clause 5—	2949
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Mark McArdle's amendments.....	2949
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to.....	2951
Resolved in the negative.....	2951
Non-government amendments (Mr McArdle) negated.....	2951
MOTION.....	2951
Suspension of Sessional Orders.....	2951
TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL.....	2951
Consideration in Detail.....	2951
Clause 5, as read, agreed to.....	2951
Clause 6—	2951
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2952
Resolved in the negative.....	2952
Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.....	2952
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2954
Resolved in the negative.....	2954
Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.....	2954
Clause 6, as read, agreed to.....	2954
Insertion of new clause—	2954
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2955
Resolved in the negative.....	2955
Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.....	2955
Clause 7, as read, agreed to.....	2955
Clause 8—	2955
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.....	2957
Resolved in the negative.....	2957
Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.....	2957
Clause 8, as read, agreed to.....	2957
Clause 9, as read, agreed to.....	2957
Clauses 10 to 40, as read, agreed to.....	2957
Schedule, as read, agreed to.....	2957
Third Reading.....	2957
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a third time.....	2957
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2957
Long Title.....	2958
ADJOURNMENT.....	2958
Mary Valley.....	2958
Redcliffe Electorate.....	2959
Bonney Electorate.....	2959
Women at the Wheel Program.....	2960
Hannant, Mrs N.....	2960
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document titled 'Norma's story ... my time on Fraser Island 1966 to 2003'.....	2961
Morningside State School.....	2961
Gold Coast Community Legal Centre.....	2962
Miller Electorate, Transport Infrastructure.....	2962
Forsayth Primary Health Centre; Traeger Electorate, Roads Funding.....	2963
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Petition seeking the upgrade of staffing of Etheridge Shire primary healthcare facilities.....	2963
Mount Ommaney Electorate.....	2964
ATTENDANCE.....	2964

WEDNESDAY, 17 OCTOBER 2018

 The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Curtis Pitt, Mulgrave) read prayers and took the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge that we are sitting today on the land of Aboriginal people and pay my respects to elders past and present. I thank them, as First Australians, for their careful custodianship of the land over countless generations. We are very fortunate in this country to have two of the world's oldest continuing living cultures in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples whose lands, winds and waters we all now share.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tour

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise that this morning in the House we will be visited by students and teachers from Mount Archer State School in the electorate of Keppel.

LEAVE TO MOVE MOTION

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.31 am): I seek leave to move general business notice of motion No. 2 standing in my name.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

AYES, 44:

LNP, 38—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 47:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Resolved in the negative.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS

MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Hinchliffe)—

[1651](#) Response from the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs (Hon. Hinchliffe), to a paper petition (3012-18) presented by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and an ePetition (2980-18) sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(4), from 427 and 840 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to note a vote of no confidence in Councillor Stephen Robinson of the Sunshine Coast Regional Council and to take such action as it deems appropriate.

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Maiwar (Mr Berkman)—

[1652](#) Nonconforming petition regarding the voting procedure for divisions on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Adolescent Mental Health Centre

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.37 am): It is the responsibility of government to do what is right for the people it serves and to make things right when a wrong has happened. Previously in this place I have spoken about the closure of the Barrett adolescent centre at Wacol under the former LNP government and of my government's determination and commitment to build a new bed-based treatment and rehabilitation centre to support young people with severe and complex mental illness. That was a key plank of our response to the report from the commission of inquiry into the Barrett centre closure.

Today I am pleased to announce an important milestone. Construction for Queensland's newest adolescent mental health centre will commence next month, with the tender being awarded to ADCO Constructions Pty Ltd. The facility heralds a new era in the treatment of adolescents with severe and complex mental illness. We are committed to making sure that Queensland's most vulnerable young people have access to highly specialised healthcare services, so that they can recover and return to their families, friends and communities.

ADCO has vast experience in building health facilities, including hospitals, mental health clinics and aged-care centres. The awarding of this contract is a major step in this important project. The new 12-bed extended treatment centre will also provide day programs and an integrated educational and vocational program.

Young people from the former Barrett centre and their families have provided invaluable input to ensure that the facility and the services it provides are safe and effective. We will never forget Talieha, Will or Caitlin.

The new centre is expected to be operational by early 2020. The project is being overseen by Queensland Health, which will provide the clinical services, and the Department of Education, which will deliver an education program. It forms part of \$68.2 million worth of capital works investment by my government to rebuild and expand vital mental healthcare services for young people across our state.

St George Cemetery, Chinese Memorial

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.39 am): The story of the Darling Downs and the pastoral industry in Queensland is rich and moving, going back to the early 1800s. Today we owe a debt of thanks to those who went before us, leaving behind homes and families to travel to new areas where they worked hard to establish this special part of our state. On the Western Downs at St George, the story includes a remarkable chapter involving shepherds from China.

The St George Cemetery is the resting place of 300 Chinese settlers who left their famine-ravaged villages in the mid-1800s for the promise of gold in New South Wales. From the goldfields they moved north to work as shepherds and labourers in Southern Queensland. They came from Xiamen, which was formerly Amoy. They are known as the Amoy Shepherds. Those hard working men tended more than 450,000 sheep and used traditional skills in irrigation and crop production.

It is important to acknowledge the heartache and hardships faced by our earliest Chinese migrants, who sowed the seeds for the multicultural Queensland we have today. My government has contributed \$2,000 towards a new granite memorial at the St George Cemetery to honour the shepherds. The original timber headstones on the men's graves burned down in the 1970s and a simple marble headstone was erected in their place. Now a substantial memorial is replacing it, thanks to fundraising by the St George Chinese Community Memorial Committee headed by Jack Sun and with great support from our own member for Toohey, Peter Russo. I thank him for all of his support in helping to drive this important restoration project. I also thank federal member for Moreton, Graham Perrett, and Balonne Shire Council Mayor, Richard Marsh.

As will be described on the new memorial, these people never earned enough to return to the families they had left behind in their ancestral villages. The winning design was created by year 7 St George State High School student Daisy Brown. The first sod was turned at the St George cemetery in April. My government is only too pleased to play a part in this culturally and historically significant project and to highlight a very special story in our state's development.

Storms, Bravery Award Recommendation

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.42 am): These past few days we have been reminded of the very real dangers of Queensland's storm season. Lives can be and are lost. There is also the high cost of damage to property and crops all caused in the minutes it takes for a Queensland storm to pass. As well as the savagery of the season we are reminded of the kind of people we are. Is there anywhere but Queensland that there is a mud army? The faces change but the squadron never rests.

Then there is a young mum named Fiona. Trapped in the storm with her grandmother and her baby, Clara, even the car they were in gave them little protection. Huge hailstones smashed through the windows. Fiona threw herself over her baby. The cuts and bruises Fiona suffered show how bad it was. Clara had barely a scratch. This morning I have signed a recommendation to the Council for the Australian Bravery Decorations to formally recognise Fiona's courage and act of bravery.

Governing from the Regions, Toowoomba; South-East Queensland City Deal

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.43 am): Queensland is a growing state with growing regions. That is why the Palaszczuk government's priority is to build Queensland and deliver jobs, especially in our thriving regional communities. I was delighted to be part of governing from Toowoomba in September. I enjoyed the opportunity to meet with locals and talk about how the Palaszczuk government's investment in Toowoomba is helping to deliver jobs and infrastructure in the region.

While I was in Toowoomba I met with apprentices from McNab, one of 72 local businesses currently claiming the Palaszczuk government's payroll tax rebate for apprentices and trainees. With 13 apprentices on the books, including four in Toowoomba, McNab is leading efforts to ensure that our next generation of construction workers has the skills they need to get ahead and help us build tomorrow's Queensland.

In this year's budget we committed more than \$26 million to extend the payroll tax rebate, providing tax relief for businesses and supporting the employment of thousands of apprentices and trainees. That is because jobs remain this government's No. 1 priority, particularly in regional areas where it can be harder for young people to find opportunities to get an apprenticeship or traineeship. The payroll tax rebate is just one way the Palaszczuk government is supporting businesses to create employment opportunities, particularly for young people. More than 2,000 apprentices and trainees were in training in Toowoomba at the end of the last financial year, which is fantastic news for the local community.

We are delivering more jobs in Toowoomba and we also have a plan to deliver more infrastructure. We are investing more than \$1.2 billion in infrastructure this year for the Darling Downs region, supporting more than 4,000 jobs. In order to help deliver the infrastructure we need to support our growing population we have also been working with councils on delivering city deal partnerships.

City deals are place based partnerships that bring together the three levels of government to drive more prosperity and more livability. To manage the enormous growth in the South-East Queensland region, we need to continue investing in infrastructure like schools, hospitals, roads and public transport to support our growing communities. That is why city deals are so important—they bring different levels of government together so that we are all working towards the same goals.

The Palaszczuk government has already worked with mayors through the South East Queensland Regional Plan to deliver a 50-year vision for our region—to grow sustainably, to compete globally and to offer high-quality living. A South-East Queensland city deal is an important part of delivering this ambition. I was pleased to meet with the mayor of Toowoomba, Councillor Paul Antonio, to talk about a city deal for South-East Queensland. It is something I know Mayor Antonio understands in terms of benefits for his community, both economically and socially.

Toowoomba is already a critical gateway for Western Queensland, the southern states and international markets. A South-East Queensland city deal can build on the big investments we are already making in this city. Councillor Antonio is a strong supporter of a city deal for South-East Queensland because he knows that it will mean more jobs and infrastructure for Toowoomba as well

as South-East Queensland. Councillor Antonio, like all the mayors in South-East Queensland, has been lobbying the federal LNP government and the new cities minister, Alan Tudge, to get the Commonwealth to sign on to a city deal for South-East Queensland. So far, unfortunately, the Commonwealth is making some small steps in the right direction, but they are yet to sign up to a city deal. We will continue to fight for a city deal for South-East Queensland because we know it will help build Queensland and deliver jobs.

Get Ready Queensland Week

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.46 am): Last week's extreme weather across our state's south-east has sent a clear message that Queensland is once again heading into our annual storm and cyclone season. Last Monday I had the pleasure of joining the Premier, the Minister for Fire and Emergency Services, as well as some of our state's emergency service workers and disaster recovery personnel to launch Get Ready Queensland Week in the Queen Street Mall. Whether it is the risk of fire, floods or storms, being prepared is essential.

Our government urges all Queenslanders to prepare what-if plans and get ready for the upcoming storm and cyclone season. Simple steps like preparing an evacuation kit that includes medication and important documents can ease the impact of a disaster and enable faster recovery. It is also important to note that disaster preparedness is not just a one-week effort.

Our government, through the Queensland Reconstruction Authority, has provided \$2 million to councils in this financial year to help them build community resilience as part of the 2018-19 Get Ready Queensland program. Queensland will use this funding for first-aid equipment, sandbag machines, defibrillators, training for local disaster management staff, equipment for evacuation centres and much more. We have also created a \$38 million fighting fund to strengthen the state's resilience to future disaster. I repeat my call to the federal government to support Queensland and match our funding.

Queensland is the most disaster impacted state in Queensland, with more than 60 disaster events since 2011. Last week's storms are a timely reminder of what may lie ahead. While the federal government is not supporting Queensland, Queenslanders can support themselves by making sure they get ready.

Gold Coast 600

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.48 am): Mr Speaker, 'get your motor runnin'—because all eyes will be on the Gold Coast this weekend. Sorry, Premier. As I speak, organisers are putting the finishing touches on the track for this year's Gold Coast 600. As many members would have read in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* this morning, the GC600 is set to benefit from the infrastructure delivered by the Palaszczuk government ahead of the Commonwealth Games.

As part of more than \$1.5 billion in infrastructure upgrades delivered ahead of the games, the Gold Coast's vast CCTV network, which now includes cutting-edge facial recognition technology, has been significantly bolstered. GC600 organisers will use this technology over the weekend to monitor crowds at the event this year. We know that as this event continues to grow we will have more visitor nights than ever before and security will be more important. In fact, compared to 2015, last year we saw 10,000 additional visitor nights spent on the Gold Coast during this major event.

This is also one of the key legacies of the Commonwealth Games. We are seeing more and more people attending major events on the Gold Coast. We only have to look at the record numbers at the Gold Coast Marathon earlier this year. In total, we expect that the GC600 will deliver more than \$45 million for the local economy. The Palaszczuk government is determined to grow Gold Coast events now and into the future.

Mr Hart interjected.

Ms JONES: See you there. You bring the wine!

Education

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.50 am): The Palaszczuk government is committed to providing a world-class education for all Queensland students no matter where they live. We know that our schools in rural, remote and regional locations provide a rich, rewarding and well-rounded education for students. We know that state schools are often the heart of our regional towns.

It was my great pleasure to visit one such school recently with the Premier and Deputy Premier during governing from Toowoomba. We met with student leaders and staff from Harristown State High School during their holidays and inspected the site of a \$15.4 million classroom building, which is part of our 2020 Ready program.

Ms Trad: They came in their uniform.

Ms Palaszczuk: During the holidays!

Ms GRACE: I take the interjections from the Deputy Premier and Premier. They were in their uniform during the school holidays, and we greatly appreciated their dedication in coming along. The project will deliver 14 new classrooms, two flexible learning areas, a new administration space and additional car parks—a welcome boost for this regional state school that provides great education.

Last week I also had the pleasure of visiting schools at Mount Isa and opening our new Centre for Learning and Wellbeing in the seat of Traeger. It was a great pleasure to meet Lead Principal Mr Tim Moes—a truly wonderful principal—and see firsthand the important work being done to ensure that students in rural and remote Queensland are provided with access to quality educational opportunities and that their teachers receive all the support and training they need.

This is the first of four centres of learning and wellbeing which we are delivering as part of our four-year, over \$100 million Rural and Remote strategy. It was also great to have Mayor Joyce McCulloch and Councillor Peta MacRae present at the launch. We are also establishing a centre at Roma in the seat of Warrego which will be managed by Lead Principal Dale Magner.

Today I am pleased to announce the location of the two remaining centres. These will be established at Emerald in the seat of Gregory in Central Queensland and at Atherton in the seat of Hill in Far North Queensland and will open in 2019. Soon the department will start recruiting for principals to lead these centres and I look forward to meeting with them when I visit the centres to see them in action.

School communities across Queensland will celebrate World Teachers' Day next Friday, 26 October. This is a time for all of us to stop and acknowledge the incredible work teachers do every day in our schools. All Queensland teachers in state and non-state schools will receive a commemorative ribbon which they can wear with pride on the day. All members in this House have also received ribbons. I encourage all MPs to join with me in wearing their ribbons in support of Queensland teachers. I also urge MPs to take part in the exciting events taking place in state schools next week as part of State Education Week celebrations, culminating, of course, on Friday for World Teachers' Day.

Toowoomba Hospital

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.53 am): The Palaszczuk government is planning for Queensland's future. That means building the hospitals of the future. While in Toowoomba recently I joined the Premier at Toowoomba Hospital to announce Baillie Henderson as the preferred site for a brand-new hospital for the Toowoomba region.

While visiting the hospital I spoke to some of the hardworking healthcare staff. The doctors, nurses and healthcare team at Toowoomba Hospital do a tremendous job caring for their community. To ensure they can continue to deliver the best possible health care and to ensure they continue to meet demand, we need to plan for a new hospital now. That is why our government is investing an additional \$6 million for the detailed planning for a new Toowoomba Hospital, in addition to the \$3 million we are already investing. That is a \$9 million boost to make sure we get the detailed planning right. This is part of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to ensure everyone in Queensland continues to have access to world-class health care, no matter where they live.

Planning is already underway for the new hospital to be located on the Baillie Henderson hospital site in Cranley where there is plenty of land. The site is ideal because it is 75 hectares and adjacent to the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing. The detailed planning which will be developed over the next 18 months will include a full master plan of the site.

While we plan for the future Toowoomba Hospital, the Palaszczuk government is also investing in health care across the Darling Downs right now. This financial year we are investing a record \$801 million in health care in the Darling Downs region. Toowoomba Hospital has seen significant demand for health services. We are investing extra growth funding to help our hardworking doctors and nurses meet this growing demand, particularly in the busy Toowoomba emergency department. This funding is supporting the opening of an additional 31 beds. Because we believe everyone should have access to high-quality health care, this government is investing in the infrastructure we need now and in the future.

Toowoomba Second Range Crossing

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.55 am): The \$1.6 billion Toowoomba Second Range Crossing is a once-in-a-generation project. When the second range crossing opens next year, the benefits will be immediate and lasting for the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley communities. It will remove up to 80 per cent of trucks from residential streets and improve road safety.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr BAILEY: Local roads will be freed from the slow convoy of large vehicles that crawl up the range—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North.

Mr BAILEY: I would have thought the member for Toowoomba North would be interested in this, Mr Speaker.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister, that is not helpful. Member for Toowoomba North, the minister appears not to be taking your interjections. However, that remains to be seen.

Mr BAILEY: Local roads will be freed from the slow convoy of large vehicles that crawl up the range and through Toowoomba streets. Members of this House had the opportunity to visit Toowoomba last month as part of the Palaszczuk government's Governing from the Regions program. The visit afforded me another opportunity to see those trucks on local roads and appreciate the difference that the second range crossing will make.

There is a tremendous sense of optimism among the people we met in Toowoomba. As Queensland's largest inland city, Toowoomba is an important contributor to our Queensland economy. Local investment in infrastructure is driving excitement for new ideas and opportunities. The Pulse Data Centre at the Toowoomba Technology Park, the Wellcamp airport and its associated industry precinct and the plans we have seen for an innovative food and fibre hub are being set up to create jobs of the future. The construction of the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing will play an important supporting role in that prosperous future.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, you are warned under the standing orders. You are repeatedly interjecting. Minister, please continue.

Mr BAILEY: When completed next year, it will be a 41-kilometre-long toll road, passing Toowoomba's northern side, linking the Warrego Highway at Helidon Spa in the east and the Gore Highway—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, I have just issued a warning. If you would like me to name multiple members at once, I am happy to do so, but I would hope you could take my lead.

Mr BAILEY: When completed next year, it will be a 41-kilometre-long toll road, passing Toowoomba's northern side, linking the Warrego Highway at Helidon Spa in the east and the Gore Highway at Athol in the west.

The second range crossing is projected to contribute more than \$2.4 billion in economic and productivity gains for Toowoomba businesses and industry over the next 30 years. We have already seen significant economic benefits for the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley regions since the contracts were signed by the Palaszczuk Labor government and the federal government in 2015 and since construction started in April 2016.

Local participation from the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley region on the project has been measured at just over 80 per cent in the total dollar value of contracts awarded to August 2018. Up to 1,800 direct and indirect jobs were forecast to be created during the construction and operation and maintenance stages of the project. More than 5,000 people have been inducted to work on site during the construction stage, with up to 700 people, including subcontractors, working on site daily.

The local benefits are clear, but the wider freight industry also stands to gain from this project. Trucks headed to the port of Brisbane will avoid 18 sets of traffic lights on the existing Toowoomba range crossing through Withcott and Toowoomba. It will also improve driver safety and reduce vehicle operating costs by ensuring a maximum gradient of 6.5 per cent across the range. Upon its completion,

more than 10 million cubic metres of earth will have been moved and more than 2,000 pieces of heavy machinery used. To date, project hours exceed 3.3 million. If the weather is kind, the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing is expected to open for business around mid-2019. I look forward to joining the people of Toowoomba and the Lockyer Valley to celebrate that milestone, one of many, I am sure, the region will continue to enjoy in the years to come.

National Disability Insurance Scheme

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (10.00 am): Two weeks ago in Toowoomba I had the opportunity to hear from people about their experience with the NDIS and the transition process. People who have lived experience in the disability sector always know so much more than a room full of experts, and it is for this reason today that I am pleased to announce the start of the public consultation period for the review of the Disability Services Act 2006.

The Palaszczuk government is a responsive government and we will make sure that the disability legislation meets the needs of Queenslanders with disabilities, their carers and families once we reach full scheme operation for the National Disability Insurance Scheme. The Disability Services Act 2006 came into effect on 1 July 2006 and is the primary legislation in Queensland governing disability rights, services and safeguards.

Now that the NDIS is here and is changing the very landscape of how services and supports for people with disability are delivered, it is time to consider the Disability Services Act 2006 to make sure it delivers what is needed next. For the future we will continue to strive to build a Queensland where every aspect of community life welcomes and includes people with disability. For this to be truly responsive to communities' needs, it needs to be built by people living in these communities.

As Minister for Disability Services, I have always been particularly concerned about making sure that the voices of people with disability are at the centre of all the decisions we make. It is for this reason we have designed a consultation process that focuses on the views of people with disability, their families and carers. The views of service providers are also important in this process and there are many ways that people can have their say.

An options paper 'Reshaping the Disability Services Act 2006: an inclusive and accessible Queensland', will be released online to engage Queenslanders in the review and help guide public consultation. An easy-read version of this paper will also be released. The consultation period will close on Friday, 9 November this year. I encourage everyone to access the Get Involved website through www.getinvolved.qld.gov.au or my department's website to find out how they can share ideas for Queensland's future disability legislation.

Highfields Police Station

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (10.03 am): Earlier this week I had the pleasure to once again visit Toowoomba. It was so good to be back there so soon after the government's period of governing from Toowoomba last month. It was also so good to be able to formally announce the location for a new police station in Highfields. As you know, Mr Speaker, the Palaszczuk government made an election commitment to the people of Toowoomba last year. We promised that if we were re-elected we would build a new police station at Highfields, and we are delivering on that promise.

Highfields is a growing community and the new station will be built with future growth in mind. It will be able to accommodate additional policing resources as and when they are needed in the years ahead. The new station, to be constructed on land in Dau Road, is a \$2.77 million investment in the future security of the broader Toowoomba community. I can assure residents in Toowoomba that various locations were carefully considered before the Dau Road site was chosen as the best location to meet the needs of the Highfields community and the Queensland Police Service. In good news, construction is expected to start on the new police station in the next financial year.

I have even more good news for the people of Toowoomba and Toowoomba police. As part of our government's commitment to provide more resources to our police, a further 24 QLiTE iPad devices were delivered to front-line police in Toowoomba this month on top of the 70 devices already allocated, but the good news does not stop there. The good news for Toowoomba police continues.

Mr Speaker, you may remember that when the Newman government was in power the Newtown police beat in Toowoomba was closed. At the last election our government promised to open a new police beat in Newtown, and I am very pleased to announce that we have decided to go one better. The

Palaszczuk government will now instead establish a larger police facility at Newtown—a facility bigger and better than a traditional police beat. Negotiations are already underway for the acquisition of a suitable site, and I look forward to making further announcements in respect of this matter in the near future. The takeaway from all of this is that, where the LNP takes away from people, we give back to people. Where the LNP takes away, we give back more.

Anti-Poverty Week

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.06 am): As many members would know, this week is national Anti-Poverty Week. Now in its 15th year, Anti-Poverty Week gives us an opportunity to highlight the plight of people experiencing poverty and to recommit to addressing these issues. It is estimated that there are currently half a million people in Queensland currently experiencing poverty. It remains important that we continue to focus on combating women's poverty. Research released yesterday by ACOSS and the University of New South Wales reminds us that women are more likely to live in households below the poverty line than men. Yesterday it was an honour to co-host a women and poverty forum with Micah Projects and my colleague Minister Farmer. It was a fantastic event and we were privileged to hear personal stories from women with a lived experience of poverty. I want to thank them for their courage in sharing their stories.

The ability to access education and training is often key to escaping poverty and gaining financial independence. Initiatives like Skilling Queenslanders for Work are giving women the training tools to break the cycle of poverty and create meaningful careers. More than 17,500 women have been assisted through the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program, with 63 per cent reporting a positive outcome of either secure employment, further training or education.

During the recent period governing from Toowoomba, I visited the YWCA to congratulate them on winning the 2018 Community Training Initiative of the Year award in this year's regional training awards. They are a fantastic example of how our Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative is helping women gain work skills and giving them a step up to find a job. Through the giving a hand project the Toowoomba YWCA has assisted 26 women gain work while at the same time giving back to the community. The project sees food that would otherwise be wasted delivered to homeless people and women and children fleeing domestic violence. It is truly an incredible program. They are showing the difference that one organisation can make in addressing poverty in our community.

While I was at the Y, I had the opportunity to meet Zahra. She is a migrant from Afghanistan who engaged with the Y and Skilling Queenslanders for Work program and has now commenced employment as an apprentice electrician with Ergon Energy. Not only has Zahra worked incredibly hard to gain work skills; she has commenced employment in a male dominated industry and she is loving it. Zahra is showing what can be achieved if we give women the education, training and mentoring to achieve their dreams. It is fantastic to see programs like Skilling Queenslanders for Work giving women like Zahra meaningful careers, helping them break the cycle of poverty.

Sexual Violence Awareness Month

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.08 am): October marks Sexual Violence Awareness Month, a time to take a stand against sexual violence. It is an opportunity to show our support for victims and survivors and stand together against all forms of sexual violence.

Across the state, events are being held to raise awareness of sexual violence and the impact it has on too many lives. This weekend Brisbane will be awash with teal, as prominent buildings are lit up as part of our awareness-raising efforts. The theme this year is #respectmetoo which encourages consensual, safe and respectful relationships free from violence. It is very pleasing to see so many members in the chamber today wearing Sexual Violence Awareness Month ribbons and badges. We are at the start of an important conversation about sexual violence. This month brings awareness, but the conversation must continue long after the month ends.

The Palaszczuk Labor government is committed to making sure women who experience sexual assault get the help they need. That is why we are opening a grants program this month that will be available to community groups and other organisations to undertake community based projects to continue the conversation. The grant applications will open at the end of October and I encourage everyone to visit our website for more details.

We will also be announcing community champions who will help us to continue this vital conversation across Queensland. I am looking forward to an afternoon tea which I am hosting at the end of this month to thank our sexual violence and sexual assault services for all of the work that they do.

Sexual violence can affect anyone, but women and girls carry the largest burden. At a stakeholder forum in Toowoomba last month I was very pleased to talk to the acting CEO of DVAC, which runs the Service Against Sexual Violence in that city. They are too aware that terrible abuses take their cue from dangerous attitudes towards women. We are working to change these attitudes by making respectful relationships education available to every school.

The Palaszczuk Labor government's Queensland Women's Strategy targets economic security, safety, health, and participation and leadership as our four pillars for progress for women in Queensland. On the leadership front, I was very inspired and proud to join the Premier for a Women on Boards event in Toowoomba last month. We joined 137 people to explain the initiative and to announce a stellar board appointee, Jo Sheppard. Jo has been appointed to the board of SunWater and brings an extensive understanding of local government, agriculture and natural resources. She is the CEO of the Toowoomba Chamber of Commerce and former mayor of Paroo shire and a shining example of the talent in our regional centres.

A report commissioned by the Office for Women predicts more women on boards would result in an annual productivity gain of \$87 million for Queensland and that greater representation of women enhances the performance of organisations. This opportunity cannot be ignored. That is why we launched the Women on Boards initiative as part of our five-year Women's Strategy and invested \$600,000 to build the talent pipeline of women seeking board appointments. We are on track to achieve 50 per cent women on government boards by 2020. As of last month we were at 47 per cent. Together we can make Queensland a safer place and a place of even greater opportunity for women.

PARLIAMENTARY CRIME AND CORRUPTION COMMITTEE

Reports

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (10.12 am): I table the following Crime and Corruption Commission reports pursuant to sections 314 and 358 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and sections 138 and 146ZQ of the Crime and Corruption Act 2001:

- annual reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee for the periods 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018 and 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 on compliance requirements under the Crime and Corruption Act 2001 for assumed identities in relation to corruption offences;
- annual reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee for the periods 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018 and 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 on compliance requirements under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 for assumed identities in relation to criminal activity;
- schedule of controlled operations applications for corruption offences for the period 1 July 2017 to 30 June 2018;
- schedule of controlled operations applications for corruption offences for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017; and
- surveillance device warrants, annual report 2017-18.

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 and 2016-17 Annual Reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on authorities for assumed identities for corruption offences pursuant to section 146ZQ of the Crime and Corruption Act 2001 [[1653](#)].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 and 2016-17 Annual Reports to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on authorities for assumed identities relating to criminal activity pursuant to section 314 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 [[1654](#)].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on controlled operations applications for corruption offences [[1655](#)].

Table paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2016-17 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on controlled operations applications for corruption offences [[1656](#)].

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission: 2017-18 Annual Report to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee on aspects of surveillance device warrants pursuant to section 358 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 [[1657](#)].

The committee is required to table the reports within 14 sitting days of receipt. The committee received six reports on 23 July 2018 and one report on 10 September 2018 following additional inquiries. Three reports for the 2016-17 financial year were provided by the CCC outside of the statutory

time frame. The CCC chairperson could not provide a reason for two of the three reports being late other than simply an oversight. For the third report, the CCC chairperson advised the committee that the failure to meet the 2016-17 reporting requirements appears to be due to the departure of an officer from the legal services area in 2017 who had responsibility for coordinating the annual report and a failure to ensure this responsibility was handed over to a new employee.

The CCC chairperson, under questioning, advised the committee that continued improvements to document and monitor the CCC's compliance obligations will reduce the likelihood of the oversight occurring in the future. At the committee's request, the committee secretariat will also establish a monitoring system to oversee the CCC's ongoing requirements in this respect. I should point out that there were no issues of concern identified in the CCC's reports. The committee will continue to monitor the CCC's compliance with their statutory reporting responsibilities.

I also table the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner's report titled *Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000: September 2018*. The committee is required to table the report within 14 sitting days. The committee received the report on 14 September 2018.

Tabled paper: Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner: Report on the results of the inspection of the records of the Crime and Corruption Commission pursuant to section 362 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, September 2018 [[1658](#)].

EDUCATION, EMPLOYMENT AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Report

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (10.15 am): I lay upon the table of the House the Education, Employment and Small Business Committee's report No. 7 on portfolio subordinate legislation tabled between 13 June 2018 and 21 August 2018. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 7, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 13 June 2018 and 21 August 2018 [[1659](#)].

HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE

Report

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (10.15 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 13 of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 2 May and 12 June 2018*. This report details the Health Legislation (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2018.

Tabled paper: Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 13, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation tabled between 2 May and 12 June 2018 [[1660](#)].

NOTICE OF MOTION

Queensland Rail; No Confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (10.16 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House—

1. notes:
 - (a) in early 2016, GIRO and Indec warned Labor of a driver shortage once the Redcliffe peninsula line opened;
 - (b) on 30 September 2016, 48 services were cancelled and Minister Hinchliffe found out on Twitter;
 - (c) on 4 October 2016 the Redcliffe peninsula line opened with Labor employing fewer qualified drivers than in January 2015;
 - (d) on 21 October 2016, 12 per cent of scheduled services were cancelled with large scale disruptions to services occurring over the following weeks;
 - (e) on 24 October 2016, Labor announced a plan to recruit 200 train crew, despite an earlier EBA that blocked external recruitment for these positions;
 - (f) on 27 October 2016, the QR Chair and CEO resigned;
 - (g) on Christmas Day 2016, 261 or 36 per cent of all scheduled services were cancelled;
 - (h) numerous interim timetables announced by the government have been changed frequently and without warning;

- (i) the Labor/unions MOU to pay multi-million dollar Commonwealth Games bonus payments;
 - (j) the RTBU taking Queensland Rail to the Fair Work Commission to block external recruitment based on Labor's 2017 EBA;
 - (k) on 4 October 2018, Labor accepted the resignation of QR Chair Phillip Strachan, handpicked by the Premier to fix the trains, and two other board members;
 - (l) Labor has paid millions of dollars in overtime to staff because of the RTBU's preference for a structural deficit of staff;
2. notes Labor's failure to nominate when rail fail will end and the 472 weekly services will be restored; and
 3. expresses no confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.18 am.

Lady Cilento Children's Hospital

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.18 am): My first question without notice is to the Premier. Given that the decision to change the name of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital will incur costs for signage, uniforms, IT systems, marketing and stationing, will the Premier guarantee that the total cost of Labor's decision to change the name will not exceed \$500,000 as promised by the health minister?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. As has been canvassed here and publicly, the Minister for Health was approached by a number of doctors who saw the virtues of changing the name in an effort to gain more international and national funding for what has always been our premier Queensland children's hospital. The health minister has given me an assurance that there will be no money coming out of the Health budget and that the cost will be no more than \$500,000. Not one single dollar will be coming out of the Health budget; he has given me that assurance and we have had that discussion. Unlike those opposite, my government does consult and we do listen to stakeholders extensively.

Ms Trad: How much consultation did they do on the Barrett centre?

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right. I will come to that.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So rude!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members. I am having difficulty hearing the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There was extensive consultation. There was an online survey as well where people were able to make their views known. I look forward to a very bright future for the Queensland children's hospital. As we know, many of our children who suffer injuries right across our state are flown there to get the best possible care. From the outset I want to thank all the staff—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, please resume your seat. Member for Kawana, you are warned under standing orders. I give a general warning for members that I will not tolerate comments that are not through the chair. You will refer to members by their correct titles.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We know they provide the best care for our young children, no matter if they have an injury or a life-threatening occurrence anywhere in this state. It is Queensland's premier children's hospital. It is Queensland's children's hospital; it is for the children of this state.

Whilst I am on my feet, I want to thank LifeFlight for the great service that it provides to the state. I was able to attend their function on Saturday night with former premier Rob Borbidge and former deputy premier Jim Elder. They are doing great work in a bipartisan manner in terms of the aircraft and the services that are utilised in flying children from across the state to Queensland's premier children's hospital.

Lady Cilento Children's Hospital

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question without notice is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Lady Cilento's son, Dr David Cilento, said recently—

The only reason people have their names ripped off buildings and things like this is usually because they're persons of ill repute or actual criminals—my mother was neither.

Will the minister tell the House why neither he nor the Premier took the time to meet with the Cilento family to explain to them why Labor has trashed their mother's reputation and legacy?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I am hearing a point of order, member.

Mrs D'ATH: Once again, those on the other side are putting imputations in their questions. The language they are using is inflammatory and there are imputations. The question should be withdrawn or reworded.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the House, I will allow the question. The minister is able to answer that question as he sees fit. I will give the minister a broad range in terms of the options in his response.

Dr MILES: Thank you for that guidance, Mr Speaker. I repeatedly assured the Cilento family and the Queensland public that there was no intention at all to impugn the reputation of Lady Cilento. I have been very clear about the reasons for this decision and the process that was undertaken. Those opposite—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members. Members to my left, I have allowed a question. I may have ruled that question out of order but I allowed the question. I would appreciate hearing the answer from the minister. In future I may not show the same degree of latitude in terms of the question.

Dr MILES: In all of my public statements I gave that assurance. Let me remind the House, because the LNP seem to have forgotten, what happened here. The Queensland government built the Queensland Children's Hospital. Campbell Newman named it; he changed its name arbitrarily with no consultation—without consulting the community representatives who had been part of the community representative group. He arbitrarily changed it with no consultation. Since then a series of concerns were raised by doctors about how it was impacting their ability to deliver care, how it was impacting their ability to be published in internationally recognised peer reviewed journals, how it was impacting—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Minister—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, Deputy Premier. Member for Nicklin, you are warned under standing orders. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under standing orders also. You are making direct comments to other members and I have just issued a general warning.

Dr MILES: I was petitioned by more than a thousand of these staff to consider changing the name. The responsible thing to do when you are the kind of government that listens, the kind of government that consults, is to consider what would be an appropriate way to recognise the views of these doctors, and so we put in place a process. I attended two of the staff association meetings to understand their view. I canvassed the views of the board and of the Children's Hospital Foundation and they both said they thought it was a good idea, so we consulted the public. Roughly two-thirds of the public said they supported a name change.

The only people still prosecuting this—against the views of patients, doctors, the foundation, the board and the public—are those opposite, because they cannot accept that their then leader, Campbell Newman, made a mistake. He should have consulted the doctors, he should have consulted the public, he should have consulted the community representatives who were involved in the development of the hospital, but he did not. They continue to defend their approach in government, which is in contrast to ours—their approach to government to not listen to doctors, to not consult the public, to not go through deliberative decision-making processes like we have done here. By their indignation today they show that they have no idea how a good government works.

(Time expired)

Toowoomba Region, Qantas Pilot Training Academy

Mr WHITING: My question is of the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier please update the House on the Qantas pilot training academy set to open in Toowoomba and any other significant announcements in the region?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Bancroft for that very important question. As we heard in the House yesterday when the Minister for State Development talked briefly about the great achievement of helping to secure that pilot academy for Toowoomba, we know how important it is for jobs in the region. Some 250 pilots a year will be trained there. As I said yesterday, the second runway is being built by the airport corporation. Of course, that will mean even more planes will be coming into Brisbane and we will need the pilots to fly those planes into the future. This is great news for Toowoomba. As I mentioned in this House, we look forward to also backing in Mackay for that second pilot academy.

I was very pleased that we were able to spend the week governing the state from Toowoomba. From the outset I thank Mayor Paul Antonio for the warm welcome he showed each of my cabinet ministers. The Minister for Tourism and I very much enjoyed attending the Carnival of Flowers. Next year will be the 70th year of the Carnival of Flowers for Toowoomba. It will be bigger and better, and of course we will make sure that we provide extra funding to ensure they are able to celebrate the 70th flower show in style.

The Minister for Education spoke earlier about our commitment to Harristown State High School, and with \$15.4 million we are able to see that under construction. We also announced \$1 million for the SES headquarters in Charlton. The Minister for Health and I met with Mike Horan, the chair of the board, when we were in Toowoomba to announce business case planning to go ahead for a brand-new hospital at the Baillie Henderson site.

It appears that my government is delivering a lot for Toowoomba. On top of that, I was happy to join our minister for jobs and training at TAFE Queensland, where we are investing \$7 million to provide extra services for the training of nurses and a centre of excellence for agriculture. That is something that we know the area is going to need in the future, and we want to make sure that we are up to date with all of the modern technologies.

We also held our first regional Women on Boards seminar. I am very pleased the Minister for Women today announced that we are up to 47 per cent. We are on track to meet our target of 50 per cent of women on boards by 2020.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Sorry, what was that? Member, you said something about water boards, did you? No?

Mr SPEAKER: Premier—

A government member: Maybe it was 'parole board'.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right; the deputy leader does not want too many women on those boards. On this side of the House we back women. We like preselecting women. We like women in our cabinet. We even have women in—

(Time expired)

Crime and Corruption Commission, Chair

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer the Premier to the forum organised by the members for Redlands and Capalaba where the chair of the Crime and Corruption Commission is reported to have joked about delaying the use of his investigative powers to influence the democratic process. Will the Premier refer this matter to the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Commissioner for a full investigation?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have read those reports today. I was not at the seminar. I do not have a transcript of that seminar. I understand that the LGAQ is looking at raising an issue. They are absolutely entitled to raise any issue they want. That is for them. Let me say that I have absolute full confidence in the CCC and I have absolute full confidence in Alan MacSporran.

Drought Appeal; Wild Dog Fencing Program

Mr MADDEN: My question without notice is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier provide updates on Queenslanders' contributions to the Drought Appeal and progress with regard to the highly successful wild dog fencing program?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Ipswich West for the question. From the outset I thank Queenslanders. We are now up to \$3 million with the Queensland Drought Appeal. Thank you very much. Of course we could always do with some more. I am also pleased to advise the House that

the parliamentary event which was held here to raise money for the Queensland Drought Appeal raised \$140,000. I would like to extend my thanks to all of the members. Once again, it was a bipartisan event. It is lovely when we can do things for the good of people across our state. I want to thank you, Mr Speaker, and the Leader of the Opposition for participating.

I had the opportunity to go to Blackall recently with the Minister for Agriculture. I was met by the mayor at the new Blackall Airport, which was opened by our former minister for state development, Anthony Lynham. The mayor drove me in his car and pointed out the roads that my government is investing in after conversations with Minister Mark Bailey. He then spoke to me extensively about our Works for Queensland projects. We are putting \$1 million into Blackall. The mayor thanked me and asked me to pass on my best to the Deputy Premier for our Works for Queensland initiative. Then he pointed out the future site of the expansion of the Blackall Hospital and said, 'Please pass on my thanks to the Minister for Health.' Who is delivering for Blackall? We are!

There is one achievement that I am incredibly proud of as Premier of this state, and that is the delivery of wild dog fencing out west. I am absolutely proud of this investment. I was out there with Minister Furner, and we were able to announce another \$6 million that will go into more wild dog fencing. Let me put this in perspective, Mr Speaker. As a result of grants from our government—with slightly matching funds from the federal government—we have been able to roll out 7,000 kilometres of wild dog fencing. This \$6 million will roll out another 2,000 kilometres. We are bringing back the sheep industry in Queensland. Yes, we are! Who is delivering it? We are.

Mr Dick: We back the bush.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the Minister for State Development. On this side of the House we back the bush. In conclusion, I also thank one of the school captains there. He was a recipient of the Premier's Anzac Prize and he is now school captain. That shows that—

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board

Mr POWELL: My question is to the Deputy Premier. With the appointment of Labor's Paul Lucas as chair of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board while he also holds the position of infrastructure consultant at Labor law firm Holding Redlich, can the Deputy Premier explain to the House how the Deputy Premier is managing this conflict of interest and has the Integrity Commissioner approved the appointment?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for the question. Can I say from the outset that Paul Lucas, a former deputy premier of this state, is one of the most appropriate people that I know. He holds a very high standard of integrity, and I have full confidence that Mr Lucas, as chair of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority, and every single one of the board appointees will manage their conflicts appropriately as is required under governance arrangements on every board that the Queensland government constitutes to provide advice and direction to the Queensland government.

I will take on notice whether or not Mr Lucas has sought advice from the Integrity Commissioner. We have assembled on the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority board—

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Warrego, the Deputy Premier is being responsive in answering the question. She has listened to the question. I would like to listen to the answer. I ask you to cease your interjections.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Who was that? Member for Logan, I was issuing a ruling. You are warned under standing orders.

Ms TRAD: Mr Lucas is a lawyer and understands how to manage conflicts of interest. He comes to the table with vast experience in delivering infrastructure projects for our state—much more than those opposite can fully appreciate or understand. Additionally, Mr Lucas has also gone back to university and has a masters degree in urban planning. I can think of no-one better to head up the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority because it is not only about delivering our No. 1 infrastructure project for Queensland, which is a second crossing for heavy rail across the Brisbane River, but it is also about transforming our city.

I have full confidence in Paul Lucas to carry on this job. We have assembled some of the best infrastructure, planning and finance people this country has to offer in populating the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority board, because we know how important this project is to the future of South-East Queensland and our state economy.

Those opposite have never supported this project. They have never, ever supported Cross River Rail. They have never, ever supported any infrastructure project in this state apart from 1 William Street. They should hang their heads in shame when it comes to delivering for Queenslanders—

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, direct your comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD:—whether that is in Blackall, as the Premier has already revealed, or whether it is in South-East Queensland.

(Time expired)

South-East Queensland City Deal

Ms RICHARDS: My question is for the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier advise what progress has been made in negotiating the city deal for South-East Queensland and what this would mean for my community as well as the broader region?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for the question. The member for Redlands, in contrast to the member for Nanango, understands what it means to think, plan and deliver for the people of Queensland.

Mrs Frecklington: How's your time line going?

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, you are warned under the standing orders. Only 30 seconds ago I gave you a warning and I did not follow through.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. Under those opposite there would be no time line. There would be no Cross River Rail project and there would not be the thousands of jobs that come with that, whether directly on the project or in associated jobs because of all of the development that will ensue.

I am incredibly proud of our determination to get on with the South-East Queensland city deal. We are working in concert with the mayors of South-East Queensland to deliver what we think is an important plan to sequence, to finance and to deliver critical infrastructure projects for the fast-growing South-East Queensland corner. The member for Redlands understands that. Because she has been listening to her community, she understands that better transport infrastructure and better infrastructure generally is needed. That is why we are making significant investments in the Redlands area—in schools, in hospitals and in transport. We need the federal government to come on board, because fundamentally a city deal—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Warrego, you have been warned a couple of times today. You are now warned under the standing orders. The Deputy Premier was not being provocative.

Ms TRAD: We do need the Commonwealth to come on board, as it has in other city deals across the nation. I think those members opposite think that South-East Queensland should get a worse deal than Tasmania or western Sydney. Those opposite think South-East Queenslanders should get a worse deal than those in other jurisdictions. I think those opposite have made their position quite clear.

We will always stand up for South-East Queensland and the whole of Queensland. Unless we get cooperation from all tiers of government, we will not do the best we can for our growing region. That is fundamentally what a South-East Queensland deal is all about.

Of course the federal government cannot focus on this. It cannot focus on anything. It has its third leader in as many years, its fifth energy policy in as many years, two positions in 24 hours on one motion about whether or not it is okay to be white, its third position on the GST and its third minister on city deals. For God's sake, what we need is a bit of adult, mature behaviour in Canberra. We need a government that is focused on the people of Australia. We need a Labor government.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, can I ask that you withdraw the unparliamentary language.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw.

Crime and Corruption Commission, Chair

Mr JANETZKI: My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Premier's earlier answer with respect to the CCC chairman attending an event organised by the Labor members for Redlands and Capalaba. Does the Premier consider it appropriate for the CCC to attend Labor supported forums?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will get more information for the member. I understand that it was an event on integrity.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: And a public event.

Population Growth

Mr POWER: My question is for the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister advise the House how government infrastructure investment is supporting population growth in South-East Queensland and whether there are any alternative policies?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Logan for his question, because he knows about the value of investing in infrastructure to make a difference in Queensland. That is why our government committed significant funding at the last election and in our first budget since the election to expand Logan Hospital, to expand Caboolture Hospital and to expand Ipswich Hospital. It is why we brought forward funding to expand the M1, a critical artery for transport in the south-east.

It is little wonder that the Commonwealth government—the Morrison government—is not focused on Queensland. It has started a debate, the debate we have all been waiting for, about where the Australian Embassy should be in Israel. That is its priority. Forget the holy city. What about a city deal for South-East Queensland? Never mind Jerusalem. What about Jimboomba? What about funding that community? Frankly, from my perspective, the holy land is not in the Middle East; it is the city of Logan. That is why we are spending up-front to fund the expansion of the M1 while we have to wait four years for real money to come from the Morrison coalition government.

Our government has put into the budget for this financial year and over the forward estimates the largest infrastructure expenditure since the 2011 floods. What was the great project of those opposite? 1 William Street. That is it—their single biggest infrastructure project when they were in government. They took credit for Labor projects. Even when they took credit for them, they botched the opening of things like the Queensland children's hospital, which put patients at risk because of how badly it was opened. The commissioning report demonstrated that.

The LNP represents a massive fail when it comes to Queensland. They cannot even find Queensland on a map. Remember when Scott Morrison spent more time travelling to Germany than he spent coming to Queensland? We have seen no difference since he has become the Prime Minister. It is about time one person did her job and stood up for Queensland—that is, the Leader of the Opposition. Hope springs eternal. Here is another chance. The member for Nanango should get on the phone, tell Prime Minister Morrison where Queensland is and tell him to give us our fair share. We cannot fund a growing state. Our planning documents demonstrate clearly the need for more houses and more infrastructure. We are the engine of the Australian economy for this century, and it is about time we took some of the money that is going to New South Wales—\$5 billion for western Sydney—and Victoria—\$7.2 billion—and got our fair share for our state.

Ex-HMAS *Tobruk*

Mr BENNETT: My question without notice is to the Minister for the Environment. In light of the minister's comments reported last weekend—

Let's face it, it was a successful scuttling. We saw a ship get scuttled—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, the question will be heard in silence. That is the last warning I will issue today. I ask you to continue your question, member for Burnett.

Mr BENNETT: Thank you. I will just repeat that last bit.

Mr SPEAKER: No. Please continue your question, not repeat any elements of the question.

Mr BENNETT: Does the minister accept responsibility for what the government's own experts are calling a 'disappointing outcome' in the botched scuttling of the *Tobruk*, and will she now apologise to the people of Wide Bay?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. Unfortunately, what we have seen from the member for Burnett is this consistent talking down of his region and the tourism opportunity that has been presented to the region. The independent reports that have been presented to me that are online—that have been online since Monday—that have been provided to the government in terms of making some decisions about the current orientation of the vessel have made it very clear that the risks in terms of changing the current orientation are too great to the structure of the vessel. In addition to that, I have been able to secure an independent dive report with regard to the suitability of the current orientation of the ship and what we have been told by experts is that in its current—

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, resume your seat. Member for Glass House, you are warned under standing orders. Your comments are not directed through the chair. I have issued plenty of warnings today.

Ms ENOCH: A well-renowned dive expert, the chair of Dive Queensland—somebody who has dived some 76 wrecks across the world—has made it very clear that the current orientation makes it a world-class dive site. The diving industry is calling out for those opposite to support this great tourism opportunity to support the dive industry in the region and the dive industry in our state. All we have heard—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, the minister is providing, I think, a very factual response. I do not believe there is any cause for interjections. She is not being provocative.

Ms ENOCH: All we have heard from those opposite, and in particular the member for Burnett, is negative talk talking down his region when both mayors who have been engaged in this partnership have been positive about the steps forward. The dive operators have been seeking out positive steps forward. He is the only one—he is now on his own—talking down his region and talking down the tourism opportunities of this vessel. On top of that, we have seen negative personal attacks coming forth from the member for Burnett and that has opened the gates for others to make personal attacks on me. I have not heard from the member for Burnett with regard to some comments that were made by a particular councillor—no comment whatsoever. This is on top of the fact that what we have seen from his party—

Mr BENNETT: I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence at the reference that any comments made by a councillor had in any way influence from me and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, the member has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

Ms ENOCH: I withdraw.

Ms Trad: Denounce them!

Ms ENOCH: In terms of those comments however, I would call on the member for Burnett to denounce those comments—

Ms Jones: Publicly denounce them!

Ms ENOCH: Publicly denounce them. When a topic of discussion moves so quickly to the subject of my appearance, of my culture, of my race, it is a disgrace and the member for Burnett, who has been peddling negativity about his own region, should denounce those comments publicly.

Tourism Industry, Major Events

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please update the House on the progress of the government's strategy to grow Queensland's major events sector to support the tourism industry?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for Cairns for his question and I am very much looking forward to joining him in Cairns next week at the next meeting of the Tourism and Events Queensland board. I am really looking forward to sharing time with not only him but also Tourism Tropical North Queensland, which is doing a fantastic job in growing the market there. This will also be the first meeting of the brand-new board and I look forward to welcoming the addition to the board.

As the honourable member just said, we know that major events are a major drawcard to grow tourism. He knows that from his time working in the tourism industry, and that is why we are really proud as a government that we have grown the value of Queensland's event calendar from around \$330 million per year to more than \$780 million this year. This has happened because we did a number of things. The first decision we made at the request of the former chairman of the board of Tourism and Events Queensland was to lock in its funding for a four-year funding guarantee. This meant that it could go into negotiations confidently knowing that it would have the money to secure the events. This stands in stark contrast to those opposite in government that demanded that Tourism and Events Queensland went back to the Treasury each and every single year cap in hand asking for money and put it in a negative position compared to other states to bid for major events.

This year we have had a number of the largest events ever. The Premier mentioned in her comments the Carnival of Flowers in Toowoomba and we have had the largest ever Mount Isa Rodeo and of course we have had major success in securing Jeff Horn's next fight against Anthony Mundine. This is certainly going to be a blockbuster, as Anthony Mundine has now announced that this will be his final boxing bout ever. I know that that will see many more people wanting to be part of that action. Also this morning I spoke about how after the Commonwealth Games we have seen all of the major events on the Gold Coast getting even bigger, including the GC 600 this weekend.

There is one major event that is capturing the attention of LNP members on the Gold Coast, and that is the ever-mounting speculation that the member for Currumbin will be retiring at the next election. Surprise, surprise, the only person that they are talking about is another bloke to replace a woman retiring on the Gold Coast. We know that Verity Barton got shifted to the sidelines and replaced by a man. Now they want to get rid of the honourable member for Currumbin.

Mr Dick: Dream come true—no women at all!

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms JONES: That is it. The member for Mudgeeraba, who is calling out, should be watching her back. They will be coming for her. She is the last woman standing on the Gold Coast.

Mr Dick: Too many on the Parole Board! Too many on the frontbench!

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. We know that the deputy leader does not like women on the Parole Board. There are too many women on that board. Is his position that there are too many women on the Gold Coast? The LNP is completely out of step when it comes to the representation of women in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Container Refund Scheme

Mr CRISAFULLI: My question without notice is to the Minister for Environment. For the container deposit scheme start next month, Labor is proposing to have around 250 collection spots, with many of these nominated sites not yet ready to go. Can the minister guarantee that the lack of operational collection sites will not botch the rollout of the scheme?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. I might just need to correct a few things for the record. The member is indicating that it is the idea that there would be some 250 sites. There is a contract that has been agreed upon with the actual product responsibility organisation, which is a not-for-profit organisation, that is delivering this program in Queensland similar to other states that have a Container Refund Scheme. That contract requires the product responsibility organisation to have 232 sites available across Queensland. It has publicly made it clear that it is confident—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Broadwater, you have asked the question. I would like to hear the answer.

Ms ENOCH: That organisation, CoEx, has made it clear publicly that it is confident it will reach that 232-site agreement. On top of that, what we have seen through substantial consultation across Queensland is that many community organisations are also very interested in terms of being donation points where people will be able to not only get their 10 cent deposit back to them through the Container Refund Scheme but also donate that 10 cents to their charity of choice. There have been more than

2,000 community organisations that have been interested and have registered their interest to be a point of donation so that people can donate those bottles and cans and that 10 cent refund to that particular organisation.

This is a scheme that is about setting this state on a trajectory with regard to our litter and our recycling opportunities in Queensland. We use about three billion beverage containers in Queensland right now. If you lay them end to end, that wraps around the world almost 10 times. That is why this Container Refund Scheme is such an important part of the story of recycling in Queensland and why we have entered into an agreement, similar to every other state, with a product responsibility organisation to deliver this scheme for Queensland.

They have made public statements about their confidence. As we move through the years of the delivery of this scheme, those numbers will grow. More Queenslanders will be able to be part of the story of recycling in this state. In terms of those numbers, as I have said, CoEx has made it very clear that it is confident it will reach the contracted number.

Electoral Laws

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Will the Attorney-General update the House about any risks to Queensland's open and transparent electoral laws?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Pine Rivers for her question. When it comes to transparency and accountability, it is important that we ensure that we have the strongest electoral laws in this state and in this country. I want to go through the history of these laws. Under Campbell Newman, the LNP government increased the threshold for disclosure around political donations to \$12,000, which meant that, on any given day, someone could go into the office of a member of parliament and give \$12,000 in cash and no-one—no-one—could know who was donating, how much and to whom, because there was no requirement to disclose that donation because the threshold was lifted.

It took the Palaszczuk government, in one of the first pieces of legislation it introduced, to bring that threshold down to \$1,000—and not link it to increases in CPI so that every year it went up; today, it is \$1,000, as it was \$1,000 in 2015—to ensure transparency around donations. This government brought in real-time disclosure. We know that those opposite have fought these laws every step of the way. They challenged the disclosure laws in the Supreme Court. Then they appealed that decision requiring them to disclose donations. Then they started a High Court challenge in relation to developer donations and the ban.

Now Scott Morrison, the Prime Minister of this country, has slipped amendments into a bill that was supposed to be about the transparency and accountability of foreign donations so that he can override state and territory laws around disclosure and bans on developer donations. What does that mean? The LNP wants to hide all of its donations.

The members opposite asked the Premier about the integrity and accountability event that was held by two government members that the chair of the CCC attended. Who else was a guest speaker? The Integrity Commissioner. This was a public forum about transparency and accountability. I encourage all members to hold these events so that the public have a better idea of what the laws are in this state and the importance of transparency.

It is disgusting that the LNP, at a state and federal level, will do whatever it takes to hide donations, such as making legal challenges. Now it is putting in amendments to the federal parliament to do everything possible to override state laws so that no-one knows who is donating, how much and to whom. What does the LNP have to hide? The LNP should tell the people of Queensland and so should Scott Morrison.

(Time expired)

Drive It NQ

Mr DAMETTO: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Minister, the Drive It NQ not-for-profit organisation in Townsville has been working on a proposed \$23 million driver training and motorsport precinct in Townsville. Will the government support the construction of this motorsport and driver education facility in North Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: I am going to rule the question out of order. You commenced your comments with 'Minister'. In the past, I have given very clear guidance on that. If the minister is prepared to answer the question today, I am prepared to allow the question.

Mr DICK: I am happy to do so. Mr Speaker, the member does not get an opportunity to ask questions very often, so I thank you for your indulgence. It allows me to talk a little bit about a project that is important to North Queensland. I understand that the federal government has committed some funding to it. The way the Morrison government has treated Queensland, it is appropriate it funds it and it is appropriate that it should put more funding towards it. It is a matter of some millions of dollars.

I want to reiterate what I said earlier during question time about the investment that is going to other states and not to Queensland. I say to the honourable member that I will come back to the department of state development. In New South Wales, there is \$5.3 billion for the Badgerys Creek Airport and \$2.9 billion for the Western Sydney Infrastructure Plan. In Victoria, there is \$1.8 billion for the North East Link, \$475 million for Monash Road, and \$5 billion for the airport rail link to the airport in Melbourne, which does not yet have a plan, a business case or an alignment.

It is about time the Morrison government put money into Queensland. If it wants to fund this project, it should. From my perspective as the Minister for State Development, the project came through the market-led proposal project. It did not meet stage 2 of the proposal. The market-led proposal program is not a funding program, it is not a grant program, it is not a program designed to allocate government funding to specific projects; it provides a gateway for projects that are ready to go and need an exclusive contract to get going.

In this case for our government, the Logan Motorway enhancement project, which is not funded by the state, is going ahead in leaps and bounds. The international cruise ship terminal on the waterfront in Brisbane is a big project. It is funded by a private company, Dexus, but it needs the facilitation of the state government to be developed. The short answer is—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DICK: It might be useful for those honourable members opposite to be respectful to the member who has asked the question and listen. If they want to fund the project, they should find the funding from Scott Morrison. Why would the federal government fund half the project and not all of it, or some proportion of it and not all of it? The members of the LNP laugh, but perhaps they could find the money for it.

I say to the honourable member opposite that, if it is a road safety program, it has to compete with every other road safety program in Queensland. That would be a matter for the Minister for Main Roads. The reality is that it does not satisfy the criteria for a market-led proposal and perhaps the funding should be sourced from the federal government.

Sheep Industry

Ms HOWARD: My question is to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries. Will the minister update the House on Queensland's investment in the sheep industry in Queensland and is the minister aware of any alternative views?

Mr FURNER: I thank the honourable member for her question. Last Wednesday, I travelled with the Premier to announce \$6 million in Queensland government funding to support cluster fencing in Western Queensland. The industry was pleased with that announcement. The locals were pleased. The Mayor of the Blackall-Tambo Regional Council, Andrew Martin, was overwhelmed by this statement. Also, the local sheep farmers were very excited.

As for the opposition members, if there were a tumbleweed out there it would have been more vocal than them. Since coming into government, through considered investments in cluster fencing grants we have supported the sheep industry in Western Queensland. Those grants have made a real difference in stopping the wild dogs preying on sheep and lambs in the west. In fact, lambing rates were once below 10 per cent. They have now increased to 90 per cent.

Yet the mindset of those LNP members opposite—and I exclude the member for Gregory, as he gets it, just as his predecessor did—shows that they just do not get fences. When the Leader of the Opposition was the shadow agriculture minister, she was not impressed with Labor's keen interest in cluster fencing. The member Nanango's response was scathing. She said—

Labor seems to believe the wild dog menace will be solved by shiny new fences being erected in cluster models promoted by individuals and some local shires.

From what I see out there and from what I am told, cluster fencing creates jobs. It stops this menace of wild dogs. As minister, I am impressed with the shiny new fences that I see being built to help out the industry. I wonder if the member for Nanango will come on board and welcome the government's further commitment to support the industry.

Labor in government has done more to support the sheep industry than the LNP ever did and ever could do. When it comes to policy development, the LNP is still straddling the fence. Those opposite need help. We can sit down over a glass of Queensland wine and discuss the best policy for agriculture in this state. We would not have to go to Western Australia to do that. Better yet, the LNP could make the member for Gregory shadow agriculture minister. That will ensure the LNP has support for cluster fencing.

It is clear that Labor delivers the fences. Labor is keen to see the return of sheep to the west. It is in our blood. Labor was created by shearers and we will never forget our history—our origins. Labor is the party of building jobs and opportunities for everyone in Queensland. As I said in Blackall, legends are born in the bush. The Labor Palaszczuk government will be a legend when it comes to this incentive in Western Queensland.

Container Refund Scheme, Collection Points

Mr BOOTHMAN: My question is to the minister for the Environment. I table a map of the government's collection points that will be available when the container refund scheme commences on 1 November 2018.

Tabled paper: Map, undated, titled 'Container Refund Points, as at 5 October 2018' [1663].

Will the minister say how tens of thousands of people who live in the electorate of Springwood and my neighbouring electorate of Coomera can participate in a scheme when there is not a single collection point in their communities?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. Collection sites were determined through the product responsibility organisation in a very analytical way.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Broadwater, you are warned under standing orders. You have been repeatedly interjecting this morning. I would like to hear the minister's answer.

Ms ENOCH: They looked at where people travel, where they shop and where they live. They did not look at electorate boundaries. Electorate boundaries are not visible walls that you cannot cross. It was an understanding of how populations move, and those were the locations that were sought in terms of where collection points might be. The product responsibility organisation, CoEx, which has been contracted to deliver this scheme for our state, looked at those sites and determined that they were the best sites for the initial rollout of the container refund scheme. Of course, remember that this is the initial rollout. There are more to come over the next 12 and 24 months. We want to see this scheme grow in popularity. We want to see this scheme grow for Queensland so that we can build our recycling efforts across this state.

Those opposite encourage recycling even in their own party. The member for Broadwater is the champion of recycling in his own party. He recycled poor old Verity, the former member for Broadwater. He recycled himself from Townsville to the Gold Coast and we know he is looking at a recycling scheme of his own in terms of the leadership of the LNP. The fact we are receiving questions about recycling is great. I look forward to seeing the recycling efforts of those opposite in terms of their leadership in the future.

Moreton Bay Healthcare Services

Mr KING: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline how the election of a federal Labor government would improve health services in the Moreton Bay region?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Kurwongbah for his question. I know he is committed, as I am, to ensuring that Moreton Bay region residents have the healthcare services they need. One of the biggest challenges facing our health system is the crisis in general practice. In fact, general practice has been systematically starved of funding, putting at risk its very survival. They are not my words; that is what the AMA president says. This LNP Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government has made GPs inaccessible and unaffordable for many Queenslanders, and that is making the job of our hardworking doctors and nurses harder. They are facing unprecedented demands at their emergency departments.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, you will put your comments through the chair. You will cease interjecting. You are warned under standing orders.

Dr MILES: In part, that increase in demand at our emergency departments is caused by people not going to see a GP or waiting too long to see a GP until their health declines and they have to visit an emergency department.

In the first six months of this year, 290,000 Queenslanders went to an emergency department with a condition that could have or would have been better dealt with at a general practice. That is even more so in the Moreton Bay region because of our population growth. That is why I was pleased that federal Labor committed to build an urgent care clinic in the Moreton Bay region. This \$17 million facility would assist people who cannot get in to see a GP and save some of the 5,000 people who currently travel from Bribie Island to Caboolture Hospital. The people of Longman supported that initiative. They voted Labor. They elected Susan Lamb. I was surprised to learn, though, that there is someone else who supports this fantastic federal Labor initiative. There is at least one member over there who agrees that this federal Labor initiative is a great idea and that people should vote Labor to get it.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Dr MILES: The member for Pumicestone has written to me to say what a fantastic idea this is and how she really would like one.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Dr MILES: I have some news for the member for Pumicestone. The way to get federal Labor commitments is to vote for a federal Labor government. I look forward to hitting the hustings. I will be out there on Bribie with you ensuring that we can get an urgent care clinic on Bribie Island for your constituents. The way to do that is to vote Labor and make Bill Shorten our Prime Minister.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, can I ask you that you put your comments through the chair. Member for Pumicestone, I appreciate there was some provocation, but if you take exception or find things unacceptable, rise to a point of order. Do not continue to interject the way you were or you will be warned under standing orders.

Container Refund Scheme

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Premier. In light of the minister for the environment's bungling track record on implementing the waste tax, the ex *HMAS Tobruk* scuttling, protecting North Queensland residents from toxic contamination and protecting Queensland's koala population, does the Premier have confidence in the minister to implement the container deposit scheme?

Mrs D'ATH: I rise to a point of order. There are imputations in that question.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Scenic Rim, I have heard the point of order from the Leader of the House. I would ask that you rephrase your question. There were inferences in it.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my right! I would ask you to rephrase that question. You will have one opportunity.

Mr KRAUSE: My question is to the Premier. In light of the minister for the environment's track record on implementing the waste tax, the ex *HMAS Tobruk* scuttling, protecting North Queensland residents from toxic contamination and protecting Queensland's koala population, does the Premier have confidence in her minister to implement the container deposit scheme?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, you will have two minutes to answer that question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will be much shorter than that.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I have a lot to say, but I will keep my answer succinct.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my left!

Ms PALASZCZUK: At least they are in a happy mood today. That is good to see. In relation to the member's question, the answer is yes.

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Further Answer to Question, Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (11.19 am): In reference to the question asked of me earlier, I committed to getting back to the House. Mr Lucas has been on the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority Board since April 2017. During the appointment process he underwent a thorough due diligence process, as is standard practice for all government board appointees. Notwithstanding this, I have sought further advice on this matter since this morning.

I am advised that as a board member Mr Lucas has declared all of his interests, both on his original appointment and on his elevation as chair. Those declarations include his other employment, as one would expect from an experienced board member. I am advised that all directors lodge a pecuniary interest declaration with the board. I am further advised that at each meeting all board members lodge an updated conflict of interest declaration, including any employment matters. I am further advised that the delivery authority's internationally renowned probity advisor O'Connor Marsden, who provided direct advice in relation to all aspects of the project, is aware of all Mr Lucas's interests and no concerns have been raised.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the Clerk, I advise members who are under warnings that those warnings remain through until 1 pm; that is, the members for Toowoomba North, Kawana, Nicklin, Everton, Logan, Nanango, Warrego, Glass House, Broadwater and Southport.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 16 October (see p. 2859), on motion of Dr Miles—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (11.20 am): I rise to make a contribution to the bill before the House. Before doing so, I thank all committee members who partook in the discussion, dissection and preparation of the report with regard to this important bill. To the members of the committee secretariat I extend my thanks for the great work that they did. I thank committee secretary Rob Hansen and all members of the committee secretariat, as well as other members employed by the parliament, who read through each submission when it came in. We tend to forget that these submissions are first viewed by staff of this parliament. Some of the images in some submissions were indeed shocking. They were meant to shock. I hope that staff members who had to wade through those submissions and see those images did not suffer any trauma or at least any long-impacting trauma. Those images hardened my resolve not to be swayed one way or the other in relation to the bill.

Emails were sent to my office, some saying that they would no longer be my friend if I voted in a certain manner. I say to all people that I will vote on this bill in relation to my conscience. I will not accept the gratuitous advice of those who seem to have the opinion that I should vote in a certain set manner. I accept that this is an emotional bill. However, I put on the record that some parties on both sides of the debate need to reflect on their behaviour and tactics. They should be mature enough to conduct themselves otherwise. In some regards their actions and tactics were quite repulsive.

I thank the Queensland Law Reform Commission. I acknowledge their expertise, knowledge and access to expert opinion and advice. In many reports there are things that I agree with and other things that I do not agree with. I can state now that the role of the commission is finished. It is for this body and this body alone to scrutinise, debate and ultimately determine if the bill is in the best interests of Queenslanders.

The bill has two components: one, the decriminalisation of the termination of pregnancy; and, two, the law that will apply if that occurs. With regard to the Criminal Code, which is the first element, if I can call it that, many speakers here have provided a history of the code and I will not go back into that. In my opinion, the role of the Criminal Code is now at an end. It has led to uncertainty and the threat of criminal sanction. In these circumstances I do not accept the argument that because it has not resulted in a charge being laid it should be retained. In this case, the uncertainty is enough. Yesterday the member for Woodridge reminded me of an amendment he moved to the Criminal Code in 2009 that had to be rectified as a consequence of uncertainty, I think, around section 282 of the Criminal Code. That example is enough for me, in current parlance, to say that the code must go.

Turning to the balance of the bill, at this point in time I cannot support it for a fundamental number of reasons. The first is termination as of right up to a period of 22 weeks and then termination beyond 22 weeks provided two medical practitioners have consulted, taking into account various factors including social circumstances. The 22-week period derives from the recommendation of the commission, but I make the point that across this nation there is no uniformity as to what that time should be. I refer to page 6 of the committee report, which outlines the jurisdictions, state and territorial, and highlights the differences in relation to gestation periods. European countries such as Germany, Belgium, France, Denmark, Switzerland, Austria and Norway have a 12-week gestation period before certain steps must be taken. I point that out not to say one is better but as examples of divergence.

At page 94 of its report, the commission made this comment—

However, the Commission recognises that, as the fetus develops, its interests are entitled to greater recognition and protection.

I agree with that. At some point in time, the foetus is entitled to greater recognition and protection. At this point I do not intend to go into details in regard to a foetus at 16 weeks and 22 weeks. However, I will state that at 16 weeks the foetus is about to undergo significant change in relation to what it will finally become. At that point, significant tests are undertaken in relation to spina bifida, abnormalities and other matters that could impact upon both the foetus and the mother. In my opinion, at 16 weeks we need to take into account the commission's statement that there needs to be greater recognition and protection of the foetus.

The other issue in relation to 22-weeks gestation is contained in clause 6. What do the terms 'consulted' and 'social circumstances' mean? If I am a doctor and I talk to a second doctor without showing him documentation, is that a consultation within the terms of the clause? Is more needed? Does the second doctor need to be fully informed of all the circumstances? That means sighting medical records, talking to the mother potentially, or undertaking more medical examinations. In my opinion, the latter is critical.

In relation to social circumstances, the member for Maiwar indicated that clause 6(2) allows an accumulation of facts or circumstances to be taken into account when a doctor is considering termination. I dispute that. Clause 6(2) could stand on one simple factor, including the 'social circumstances' of the woman. I find that phrase repugnant. It is not something that I can adhere to because I cannot define it with any certainty, and I defy any person in this chamber to define it with any certainty.

If this bill passes its second reading, I will be moving amendments in relation to those matters. At that time I will elaborate further with regard to each particular amendment.

On clause 8, conscientious objection, it worries me that, if I am a doctor with a conscientious objection and therefore am absolved from taking any action in regard to a termination, I am then made to refer that woman to a doctor or a service provider who does not have a conscientious objection. In my opinion, I should not be told to do something that I oppose. I should not be told that I have the right to have an objection but I also have an obligation to refer to a doctor or a provider who does not have that objection. In my opinion, that is fundamentally wrong and it runs contrary to what I see as the right to conscientious objection.

Nothing in the bill deals with the issue of counselling. I am not suggesting in the amendments that counselling should be mandatory. What I am saying is that I believe it is important that the offer of counselling be given. It is up to the woman, it is up to the family to say, 'No, we don't need that.' I would like it to be that a doctor has an obligation to offer it to people. I think that is the obligation we should impose in relation to termination.

There has been discussion about safe access zones. I support safe access zones. By the time a woman or a family enters a clinic they have gone through enormous trauma. They have gone through a lot of soul-searching. Though there may be rights with regard to protestors having their voice heard, at that point in time they should not be in the proximity of the clinic to cause a problem or concern for the woman or her family. They should have the right to proceed to a termination. There have been calls for amendments in relation to access zones. Let the High Court make the ruling and then, if it is required, take the appropriate action.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (11.30 am): Life is precious. Every day Queenslanders work to save lives and create a better world and quality of life for Queenslanders. We strive to develop knowledge, technology and culture to increase life span, whether at birth or towards the end of our days. Nothing hurts more than to read or hear comments that those supporting the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018

support the taking of a life. Nothing could be further from the truth, as demonstrated in this chamber yesterday and no doubt today. Many times in my life I have been told it takes a catalyst to effect positive change. I believe that this bill is one such catalyst, with the capacity to reduce the number of terminations in Queensland.

As we have heard, this bill incorporates exhaustive research and recommendations from the Queensland Law Reform Commission. Some will argue that the removal of the relevant sections from the Queensland Criminal Code 1899 is merely symbolic. Many women and front-line organisations in Queensland believe that the symbolism of removing any element of criminality from abortion is incredibly important to the development of respect for women and improved health outcomes and services. History has demonstrated a lack of respect for women, including rights to vote, work or attend university. Decisions about a woman's future were entirely in their parents' or husband's hands. How much have we really changed our attitudes over time?

Today Queensland is a modern, highly developed state. We promote equality, equity, inclusion and quotas for representation on boards and in the chamber. A recent paper titled 'Harming women with words', which was on hate speech, touches briefly on the concept that speech may constitute family or intimate partner violence, verbal abuse and/or controlling and coercive behaviour. Speech and language includes the written word. Legal frameworks and codes come into this realm. What message does it send about women when within legal frameworks terminations are a criminal activity? Could this be considered another form of hate speech?

This bill is an opportunity to speak candidly about terminations. A decision to terminate a pregnancy is not taken lightly or without great angst. To insinuate that decriminalising abortion will open the floodgates to rampant terminations is offensive, disrespectful and inaccurate, as statistics from Victoria demonstrate. What is even more distasteful are the comments that women without a catastrophic reason will be lining up for a late-term abortion. The inferences that are being made define women in the most negative ways, perpetrating a further lack of respect. We may not agree with some choices; however, we need to empathise, educate and support, not condemn.

It is also time to talk openly and without blame about how our society has contributed to women facing in one of the most difficult decisions and times of their lives. It is not politicians, laws or legislation that create a situation where terminations are considered. It is what we have contributed, knowingly and unknowingly, to the decision to terminate that is not for medical reasons.

Firstly, there is pressure. Developing character, resilience and knowledge from the very start of our schooling life onwards is vital to construct the respect and responsibility to self and others to withstand peer, partner, family and societal judgements and pressures, including reproductive coercion. The message needs to be clear and contextualised.

Secondly, there are university and work commitments, financial and family expectations, modern constructs of roles and behaviours. It takes a village to raise a child. We have become siloed with a loss of support from intergenerational families. One online submitter wrote, 'Community is always, always the answer.' That is so true.

Thirdly, there is the judgement and labelling of women, inadvertently or otherwise—being too young or too old to raise a child, too single or too engrossed in their careers. If they put their child into day care to get back to work they are judged. If they stay at the home and receive government assistance or child support they are judged. They are considered selfish if they consider adopting out a child and irresponsible if they have too many. Verbalised judgements are the forerunners to creating stigmas and labelling. Tags such as 'single mother', 'welfare dependent' and 'pensioner' now have embedded negative connotations. Let us think about the messages in our speech and categorisation and ask ourselves why we judge and how labels contribute to outcomes.

Lastly, our adoption laws desperately need modernising. With loving couples waiting years for a baby of their own, the laws that prevent a birth mother from being involved in selecting parents for her child or being part of their lives demonstrates an ignorance as to what a woman feels is necessary in carrying a child to term and then relinquishing that child to others. These are just a sample of contributing factors to how our society is shaping decisions. Regardless of the vote on this bill, we need to do much better in addressing these as a society.

There were a number of aspects of the bill that were of concern to constituents and in the written submissions. I will touch on those. Firstly, there was the 22-week gestational limit. It was felt this is too close to the viability margin. This recommendation from the Queensland Law Reform Commission

reflects existing practice and is to accommodate the small proportion of terminations where scans have identified severe abnormalities. To insinuate that women wait until this time to terminate based on a whim is deeply concerning. Is it not time we placed our faith and trust in our women, the doctors looking after their wellbeing and the safeguards in our clinical practice procedures and policies?

Secondly, there is conscientious objector referrals. Access to safe terminations is a very clear mandate of United Nations treaty bodies and recognised by front-line services as essential to women's health and wellbeing. A referral to an appropriate provider or provision of information to access referral services is respecting the objector's rights as well as the patient's rights. In regional and remote areas where there are limited service providers, conscientious objection may force women to travel great distances at great expense to a provider. It is imperative that Queensland Health ensures these women are not unfairly disadvantaged.

Thirdly, there is the importance to have counselling, information and access to all available options and time to consider these. Independent, knowledgeable and objective advice in a holistic manner that offers support regardless of a woman's decision is needed. It was pleasing to hear the minister announce that a woman's hotline would be provided. This must be a priority and it must be mandated that all doctors provide contact to this service as part of patient care and the decision-making process.

My support of this bill does not mean that I support terminating a life. I am supporting the rights of women to have choice, to access information and services and to be respected. I am supporting our most disadvantaged women in remote and regional areas who do not have the services and support we have in our communities. I am supporting what I see as a catalyst that can lead to the necessary changes to decrease the number of terminations in Queensland.

To the women of Queensland and your partners, I ask that you take responsibility for your health, wellbeing and pregnancies by understanding the ramifications and consequences of decisions made. You, and only you, are responsible for your life and the life of others including your unborn children.

To women across Queensland in the direst of situations including domestic violence households, please take this opportunity to access the available services to remove yourself and your unborn children from these environments. I met an amazing, inspirational young mother who suffered horrendously and nearly died at the hands of her partner and her simple message was, 'If you can't or won't leave for yourself, do it for others.'

To finish, I would like to acknowledge and thank those who wrote genuine, considered and well-informed submissions. I have appreciated deeply the candid conversations with women and men from both sides of this debate. The sharing of viewpoints, experiences and hopes, as well as suggestions on needed services, reforms and initiatives, have been invaluable. I give special mention to the pro-life and pro-choice advocacy organisations for the work that they do and for taking time to meet with me. I can see a future where both sides can work together in developing much better outcomes.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the government for caring for Queensland women. I also thank the health committee and the Queensland Law Reform Commission. To my own community: thank you for the respect and empathy you demonstrated to each other in your discussions and for your support of women across Queensland.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (11.40 am): As an adoptive mum and exercising my conscience vote, I rise to speak in support of this bill before the House. I want to commend my colleagues, particularly the Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General, the Minister for Health and, indeed, all of my cabinet colleagues, who have steered what is, without doubt, a very sensitive issue. I welcome that we all have a conscience vote in this House in relation to this bill. I believe it has been steered remarkably well by the Premier to ensure that all of the information that we require to exercise our vote in this House today has been given and has been open and transparent.

I have read a few reports in this House in the many years that I have been a member of parliament and I can honestly say that the Queensland Law Reform Commission report was remarkable in its detail and in the manner in which it was written and expressed. It was a very reasoned, balanced report and probably one of the best that I have read in a long time and hence why we are here today debating this bill.

I also want to thank Judi and Sam in my electorate office. Many members have spoken about some of the material that we have received in our offices. I want to thank them for their patience, dealing sensitively with all of the information that came through the door and also the manner in which they dealt with constituents. I want to thank everyone for informing me via any way they wanted to in relation to their views.

I have known about this issue for many, many years. I have been an advocate and pro choice for many years. I have heard all sides in relation to this debate. My way of thinking in relation to this is that the laws that we currently have in the Criminal Code made in the late 1800s or 1899 are simply archaic and need to change. They were made at a time when women did not even have the vote. They were made in a time when there were no women in this parliament. They were made at a time when Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders did not even have a vote in this House. They were made at a time when we had no electricity. In fact, Toowoomba got electricity in 1905, Warwick in 1912 and Ipswich in 1917. They were made at a time when there were no planes or cars.

Today we live in a fundamentally different world. We now live in a global, technologically based world with different social circumstances. It is a completely different world to the one in which these laws were made. I believe that as legislators in this House it is upon us to ensure that we have laws that are relevant, up to date, modern and express exactly the rights of our citizens in this state.

The reality is that abortions do happen. I join with the member for Noosa in saying that the fact that I am supporting this bill does not mean that I am pro women having abortion or against women having abortion. I am very supportive and I will always support their right to choose in a modern environment, in an environment that is supportive and in an environment that is without fear, stigma or uncertainty—no matter where that comes from, whether that fear comes from within their household, from their partner, from their peers or from people they do not even know.

We need to remove the stigma and the uncertainty around a decision which we know is never taken lightly—and to suggest that it is, I agree, is offensive to women and to the women who take this course of action. It should be done in an environment of choice; in an environment that is supportive, with information that they are able to access when they believe they need to access it; and in an environment where there is no uncertainty around their actions. That is our job in this House: to make these laws clear about exactly where these women stand, without fear and stigma.

I support the hotline that the minister has implemented. I do hope that women who need to access the hotline will be given that information, as I know they will, and that if they seek that support they will be able to get it. There are women in regional or remote areas who find themselves in circumstances where they need to make these decisions in an environment where maybe that support is not quite as readily available. I say to these women that we are looking forward to putting in mechanisms where they can reach out and grab that support when they need it. We live in a different world to 1899. People then would not have even imagined the world that we are living in today. They would not have imagined that we would have a premier of this state who is a woman or that we would have a cabinet with 50 per cent women. We need to ensure through modern technology that that support is available to women.

I support the safe zone. It is hard enough to make that decision and walk through the door without the stigma and fear of people making them feel like second-class citizens. It is concerning that these archaic laws made many young women have children. If we talk about trauma in the decisions that women have to make every day, imagine the trauma when many of them were stigmatised as single mothers or welfare dependents. Indeed, many organisations who thought they were doing the right thing made these women have their children and then ripped those babies from their arms and adopted them out, often without the woman's knowledge. There are stories of this. There are books that have been written. There are movies that have been made. If you want people to live with trauma for the rest of their lives, do that to a young woman without her knowledge and that is what we are facing. Surely we live in a society today where we do not condone that. Surely we live in a society today where women are free to make informed choices, with all of the information made readily available by the government.

Here today we have a duty and an historic opportunity to finally remove the criminality around this issue. These women are not criminals, nor will they ever be. You may have a belief that no-one should be able to have an abortion and I respect that belief. At the end of the day, if a woman decides that that is in the best interests of herself, her family and her situation—whatever it may be—she should be able to make that decision free of any harassment, stigma and fear and without criminality hanging over her head.

It is a modern world. We live in a global world. We live in a technological world, as I have said. We have a duty in this House to make history and remove the criminal aspect of this from the Criminal Code. It should never have been there. I do not accept for one minute that by doing that we are going to have women lining up to have abortions. That is disrespectful and it is not a considered response to this issue.

It was the same when we decriminalised homosexuality, and I did not see everybody all of a sudden becoming a homosexual. It is absolutely ridiculous to suggest that removing abortion from the Criminal Code would in any way increase its incidence. The reality is that in Victoria that has not occurred; the numbers have not increased. Let us get into the modern world. Let us make history today. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Order! Before calling the next member, I welcome school captains from Bray Park State High School and Pine Rivers State High School in the electorate of Pine Rivers.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (11.50 am): This has been a big week for life. I congratulate Their Royal Highnesses, the Duke and Duchess of Sussex, on the announcement that they are expecting a baby in the spring of 2019. Life is full of surprises. Monday, 15 October was Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day, a day of remembrance for pregnancy, loss and infant death which includes but is not limited to miscarriage, stillbirth, SIDS and the death of a newborn. Today I respectfully acknowledge the suffering, grief and loss that many women have suffered. Tuesday, 16 October is remembered by good Catholics as the day of the passing of St Gerard Majella, the patron of expectant mothers. This is a big week for life in Queensland and it is my hope that it can continue as a week of celebrating life.

My journey on this issue starts when as a young adult in the late 1970s and 1980s I held the view that abortion was simply between a woman and her doctor; it was solely a health issue; it was always a simple procedure, it did no harm as the foetus was always just a mass of unfeeling cells that was not always wanted; it did no harm to the woman neither physically nor psychologically; and doctors were free to decide if they participated or not. If they did not want to be involved, they did not have to on conscience or religious grounds. That all seemed reasonable to me as a young man, but as I grew older these simple understandings were challenged by my own experience of life—from study, research, family life, professional experience, experience of diverse faiths and culture, and a closer connection with women's experiences of pregnancy, loss and abortion. I came to see that this issue is more complex and multifaceted than I first thought.

One key facet is health—an obvious one. It is a health issue between a woman and her doctor, but it is also about the broader health system this controversial operation sits in and the regulation of it. In terms of science and evidence, as I studied human embryology and later lectured in anatomy and physiology I realised that I had not considered key scientific facts around the issue such as the baby has a heartbeat from 22 days, or even earlier according to some scientists; it feels pain well before 22 weeks; and it can survive outside the womb from 22 weeks, as recently occurred in the birth of a 22-week-old baby in Alabama.

I first became aware of the political dimension to abortion early in my first degree at James Cook University. I came to realise then and since that there is very heavy politics around abortion. Over many years I came to realise that my early understanding of abortion was based more on 1970s politics and extreme left ideology than facts. I think the same ideology, unfortunately in my opinion, underpins this bill and the two similar and now disreputed Pyne bills.

In terms of justice, as I learned about justice and human rights I realised that my earlier views had overlooked human rights and justice for the preborn baby, especially as it develops. At 20 weeks we acknowledge some form of personhood through birth and death certificates, and some Western country jurisdictions count the preborn in sentencing when, for example, a woman is killed in a car crash where the other driver is at fault. I saw that abortion is not just a health issue, because the actions of one person harm another.

As I experienced family life, raised our own family together with my wife and experienced other people's family lives, I realised that family and those close—partners—play a big part in whether the woman feels sufficiently supported to continue her pregnancy to birth. Sadly, I came to see that many women are pressured to abort by their partner. Men could do much more to support women, and many couples would adopt and be loving, doting parents if given the chance.

Another factor which changed my mind on abortion is that of freedom of conscience and religion. Queensland is a multireligious and multicultural state. Many doctors, health professionals and all kinds of other Queenslanders do not support abortion. The freedom for doctors, health practitioners and others to not be discriminated against based on their faith or culture is an important value to me.

I will detail some of the facts and some of the purported aims of this bill and why I believe this bill fails. Firstly, in terms of public support I do not really believe that Queenslanders largely support this Victorian style legislation. They may support some of the elements in it, but I do not believe they support this bill as the solution. In New South Wales generally I believe that to be the same. In Victoria, the bill which we are largely basing this bill on and copying passed by only a few votes and against huge public outcry. It would not have got up under a normal, moderate Labor government.

The public outcry here in Queensland has been huge. Almost 40,000 people signed a petition, and 78 per cent of the submissions to this bill do not support the bill. We saw a similar percentage—even higher—on the two Pyne bills. We have seen up to 4,000 people at rallies against the bill. These are massive numbers of Queenslanders. We all know the email responses we have received at our electorate offices that are calling for the bill to not pass. Then there is the recent Galaxy research. Altogether I believe the public is strongly opposed.

Secondly, supposedly in some people's minds the bill will reduce abortion. Abortion numbers in Queensland are high, at up to 14,000. If you add medical abortions—it is difficult to get exact figures on this and I believe we need to keep more accurate records—there are a large number of abortions. We do not know how bad the real situation is or how many there are. Medical abortions appear to be on the rise. I am not sure we can argue that numbers will definitely come down or the bill will help that, especially when some argue that we need more access. Access will only increase numbers. If public hospitals become involved in the future as they have in other jurisdictions, we will potentially see the numbers climb overall from medical and surgical abortions.

In terms of late-term abortion the bill fails on many levels. Somebody said that it is only one per cent, but one per cent of up to 14,000 is 140. If you look at the averages over nine years in Victoria before the bill was introduced and the year since, it rose from 250 abortions, on average, to something like almost 350 abortions. We see a large number of abortions and an increase when the Victorian legislation came in. There has also be a proportionate increase within the number of late-term abortions for maternal psychosocial reasons. Those trends would almost certainly come here to Queensland. I have great concern about late-term abortions—the numbers and particularly the proportion for psychosocial reasons.

There is the issue of what is the latest time at which a late-term abortion will be allowed. I am happy for the minister to answer this. I have not seen an upper limit of age in terms of the law itself. I know we are saying that doctors will interpret that for us. I have a great deal of faith in our doctors. However, I would be concerned about that in the sense that in the history of Queensland we have had issues like Dr Jayant Patel and the Bundaberg Hospital. I think we need to be careful in terms of assuming that all works out. Again, I have a high regard for our doctors and health practitioners, but what is the latest number of weeks? It has been called abortion to birth and others have challenged that statement. If the minister can tell us what the latest age of gestation is that will be allowed in the legislation, then the minister can rule that out.

There is no pain relief provided for almost fully formed babies. At 22 weeks, babies are virtually fully formed. There is no pain relief given to them, and the potentiality of the suffering of babies in late-term abortions is a huge concern to me.

I believe the bill is discriminatory on religious and cultural grounds. Many people of different faith and cultural backgrounds do not agree with abortion. In one sense, this bill imposes on them, in terms of agreeing with it or not agreeing with it, and to me that is a problem. There is sex and gender discrimination, as well as a whole range of other things. I would have liked to say much more should time have allowed. I will wrap up by saying that life is precious, life is sacred, and I encourage the House this week to choose life.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (11.59 am): In making a contribution to this bill, I am respectful of the deep-seated dichotomy of views surrounding this issue. For me personally, it stirs me very emotionally to think of the rights of the unborn and defenceless life that I believe we are charged with protecting at all costs. I see it as the pinnacle of civilisation that we have the medical advancements to preserve life and sustain life outside the womb, as they say, from as early as 22 weeks, compared to other cultures which are not as advanced and where there is a slim chance of survival. That is great progress that we have made.

I reflect on the very strong part in my life that a disabled child I am very close to has played, and the fact that those lives that are different now have a greater chance of being cast from the gene pool. I am sure that is not everyone's intent here, but certainly it opens the door. These children are certainly a gift to us and they have personally enhanced my life and their parents' lives so much that I cannot get my head around why they are now going to have a slimmer chance of experiencing life outside the womb. I would like to expand on that point later to explain where I am coming from. These are some of the dark thoughts that I have had surrounding this legislation.

I cannot pretend to know how confronting it must be for a pregnant woman to face personal stress in a relationship, financial hardship or any number of these adverse scenarios—what an impact on a person's life to contemplate. However, the default option of terminating a life under these scenarios completely ignores the rights of that child to live. It is like a presumption of guilt—that the child's life is the barrier to that mother's chance at health and happiness.

I am bemused by the fact that there is so much talk of women's welfare—which I think is a very important thing to recognise—yet we are not considering all of the evidence properly around the psychological wellbeing of the mother before or after any termination of life. For such a far-reaching piece of legislation around this issue, there should be a commensurate level of support and consideration for things like the cooling-off period, welfare support being mandatory and other options such as adoption.

Defining the issue is very important; it certainly is to me. To me, there has been a very misleading narrative around this debate in limiting it to primarily a health issue. Certainly, there are very strong health elements to it, but this is either ignorance or outright deceptive behaviour. There is undoubtedly a large health dimension to this issue; however, we cannot ignore the moral and ethical components, which are a large part of what everyone here has to consider very carefully.

This should not simply be an empirical analysis of quantifiable data. It is not a scientific exercise. We are discussing the ability of people to take the life of another, which draws on some enormous moral and ethical issues. In that way, the advice of the legal fraternity and the AMA, while relevant, is not a comprehensive endorsement of this bill. This also leads me to the point that, curiously, in the introductory speech and in all subsequent commentary I have heard from the government there is no reference to the rights of the child or the consideration of their wellbeing. I fully recognise the rights and the wellbeing of the mother, but there is no mention of the child. That I guess leads into the definition of a life.

The government's position on this is that they want to primarily give those rights to the mother to terminate the life of a child right up to full term in those extreme cases and at 22 weeks under those other conditions. Even if you do not believe that the child does not represent a life form at any arbitrary point from the point of conception through development and right up until the point they are outside the womb, you must at least acknowledge that when the law treats them as a life or they are capable of sustaining life outside the womb then they are a life. It is pretty hard to argue that is not a life at that point.

Notwithstanding the trauma facing the mother, I am confused as to why we spend so much time in the House enhancing the safety of Queenslanders to preserve life, and here we are legislating to make it easier to terminate life. In that sense, it is a great contradiction of the primary purpose of what we are trying to achieve here in parliament.

I am under no illusion that taking the time period for termination to 22 weeks will allow gender selection of children. I know there has been commentary that does not say that and that that is a lie, but it is still implicit, even though there is no reference to it. Many people will not do it for that reason and will do it for other varied reasons, but I think it is very naive to think it will not occur and it will not be easier under this legislation.

I have heard many stories from people, even now with the existing laws, where doctors have suggested and encouraged the termination of a child's life on account of their defects. Then I ask myself these questions. Where does this stop? Is it Williams syndrome, Down syndrome, blue eyes, brown eyes, male, female? Where does this lead? That draws me back to the point I made earlier. I know from firsthand experience of pushes within lobby groups and people associated with causes like Down syndrome and Williams syndrome about providing data to remove that gene from the gene pool. To me, that in itself raises very high moral issues because that is saying that is an inferior form of life which we would prefer not to have. I would like people to reflect on that. I am sure that is not the intention of people but, inadvertently, we are moving into a position where people will have more of an opportunity to do that.

Unfortunately, people may not be given advice and they may not be fully aware of the consequences of their decisions. A lot of these people are in vulnerable positions when they make these decisions—the mother and the father—and they are not fully aware. We can then slip into this malaise where, 10 years down the track, we are selecting on all sorts of things. That disgusts me because I think of some disabled people in my life who I love, and they have every right to have a chance at life. They have created wonderful lives for the people around them. I think there is a very dark risk of this enabling those people to be wiped out of the gene pool.

I make particular reference to the AMA submission. I am very disappointed with their support of the legislation. There was no survey made to the doctors. They represent about 30 per cent of the industry in their membership. Without acknowledging the enormous moral and ethical dimensions of that endorsement, I think many peak lobby groups are pandering to the government of the day and I believe that is a real fault. I say that on the evidence of also the coal industry and other curious elements that are endorsed. I was very disappointed with that fact.

I would also like to discuss another economic dimension in this, and that is private practices. Whether we like it or not—and people will disagree with this—there are orthopaedic surgeons out there now recommending that people get shoulder surgery so they can drum up business. This is unfortunate but there are people doing it. There are private practices that operate their business in that way. We have seen evidence right throughout the medical industries of unethical people operating like that, and this would not be excluded. If it was easier for them to perform any sort of procedure, they could gain that economic incentive. That is a very dark thought to raise but I think it is a very real thing to consider.

In conclusion, I acknowledge that most of the debate I have heard here has been pretty respectful, which I appreciate. I thought a lot of the things that were said earlier were a bit unfair. There was one comment made that we need to acknowledge—that if you are against this bill then you are against women. Just as the member for McConnel said before—‘I am not for killing babies because I am supporting the bill’—it is the same with the women. We are acknowledging both sides of the argument but this is central to our principles and what we believe. For us, life is sacred and we should be doing everything we can to give them a chance of a life outside the womb. There are women who have not been born who deserve the right to live.

The bulk of the amendments revolve around changing 22 weeks to 16 weeks. We are not accepting of that. We do not want to compromise on this. This is a principled issue that we feel does not lend itself to compromise. I respect both sides of the argument, but we are firmly of the view that this issue should not lend itself to compromise.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (12.09 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill before the House. I stand here to support a choice for women—a legal choice for women—for them to have agency over what happens to them, to be able to determine their own lives.

I think it has been made clear that the matters being considered by the parliament this week are of some significance. For many who have been at the forefront of this issue—many here in this House this week—I acknowledge the watershed moment that this debate represents and the promise that it holds. I acknowledge the leadership of the Premier and the Deputy Premier and the efforts of the Attorney-General and health minister in making available the resources for members to receive briefings from a range of experts in this field. To the Queensland Health staff who were prepared to answer my questions regardless of the time of day I say thank you.

It is also important for me to note the work of my electorate staff and volunteers over the past few months. They have been the first point of contact in my office relating to correspondence and those constituents who have attended. They have organised meetings with constituents, provided information and arranged briefings with stakeholders. They have borne witness to some of the most tasteless and disturbing correspondence. I thank them for their forbearance over this period.

It is not lost on me and possibly a few others in this House that we debate this bill this week, which started on Monday, 15 October, which was International Pregnancy and Infant Loss Remembrance Day. Honourable members may not have heard much fanfare about it; it is not a widely recognised day. There are no lapel pins or ribbons, maybe because it is uncomfortable. It disrupts the narrative that pregnancy is all flowers, baby showers and nursery swatches.

The reality is that not all pregnancies have happy endings. These are hard facts to acknowledge. The long-held convention that we do not tell anyone about a pregnancy until the 12-week mark speaks to how volatile and uncertain a pregnancy is in its early stages. They do not tell us that when we are little girls; it is a secret. It has been pointed out that a D and C under general anaesthetic is not something a woman undertakes lightly or with much choice and it is certainly not something to be used as a form of birth control.

The moment a woman learns she is pregnant is different for everyone. While for many it is the fulfilment of dreams and hopes for a family, for others it is the beginning of a troubling and stressful time. I can remember the news of my first child's impending arrival, the joy and anticipation—all the feelings—but with each successive pregnancy and each successive pregnancy loss darkness and foreboding set in and optimism went out the window. You do not get excited; you will only be disappointed. You do not tell anyone because then you have to deal with the looks of pity when it is yet another loss. I know for myself I changed the rules to not tell anyone until after 20 weeks and only if the scan was good. I cannot presume to know the circumstances of every other woman in this state at such a time. No-one in this chamber can and yet we will legislate it.

I acknowledge the publicised cases of coerced abortion. By taking abortion out of the shadows and placing it in the mainstream public health system we will be able to surround all women with the necessary support during any chosen process should they choose to accept it. What is much less publicised is the use of pregnancy as a form of coercion itself. I have met many women for whom forced pregnancies have been the ultimate form of control over their lives—literally kept barefoot and pregnant as a means of power and control to keep them from leaving. Women make decisions to remain in abusive relationships with children as the tether that keeps them there. With every additional child the ability to leave becomes a fading dream. We do not hear about these cases because, for many, the only optimistic outcome is a separation after the children have grown and the women descend into a never-ending spiral of poverty after leaving with nothing.

The member for Waterford is right in her assertion that a woman carrying an unwanted pregnancy to term quadruples the odds that she and her child will live in poverty. This is a cycle that becomes harder and harder to break. She and her child are now more vulnerable than ever to entering abusive and violent relationships. The knowledge that a woman possesses—better than anyone else, I might add—that she is not socially, emotionally or financially capable of supporting a child is apparently not considered a valid reason for termination of pregnancy. That is a social reason and the woman and child must now be resigned to their potential state of impending poverty. Perhaps if we had a viable and supportive social welfare network this may not be the case, but that would be socialism.

I am not insensible to the fact that had abortion been legal and accessible some 40-odd years ago perhaps I may not be here today. I do not think I would begrudge my mother for having looked at all the options in front of her. I am sure it was not her plan to have to leave school and to be married before she could vote. I am not yet at the point where I think I am the centre of the universe. Maybe she could have finished high school. I know she wanted a career. She could have studied, she could have travelled—all the things anyone would wish for their teenage daughter. Her life has been transformed, but I would not deny her that. I do not take anyone's support of this bill as an attack on me or women who make this decision.

I support the assertion that abortion is a health matter and not a criminal one. I have spent some considerable time in my professional career interpreting and applying the Criminal Code. While we may have prosecutorial guidelines pertaining to circumstances when a person should be charged, the continuing existence of that section means the act is itself criminal. Abortion is currently in the Criminal Code. It sits in chapter 22, Offences against morality. It sits between incest and indecent offences. It is a crime and it is only lawful in circumstances where the provisions of section 282 apply in that it is necessary to preserve a mother's life.

The 1986 ruling of *R v Bayliss and Cullen* made it quite clear that in Queensland abortion on request, section 282 notwithstanding, is not legal regardless of gestation, yet up to 14,000 occur in Queensland each year on the latest figures. I find it hard to believe that those 14,000 fell into the category of needing to preserve the life of the mother. For women to procure an abortion in today's setting they need to declare a mental infirmity or some other exigent medical reason, even when none actually exists. That is what is protecting women and practitioners from prosecution.

I would like to say a few things about the term 'viable'. This is important because it speaks to the issue of 22 weeks. I have heard here in this House that 22 weeks is viable and that 23 weeks is a grey area. This is nonsense. Clinical guidelines in Queensland are quite clear. Prior to 23 weeks, life-sustaining interventions are not recommended. At 23 weeks it is also not recommended, but a doctor may take the wishes of a parent into consideration. It is only at 24 weeks that intervention is recommended. There are medical cases from around the world that show viable births at that time, and do honourable members know why they make news? Because survival at that age is newsworthy! It is not the norm. They are in the single digits out of the hundreds of thousands of premie babies born every year throughout the world.

I might add that there is a big gap between the terms 'viable' and 'healthy'. If a baby is born at 22 weeks there is only a one per cent chance of that infant surviving to discharge. There is no data beyond six years; they do not make it. At 23 weeks 11 per cent will be discharged with 90 per cent dying before the age of six. If born at 23 weeks only one per cent will achieve a life without disability. I make no judgements about the parents facing these decisions. It is their decision and it is one done in consultation with their doctor and their beliefs, not in Galaxy polls and not in letter-writing campaigns.

I took the time to consider young women in my electorate, those most directly impacted by this legislation. I would like to mention Kendra, who contacted me. She wrote—

I am only 22 and I feel this Bill is essential to give young women who come into unexpected situations a safe choice.

...

Please be my voice for my generation and vote to approve this Bill.

I stand here to support the rights of Queensland women. No woman should be forced to carry to term a child she is not ready or capable of looking after because someone wholly unconnected to her feels the need to sit in judgement of her. Women are not merely engines of procreation. We are not incubators on two legs. A woman should be able to determine the direction her life takes. We will decide when we have our babies, and we will decide the circumstances in which we have them.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (12.19 pm): I rise to oppose the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. Many in this House want Queenslanders to believe that this bill is about women's health, about allowing them to have access to safe terminations and about removing the potential for them to be labelled a criminal. I accept many Queenslanders would consider that removing abortion from the Criminal Code and clarifying that it is sometimes tragically necessary for medical reasons or in instances of incest or rape is a reasonable outcome, but this bill does not do that. This bill goes far, far further. This bill is far more radical.

Yes, this bill decriminalises terminations so that women and health practitioners will not be criminally responsible while ensuring unqualified persons are still criminally responsible, but this bill allows terminations on demand by a medical practitioner on and up to 22 weeks gestation. This bill allows terminations by a medical practitioner after 22 weeks if they are satisfied that it is appropriate when considering all of the following: all relevant medical circumstances; the woman's current and future physical, psychological and social circumstances; and the professional standards and guidelines that apply.

Yes, this bill allows registered health practitioners, doctors and nurses to conscientiously object and not advise, perform or assist in a termination, but it also requires that same practitioner to refer the woman to another health practitioner who the first health practitioner believes will perform the termination. The bill creates an offence for persons who engage in prohibited conduct that is visual or audible and is likely to deter people within 150 metres of a termination service provider.

For me, it is pretty simple. While I accept that in some tragic situations abortions are sadly required, I believe that life is precious and that life starts at conception. Life does not start at 22 weeks, it does not start at 16 weeks, it does not start at four weeks; it starts at conception. I cannot support the proposal for 22-week on-demand abortions. I particularly cannot stomach an abortion for social reasons or that such could be allowed beyond 22 weeks. I know that babies born prematurely survive and that medical advances improve their chances each and every day.

Back in 2013 my nephew Dom was born at just 28 weeks and three days. He weighed 1.1 kilos. You could hold him in the palm of your hand. His skin was transparent. He was too small for nappies, but he still cried at birth. He was intubated for 24 hours, on a CPAP for eight weeks and in hospital for a total of 10 weeks. He left hospital one week before his original due date. He is now a bubbly, vivacious, train addicted young five-year-old, but the point is that he was a life at 1.1 kilograms, just as any other child delivered at term.

I also struggle with the fact that this bill goes to great lengths not to mention the words 'unborn child' or 'abortion'. I refer members and members of the public to the contribution of my colleague the shadow Attorney-General, the member for Toowoomba South, where he listed every single piece of state legislation that refers to unborn children. In so doing, this bill creates anomalies and uncertainties, but I do not want members to take my word for it. I refer members to an article published on The Spectator website yesterday penned by Nicholas Aroney, a professor in constitutional law at the University of Queensland. It is titled, 'The mental gymnastics of Queensland's abortion bill'. Time does

not allow me to read the entire article into *Hansard*, so I encourage both members of parliament and the public to read it in full on the website. After referring to current High Court challenges regarding Tasmania and Victoria's abortion laws, Professor Aroney states—

There is, however, another provision in the Queensland Termination of Pregnancy Bill that has escaped attention so far. The provision is section 6(3), which says that in an emergency a medical practitioner may perform a termination on a woman who is more than 22 weeks pregnant if it is necessary to save the woman's life or the life of another unborn child.

The evident principle here is that saving someone's life is of such overriding importance that it may justify performing an abortion. Section 6(3) recognises that in some tragic circumstances a woman may be pregnant with two or more unborn children and aborting one child may be necessary to save the life of the other.

But notice this: Section 6(3) says that what we are dealing with here is the life of an unborn child. That is what it literally says. It is not an embryo. It is not a foetus. It is an unborn child.

And it is an unborn child whose life is of such value that it is worth saving. Just as worth saving as the life of the woman who is bearing the child. Both are lives of inestimable value and both are worth saving.

However, there are of course three lives in view, even though only two of them are mentioned in the bill. The first is the life of the woman. The second is the life of the first unborn child.

But there is a third life here as well. It is the unborn child whose life will be brought to an end because an abortion is necessary to save the life of his or her sister or brother or mother.

Sometimes very tragic decisions like these have to be made. It is understandable that the Termination of Pregnancy Bill makes provision for such situations.

However, what no one seems to have noticed is that section 6(3) gives rise to a strange anomaly which, if enacted into law, will require some spectacular mental gymnastics to overcome.

The problem is caused by the fact that the bill speaks only of the termination of pregnancy. It never says clearly and plainly that the purpose of the law is to legalise abortion.

Professor Aroney continues—

The Termination of Pregnancy Bill never refers to abortion or the inducement of miscarriages. It refers only to the termination of pregnancy.

This creates an anomaly for section 6(3) in circumstances where a woman is pregnant with two or more unborn children and it is necessary to abort one child in order to save the life of the other unborn child. For if a woman is pregnant with twins and one of the twins is aborted, the woman is still pregnant. Her pregnancy has not been terminated. But if her pregnancy has not been terminated then section 6(3) will not operate to authorise the conduct of the abortion.

He concludes with the following—

While this may be so, statutes should not be drafted in a way that obscures their intent. There is something wrong with a law that does not state expressly and clearly its intended scope and operation. We all know that the bill is about abortion, but the bill never says so expressly.

Why is this so?

I believe that is a question that deserves an answer from the minister and the government potentially as they sum up the second reading debate.

If time permitted I would like to also unpack the lamentable situation regarding adoptions in this state. This situation could have been improved had the government taken a broader approach when considering unplanned pregnancies.

Before I conclude I want to address some comments to those who share my concerns. I do not know how this vote is going to conclude, but whether the law succeeds or fails we need to consider how we respond. I, like you, worry about where we are heading as a society. As a husband, a father of five brilliant kids and an evangelical Christian, I worry about the world they are going to live in. As challenging as the changes that have occurred and may occur are, it is beholden on us to respond appropriately. I do not support condemnation. I do not condone vitriol. I do not condone abuse. It is not the solution, even when we are demonised for our views and our beliefs. Similarly, I do not believe that isolating ourselves from a society we increasingly disagree with is the way to go either.

If you, like me, value life, then I pray we will demonstrate comfort, support, love, grace and forgiveness to any woman experiencing an unplanned pregnancy and to all those who do not share our beliefs. I cannot and will not support this bill, and I cannot and will not support any amendments.

Debate, on motion of Mr Powell, adjourned.

WORKING WITH CHILDREN LEGISLATION (INDIGENOUS COMMUNITIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (12.29 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities (Justice, Land and Other Matters) Act 1984 and the Working with Children (Risk Management and Screening) Act 2000 to allow for particular persons to provide services involving children in particular Indigenous communities. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Working with Children Legislation (Indigenous Communities) Amendment Bill 2018 [[1661](#)].

Tabled paper: Working with Children Legislation (Indigenous Communities) Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes [[1662](#)].

The objective of this bill is to provide a new blue card framework that empowers Indigenous communities to make decisions that best serve their interests in relation to child protection and the employment of community members.

The health, safety and wellbeing of all children is paramount and must continue to be the No. 1 priority of the community; however, the one-size-fits-all approach to the blue card system is having a negative impact on our first Australians within Indigenous communities in Queensland. The current blue card system contains significant limitations in the way it applies to the unique circumstances of Indigenous communities. This is resulting in missed opportunities for social and economic development.

There have been many instances of individuals being denied access to work due to the inflexibility of the current system. In a number of cases the local community, through community leaders, law enforcement and judicial representatives, has determined that the person poses no risk to children and that their employment would have broader positive community impacts. Feedback from community leaders, law enforcement and judicial representatives indicates that handing more decision-making power to the communities themselves will assist in opening up employment opportunities whilst maintaining child safety standards.

Specifically, the current blue card system contains the following limitations. There is no mechanism to allow the local community to have input into the issuing of blue cards for employment in that community, unless of course they have some appearance in an appeal process. No mechanism exists that recognises behavioural improvements and the positive impact the employment of an individual may have on the community. The current application process has no set time frame for the issuing of blue cards for individuals in Indigenous communities. This creates a significant barrier to accessing employment. The current application process does not allow an applicant to undertake work during the application process, even if it can be determined that the individual poses no threat to the safety of children. This can often result in the loss of long-term employment opportunities.

This bill creates a framework that overcomes these limitations by enabling the community justice group, as defined in the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities (Justice, Land and Other Matters) Act 1984, to make a binding recommendation to the chief executive to issue a positive notice to an individual for work within that community, even if the individual would be issued a negative notice by the chief executive due to previous criminal offences. That gives them the ability to override what otherwise would be a negative notice.

A community justice group typically includes elders, traditional owners, respected persons and community members of good standing. There are currently close to 50 community justice groups operating around the state. It is our expectation that they would also involve primarily the local police and, in circumstances, the local magistrate. That not only protects the community justice group itself but also gives input from other institutions into whether that would be approved. Additionally, the bill creates a time limit of three weeks for the chief executive to notify the community justice group of the proposed decision in relation to a community area application.

The policy objectives are achieved through the development of a new blue card assessment framework. The framework enables a community justice group to use its judgement, based on its knowledge of specific circumstances and the individual involved, to issue a binding recommendation to the chief executive to issue a restricted positive notice—it is not a notice forever; it is restricted to that community—where a negative notice would have been issued under the current system by the chief executive due to previous serious offences being committed by the applicant. A positive notice issued in this way can be used only in the specific community areas defined by the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities act.

I will outline the proposed new regime. An application is made to the chief executive and the applicant indicates that the application is for a restricted positive notice in a community area. A restricted positive notice allows the person to undertake employment only in the community in which the community justice group has jurisdiction. Where a community area application is made, the treatment of a narrow range of offences that would be classed as serious offences under a normal application is augmented to enable the application to be determined by the community justice group. These offences relate to stealing, burglary and unlawful entry of a vehicle and drug related offences. Upon receipt of the application, the chief executive has five business days in which to notify the community justice group that a community area application has been made. The notice must be in writing and include a copy of the application. Once the community justice group has been notified of the application, it may make a binding recommendation to the chief executive that an interim restricted positive notice is issued. That is an important point that I will come back to. This enables the applicant to undertake the regulated employment while the application is being considered.

When deciding to issue such a recommendation the community justice group will have regard to the following: any police information, investigative information or disciplinary information about the person that the group is aware of; whether, and in what capacity, the person has previously worked with children; the person's social standing and participation within the community area; whether, in the group's reasonable opinion, withholding the recommendation would have a negative impact on the social or economic wellbeing of the community area's inhabitants; and anything else the group reasonably considers relevant to the decision.

An important point is that, once a community area application is made, the chief executive has 21 days in which to decide whether to issue a positive or negative notice to the applicant. That is an important point to acknowledge. To put that in practical terms, if you are a schoolteacher, a principal or an education officer in Doomadgee and you finally have someone who has turned over a new leaf and is off the grog, off the drugs and turning up for work—often these people lack education in other areas and do not understand the system—the first thing you have to say is, 'Just stand aside for a while because we are going to have to review this. Just go home and stay on an even keel. We'll have you back.' That just does not work. A lot of these people are in a very vulnerable position. It is excruciatingly frustrating for people. If you talk to many people in the Mount Isa area who are seeing what is happening from afar, they will tell you that they have a good person turn up but they lose them because in that critical time they have had this negative feedback: 'You're not eligible, but come back when you are.' That is why the timing is crucial. We can say, 'Let's speed up the process.' That is good and that is welcomed, but unless you can keep them in that period you are really offsetting any good work you do in trying to recruit those people in the first place.

I would like to give members a bit of background to this bill. This bill was introduced during the last parliament, so I will be recycling some of the points I made when I introduced the bill then, but I think they are really important to make. The first time I became aware of this issue was when a bloke by the name of Clarence Waldron came to my attention after he got the job as the student attendance officer in Doomadgee. Clarence had a rap sheet probably three inches thick, to which he admits. He had an assault that was maybe four to six years old. When he got the job, the local police officer in charge said, 'This is a terrific outcome. Clarry's in great shape. He's turned up to school. Everyone in town thinks he is doing a wonderful job going and getting these kids to school.' Clarry was as proud as punch. He was looking as healthy and fit as I had ever seen him, because he had this job. He said, 'I've turned over a new leaf and I want to give something back to these kids.' People around town, who were not friends of Clarry, were saying, 'Clarry's going terrific in this job. He is doing a good job.' Everyone in Doomadgee—it was their kids he would be working with—wanted him to work there, but even on appeal—I was a witness at that appeal—he was rejected. To this day he still does not have a blue card. This bill is not about Clarry Waldron; this bill is about a lot of people like him in very similar positions in those communities.

Another example came to light when the committee went to the area during the last parliament. A young bloke came in and said, 'I can't get a blue card. I lost my job with BAS. We've got to do work at the schools and the hospital. Most of the work in Doomadgee requires me to go into the hospital and schools. I need a blue card or else I can't get work.' He was trying to put his life together for his wife and kids but he cannot now.

Some of those people will have disqualifying offences against their name, and we are not challenging that. If they have a disqualifying offence, fair enough. I would challenge it down the track but not in this bill, because there needs to be a point in time where we say, 'That might have been a serious offence 20 years ago, but at what point do we give this person another chance?' I estimate that

90 per cent of jobs would require a blue card in Doomadgee and most people in Doomadgee are having trouble getting a blue card. If we are trying to really help empower people to get work and take them off drugs and alcohol in these areas, this is something that we have to seriously look at. The longer I canvass this issue around Indigenous communities the stronger the feedback I get and the more people become aware how big a problem this is.

We are trying to attempt to address this problem. I am sure that everything here is being done with the best of intentions. Everyone wants to keep these kids safe. If we stand back and look, the blue card is trying to keep kids safe. If we are trying to keep kids safe in Doomadgee, one of the priorities should be getting mum back into work and giving people meaningful employment so that they can get off drugs and alcohol and get out of that cycle. If they are prevented from doing that, I would argue that we are putting just as much risk on the kid in that house because their parents cannot get a blue card. There needs to be an acknowledgement of the cost of trying to protect kids through the blue card system and the benefit there would be if we amended it so that it empowered the communities to make that decision.

Let us not forget that most of these communities we are talking about—in my area Doomadgee and Mornington are the discrete communities—only have about 2,000 people in them and in a community of 2,000 people everyone knows everyone. Everyone knows who the risks are with the kids. If they have consultation with the police, that can take the pressure off the local justice groups. It is really crazy at the moment where mums will be looking after kids at home and the same mum cannot get a job at the school to look after some of the same kids because she does not have a blue card. The kids will be living with the mum in the home, but when they walk two blocks to the school she cannot look after the same kids because someone signing off on blue cards down in Brisbane said, 'No, I don't want them there.'

I want to make another point on that in terms of one of my discussions with the officers, and I say this with the greatest respect to the officers. They have a job to do to keep kids safe under this legislation, but we were teasing out the issue. I said, 'If you've got a fifty-fifty, there's some subjectivity to this. If you've got a rap sheet for someone and you're saying, "Do we give this person a blue card in Doomadgee? Do we give Clarry Waldron one?", there must be some subjectivity,' to which the answer was, 'Yes, there is. There are some fifty-fifty calls on this.' I said, 'If they're fifty-fifty calls I hope you're putting a cross next to their name because we don't want to give you the latitude down here. You don't know if that person's going to put the child at risk,' to which the response was, 'Yes, we'd be likely to give it a cross.' That to me really cuts to the heart of this issue. There are people in Brisbane who have no idea who these people are. They just have pieces of paper giving them this information and they have little idea of the background or the circumstances of these offences and it is causing really big problems back in the communities because we need people in work.

This is such a big issue for me because if I have people in Mount Isa coming into my electorate office asking, 'Rob, what are you doing about these kids on the street? They're running around the street. A lot of these Indigenous kids are around the street. What are you doing about them?', I say, 'How long have you got, because I will tell you one thing I am trying to do is fix the blue cards in Doomadgee and some of these communities, because the reason some of these kids are running around in the street is that mum and dad are in a cycle of drinking alcohol.' They ask, 'Why are they doing that?' I say, 'Because they haven't got a job.' They ask, 'Why haven't they got a job?' I say, 'In many cases it's because of a blue card.' If we want to try to help these people—we can talk about tokenism and things that do not affect something—here is something that really affects them. Blue cards are one area where we can help them.

This might not be the greatest solution. It is the best thing I could come up with. I know there have been attempts to try to tighten it up, but it falls well short of what is needed. There are still people up there—we went up there for committee hearings—who have applied, applied and applied but are told that, no, they are not going to get it, and I refer back to Clarry Waldron who still cannot get it. I think Clarry said it best in Doomadgee in that committee hearing. When he was asked, 'What do you want?', he said, 'Clarry Waldron can go back to the Clarry we knew back then. I can go back, but at what stage do I get an opportunity to go forward? Because going forward for me is trying to help kids in the town and be a positive influence, but I can't get a blue card, end of story.' I am sure there are hundreds of Clarry Waldrons up there who we should be trying to help go forward and we are not. We are putting the brakes on.

We have been nice about this issue. We have been politely trying to push it, but it is time to act on it. I get stirred up about it because we know of the hardship and all of the adversity that people face in these communities and then we get the ones who are trying to have a go and we are knocking them

down with these blue cards. Some people still will not get through the system, but there are a lot of people out there who deserve a go and deserve a break. With this bill we can help empower them and the local communities to have more decision-making powers, and that is how it should be. I am sure everyone would agree that that is how the system should be—that is, giving them more autonomy at the local level and not us making decisions on their behalf down here.

I speak with a bit of emotion here because so many social issues that we are experiencing in the north come back to this issue. This is not a silver bullet. It is not going to solve everything, but it is something staring us in the face that has not been addressed. This is the second time I have put this bill before the parliament, but it is five years too late. People really need to look at this and, if they have problems with it, I ask them to please talk to us. We are happy to look at amendments, but the issue is there. It is real and we need to get these people into employment. We need to make blue cards localised, which was never my idea. It was brought to me jointly by the local justice group in Mornington Island that was trying to figure out ways around this issue and also people in government jobs in Mount Isa asking, 'Rob, can you do something about this blue card? We've got great people. We've finally got someone in Doomadgee to fill that position. They're great, but we can't get them the blue card, or the first message we're giving them is to go home.'

I know people are going to have problems with the fact that they will be preapproved before they have gone through that analysis by the local justice group for a period—that is, one month or two months. One might think, 'That's a huge risk,' but I always come back to the fact that it is a much greater risk to sit here and do nothing. Those people deserve a right to get back into and engage in society. Everyone formulated the blue card system with the best of intentions, but it is an issue that is boiling away and getting worse out there. It has to be put back in front of this parliament. I will not accept talk about helping these communities without addressing this issue, because I think this is a very big issue that is confronting them, which needs to be addressed.

First Reading

Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (12.47 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2900, on motion of Dr Miles—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (12.47 pm): I rise today to speak to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. This is an extremely complex, personal and emotive issue for all Queenslanders, as are all matters concerning life or death. I would like to acknowledge the opinions of those on both sides of this debate. The LNP party room voted unanimously in favour of a conscience vote on this bill and it is with my conscience that I oppose Labor's extreme Termination of Pregnancy Bill. I strongly believe in the sanctity of human life and feel we should make every effort to protect that life, particularly when it comes to our most innocent and vulnerable. Queensland law has always allowed for an abortion when the pregnancy endangers the life of the mother. However, this same law has always been carefully balanced against the desire to uphold the sanctity of life of the unborn child. As described by Justice McGuire when he spoke of the common law tradition of sanctity of human life, he said—

The law in this State has not abdicated its responsibility as a guardian of the silent innocence of the unborn. It should rightly use its authority to see that abortion on whim or caprice does not insidiously filter into our society. There is no legal justification for abortion on demand.

Justice McGuire's words would resonate with many Queenslanders and I am sure they resonate with some members of this chamber. This legislation strips away the critical balance that we have always sought to achieve between protecting the sanctity of life of the unborn child and the health and wellbeing of the mother. Reasonable people might believe that, where a pregnancy has resulted from an act of criminal violence, the fate of the pregnancy should be solely the decision of the mother and that we as a society should do whatever we can to support the mother, whichever path she chooses. Reasonable people might also believe—as do I—that, where there is no criminal violence and no medical danger, it is our responsibility to not only support the mother but also protect the life of the unborn child. That is the balance that the Queensland law achieves right now and it is as close as we can get to justice on this fraught issue.

There is no balance in this legislation. Labor's extreme abortion bill will allow the termination of pregnancy for any reason, including gender selection, up to 22 weeks. Labor's Termination of Pregnancy Bill is more extreme than legislation in other western nations. We can look at very socially progressive countries such as Norway, Denmark, France or Belgium and find that even they do not have abortion laws as extreme as this bill. For all of those countries, and many others in the Western World, the cut-off for abortion on demand is 12 weeks, not Labor's 22 weeks.

In Germany, between 12 weeks and 22 weeks abortion is allowed only on the grounds of medical necessity, that is, to prevent danger to the mother's life or grave injury to her physical and mental health and if the danger cannot be reasonably averted another way. If Labor were proposing a law such as the law in Germany, France, Belgium, Norway, or Denmark, a reasonable person might accept it, but Labor is proposing only an extreme, take-it-or-leave-it, unlimited abortion up to 22 weeks and no meaningful restraints after 22 weeks.

Labor's Termination of Pregnancy Bill will allow for abortion for undefined social reasons, including gender selection, up to 22 weeks. Further, the absolute abhorrence of this bill is that, beyond 22 weeks and right up to birth, there are no serious enforceable restraints on abortion. This bill gives one doctor total power to decide whether a very late-term abortion is reasonable even on social grounds. There is no panel of specialists or ethics committee involved. Nobody can challenge the doctor's decision, even if it is a doctor with a commercial interest in the abortion. The doctor is meant to get another doctor's opinion but, if that step is not fulfilled, there is no penalty under this bill. This bill is wide open to abuse with no meaningful restraint on late-term abortions.

Another way to understand how extreme this legislation is is that, in Queensland, the birth of a baby after 20 weeks must officially be registered. If the baby is not born alive, a death certificate must be provided. If the birth of a premature baby at 20 weeks requires a birth and/or death certificate, why can someone stand here today and consciously vote in favour of legislation that will legalise abortion of an entirely healthy baby from an entirely healthy mother at 22 weeks?

I acknowledge that, in a happy situation, no woman chooses to seek an abortion. The decision to abort an unexpected or unplanned pregnancy is often heavily influenced by many external factors, including financial, psychological, social and physiological circumstances. In a civilised society, when a woman finds herself unexpectedly pregnant, it is our duty as fellow citizens and legislators to ensure that all reasonable measures are in place to support that person. However, this extreme Labor legislation is concerned only with procuring an abortion. It fails to provide a structure of support for women through counselling, pregnancy support services, a cooling-off period and other important safeguards that could make all the difference to women who feel that they have no choice other than to abort their pregnancy.

It has been claimed repeatedly that abortion is wholly and solely a health issue, but pregnancy is not a disease or an illness. Pregnancy is an opportunity for new life. Unless pregnancy threatens the health of the mother, I challenge the notion that abortion is solely a health issue.

I am gravely concerned that this bill fails to provide safeguards for doctors, nurses and support staff to conscientiously object to abortion. Clause 8 of this bill criminalises any doctor in Queensland who refuses to cooperate with a request for an abortion, even after 20 weeks, even when there is no medical justification for abortion, even for sex selection. I believe that any change to the abortion law in Queensland must fundamentally protect the beliefs and values of doctors, medical staff, cleaners, nurses and administrators who cannot in sincere conscience participate in such a procedure.

I cannot stand here and support a bill that is as open to abuse as this one, that offers no structure of support to the mother, no protection for the life of the unborn child and no respect for the conscience of doctors and nurses. I add that the AMA's decision to endorse this extreme Labor bill can be regarded only as abandoning the welfare of the not born yet. It is very disappointing that the AMA made that decision without surveying its members.

I ask everybody in this chamber to look to their conscience and ask themselves seriously: is this is best we can do? Will this legislation stand the test of time—or have we just wasted a lot of time in this chamber on debating something that does not walk a sensible path that the people of Queensland can respect, that does not provide the protections and the safeguards that we know people need? We can do a much better job than this legislation. I think the people of Queensland deserve much better than this legislation. This legislation is extreme, it is unjust and I oppose it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Before I call the member for Miller, joining us in the gallery today we have student leaders from Alexandra Hills State High School in the electorate of Capalaba.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (12.57 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. I start by acknowledging the very heartfelt and sincere perspectives that people have on this matter on both sides of the issue. I would like to acknowledge and thank all members for a very respectful debate. I think that it is to the credit of the parliament that it has been so.

This bill is about women. It is about trusting women to make their own health and medical decisions for themselves, because they are in the best place to make those decisions. I would like to acknowledge all the women who for many years—and many decades, many generations—have fought for their rights and the rights of other women and for their leadership on this issue, including the women in the government and across the Queensland community, including the Labor movement.

It is well known that I have been a long-time supporter of the decriminalisation of abortion in Queensland. For many years, I have been vocal on this matter. I believe that no-one in my electorate or in the wider community would be surprised to hear my stance today. Health and medical matters are an issue for a woman and her doctor to discuss. They are not a matter for the Criminal Code. In terms of fertility and pregnancy, the time is certainly long overdue in our state for women to stop being criminalised for making their own health choices in consultation with their doctor. Although it may be true that there have been few or no convictions under the current laws, it is undeniable that the current law has been used as a weapon against women—outside clinics, in hospitals, in workplaces, in lounge rooms, in discussions; in so many places—and it is time for that era to end.

The first issue of importance is access to terminations on request up to 22 weeks gestation. That has been an issue that has been well raised by many people. There are many reasons a woman may seek a termination of a pregnancy. It is not my role, nor any other person's role, nor the role of the government or the police, to judge those reasons. That medical decision should be made by a woman in consultation with her doctor or doctors. We know that a woman who has a much wanted pregnancy may be faced with the terrible decision as to whether to continue a pregnancy based on adverse medical advice about the viability of her pregnancy. The gestation limit of 22 weeks will give a woman who receives a poor or fatal foetal diagnosis at her 18- to 20-week scan the time she needs to seek further expert medical opinions and make difficult decisions without feeling rushed.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

 **Mr BAILEY:** It is vitally important, not just for women in my electorate who, as residents of Brisbane, have access to health service options, but also to women who live in regional and remote areas of Queensland who require extra time to travel to meet with doctors, make important decisions and travel to a medical facility.

This bill also reflects the reality that a very low number of terminations may occur after the 22nd week of pregnancy. South Australia is one of the only states to collect and publish data relating to terminations. In that state over 90 per cent of abortions occur in the first trimester each year with less than two per cent occurring after 20 weeks gestation. These are wanted pregnancies that involve complex and very personal circumstances. It may be that there is a great danger to the mother or child or both or a termination may be required to save the life of another foetus in a multiple pregnancy and difficult decisions must be made. This bill seeks to reflect that reality rather than shaming and criminalising the women facing these difficult decisions. As part of this bill, after 22 weeks gestation two doctors must agree that performing an abortion is appropriate in all of the circumstances. There has been some very irresponsible and, to be frank, clear untruths being circulated regarding this bill, in particular on social media, designed to scare and to mislead people.

Another important aspect of this bill is the introduction of safe access zones. There are a number of medical facilities on the south side that offer reproductive health services and some of these have been targeted by those verbally abusing, threatening and impeding entry of the women and men who attend these clinics, as well as the medical staff who work there every single day. This bill proposes to establish safe zones around the entrances of medical facilities that provide termination of pregnancy

services. This is to protect the safety, wellbeing and to respect the privacy and dignity of people accessing medical services—a basic human right—provided at termination services premises as well as people who need to access those premises in the course of their duties and responsibilities. Earlier this year we saw New South Wales become the fifth Australian jurisdiction to enact legislation that establishes safe access zones around facilities that provide termination services. I believe it is a fundamental right to access any health service without fear of harassment or intimidation.

Another important aspect of the bill is the provisions for conscientious objectors. We recognise that some practitioners may wish to exercise their right to conscientious objection to termination of pregnancy services. However, it is important to note that all women need to have certainty in access to the medical services that they require. For this reason doctors who have a conscientious objection will be required to refer their patient on to another health professional who does not have a conscientious objection. This will be particularly important for women in regional and remote communities.

It is time to move on from the 19th century—1899, in fact—when the current bills were drafted. We are a different society. We are a different community. Our medical knowledge, the quality of our health care and respect for the rights of people to live freely and make their own decisions have all advanced and expanded immeasurably in the last 119 years. I respect women who do not support abortion and their choice to lead their own lives accordingly and I acknowledge their sincerely held beliefs. However, I do not believe it is right or fair for one group's moral framework to be imposed on others by the state to override the legitimately held view that women should have the right to make their own choices with their health.

The current laws do not provide certainty or fairness for patients or for health professionals. Abortion is a personal health matter. It does not belong in the Criminal Code. It has been estimated that one in four women in Australia will terminate a pregnancy for a variety of reasons and circumstances. These are our partners, our mothers, our sisters and our friends; they are our workmates and they are our neighbours. Opportunities like this come very rarely in our state and I commend the many generations of women who have fought for the reform. We in support of this reform stand upon their shoulders. In the context of the domination of men exercising power that has prevailed for millennia across most cultures, it is the modern values of this era that have challenged the subjugation of women, challenged the denial of women and challenged the control of women. Over time we have reformed the law and I see this in that context. Those sections in the Criminal Code should be repealed.

I respect the fact that other people have different moral views on this, but my belief is that the rights of an individual start at birth. Until that point, a foetus is dependent on the mother and it is the mother's right to make her own health and medical decisions. While I have respect for the member for Caloundra and the sincerity of his views, I cannot support his amendments. I think it is a robust piece of work from the Queensland Law Reform Commission and, in fact, I find it demeaning that counselling has to be mandated. I think women and their doctors are best placed to deal with those issues. To make it compulsory for counselling to be offered, when I think it is pretty obvious that if you need it it is there, is demeaning to women.

In relation to social circumstances, there are myriad issues for women to deal with in terms of pregnancy. It is not our role in a blanket way to make those decisions for women. In terms of referrals, women must have access to health services wherever they may be. It is not appropriate for women to have the threat over their heads of the Criminal Code. I am hopeful that this bill will pass and those sections will be repealed. I acknowledge all those who have fought for this reform: people I have worked with closely and members of the Labor movement. I acknowledge all of the women over many generations who have been an important part of this reform process, especially Alana and Jess Tibbitts in recent times. Abortion is not an issue for the Criminal Code; it is an issue for women. I trust women. I hope this parliament trusts women. If it does it will be an historic day.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (2.07 pm): From the beginning and for the record, my personal view is that abortion is a private matter that should be discussed and decided by the woman, her family and her doctor. For absolute clarity, I believe it should not be included in the Criminal Code. The provisions and penalties in section 224, 225 and 226 more closely reflect the views of 1899 rather than 2018. As members of this place we have an important job to not only ensure that the laws we pass are good for the Queensland community but also reflect to some extent their expectations. Over 150 years the sheer amount of legislation that has been passed through this place means there are anachronisms and loopholes that it is our job to fix. We should do so effectively and leave the provisions in a better condition than before we considered them. We should also, where debate requires it, consider matters appropriately. Governments should not display arrogance in presenting legislation, they should not rush those things that should be thoroughly considered and they should not be afraid of, ignore or deride different opinions.

Despite my personal view that sections 224 to 226 of the Criminal Code should be repealed, I have concerns about other provision in this bill, as well as the conduct of the government in presenting this bill to the House. The issue of choice is complex and delicate enough without conflating it with another very complex issue: free speech. This bill, as we have heard, includes provisions that would seek to exclude people from a zone around a premises that was conducting termination services. As we know, this matter has been debated in other jurisdictions.

The question here is whether the obvious limitation on free speech is justified. A woman should not be harassed or intimidated at a deeply personal and vulnerable time. I accept submissions to the effect that these kinds of protests can be distinguished from other forms of protests, such as those we see outside this place, because they have the ability to inflict direct harm or distress to another individual. However, the sufficiency of existing laws must be considered. We already have laws that prohibit conduct that seeks to harass, intimidate or create a public nuisance. Full consideration has not been given to whether existing laws are sufficient.

Further, consideration has not been given to why these particular circumstances require specific provisions and whether those broader provisions should be strengthened to remedy some form of deficiency as opposed to targeting a specific form of expression. In addition, arguments put forward for prohibiting certain conduct make few attempts to distinguish different forms of conduct. It is also poor form of the government to try to use a previous committee's deliberations on a different bill with different access zones. There are also arguments in favour of exclusion zones that would seek to distinguish activities within those zones such that they would allow activities supporting termination and prohibit those against termination. Conceivably, the same action, for example counselling, could be undertaken in the attempt to have the woman reach two opposite outcomes. It would be difficult and problematic for a law to seek to distinguish between the two intents. This has not been fully resolved.

To underscore the complexity of these matters, it is again worth noting that they are currently being considered by the High Court of Australia. Their presentation in this place as part of this bill is unnecessary at this time and underscores the conduct of the government on the issue. This bill should be a simple consideration of repealing the relevant sections of the Criminal Code. The government has decided that it would prefer to crash forward with provisions that are not clear-cut, that confuse the more important issue, that have not been considered appropriately and that are currently subject to review by the High Court. That behaviour was most stark when the government members of the committee saw fit not only to comment on the content of the bill but also on the manner in which members of this House should vote. The recommendation by the committee for a conscience vote was unprecedented. It shows a Labor government that is so arrogant and so focused on ramming through its agenda that it is willing to cast aside proper parliamentary process and conventions.

I also reject the virulent comments made yesterday by the member for South Brisbane that speeches against the bill are about repressing women. Such statements have no place in a conscience debate in this place. It is a sad day when, because of political arrogance, we are not debating the really important issue and are not able to consider it on its own merits. I hold little hope that the government will heed these comments, set aside consideration of the disputed areas and allow the House to focus on the core issue of repealing sections 224 to 226.

I know that people will look at the vote on this issue and judge our voting record. That is an important accountability. However, we deliberate for a reason. In this place speeches are important and I hope that my comments are read in conjunction with my vote. When it comes to my vote, I cannot support the amendments and I cannot support this Labor bill.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.12 pm): I rise to speak to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. Today, we have a great responsibility. What we say and do today will affect the lives of thousands of Queenslanders for many years to come. Unfortunately, it will affect the lives of many thousands of unborn children as well. Today especially, political allegiances count for little. Like members on both sides of the chamber and on the crossbenches, I have received phone calls, emails and letters imploring me to vote one way or another on this bill. However, today we meet in this place as the elected representatives of our constituents. We must uphold the spirit of this place and truly represent those Queenslanders who empowered us to represent them.

I will be voting against this bill. The reason for that is simple: the overwhelming feedback from my electorate is to not support the legislation. My vote is about representing my constituents and it is about refusing to accept bad legislation. This bill will allow adults to put their unborn babies to death at up to 22 weeks gestation on demand, no questions asked. Advances in medical practices and procedures mean that unborn babies as young as 22 weeks have a chance of survival, that will only improve in line with medical advances.

Today, many will rise to speak about rights: the rights of mothers, the rights of the children and even the rights of the medical practitioners. My constituents also have rights and among them is the right to representation in this parliament. The key objection that I have heard from my constituents relates to late-term terminations. The overwhelming message from my constituents is that termination after 22 weeks is not acceptable unless it is absolutely necessary to save the mother's life.

What horrifies me is that, for a woman who is more than 22 weeks pregnant, a termination may be performed by a medical practitioner where the specified ground is satisfied and there has been consultation with another medical practitioner who concurs. The single broadly expressed ground is that the medical practitioner considers that the termination should in all the circumstances be performed having regard to all relevant medical circumstances, the woman's current and future physical, psychological and social circumstances, and the professional standards and guidelines that apply to the medical practitioner in relation to the performance of terminations. I note an exception to strict compliance with the requirements for a termination after 22 weeks is made in the case of an emergency to save the woman or, in the case of a multiple pregnancy, another unborn child's life. I shudder to think that a woman and perhaps her partner would consider terminating a life because it is the wrong sex, their relationship has dissolved, it is no longer convenient to have a baby or the mother has lost her job. To me, that is nothing short of murder.

Like members on both sides of the chamber, I have heard the emotive arguments. My office has received the letters and the emails from both sides of this campaign containing horrific material. Many have said that termination of pregnancy should not be a criminal matter and I agree. However, it also should not be a political issue driven by ideology. To use such an emotive issue for political gain or newspaper headlines should be condemned by all of us in this place. Why? Because it is well and truly condemned by the majority of the public who want their elected representatives to get on with the job of listening to them and representing them in this place. To attempt to wedge Queenslanders against each other for political gain is simply abhorrent. To taunt and throw around accusations illustrates perfectly why many in our communities are disillusioned.

Personally, I admire people who are passionate about issues that are important to them; people who can give their point of view and also listen to the alternative arguments in a respectful way. I have no admiration for those who dismiss civility and respect just because another person disagrees with them. As elected representatives, we should be setting the standards. We should be illustrating that we must listen to those with opposite opinions and consider their arguments, to ensure that our arguments and opinions are sound.

There can be no greater debate than a debate about health, a debate about life and death. However, we must be careful that the debate is an accurate debate. To argue for this legislation on the grounds of preventing prosecution is a petty argument to say the least. While many Queenslanders will raise concerns about our judicial system, I have faith that the Queensland judicial system does not and will not prosecute a woman for terminating a pregnancy when it is done in the right way and for the right reasons.

As I mentioned earlier, feedback from my constituents is not to support this legislation, but it must also be noted that this is flawed legislation. To allow late-term abortions without counselling provisions shows a lack of respect for women and their partners, where applicable, when making one of life's toughest decisions. Not including guarantees that women are not being forced or coerced into these procedures is, again, disrespectful to women and fraught with danger. As leaders of our community, we should be ensuring that there is support for women and their partners during such a difficult time, but this legislation does not do that.

We must strike a balance between ensuring access to safe health services and the expectations of the community. We can ensure the rights of women whilst ensuring there are protections in place for those women who are deliberately misled about these procedures. I can respect women who make a conscience decision while, at the same time, supporting those who are coerced or threatened into seeking to terminate a pregnancy. This legislation does not achieve any of those things.

Earlier I mentioned that issues like this must be debated in a respectful manner. I would like to especially pay tribute to those who provided submissions to the committee, whether it be in writing or in person. It takes great bravery for you to share your stories. Even though I may not agree with your point of view, I do want you to know that I admire you for having the courage to make your voice heard.

This legislation is not in line with community expectations and certainly not that of my electorate of Burdekin. My constituents have told me that they do not support late-term abortion regardless of any claim that it is rare. This legislation does not provide the support and safeguards that women in Queensland deserve. Put simply, this legislation falls well short of the mark and for these reasons I will not be supporting it. I urge all members of this House to do the same.



Hon. LM ENOCH (Algerster—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (2.20 pm): I rise to support the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. I was very fortunate to grow up in a family home where everyone was welcome. My father was one of 15 and my mother, when she married my father as an 18-year-old, became a sister, cousin and aunty to a vast extended family. I always remember there being people staying at our home—sometimes just for a night, sometimes for a few days and sometimes for weeks, months and even years depending on the circumstances.

We had aunties travel from Far North Queensland to stay whilst they had their babies. We had uncles from rural Queensland stay to receive medical attention. We had cousins who lived with mum and dad for months on end whilst they studied at university. It was very normal to have people staying with us—something I proudly continue in my own home with my two sons.

When I was very young—maybe around six or seven—I was so accustomed to family and friends staying with us that it did not faze me when someone new arrived at the house. I gave up my bed and had the exciting chance to sleep in the lounge room, which was pretty normal. I had never seen this woman before and I have never seen her since. She was younger than my mother. She was a tall, smart and beautiful Indigenous woman.

I remember, however, that she had a terrible sadness about her. She cried a lot and even though she had all of us she seemed quite alone. I remember my mother comforting her and counselling her—seriously, that is my mum. Her story was a fleeting one in my life, but it is one that has stayed with me all my life. It is a story that formed my pro-choice position. She was staying at our house and travelling the next day to New South Wales to terminate a pregnancy because it was illegal in Queensland. My mum tried to explain it to me and I pieced the rest together by quietly reading the energy in my surroundings, as many kids do.

She had made an agonising decision. It was one that weighed heavily on her. She was not in this position because she was irresponsible or a terrible human being or a murderer or stupid or any of the things that those opposed to this bill would have us think about women. She had thought this through. She had received medical advice related to her own complex medical situation and she had reached a conclusion that this was the best choice for her.

As a small child I remember thinking how hard it must have been for her to be going through this so far from her family—how hard it must have been to navigate the judgement of others, to speak to medical professionals and to step into a very foreign set of circumstances. I should be clear. My mother, as a Christian woman, is by no means pro abortion. I do not think anybody is. We had been raised to show love and compassion to others, to check our assumptions and to avoid judging the decisions of others. That is how my Christian home raised all of us.

This bill is fundamentally about the right of a woman to make the best decision for her and her circumstances and it supports the fact that it is fundamentally a decision that is between her and her medical practitioner, not anyone else—including the criminal justice system. The fact that we still have laws that belong to a time when women could not even vote, a time when a woman's body, her assets, her views all belonged to a male dominated structure is so far from what is considered a modern community's expectations.

I want to be part of a society that allows women choices, even if not everyone agrees. I want to be part of a society that values the relationship between a woman and her medical practitioner and I want to be part of a society that does not degrade, judge or condemn a woman for her choices. I want to be part of a community and a society that opens its doors and that shows love and compassion the same way my mum and dad showed love and compassion to that young woman all those years ago.

There has been a lot of information from multiple sources coming into my electorate office in the last few weeks. Some of this material has been incredibly distressing. Facts have been twisted and lies have been peddled in this debate. Every time I see this horrible, hateful material I think about that young woman who stayed with our family. I think about other women in my life who have been confronted with similar situations and how they have had to navigate a system that does not trust their ability to make informed and considered decisions. This legislation is about providing a full range of safe, accessible and timely reproductive services for women.

The Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018 reflects the positions of informed healthcare organisations and stakeholders, including the Australian Medical Association and the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. It is consistent with other Australian jurisdictions and will bring our current law in line with contemporary and safe clinical practice.

This is a bill about dignity and respect. It is disappointing that we have not always seen that in this debate. I am personally appalled at the baseless attacks on my parliamentary colleagues. Every time I hear these kinds of attacks I think of myself as that six- or seven-year-old child and what I witnessed of somebody who had made an agonising decision. I cannot imagine that kind of hatefulness being pushed onto someone in that situation.

We are standing on the shoulders of countless women who have fought inside this place and in the community to get a common-sense approach to what is fundamentally a health issue. I pay my respect to these women who have worked tirelessly on this issue. This debate is charged and it is intense, but your voices are powerful. Your contribution is meaningful and your struggles are recognised. We would not be here today without the collective strength and resilience that you have all provided.

I want to also acknowledge the hard work of my colleagues—the Deputy Premier, the Premier, the Minister for Health and the Attorney-General—who have navigated this very complex legislation through all of the emotions and the concerns that people have had. It has been a brave and outstanding approach to something that is really about human dignity. This legislation is historic. I for one am happy to support the bill and be on the right side of history for the sake of that woman all those years ago and all women who will go after us and have the opportunity to make dignified, informed decisions and not feel the brunt of judgement and harassment.

I cannot stop thinking about this woman. She has been on my mind from the beginning of this legislation. I think about her travelling from a very remote part of Queensland and being with a family that she only knew through relatives and what she went through. I cannot imagine what she would have faced if she had to go through what some women in Queensland have had to go through because of this archaic legislation. I do not want that for any other woman in this state ever again. I absolutely commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (2.28 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. Before talking in detail about the bill, I would like to place on record my congratulations to the Duke and Duchess of Sussex, who are visiting Australia, on their announcement that they are expecting their first child.

Returning to the bill, I have taken the time to consider the legislation, the views of my electorate and the LNP party policy position. LNP members have a conscience vote on this issue so they may determine, on the basis of their personal beliefs, experience and input from their constituencies, how they wish to vote on this legislation. I do not support this legislation and will be voting against this bill and any proposed amendments.

It is proposed in this legislation that a medical practitioner be allowed to perform a lawful termination on demand during the first 22 weeks of pregnancy. After 22 weeks of pregnancy, if the medical practitioner considers that the termination should be performed and has consulted with another medical practitioner who also agrees, that termination should be performed. This bill legalises abortion on demand and legalises abortion to birth.

Like many of those opposing the bill, I have grave concerns as to the 22-week gestation on-demand threshold, the lawful potential for late-gestation terminations for undefined social reasons, the lack of true and complete conscientious objection for medical professionals, and the potential unconstitutionality of the safe access zone provisions. It is my view that this is poor legislation that proposes to radically overhaul the law in Queensland. As the opposition leader, Deb Frecklington, said in this House, this is a badly crafted bill and she is correct, I believe, in this interpretation. I, too, do not believe abortion should be available on demand and this bill has been badly crafted from the beginning.

There were abhorrent bills presented in the previous parliament by the former member for Cairns. The Labor government then referred this matter to the Queensland Law Reform Commission and it did so to keep this issue out of the public arena during the 2017 state election campaign. This is not about a more workable framework for our health professionals or, for that matter, improving services to families in regional or isolated areas. This bill, unfortunately, is about ideology—and, unfortunately, that ideology seeks to divide and turn us against each other.

As we heard from the shadow Attorney-General and member for Toowoomba South, the law relating to abortion has deep and significant roots in the common law and statutory framework over the centuries. The adoption of anti-abortion statutory measures from the mid-19th century was a natural progression of the long common law history regulating abortion in this state. We saw this in 1986 when the District Court Judge McGuire held that abortion is lawful in Queensland where it is carried out to prevent serious danger to a woman's physical and mental health from the continuance of the

pregnancy. Judge McGuire added that 'there is no legal justification for abortion on demand'. This decision remains the current legal basis for exemption from criminal liability for procuring an abortion in Queensland.

We know that there are approximately 14,000 abortions performed in Queensland every year—in complete accordance with the common law's interpretation of the Queensland Criminal Code. Many of these abortions are conducted in connection with severe foetal abnormalities and which lawfully seek to preserve the mental health of the mother. This is the legal framework on which laws relating to the termination of pregnancy stand today.

No-one in this House would hold the view that a woman should run the risk of going to jail for having an abortion. It is not right for supporters of this bill to say that this is just about decriminalising abortion in Queensland. It is not. No convictions have ever been recorded in Queensland of a woman, even though there have been thousands of abortions performed every year. As I and other speakers have already outlined, abortions are conducted lawfully in Queensland every year. Safe termination of pregnancy is available now.

One has to question: why is this Labor government progressing down such a radical path when the legal framework is in place that works and there is no evidence of this legal framework delivering perverse outcomes in the form of convictions? The answer is that it is all about ideology. It is not about fact. It is not about compassion. It is not about concern for unborn babies who are unable to defend themselves.

I have had many people in my electorate contact me in relation to this legislation. Interestingly, many of these constituents are women. I have spoken to many of them personally, as this is a sensitive and highly personal issue for many of my constituents, and I have the greatest respect for their views. They are women from different ages and women from different backgrounds. There are also men from different ages and different backgrounds who are greatly concerned by this legislation. Despite their differences in backgrounds, gender, age and locations, the view that my constituents have expressed has been overwhelmingly consistent. They have requested that I vote no against this legislation. I can say to my constituents that it is clearly my intention to vote no to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill.

I also wish to reaffirm the position of the LNP membership, the grassroots members of the LNP party who have repeatedly debated abortion laws—and I think I have probably heard debates on the abortion issue for some 20 years. They have concluded that there is no reason to change these laws. Like the shadow Attorney-General and member for Toowoomba South, I also reaffirm the position of the parliamentary wing of the LNP who committed prior to the 2017 election that they would not amend abortion laws in Queensland. I will continue to stay strong to this commitment to the people of Queensland, the LNP and the people of my electorate of Warrego who have taken the time to contact me through my electorate office or personally with their views on this bill, and I greatly appreciate their input.

There is one organisation, however, that I feel needs to be raised during this debate. I find it very disappointing that this organisation is a registered not-for-profit organisation in this country. The organisation originated as an American political action committee that aims to help elect pro-choice Democratic female candidates to office. Accordingly, the *Washington Examiner* named Emily's List as one of America's most influential pro-choice political action committees.

This organisation is a political network in Australia and it supports women candidates seeking election to political office. Emily's List Australia was inspired by Emily's List America with similar goals to that in the United States—that is, supporting women into office who are pro choice.

The Australian website for Emily's List provides information about how the organisation supports its candidates through early money and direct donations—and support they do. The Electoral Commission of Queensland's electronic disclosure system records donations made to political parties and candidates in Queensland, which I am sure we all know a lot about. I have had the public data searched—

Ms BOYD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order in relation to relevance. Emily's List was not a submitter to this process. There is no reference to them in any capacity in the long title of the bill. I seek your direction in terms of relevance.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Thank you, member for Pine Rivers. I will take some advice from the Clerk. In relation to the issue of relevance, please, member, keep the matters that you are referring to towards the bill. I think the matters are relevant.

Ms LEAHY: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is quite clear that Emily's List support the termination of pregnancy legislation, and they have donated to the Labor Party in Queensland. In fact, there were four donations made on 6 November and they specifically donate to support political candidates who are pro choice.

Let us have a look at what the Emily's List members around Australia did and how similar the campaigns that have been going on around Australia are to this legislation in Queensland. Emily's List members around Australia have been involved in campaigns to spearhead the passage of abortion law reform in the ACT and in the Northern Territory and the decriminalisation of abortion in Victoria; to create buffer zones around reproductive health clinics in Tasmania and Victoria; and to prevent protestors from intimidating or harassing people entering clinics. That sounds exactly like the legislation here in this parliament.

It is simple: those who are pro choice join Emily's List, who then fundraise for them on the proviso that those candidates when they are elected as members of parliament will pursue the pro-choice agenda. I know of no other organisation that operates as a not-for-profit in this country for the purpose of killing unborn babies who are unable to defend themselves. It is appalling that this organisation is able to operate as a not-for-profit. I believe that this status should not be afforded to Emily's List.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (2.39 pm): We are here in this place to debate what will be one of the hardest moral tests of this parliament. Today we will test ethics, morals and modern medicine and decide what part legislation should play in all of this. To be completely honest with my constituents of Hinchinbrook and members of the House, I really did not believe that I had a position on this until I entered politics.

The issue of the legalisation of abortion first became apparent to me during my time as a candidate in the 2017 state election. The first night, in front of my town, I sat on a stage to answer questions from interested potential voters and I was hit with the question: would I support the legalisation of abortion? I was taken aback by the question but the answer rolled out of my mouth as if somehow I was prepared for this. It went something like this: 17 years ago I was in high school contemplating completing year 12, and my now wife and I were faced with the dilemma of a teenage pregnancy. We were given options. Coming from a small town with all the social pressures in the world, it would have been easier to abort. No-one would ever have known, like so many others who have come before us and gone down this road. It could have changed our lives and we could be in a completely different place today. But when I was faced with the stone cold facts that we would be facilitating the killing of our unborn son or daughter, that is something that I would not be able to live with on my conscience for the rest of my life.

Right then and there I knew where I would be voting on this and I would be voting against an abortion bill if it came up in the House. In the modern, hook-up society that we have today, it is easy to forget that sexual acts may end up in pregnancy. I have been brought up on Catholic values and I believe they have been a contributing factor to my decision. I have heard today that religion should not play a part in creating legislation and I disagree. Although I may not be the greatest Catholic, I can assure the House that my morals have stemmed from those values that I was raised on.

I will not be supporting the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. With my hand on my heart I can say that 90 per cent of the contact my office has had with the constituents of Hinchinbrook has been unsupportive of the bill—from outright condemnation to uneasiness about the late-term termination components of the bill. As a KAP member I have always said that I would vote with my electorate, and in this case I will. People have had their opportunity to have their voices heard through my office and I will bring those voices to the House today.

The government's late-term abortion bill I believe is a little more extreme than the Pyne bill, which was rejected in the last parliament in 2017. The Termination of Pregnancy Bill appears to be modelled on the Victorian law under which almost half the late-term abortions in recent years have been performed on healthy babies of healthy mothers for psychosocial reasons. This is something I do not want to see happen in Queensland. Another thing that deeply disturbs me in reports that I have read is that unborn children as old as 37 weeks have been aborted. That upsets me. In 2011 there were 10 late-term abortions in Victoria for psychosocial reasons of viable, healthy babies of healthy mothers between 28 and 31 weeks of pregnancy. I believe this should not be allowed to happen in Queensland.

Abortion is already highly accessible in Queensland, with about 14,000 terminations already happening per year. I know that this bill has been framed as a woman's health issue and I respect that opinion, but from the other side of the debate I would like to make the House very aware that for many Queenslanders this is a moral and ethical issue and I will stand with those who ethically do not support

this bill. I will not stand here and pretend to understand women's issues. A man does not have the right—and I believe that in some cases—to make a woman's decisions for her but the fact is that abortion is accessible right now without making these legislative changes. I fear that these changes will further discount human life in an increasingly fast paced, throwaway society.

Yesterday the Minister for Health said that those voting against this bill would go down in history for voting against women and their right to access women's health. When this vote is counted, I will be happy to go down in history as someone who valued human life. I believe history will forget this, but we will take our decisions into our eternity.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (2.45 pm): I rise to speak in support of the bill before the House, and I am very proud that for eternity it will be on the record that I did. As I have said previously in this place, I thought it was fundamentally important on a bill such as this—one that has been talked about for all of my life growing up in the Joh era of Queensland, seeing the reforms that have happened over the last 20 years to bring Queensland into line with other states, to make us a truly modern democracy—that all members of parliament had an opportunity to exercise their conscience. I am very pleased that after months of speculation the decision was made in the LNP party room to enable their members of parliament to have what we know is a right when we sign the membership form to join the Labor Party, because we are a party that respects all views. In saying that, I am deeply concerned today to see media reports that the LNP state council have threatened their members with disendorsement if they support the bill.

Mr Bleijie: That wasn't the state council.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. I am sorry if I misled the House—elements of the LNP that are still putting pressure on their members with regard to them exercising their conscience. I hope that they do not weigh—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! The House will come to order.

Ms JONES: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. What I am saying is that I hope those reports and those threats do not influence the decisions or the exercising of conscience of those in this chamber. I think every Queenslanders expects us to rise above that. I hope that they do have the strength to stand up to those threats within their party.

As everyone in this House is aware, this bill was introduced in response to the Queensland Law Reform Commission's comprehensive and considered review of Queensland state abortion law. The review made 28 recommendations to modernise Queensland's laws regarding the termination of pregnancy, including finally removing the offence from the Criminal Code.

The member for Burdekin and the member for Warrego in their contributions, which we just heard, tried to tell Queenslanders that this was a plot to drive a wedge through the Queensland community. That is not what this review is about. The review recommends that Queensland laws should align with contemporary international human rights obligations; that Queensland laws should be consistent with contemporary clinical practice; and that Queensland laws should also be broadly consistent with other Australian jurisdictions that have already modernised their abortion laws.

The Criminal Code currently makes it a crime to unlawfully terminate a woman's pregnancy in Queensland. While I appreciate that Queenslanders do have diverse views in our community in regard to these laws, I fundamentally believe it should not be considered a criminal act in our state. I believe this because, as we have heard from many of the contributions, having termination of pregnancy in the Criminal Code disproportionately impacts unfairly on women. This is particularly the case for women in rural, regional and remote areas of our state, women from low socio-economic backgrounds, and Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women. As a fundamental right, women must be free to choose contraception, termination and pregnancy without coercion or pressure of threat of criminal prosecution. For me, I strongly believe that abortion should not be treated as a criminal matter.

I also firmly believe a woman is best placed to make decisions about her body and she should also be able to make decisions about what advice, support or counselling she requires or likes or does not. That is her choice, and I fundamentally trust women to make those decisions for themselves.

There has been, as we have heard from a number of members contributing here over the last couple of days, a lot of mistruths. I thought the health minister made a very good contribution when he put a number of facts clearly on the table for all members to consider: that 99 per cent of terminations happen well before 20 weeks, with the overwhelming majority before 12 weeks; that terminations after

22 weeks usually involve complex medical circumstances; and that the figure of 22 weeks was not arbitrarily chosen. It was not chosen by politicians; it was after the Queensland Law Reform Commission did detailed research and consultation with medical practitioners and experts, and this is the recommendation that came out of that process. I agree entirely with the health minister when saying that politicians who are trying to pick another gestational limit on the run—20 weeks, 18 weeks, 16 weeks—ignore the independent evidence based on the work of the QLRC and this would lead to less time for informed decision-making for women.

I want to finish by saying that I also strongly support the establishment of safe access zones to prevent the harassment and intimidation of women and workers in Queensland. Safe access zones will be created up to 150 metres around clinics where abortions are performed to protect women and their loved ones and the workers in these clinics.

Today is an historic day in Queensland. Something that has been talked about all of my life in this state I hope will happen today. I want to finish by thanking all of the women—many of whom are in the gallery here today—I have looked up to in my lifetime in Queensland for their bravery in continuously campaigning for this important law reform. Thank you to those women here today.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (2.51 pm): The hardest speech I have written thus far in my life took place four years ago when I delivered a eulogy speech at my father's funeral. I still miss him dearly every single day. This speech I am about to deliver is by far the hardest speech I have delivered as a state member of parliament, and I do so with the privileged gift of a conscience vote as a result of a unanimous decision of the LNP party room. This privilege afforded to me is one that I do not take for granted and carries with it enormous responsibility. One way or another, we are all about to make history this week in this chamber that I love so much which will be forever recorded in the parliamentary *Hansard*.

For many of us, our names once added to the members' honour board will fade into political obscurity, but the impact the passage of this bill will have on subsequent generations to come will not. I would like to thank the many fine individuals who reside in my electorate of Chatsworth who took up my invitation to meet with me and outline their viewpoint on this highly emotive topic. As one would expect representing a middle-ring Brisbane electorate with a varied demographic, the assortment of views ranged from pro life under any circumstances to the diametric opposite of pro choice in all instances. Many of the people I met had very personal anecdotes they shared from both sides of the debate, and I take this opportunity to sincerely thank them for the courage and respect they displayed in conveying their views.

In considering this deeply emotional bill, I have read and consulted as far as I could and questioned previously deeply held beliefs framed around my ideological framework. Key precepts of my liberal value system include the notions of freedom and choice. It is fair to say that my value system tries to combine the best of economic conservatism and socially progressive liberal ideals. I believe in the doctrine of the separation of powers and the separation of church from state. I believe in the inherent decency of society. I believe in the fundamental right of women to be treated as equal members of a free society which acknowledges that, although there are obvious differences in men's and women's physiology, there should be no difference in their opportunity to have sovereign reign over their own bodies.

In considering this bill in detail, the obvious starting point is to establish what the real intent of the bill is to achieve. The bill seeks to modernise and clarify the law for termination of pregnancy in Queensland. Chapter 22 of the Criminal Code Act 1899, 'Offences against morality', currently makes it a crime to unlawfully terminate a woman's pregnancy. An unlawful termination of pregnancy may be committed by the person performing the termination, section 224, or the pregnant woman herself, section 225. It is also a crime for anyone to supply or procure anything which that person knows is intended to be used unlawfully to procure a miscarriage, section 226.

The Criminal Code does not define 'unlawfully' for these sections. However, section 282 of the Criminal Code provides an excuse from criminal responsibility for a person who performs a surgical or medical termination in certain circumstances. The current case law on section 282 provides that a termination will be lawful where it is necessary to prevent serious danger to the woman's life or physical or mental health and is not out of proportion to the danger intended to be averted.

I recall watching local current affairs shows in the late 1970s when Dr Peter Bayliss and Dr Dawn Cullen of the Greenslopes Fertility Control Clinic on Logan Road at Greenslopes were habitually raided and eventually charged in 1985 under the anti-abortion provisions of the Queensland Criminal Code.

The possibility of prosecution of health professionals and women also potentially impedes provision of a full range of safe, accessible and timely reproductive services. This is of particular concern to many women in regional and remote areas of this vast state. The lack of certainty under the current provisions as to when a termination is lawful negatively impacts the accessibility and the availability of termination services by causing fear and stigma for women and reluctance by some health practitioners to provide such services.

Back in 1899 through to the 1970s, Australian women's bodies, livelihoods, financial security and behaviour were controlled to a large extent by gender based laws that actively discriminated against them. At various stages throughout this period women could not vote or stand for federal election, work in public service jobs after marriage, drink in public bars, be paid equally for the same work as a man, refuse sex with their husbands, borrow money independently, travel overseas without the permission of a man or exercise reproductive freedom. Their role essentially was to manage the household and bear and raise children—all with minimal autonomy, independence and agency. I put it to you, Mr Deputy Speaker, that had we stuck with the laws of 1899 and not evolved socially we would not have a female premier of this great state or opposition leader, we would not have female home and business owners, and we would not have the respectful egalitarian society that we have today.

Why do we make it a criminal act for women and girls who do not wish to have a pregnancy or a child at a particular time in their life? Why is forced pregnancy seen as a socially and legally acceptable solution to an unplanned conception? Why in 2018 do we not give women the respect to make their own reproductive choices and decisions about their own body, health and future?

In many areas of healthcare law in Australia we cannot force people against their will and without their consent to donate blood, tissue or organs or to allow their bodies to be used medically in any way without their consent—even if it means that another person on a waiting list will die as a result. Even after a person dies, unless they had clearly given their written consent to being an organ donor before they died doctors cannot harvest their organs, even if it means another person will die without a transplant. If we as a society start saying that a foetus has the right to life that overrides the pregnant woman's right to give or deny consent and by law forces women to continue pregnancies against their will and without their consent, then effectively we would be giving a foetus more rights than an actual person and, as a logical extension and corollary, we would be giving pregnant women fewer rights than a corpse. I am yet to find anyone who can convince me that women should have fewer rights when they are alive than they do when they are dead.

I am the father of two wonderful young men and have been married for 25 years to my brilliant wife, Roz, all of whom I would lay down my own life for in a heartbeat. Being a willing party to bringing those two individuals into this world was an honour and a privilege that my wife and I chose at times that were appropriate for us and our life circumstances. I believe that all Queensland women should have the fundamental human right to elect this privilege and not have it thrust upon them as a punishment for being sexually active or having an unplanned pregnancy. No-one should be forced to endure a pregnancy they do not want when safe, modern medical options are available to assist them. I am not pro abortion; I am pro choice, pro autonomy, pro respect. I support the right of all Queensland women to make reproductive choices that respect their agency, individuality, desires and dreams.

In the 21st century this issue should, indeed, be a health issue and not a criminal issue. Future generations will look back on our contributions to this bill. I choose to believe from the quality of the contributions I have heard that, whilst I vehemently disagree with much of what has been said, the old Evelyn Beatrice Hall quote, often attributed to Voltaire, comes into play—

I disapprove of what you say, but will defend to the death your right to say it.

I was born in 1965 to two loving and caring parents who taught me the essence of responsibility and respect. If I had a daughter I would want her to have the same chances in life that my two sons currently have: freedom of religion, freedom of association, freedom to pursue her own happiness, and liberty and freedom of choice when it comes to sovereign right and agency of her own body and sexuality. If we are truly to be a modern, egalitarian state in the 21st century we need to decriminalise archaic laws contained in an act from the 19th century. This is not about semantics; it is about legal freedom of choice. I respect the contribution of all of the other 92 members of this parliament. I merely ask that my conscience vote be equally respected, as nobody—I repeat: nobody—has a mortgage on the truth and passion of their convictions regardless of how they ultimately vote on this emotive bill.

An incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Members of the gallery, there will be no clapping.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (3.01 pm): I rise to speak on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. As Premier, I am proud to offer this bill my full support. I support it as a respectful member of this House, as a lifelong advocate for women, as a representative of my electorate and, by no means least, as a woman. I believe—and I have always believed—that a woman should be able to talk to her doctor about her own health and her own body without it being a crime.

Rarely are we given an opportunity to make such a difference. This is a once-in-a-century chance to make a profound and lasting change that will grant the women of this state a basic freedom afforded to others around the world. We must listen to the 50 per cent of our population who are women. No matter how well supported they are, a woman will ultimately make this decision alone. Unless we can stand in the shoes of that woman at that moment, how can we possibly know how she feels? How can we possibly tell her that we know what is best for her? I have always stood for equality. That means equality everywhere. Like every right we enjoy, they have been hard fought for and won. We believe in women's equality. That is why we believe in a woman's right to choose.

The crime of terminating a pregnancy was added 119 years ago. No woman voted for it because women had no right to vote, let alone be elected. Few were encouraged into further education. Our mothers and grandmothers were forced out of work when they were married. We left all of those attitudes in the past. This law deserves to be left in the past as well. In fact, like so many of our laws, it was imported from Britain. Britain repealed it 50 years ago.

Women who are faced with a decision to terminate a pregnancy are confronted not only with issues surrounding their health but also by their deepest beliefs and their conscience. They should not also have to worry about whether or not they are committing a crime. This difficult decision should be one for a woman to make in consultation with her doctor and her family, and this legislation preserves those measures.

I have had close friends who have had to make very difficult decisions based on the medical evidence that has been handed to them. It has been incredibly upsetting to them. How do they get over something like that? It is a decision never, ever taken lightly. Among the many personal stories related to me on this issue was this one. A woman had a termination because of unsurvivable foetal abnormalities. She fell into that one per cent who desperately want their baby but get the terrible news that a post-20-week termination is required. They told me that time of grief was overhung with an air of suspicion, secrecy and uncertainty. They went on to say it is unimaginable cruelty to force a woman to carry a baby that has no brain. Care, comfort and clarity is what is needed and the current laws do not provide this. A doctor wrote to me about the incidence of suicide amongst women who are pregnant. That secrecy surrounding abortion in Queensland cuts them off from normal support services. Criminality makes them marginalised and disconnected. Who are we as legislators to compound their suffering?

A phrase that has been repeated often in this debate is that people have a right to their view. I could not agree more; however, I do not have the right to impose my views on others, especially when it has to do with their own health care and their own bodies. Supporting this bill does not encourage termination. It does not make anyone else live the life I choose. However, if we fail to pass this legislation, it does force all women to live their lives according to one view.

The bill is clear and its objectives are plain. It puts a woman's health front and centre and it gives all women the right to make a choice. It ensures that a woman is getting the best medical advice. It ensures she gets the best and safest treatment and it protects health professionals. It is based on the sound recommendations of the Queensland Law Reform Commission which found that termination should be treated as a health issue rather than a criminal matter, as is the case in almost all other Australian jurisdictions. It is also supported by the AMA Queensland, representing more than 6,000 medical practitioners across Queensland. In a letter to the committee on this issue the president wrote—

Queensland's current laws, which criminalise terminations of pregnancy are a barrier to a doctor's first duty—best patient care. This bill, should it become law, would provide legal certainty to Queensland doctors when it comes to performing terminations of pregnancy and patients who seek termination from doctors.

In a previous letter in March 2018 to the Queensland Law Reform Commission, when asked should a woman be criminally responsible for the termination of her own pregnancy, AMA Queensland chair, Dr Shaun Rudd, wrote just one word. That word was: no.

Getting us to this point has not been done blindly or in a rush. This has been a careful, considered and consultative approach, as it should be. I thank the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and the Minister for Health and Ambulance Services for their ongoing work to pursue change and reform. The Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee

has undertaken a thorough inquiry into the bill and recommended that it be passed. Nearly 10,000 submissions were received throughout the examination of two previous bills, the committee's inquiry and the review by the Queensland Law Reform Commission. I also understand the committee invited views on the bill via online submissions for the first time. I say thank you to everyone who has had their say; your voices have been heard.

I also want to thank the Deputy Premier and members of the government for their very considered response and approach to this. There has been absolutely thorough consultation. I do really want to commend everyone for the way in which they have conducted themselves in a very important and sensitive debate in Queensland's history. I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all the members of the committee for their careful consideration. I applaud those members who have spoken before me with the utmost sincerity. Respect is an important word. It is one that I value and one I always try to adhere to. I know no-one will arrive at their decision lightly. It is a deeply, deeply personal issue. It is one of conscience. I know, because I took my time in arriving at the decision, considering the Law Reform Commission report and talking to my colleagues and members of my electorate.

Ultimately, this is a health issue. Does a woman who you love, a friend or daughter or any of the generations to come, have the right to talk to a doctor about her health without committing a crime? The answer is yes. The failure to pass this legislation would consign women to the same fate they faced 100 years ago. I commend this historic bill to the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (3.09 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I do not support this bill. I do not support abortions in the state of Queensland. I do not support abortions on demand. I certainly do not support full-term abortions for social reasons, which this bill allows. This is not a health issue. If it were a health issue, members in this place would be considering the health of a baby who could be subject to a nine-month full-term termination because of a social reason that may occur during a pregnancy—not only a social reason that may occur during a pregnancy but a social reason that may occur in the future. In this bill, mothers and fathers can take into consideration social reasons that may occur in the future for getting an abortion up to full term: a nine-month baby.

Members in this place have said that this is modernising Queensland laws. I say to members in this chamber that killing a baby in 1918 is no different to killing a baby in 2018. There is no difference. There are some in this place who will speak up for the children, and I am one of them. I am going to speak up for the kids who do not have a voice. There is choice available in the state of Queensland. There is choice available if you do not want to have a baby. There are options available for not getting pregnant. There are options available to prevent pregnancies. There are choices available, but voting on a law that would allow a mother and a father to terminate—to kill—a baby, a child with a beating heart up to nine months is something that I would never, ever vote for. Members have said that this is an historic day and it will be forever recorded in time. Yes, it is: it will be. The way that I vote will always be recorded in time.

Supporters of this bill have said that it is about the decriminalisation of abortion. I do not support the decriminalisation of abortion in Queensland. I think it sets a deterrent for those who wish—or those who are under pressure—to have an abortion in the state of Queensland. If keeping it in the Criminal Code stops one baby from being aborted, then I think that is good because that is one more child that we have in the state of Queensland who could be a firefighter, police officer, member of parliament, lawyer, plumber or whatever.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. There is too much audible noise. If you are having conversations, please take them outside. The debate is to be conducted with full respect, and I would ask that the member be heard with that respect.

Mr BLEIJIE: Rather than having more modernised laws to deal with abortion and the termination of pregnancies we should be putting more money into supporting mothers and fathers who have unexpected pregnancies. We should be providing more opportunities and resources to groups like STEMM, which is on the Sunshine Coast. I want to thank Jacqui and the team at STEMM at Burnside State High School. The STEMM program supports teenagers with education, mothering and mentoring. A member in this place earlier spoke about young women having children and how they may end up being welfare dependent or single mothers. That is not necessarily so if the state can help and the community helps these people.

We do not want to get into the situation where, just because someone may not be able to financially raise a child, this bill says, 'It's okay, that is a social reason. We are going to make it easier for you to abort that child.' We need programs and more resources like the STEMM program, which helps educate mothers. They say that if you educate a mother, you educate a family. I have been to

the graduating ceremonies of these young mums. These are pregnant teenagers who could take an easy way out under this bill and terminate their pregnancy. Their life would probably be a lot easier than being a 15- or 16-year-old mum, but this program keeps them in school. It gets them an education and it helps them. I have been to their graduation ceremony and I have seen the mums holding their babies. They have gone off to get jobs or a university degree—one became a nurse—and they have kept their babies. Those babies are going to have terrific lives because their mums received the support they needed. That is why I say if there is any deterrent for having abortions we should keep it, and that is why I do not support any changes in Queensland.

I have been a member of parliament for nearly 10 years. I have never publicly said this, but my wife Sally and I were rock and roll dance partners. Sally was 15 and I was a couple of years older. Sally fell pregnant at 17, which came as a big surprise to our families because we both kept telling them that we did not believe in sex before marriage. There was a lot of concern that a 17-year-old became pregnant and there was a lot of explaining to do. We did not tell anyone for three months—not my parents and not Sally's parents—because we were scared. I was a couple of years older than Sally, and she was 17. We did not tell anyone. We were scared of what people might think. I remember quite vividly that for three months every morning Sally had terrible morning sickness. When I woke in the morning I would go into the bathroom where she would be dry-retching, and I would cough to cover up the dry-retch sounds so we did not give away the fact that she was pregnant. When the lump showed, we had to tell people.

This was back in 2002. One thing that I have never spoken about is when Sally and I did the pregnancy test. She was not well and we thought, 'Oh dear, something's up.' I remember saying to Sally, who was 17, 'What are we going to do?' I was only 18 or 19 at the time and I guessed that if young families did not want a baby or there were issues, then there would be options available. I recall saying to my girlfriend Sally at the time, 'What are we going to do?' Less than a millisecond later Sally looked me in the eyes and said, 'We are keeping this baby.' Nothing crossed Sally's mind other than keeping this baby. I wish that I had been as strong then as my 17-year-old girlfriend was.

We now have Taylor, who is 15 years of age. She is a beautiful girl who is going through that teenage period. I am not going to hide the fact that Taylor and I butt heads a lot, as fathers do with their teenage daughters. The scary thing is that she now has a 17-year-old boyfriend, and it is bringing back terrible memories for my wife and me. My daughter is sufficiently more educated in these matters than my wife and I were at the time, thank God. She is a beautiful girl, and if my wife had been as weak as I was at the time we may not have Taylor. If we had made that decision I would not have been able to live with myself. We now have a beautiful teenage daughter who is going to go on and do amazing things in this world. I might add that our families gave us an incredible amount of support. We had nothing to fear because of the support we got from our families when we eventually got the courage to tell them. We now have another two beautiful children, Madison and Jasper. Back when Taylor was in the womb her mother spoke very strongly for her. We made the call that we were going to keep Taylor, and I am so incredibly grateful that we did.

That is why I cannot support any modernisation—if that is what people call it—of abortion laws in Queensland. Every child in an unplanned pregnancy has the right to be born and has the right to fulfil destiny, whatever that may be for that individual child. Today I speak for the children without voices. Today I choose life, and my vote will reflect that.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (3.20 pm): I rise to speak to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. Like the member for Bonney, I chose to go to my community and raise the topic for discussion. Just a few weeks ago I posed some questions to a room of about a hundred local business and community leaders. I suggested that they pretend for a moment that they were all elected members of parliament and I asked them to vote as we vote—very publicly. You cannot hide your vote in the House; everybody knows what you think.

The first question I posed was: do you think abortion should be decriminalised in Queensland? Almost every hand, bar two, went up to indicate that absolutely it should be decriminalised. I thought, 'Okay, let's go a little further with this.' As we all know, the challenge with any legislation is always in the detail. The next question I posed was: at what stage is it reasonable to terminate a pregnancy? How many of you think that at six weeks it is okay? Probably 70 per cent of the hands in the room went up. Then I posed the question: what about at 13 weeks? The crowd started to thin. It dropped to about 50 per cent of the room. Then I posed the question: what about at 22 weeks—mid term? Then the hands started to disappear pretty rapidly. Then we had some discussion around the issue of late-term abortion. We talked about some of the practices in other parts of the world and the stories we have heard from Victoria. Then I posed the question: who should make the decision? Everybody started to

get pretty wobbly at that point. Then of course other issues came up for discussion—issues around genetics and catastrophic pregnancies—and then there was some fairly robust discussion around the issue of gender selection.

I wish that this was just a bill to remove termination of pregnancy from the Criminal Code, but it is not. I wish that the bill before the House simply sought to amend the Criminal Code to remove the offence provisions from the code and leave most of the practices currently in place as they are. I really do not understand why Labor have chosen to go so far.

Nor do I want to be remembered as someone who would dare to judge others. It has been my experience on many occasions in the six or so years I have been a member of parliament that many have been very quick to judge my actions, or my lack of actions, and have made all sorts of judgements around my personal life. Earlier the member for Glass House spoke about his faith as a Christian. While I would suggest that my halo is a little tarnished these days, I want to endorse his comments. My faith reminds me that it is not appropriate to judge others. The gospel that I believe in highlights the fact that we need more grace, hope, forgiveness and restoration in the world. Luke 6: 36-38 states—

'Do not judge others, and you will not be judged. Do not condemn others, or it will all come back against you. Forgive others, and you will be forgiven. Give, and you will receive. Your gift will return to you in full ...'

I absolutely believe that that as a principle is paramount, but I struggle with this legislation. In fact, I have felt incredibly sad this week as we have pondered the bill before the House. There will be no clear winner from the debate this week, regardless of how the votes go this afternoon or tomorrow. I am not a woman, but I am a dad, a son, a granddad, a brother, an uncle, a great-uncle, a great-great-uncle, and I am a person who has, I believe, sincere compassion for others. It is not my desire, in speaking against this legislation, to in any way condemn or criticise those who make this very delicate and challenging choice in their lives.

I am also sad that this issue has been, in many respects, dumbed down so much. If it was just a simple decision to decriminalise, that would make it easy. The optics and the politics of this in the past few months have been really quite saddening. Those on the other side of the House have sought to make this an issue about whether the LNP are biased or bigoted, whether we will have a conscience vote or not. Everyone keeps talking about it being a woman's choice but nobody really wants to publicise or talk about the detail.

A lady came to my office just a week ago and said to me, 'Do you understand what the procedures are for conducting an abortion?'—or a termination of pregnancy, as we prefer to call it now. I am certainly not going to elaborate on the conversation I had with her, but I have to say that I was horrified at some of the procedures that are undertaken. I am not sure that everybody in the general public fully understands or appreciates just how invasive and horrific some of these procedures are.

The member for Kawana shared a very personal insight on the matter. I did not get my wife pregnant before marriage—I am not pretending to be any more virtuous than the member for Kawana—but I do remember when Melinda miscarried between our two sons. We had one son, David, who is now a doctor in Emerald. Unfortunately, a second pregnancy ended up with a miscarriage and subsequently a curette. That is a fairly pleasant term, I suppose, but back then it still involved a day in hospital. It involved significant bed rest. It involved not being allowed to fall pregnant for at least 12 months. I remember that at the time Melinda was quite stressed about the fact that there was even a risk that she may not be able to fall pregnant again. I simply want to remind the House that these are not simple procedures. They are traumatic and there are significant consequences that flow, both emotionally and physically. I think it would be remiss of us to treat these changes and this proposed legislation so lightly.

The member for Caloundra has foreshadowed some amendments. One of those I believe is a very sensible amendment in respect of consultation with another medical practitioner. I foreshadow that I would support that amendment. My sincere hope is that if this legislation does pass the second reading then those on the other side of the House will support what I think is a very sensible amendment from the member for Caloundra.

We heard from the member for Moggill. I go back to my earlier point: if we were just decriminalising this, it would be a much simpler issue. What the member for Moggill has said repeatedly is that the current system is working and that we should have faith in the medical system, which already typically has rigorous assessment processes in place.

I am sad that I cannot support Labor's legislation in its current format. I believe that it has been poorly constructed. I am sad that it has gone so far. I simply wish that the proposal before the House had been more moderate, more tempered and just dealt with the issue of decriminalisation.

There are so many other challenges that we face in society. The sort of support that we have heard about being needed so desperately by women does not just come in the form of giving them a right to choose. It also comes in the form of better housing and better service provision. It comes in the form of cheaper electricity and real support around domestic violence and crisis housing. I think it is almost somewhat disingenuous that those on the government side of the House have not done more to address some of those social issues in light of the great concern about providing a way out through economic and social circumstances.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (3.30 pm): 'I didn't think I had a choice.' Those words are from a woman who, subject to domestic violence and in great distress, felt she had no option but to abort her baby. She was not offered any alternatives, no counselling, no support; just a clinical pathway to end a pregnancy—something she now regrets. Does this bill solve this issue or provide more choices than abortion when a woman is facing a crisis pregnancy? The answer is no. However, I fear that this bill will in fact make it worse for a very real social justice issue, as doctors now under this bill must refer to an abortion provider who will enable the woman to abort the child for social reasons—no questions asked about the help she may want if someone had asked her, if someone had offered.

Abortion is a health issue, but it is also a justice and a social justice issue. I have met with and talked with women who have suffered domestic violence and pregnancy and their stories are tragic. The most tragic story that I know is that of Tracey Wooding, whose son Zach was killed by her de facto with a karate kick to her stomach when she was eight months pregnant a few years ago. However, the law did not recognise the humanity of Zach with an appropriate penalty. It was because of Tracey's bravery as a victim of domestic violence that she fought back and sought a change in the laws. It was a hard-fought campaign. When I first raised it with the Labor Attorney-General at the time, Labor MPs in this place literally shouted and screamed at me to sit down and shut up, that it was an abortion issue and we were not going to talk about it even though this baby was wanted.

I believe all life is precious, but it was so interesting to note that the real issue then was that people did not want to recognise the humanity of a child who had not yet been born. This was a justice and a social justice issue—and it still is—yet that gets lost so often in the debate. Under the Liberal National Party government I was proud that we put a protection into the Criminal Code to recognise people who attacked pregnant women causing the injury or death of their unborn child, and I acknowledge Tracey for her guts and her determination. Tragically, more still needs to be done to protect women who face a pregnancy with domestic violence. Some figures show that about 18 per cent of women experience domestic violence for the first time or a spike in domestic violence while pregnant. There is a case for better support. Tragically, this legislation does not do it.

All life is precious—women, children and their families—and we must love and respect and provide practical support for women who do face this dilemma of unplanned pregnancies, whether they choose to have an abortion or not. I do believe women should have safe and legal access to abortion for health reasons, and currently they do. The whole law, which includes the common law, provides for that. That is why women are not prosecuted under the Criminal Code and why there are 14,000 abortions in Queensland today and why we do not hear stories of emergency departments reporting backyard surgical abortions having to be treated.

I want to cover a few issues in the very limited time we have. We do not know the exact number of abortions. A bit like Victoria, the statistics are not clearly kept. However, we do know that with the advent of RU486 on the PBS since 2013 there has been a dip in some of those surgical abortions and other reasons why we see this around Australia, but there is a desperate need to keep statistics so women get the support they really need. I do not support abortion on demand until 22 weeks for social reasons as provided in this bill. I also do not support doctors having to refer to another doctor or an abortion provider for these social abortions if the woman requests it. There is nothing in this legislation that mandates that the doctor has to refer to counselling or to that social support for these social circumstances.

Mr Costigan: Nothing.

Ms SIMPSON: Nothing. There are social circumstances such as housing, finance or, as I have outlined, domestic violence, which is a very real issue. That is where this legislation lets us down.

I have heard some members say, 'This is going to reduce abortion rates in Queensland.' There is no evidence for that. We have heard that there are going to be safeguards and guidelines. They have not been written yet. I saw the health minister flourishing the existing guidelines in his hand in the parliament, but the health department briefing that I took advantage of—and I thank the health minister for that—confirmed that those guidelines are still to be written and also confirmed that those guidelines

do not apply to private health facilities; most abortions occur in private health facilities which are under the Private Health Facilities Act, so there is regulation around those facilities. However, there are no guidelines. These guidelines as referred to by the health minister do not apply to private health facilities, and that was confirmed during the briefing I received from the health department.

There is something awfully lacking here to take something out of legislation—and arguments can be made about the need for reform—but to not put something back in that provides those safeguards and protections is really leaving a lot in a grey area. People have talked about reducing the grey areas. This ain't grey; this is downright opaque. I know that some people think doctors are gods who act with superior ethical and moral abilities, but they are human like the rest of the population. There are the good, the bad, the outstanding and, unfortunately, those who give others a bad name. I am very disappointed that the AMA has also let us down with regard to making a captain's call by announcing a position with no consultation with its membership of GPs who represent about 30 per cent of the GPs in Queensland.

If the law is liberalised in Queensland to make abortion legal for social reasons up to 22 weeks, surely there should have been a definition of what these social circumstances are. There should be an opportunity for people to know they have access to other options when there is evidence that there is a need for this so that particularly women who face poverty do not feel through de facto social eugenics that they have no option. People should not stand up in this place and advocate for abortion as a solution to poverty when really we should first provide financial support, otherwise that is social eugenics and it does not help those people who face a very desperate situation.

I have a question for the Attorney-General with regard to what protections there are under this bill for children who are impregnated. It is still not clear, and I would appreciate her clear advice and not just guidelines that have not been written. What will happen with children who have been impregnated? Will they simply get an abortion and no evidence taken to follow up where there is prima facie evidence of a crime and reasonable suspicion of abuse of that child? That child may be pregnant due to rape or incest by a stepfather or a stepbrother. That is a concern around what legal protections there are for the child. The social reasons I have outlined are very real and concerning. They may go to matters of housing, and these are things that first should be offered to women when they have needs. If they are in financial distress, they should have the opportunity to seek that financial support.

I refer also to the Law Reform Commission, which has been used as a bit of a rubber stamp and an excuse for why this should go through because it has done the research. What was very disappointing is that the Queensland Law Reform Commission, which is charged with acting independently, has Law Reform Commissioner Dr Nigel Stobbs—not a medical doctor; he is a lawyer—who engaged in the political debate on this issue of this legislation after the Law Reform Commission brought down its findings, and that taints this process. It taints this process when we have a Law Reform Commissioner implying that decisions could be made on gender lines and questioning the LNP's number of men and women—a line, by the way, that the Labor-left women of this government have unfortunately pursued. It is a shame that this action of the Law Reform Commissioner has not been condemned, because the Law Reform Commission's processes have been tainted by this particular commissioner's removal from what is standard practice; that is, you do not engage in debating legislation that you have been involved in formulating.

There is a need for a better solution than this bill—one that compassionately provides other choices and other options. This is not pro-choice legislation that provides women with more choices than abortion. It is wrong that doctors should be forced to refer to someone who will give an abortion for social reasons up to 22 weeks and, if it is after 22 weeks, with a second doctor's referral but not provide the opportunity for counselling, a cooling-off period and genuine support that may provide another way than this very final way when an abortion is undertaken.

We do not want to see women who have had abortions stigmatised. We also do not want to see women who keep an unplanned pregnancy, particularly young women and particularly those who might be carrying a child with a disability, come under tremendous pressure. We need to stand with women in a practical way. This bill does not do that.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.40 pm): I rise to speak in support of this bill before the House. I had the great pleasure to introduce this bill and now support the Minister for Health in its progression through the parliament. I will not go into the detail of the bill. That has been done already. I want to make a couple of comments.

Firstly, as others have done, I thank my electorate staff who have been at the front of this campaign and who have seen the worst of the worst in the material that has come in. Those who believe that what they are espousing has broad support across the community and is factually correct should

be willing to put their name to that material, as opposed to circulating anonymous information that is vile and offensive. I also want to thank everyone in my electorate who has sought a meeting with me. I have met with every person from my electorate who has sought to meet with me on this issue. I also want to thank the committee for their tremendous work, those brave witnesses who put forward their stories and those who put submissions before the committee.

A number of members have said that they support the decriminalisation of abortion. They have said that they support the right of a woman to choose and the right of a woman to have control over her own body. At least nine members on the other side have espoused that view. However, they have also said that they cannot support this bill for various reasons. To those members who oppose this bill primarily on the basis that they are concerned it is silent in relation to providing protection to women who may be coerced into terminating a pregnancy, particularly in relation to domestic and family violence—and the member for Maroochydore just touched on this as well—I say that this bill does not decrease or increase the risk of that coercion any more than the current Criminal Code. Each member who raised that concern has talked about cases that have occurred already where a woman has been coerced in awful situations and, of course, tragic situations.

That shows that coercion is happening right now under the Criminal Code. It is not the case that women are protected under the Criminal Code and that by moving abortion out of the Criminal Code that somehow puts those women at risk. The reality is that we do not need to put any provision in this bill around that protection because the offences under the Criminal Code continue to exist. The offences of threatening violence, threats, extortion, assault, stalking and torture are still in the Criminal Code and they are still offences. We need to get cultural and attitudinal change towards domestic violence so that women feel safe and supported to come forward and seek the help they need when they are faced with that sort of coercion. Of course, when it comes to domestic and family violence, that is what we are trying to do across the parliament.

The other issue relates to the general support for this bill by many across this parliament. However, some members have said that they still cannot support this bill because it does not quite deliver on all of their preferred elements. It is not their preferred model. I ask all of those members who truly believe and who have genuinely made very passionate speeches over the last two days and said that they support decriminalisation and the right of a woman to choose: how do we get to where we want to be? How do we get to giving women that choice and decriminalising abortion if we do not support this bill? When? How?

We can spend every day that we are in parliament as members suggesting different ways to achieve that aim, but ultimately we have to make a decision. Fundamentally, we agree on the key aspects. We agree on decriminalisation. We agree that there should be a criteria around that. We agree that we should allow a conscientious objection. We agree that there should not be intimidation outside sexual health clinics and abortion clinics. Many of us across this parliament agree on these aspects. How many reviews and how many reports do we have to have before we finally exercise our obligations and provide that right to women? If not now, when? If not this bill, how? Are any one of those members honestly saying that they are going to bring a bill to their party room, get endorsement and bring it to the floor of this parliament that would deliver that consensus on a preferred model? I get that not everyone thinks that this bill is perfect. I get that this is a very serious issue for everybody, no matter where they sit on this issue, but we have an obligation to the people of Queensland. We have an obligation to the women of Queensland.

Many members have said that we do not need to change the law at all because, in their view, abortion is already lawful—that there are roughly 14,000 terminations a year that the police are not charging people for, that the courts are not convicting people for, so we do not need to change. If we accept those facts, is that not really saying that the medical profession has moved on beyond the Criminal Code and accepted that abortion is a right of a woman and has been providing this important service to women? Police have said, 'We have moved on. We reflect community's expectations and we are not charging women.' The courts have said, 'Despite the Criminal Code, as a court we reflect the community's expectations and we are not convicting women.' When do we play catch-up? When the medical profession, the police and the courts are reflecting community expectations, is it not our responsibility now to do so? They are waiting for us to catch up and make sure that the laws reflect the practice—that, as lawmakers, we reflect the practice, that we remove the fear and the stigma that applies to this very important issue.

Ultimately, we owe people a duty to deal with this matter when those who have come before us have found it all too hard. Now is the time to do this. Why? Because we can confidently do it on the basis that this issue has gone through a comprehensive body of work with the Queensland Law Reform

Commission for 12 months. It has been subject to opportunities for submissions and witnesses and hearings and consideration. The committee that reviewed the bill has looked at what occurs in other jurisdictions. The bill is based on sound reasoning and evidence. If not now, when? We must do this. I call on members to support this bill. I know that it might not be their perfect model, but it achieves those key aspects that many across the parliament have said they truly believe in.

I thank each and every member who has spoken. We do not have to agree on our views, but it has been a respectful debate. I do this as an elected member of parliament on behalf of my constituents. I do it for the women of Queensland. I do it as a woman. I do it as a mother. I do it for my daughter.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (3.49 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this debate fully aware that the Termination of Pregnancy Bill is one of the most controversial pieces of legislation ever brought into this parliament. As members of this Legislative Assembly, we owe it to all Queenslanders to show that we can debate such a serious issue in a respectful way, with both sides being heard fairly and fully. Not to listen is to be disingenuous. As the elected members of this Legislative Assembly we have two fundamental and coexisting duties: to represent the views of our constituents in this parliament and to carry out our responsibilities as legislators, the law-makers of Queensland. After deep deliberation, it is my firm belief that voting in support of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill would be an abrogation of both duties.

The responsibilities we take on as legislators are grave. The laws we make in this House have real effects on our fellow Queenslanders. When we examine proposed legislation, every single one of us should be thinking about the quality of the legislation and the foreseeable effects of the proposed laws in the real world. Key questions we should all consider include: what are the existing laws; do the existing laws create such a bad effect that there is a clear case for change; is the proposed bill the best way to bring about such change; will the proposed law create bad outcomes itself; will it disadvantage some Queenslanders or remove their rights; will it place an unfair burden on some Queenslanders; and are the proposed laws open to abuse? I have asked myself these questions with regard to this bill and I have concluded that, in a purely legislative sense, the Termination of Pregnancy Bill fails every hurdle.

Firstly, let us look at the existing laws and whether they have such negative consequences that there is a pressing case for change. Terminations supervised by doctors and carried out for medical reasons are entirely legal under the existing Queensland law. As the member for Nanango and Opposition Leader said yesterday, more than 14,000 terminations are performed in Queensland each and every year. We are not seeing women and their doctors being charged by police or prosecuted in our courts. I sincerely cannot see the pressing case for a new bill in this area of law.

Any legislation in this space affects both the creation and the ending of human lives. It must genuinely seek to balance the rights of women with the rights of the unborn baby. This makes it the sort of issue where any reasonable person can appreciate the arguments on both sides. The existing laws do seem to achieve a balance. However, there is probably a case for strengthening the protections for doctors and patients. Having said that, I must consider if the Termination of Pregnancy Bill is the best way to achieve that protection, and the short answer is no. We can better protect both doctors and patients by making an amendment to the Criminal Code so that it becomes an offence to harass or intimidate anyone seeking medical care or providing legal medical treatments. Such an amendment would achieve the same outcome without the unwanted consequences of this proposed legislation.

As I see it, the laws proposed in this bill create some extremely bad outcomes. I am not overstating it in saying that if this bill passes there will be suffering because of it. I ask all my fellow legislators to consider that with an open mind. Allowing abortions for social reasons for the length of a pregnancy appals me. In the media this week there have been calls to strengthen the charges that can be brought against a driver who causes an accident that, by injury to an expectant mother or through causing her death, kills her unborn baby. All of us can relate to why people would support such an argument. The record for the youngest surviving premature baby is 21 weeks. Certainly, babies born at 28 weeks normally survive in these days of advanced neonatal care.

With today's advanced medical imaging providing moving, 3D colour scans, expecting parents see their unborn babies with such clarity it is almost scary. It is a good scary. Scary because that same medical imaging can diagnose medical issues affecting our baby and we as parents then have a very difficult decision to make. This is no different in Queensland than in every other state, but this type of decision is very different than deciding to end the life of a healthy and viable unborn baby for social circumstances. To support that as a legislator means I am not seeking to balance the rights of both key parties—that is, the mother and the baby.

Let us move on to consider the next issue: does this proposed legislation create loopholes? As legislators, we all support the fight against domestic violence in a non-partisan way. This is a crime where women are overwhelmingly the victims and men are overwhelmingly the perpetrators. Sadly, there have been reports in the media of men who have deliberately assaulted their partner because she was inconveniently pregnant and his goal was to induce a miscarriage. Even more sadly, this is not rare. Domestic violence counsellors will tell you this happens to women in our state often enough to be a familiar scenario in their work. Under this legislation, this evil can be carried out with no risk of any legal consequence for the man. He can just march her off to the GP and the problem is solved. This is the ugly reality we are discussing when we talk about abortion by coercion. There is no framework in this legislation to prevent this happening.

This bill makes another kind of abortion by coercion likely, one that will affect young Queenslanders. I am a father of daughters and I am very conscious of the risks young women face as they discover their sexuality at the very time they are most vulnerable to peer pressure and most prickly about parental involvement in their lives. Every parent hopes that, if their daughter should have to face a teen pregnancy, the daughter knows that her parents will support her in seeking the best outcome. This legislation will allow our teenagers to make an impulsive decision to terminate, with possibly only their boyfriend or best friend the wiser. Certainly, if they are over 16, their parents may never know so their parents will not be able to provide the support their teenager will desperately need. Having been a teenage boy myself, I have met plenty of callous teenage males. This legislation may empower them because they will say, 'She can just get an abortion.'

This will also place an onerous burden on one group of Queenslanders: the medical profession. The burden for approving and carrying out a termination of pregnancy will rest solely with them as an individual. There is no counsellor or other specialist to share this burden. This is not just unwise; it is also unfair. Some doctors will feel this is not what they signed up for when they took the Hippocratic Oath. One of the first principles in the Hippocratic Oath is do no harm. Nor do I agree with mandating that medical professionals, be they doctors, midwives or nurses, must carry out abortions if they have a conscientious objection to the process.

For all these reasons, in a purely legislative sense I cannot support this bill. My second fundamental duty in this parliament is to represent the views of my constituents in the wonderful electorate that is Gregory. I am always highly conscious of the privilege and honour they have given me as their elected representative and I will always ensure that I take their views and feedback into consideration. They are rarely wrong. In the case of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill, the overwhelming majority of constituents who have contacted my office and me have asked me to vote against the bill and so I will do so.

Finally, the LNP party room has a longstanding convention of granting its members a conscience vote on proposed legislation affecting the creation or ending of life. The convention takes account of the deep emotional and spiritual issues such legislation brings up.

It is this conscience vote that makes my personal views relevant. I personally—at a very deep level—do not agree with legalising abortion without a medical reason either up to or after 22 weeks. I believe we can do better by both the mother and baby.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (3.58 pm): This is not an easy debate, as members have testified over the last two days. Our values and our families, our friends and our colleagues, these are the things that make our community, our state and our country such a wonderful place to live and so we must protect and respect them and we must do it according to our beliefs. For me that is a belief in the individual, the family and free enterprise—the words Sir Robert Menzies used when asked what the Liberal Party stood for, words that are still relevant to me 35 years after I first joined the Liberal Party.

I am also mindful of the tenets of conservatism, which are to protect and respect our past and our heritage; not to blindly accept past practices and laws but to test those practices and laws and if they fail to meet community needs and modern expectations, to look to how to change them to best serve the public interest. Blind adherence to the past simply because it is the past is not in the best interests of the community. Time and experience has shown the wisdom of this approach: keeping the best of our laws, heritage and history and discarding the unworkable and the unenforceable.

Therefore, I have measured my position about this most contentious of issues against those beliefs when deciding how to vote on this bill. I do so acknowledging the vastly different views held not only by honourable members in this place but also amongst members of the LNP and members of the communities we represent. In my electorate, perhaps different to many of my colleagues on this side of the chamber, there is also strong support for these changes.

I do not support abortion. I do support women and their right to control their own reproductive health. I have been lucky to be at the birth of my three healthy children and to have experienced the euphoric feeling of holding those precious small bundles and to revel in the beauty of nature and creation held in my hands each time. I am also lucky to be able to contemplate the future for them and to share with Mary the joys, the challenges, the tears, the laughter, the frustration and the success that raising three kids inevitably brings, including, as those who have heard some of my stories would know, the occasional brush with members of the Queensland law enforcement community. I—we—would not swap it for anything and that is our decision. Here is the thing: it was our decision as a family and as individuals.

In May 2016 the former member for Cairns introduced bills to decriminalise the practice of abortion. As leader, I granted LNP members a conscience vote. I said very clearly that I could not support the laws proposed by the former member for Cairns. They were rushed, poorly thought through and, in my view, would have created uncertainty and confusion. I also said that an LNP government, in line with LNP party policy, would not change the existing laws and I did so because of my respect for the party and its members. However, that is not the situation we now face. The government did win the election and it was its stated intent to bring back a report from the Queensland Law Reform Commission on changing the law, and that has happened. This parliament must now deal with this bill. In fairness to the community and all those on all sides of this debate, it is long past due that we have a parliamentary resolution of this matter.

I thank and acknowledge the member for Nanango for the patient and calm way that she has handled this debate despite, at times, strident, inaccurate and unwarranted criticism. She has acted in the best interests of LNP representatives in this place. I respect her views and position.

In coming to my position, I have read the report of the Queensland Law Reform Commission, the committee report of this parliament as well as the committee reports of previous parliaments, and the Victorian Law Reform Commission report from 2008, including the submission of the Anglican Church at that time. I have also read the many guidelines and best practice notes, as well as practitioner codes of ethics. I have read and considered much of the material provided by those opposed to this bill. Of course, I have listened to the views of members of my electorate and LNP members, and considered the party policy. I have seen the emails, some containing quite graphic content that, if intended to shock, only served to reinforce my determination to consider this matter according to the best evidence and not hysteria or threats. I have listened carefully to the contributions of members up to this time. I especially note the story of my good friend the member for Kawana. I disagree with his position, but I absolutely respect that position and I do offer him my experiences in dealing with 15-year-olds.

Having done that, these are my views and my views alone, and my decision is mine alone. I reject absolutely any improper threats or improper inducements made to influence my position on this bill. At the moment, the Queensland Criminal Code provides offences for the unlawful procurement of an abortion. 'Unlawful' was never defined in the code and that leads to uncertainty. However, there can be no doubt about the intent behind that legislation: to criminalise abortion by the simple fact of placing the provision in the Criminal Code of Queensland, in the chapter headed 'Offences against morality'; to restrict the ability of women to effectively manage their own reproductive health issues; to treat women as criminals if they sought to look after themselves; and to consider women as unable or unfit to decide what is in their own best interests.

The law existed at a time when women were considered unable to own property or even to vote. Those positions are untenable in today's society. The member for Chatsworth has outlined many more examples. Even with all of that legal and moral restriction, abortions continued to occur, often in unsanitary conditions, often without proper or indeed any medical support, and certainly without any counselling or support services of any kind. The criminalisation of abortion also exacerbated the effects of coerced abortions and worked to deny women who, for many fair and sensible reasons, should have been able to legally access abortions. Presentations at hospitals of women suffering from complications from such abortions continued and unnecessary deaths occurred. Of course, corruption thrived around the provision of illegal abortions, as even a short read of Queensland's history under all shades of politics reveals.

In 1986 there were ultimately futile attempts to enforce the criminal law. I clearly recall the raid on the Greenslopes fertility clinic and the subsequent prosecution, the result of which was the decision by Judge McGuire to try to establish some judicial rules here in Queensland, because the parliament had failed to do so. All of that led to the further marginalisation and stigmatisation of women seeking termination services and, to an extent, that continues to this day. Despite various fictions and excuses,

in part designed to ameliorate the harshness of the law, it remains the case that the practice is still shrouded in criminal uncertainty and it is also the case that between 10,000 and 14,000 terminations occur annually in Queensland.

Uncertain and infective, honoured more in the breach than the observance and prejudicial to women in so many ways, the current law is bad law. The law fails my beliefs and it fails to support the best interests of the community and, in particular, women in our community and it should be changed.

I do not believe that changing the law will of itself lead to an increase in the number of terminations. Evidence is to the contrary. Reports show the number of terminations falling and measurably so in Victoria, where similar laws have been in place for a decade. No doubt there are a number of reasons for that, but no matter the reason; it is a good thing. I hope it continues to fall. For this to happen we must also ensure the provision of comprehensive and unbiased reproductive health education. Unbiased education and information designed by recognised specialists, in consultation with parents and free of any agenda is the best way to do that. That was a policy that the LNP took to the last election.

Concern with gestational limits has been the topic of much debate in this place. Ultimately, a limit should be set and there will be different views about it. Balancing the competing interests of the unborn and the mother, and being sensitive to the attitudes of society is never going to satisfy everyone. The QLRC report, from pages 94 through to 104, clearly sets out the reasons for the limit and canvasses many views and details. It acknowledges the difficulties of setting limits and also that such a limit is to some extent arbitrary. However, the recommendation clearly accords with current best practice clinical guidelines. It balances the competing interests between the foetus and the mother's health interests. Currently there are stringent clinical practice barriers in place for the provision of terminations after 22 weeks that are not likely to substantially change.

In considering all the claims made, I have seen no reliable evidence to support a conclusion that changing the gestational limit, that is, by reducing it, will change the number of terminations or the date at which they occur. The reality is that the vast majority of terminations occur in the first trimester. In light of that, in my view it is difficult not to think that an earlier limit would do little more than increase the difficulty and complexity for women in having what the evidence shows will be a termination they are likely to receive anyway. It is also important to note that there are currently no limits in Queensland prescribed by law and under current practice the requirement is for only one doctor to make an assessment.

A number of other matters have been raised that time does not permit me to deal with, so I will come to my conclusion. I do not support abortion. I wish that no woman felt the need to seek a termination. I wish that all of us could enjoy the enormous experience of a full challenging and rewarding family life, but I recognise reality. Our termination laws need to reflect that reality. They must be careful and understanding and, importantly, must not penalise either women or men and that which is beyond our best efforts or which is simply human nature. The current law does not do that. I believe that the proposed laws will. Women are entitled to control their own reproductive health issues, free from worry and stress from an outdated and restrictive law, and in full knowledge that their health and wellbeing is in their hands. I will support this bill.

A further incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Order! Members of the gallery, there will be no clapping or noise during the debate.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (4.08 pm): Unsurprisingly, I rise to speak in support of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018 and I do so on behalf of the hundreds of thousands of Queensland women who have had an abortion. Not one of you is a criminal. Today in this House—in your house—I join with other courageous members of this chamber to change these laws that say that you are.

Firstly, I sincerely thank the Queensland Law Reform Commission for their comprehensive analysis, their extensive consultation and their robust recommendations. The QLRC has provided government and this parliament with the reform design that we need to decriminalise abortion and regulate it as a health matter for the benefit of Queensland women and medical and health practitioners.

We cannot underestimate the importance of the QLRC process. Free from threats of electoral retribution and internal political machinations, the QLRC has provided frank and fearless expert advice and draft laws that better reflect the lived experience of women in the 21st century and not the 19th century. I challenge those who oppose this bill and have suggested that this bill has been rushed

or the development process flawed in any way to find another example where an independent expert body has conducted a wideranging 12-month inquiry considering 1,200 submissions and significant analysis from international and interjurisdictional comparisons.

I also want to thank very sincerely the parliamentary committee and secretariat, but particularly the member for Thuringowa, the member for Lytton, the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Rockhampton for their work on the committee and congratulate them on a report that fairly represents the various perspectives in this debate and gives guidance to this House in our deliberations.

I support this bill and rather than repeat what many of my colleagues have already outlined and what has been so extensively researched and outlined in the QLRC and parliamentary committee reports, I want to address some of the issues that I think have been raised in the debate both inside and outside this chamber that require a response. There have been those who proclaim to be advocates of the argument that abortion should not be a crime but rather a health matter for a woman and her doctor but who will not be supporting the bill before the House. This has left me somewhat perplexed, particularly because there has been no reasoned argument put forward by those people as to why this opportunity before them—this once in a century opportunity, as the Premier has said—should be squandered and the bill not supported. I can only regrettably surmise that the threats of disendorsement have had their desired effect.

The Leader of the Opposition claimed in her contribution to this debate that in 2018 Queensland women were not at risk of punishment for having an abortion and that she would be the first to defend them. Can I inform this chamber and the Leader of the Opposition that in the last 10 years three women and one man have been charged, as was the case in *R v Leach and Brennan*, or have been made to apply to the Supreme Court, as was the case in *Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service v Q* where a 12-year-old girl and her parents were forced to go to the Supreme Court to get permission to terminate her pregnancy.

These are lived experiences of Queensland women and young girls in the past 10 years. There was not one politician defending these Queenslanders against these archaic laws. They had to do it themselves against these laws. They, like many Queenslanders, want us as legislators to step up and do our job and not leave it up to the courts to determine when terminations should occur and whether couples are criminals for having procured an abortion because they were simply not ready to be parents. These current examples of how the laws are failing Queenslanders give us even more impetus today to take this opportunity to do our job and fix these laws once and for all for the benefit of all Queenslanders, particularly Queensland women.

I have heard those opposite say that this bill lacks safeguards. That is not the case. The strongest and surest safeguard for the protection of a foetus and an unborn child is a willing mother. The insinuation and perspective that women are not to be trusted, that somehow they wake up at 37 weeks gestation and decide that they no longer want to be pregnant is nothing short of offensive.

Those putting forward that argument need only look at the statistics from Victoria and even Queensland. Some 99 per cent of abortions are procured before 20 weeks and most of them before 12. Those after 20 weeks involve very complicated medical conditions. I say again that the strongest and surest safeguard for the protection of an unborn child is a willing mother.

There is no doubt that this is the last remaining gendered law on our statute. I have heard some of those opposite talk about coercive abortions. It works the other way. There are plenty of examples where violent partners keep their wives, their partners pregnant. What these laws allow is for these women to have choice in terms of terminating those pregnancies should they be unwanted. I have heard nothing from those opposite about those women who are in violent relationships and are forced to have baby after baby. I have heard nothing about their rights or their perspective from those opposite who want to talk about coercive abortion.

I fundamentally believe that if men were capable of bearing children we would never be having this conversation. The right of women to control their own reproduction, their own bodies is such an important part of equality in our society. The comments made by some in this chamber, and particularly by the member for Everton, only serve to continue the shaming and the stigmatisation of women and young girls.

To prioritise the rights of a foetus above that of a woman is something that I find offensive. The logical conclusion to that argument is that a woman should be forced to continue an unwanted pregnancy. In this day and age, I do not think that belongs in our society. It is something that is familiar to me from the *Handmaid's Tale* rather than Queensland legislation in the 21st century.

I could be accused of being biased in this debate or blind to the opposing side. I have made no secret of my long-held views on this matter. They firmly reflect the views of my constituency and I am proud of that. They also reflect the majority support of the broader Queensland public. I have not heard one reasoned argument from those opposite as to why these laws should be voted down, apart from religious moralising views that I think are better placed inside a relationship rather than in Queensland statute. There is no doubt that it is the will of Queenslanders that we get on with the job and fix this legislation once and for all.

I want to say a few thank-yous before my time concludes. I particularly thank the community that has been part of this campaign. It has been a community that has been assembled over the last 40 years. I want to particularly thank my Labor colleagues because there is no doubt that the herculean task of reform of any matter falls on the shoulders of the Labor Party time and time again. I thank my colleagues for getting this bill this far. I particularly thank the Premier for her leadership and the Minister for Health and the Attorney-General for their work in relation to this.

I want to personally thank Anne Warner, Norma Jones, Dr Carol Portmann and Beryl Holmes. I want to thank Children by Choice for their longstanding commitment. I thank the great women Alana and Jess Tibbitts for their hard work in this respect. I thank Emily Brogan. I want to particularly thank my electorate officers for dealing with the enormity of the things they have confronted over the past couple of months. To Kylie Gates, Michaelia and Emma, thank you so much. I want to thank Young Queenslanders for the Right to Choose, Pro Choice Queensland and everyone else. This is an historic moment. You all made this happen. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PURDIE** (Ninderry—LNP) (4.18 pm): I rise to make a very short contribution on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. I know this is a very emotive, complex, controversial and divisive issue. I would firstly like to acknowledge the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee and the secretariat for the work they have done in their research on this matter and for their detailed consideration and report.

The current abortion laws in this state are contained in sections 244, 245 and 246 of the Criminal Code and a 1986 District Court decision which expounded the state law on abortion. In this 1986 case the judge held that abortion is lawful in Queensland when it is carried out to prevent danger to the woman's physical and/or mental health. We know that there are 14,000 abortions performed in Queensland every year—abortions that are lawful in accordance with the common law interpretation of the Queensland Criminal Code; abortions in many cases which are conducted due to severe foetal abnormalities which lawfully seek to preserve the mental health of the mother.

The legislation before us here today proposes that a medical practitioner be allowed to perform a lawful termination on demand up to 22 weeks of pregnancy and post 22 weeks on the basis of current and future physical, psychological and/or social circumstances. This bill also contains provision for safe access zones to an area within 150 metres of the entrance of an abortion facility.

As a middle-age white male, I appreciate I am not best placed to make decisions and determine the best outcome for any woman, particularly a pregnant woman. That is why I have thought hard about this proposed bill and consulted broadly before coming to my position. I have listened to my wife, my mum, my current and former work colleagues, party members and importantly the constituents I represent. I have also reviewed submissions, read reports and listened carefully to both sides of this debate in this House over the last few days, coupled with my previous life and work experiences.

I have heard arguments from those opposite that I believe oversimplifies this bill as merely making abortion a health issue rather than a legal one. I have also heard people suggest that by not supporting this bill you support women going to jail for exercising their own personal reproductive rights. This debate is not just about decriminalising abortion in Queensland and that women risk punishment for having an abortion. This is misleading. As far as I am concerned, I do not believe the Labor Party have mounted a compelling case on either of these fronts for me in all good conscience to support this bill.

I firmly and wholeheartedly support the views of our leader, the honourable member for Nanango, and support the position articulated by our shadow Attorney-General, the member for Toowoomba south, in that I also hold grave concerns as to the 22 weeks on-demand threshold and even later term abortions on social grounds, the lack of a true conscientious objection for medical professionals and the potential unconstitutional aspects around the safe access zone provisions.

When hearing pro-choice advocates and those opposite supporting post-22-week terminations solely on social grounds, I was surprised how many advocates said, 'Yes, but no parent would ever actually do that.' I honestly wish I could sleep soundly at night in the naive assumption that no parent

would ever unlawfully harm or kill their born or unborn infant child. Unfortunately, my life experience does not grant me such utopian bliss. Unfortunately, in my old job at the Child Abuse Unit, nearly every day I said to myself, 'I can't believe a parent would do that.' I have seen firsthand on more occasions than I would like to recall where parents, mothers and/or fathers made decisions that are not in the best interest of their defenceless infant or child, born or unborn.

There are a number of sections in the Criminal Code, particularly sections 285 and 286, that clearly provide a legislative framework around the legal obligations of a person who has care of a child and their duty to provide the necessities of life—but at what point do we consider the rights and protection of the unborn? At what point does an unborn child warrant the protections that we afford all human beings? I am not sure when that should be. We are not here to debate the gestational period and I am not being asked to nominate a more appropriate one. I am being asked to support 22 weeks, 5½ months on demand, which I, in all good conscience, cannot.

I have spent a large part of my adult life protecting vulnerable humans who cannot protect themselves. A defenceless, unborn child on the cusp of life, I submit, also needs protection. I think it is our responsibility as a humane society to provide vulnerable persons protection. From the evidence I have seen, an unborn child on or about 22 weeks, and certainly post 22 weeks, exhibits all the attributes and characteristics consistent with life—which is no doubt why a stillborn baby after 20 weeks requires a birth and death certificate under our current laws.

As a former homicide detective, I also struggle to reconcile that, if it can be proven that a newborn baby has taken a breath, a person who terminates the life of that baby is guilty of murder and subject to mandatory life imprisonment, but terminating that baby not long before it takes its first breath is nothing more than a health matter. I remember an investigation back in 1998 when a deceased one-day-old female baby was found discarded in the backyard of a suburban home. She had been dismembered and her sex organs has been removed. Investigators were able to prove the infant had taken a breath, and subsequently both the father and mother were charged with murder. I raise this not to be alarmist but only to raise the issue that I believe one breath between murder and a simple health issue, for my mind, is too thin.

I have also heard people advocating for this legislation on the grounds of supporting a woman's rights to their reproductive autonomy. In my interpretation, there seem to be no provisions in this bill for the protection of women—no counselling, no informed consent, no safeguards around family violence or stopping coercion and no waiting periods like we see in other countries.

I do appreciate that terminations, often late term, currently occur in lawful, warranted, tragic circumstances. I would never pass judgement on anyone faced with those heartbreaking and life-changing decisions and under no circumstances should any woman under these circumstances be made to feel that she runs the risk of going to jail. Even though there are 14,000 abortions performed every year in this state—lawful abortions that are authorised, justified and excused by law—and not one person has ever been successfully prosecuted for obtaining one, I do agree that our current abortion laws need reforming, but this is not the reform we need.

I submit that the legislation currently before the House goes too far. Abortion on demand at 5½ months gestation and the inclusion of social grounds as reason for a termination post 22 weeks is too broad. It is for these reasons that I cannot in good conscience support this bill.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (4.26 pm): I too rise to make a contribution this afternoon to the debate on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. Before I get into it, I want to pay tribute to my mum—all those years ago in tough times. Goodness knows what mum would have been thinking when I was in her belly and, without the support of my late grandmother and others—many of whom I do not know—I may not have been here today. In the context of this debate, for me that is pretty significant.

This bill that is before the House is thanks to the Palaszczuk Labor government but, as I am reminded by many people—and whilst this has been a very respectful debate—this is a government that has been the most left-leaning government in Queensland political history.

Government members: Hear, hear!

Mr COSTIGAN: They clearly make no apology for that. One has to ask the question: would this have ever happened under former Labor governments headed by premiers Goss, Beattie and Bligh? I say no because there were genuinely socially conservative MPs in the Labor caucus back then and they were not held captive by those inner-city socialists and green activists, but times have changed. It is a Labor bill but it looks more like something from the Greens. I guess that is why the member for South Brisbane wants this, in many ways hoping to stave off another attack from the Greens.

It is true that Labor government MPs have been given a conscience vote on this highly controversial and emotive bill but, as I said on Sky News last Friday, I think it is a Clayton's conscience vote because I have no doubt there are government MPs who are worried about what will happen to them if they do not vote the right way. Here on the LNP side we have a real conscience vote, don't we?

An opposition member: Absolutely.

Mr COSTIGAN: That is on the back of what was decided in the LNP party room last Tuesday when it was unanimously decided that we would have that. What a privilege, in keeping with tradition on our side of the aisle.

Last week on national television I did say that I would be voting no, and nothing has changed. In my part of the world we are unashamedly pretty conservative people. My office—no different from the offices of a number of MPs on this side of the fence, particularly regional MPs—has been inundated by people who want us to vote no including many people we never hear from and some people who, to be blunt, would not vote for me in a fit. They have implored me as one of 93 just to do my bit. We would argue until blue in the face with some of those people on so many areas of public policy, but for this they, like me, say no because there is overreach and then some in relation to this bill.

I acknowledged that convergence of people from all walks of life, some of whom look at me and say that I am not their cup of tea, last Saturday in Mackay, the city that I represent, at the fourth annual March For the Babies organised by Cherish Life. I have not been before, but I felt it was important to go and look people in the eye and tell them straight. It was a well-attended march. I acknowledge the leadership of my constituent Dr Ciara Ross, President of Cherish Life Mackay, and others for organising this peaceful march which included many churchgoers from across the various denominations, in particular the Catholic Church which is significant in Mackay thanks to those Irish immigrants. I am a descendant of one of them.

Mr Lister: And the Maltese.

Mr COSTIGAN: And the Maltese; I take the interjection from my good friend the member for Southern Downs. I was coming to them as well as the Italians and the Filipinos in more recent times. Mr Deputy Speaker, guess what? They all go to church and they all vote. It is worth noting that the march last Saturday was across the Forgan Bridge, originally named after the mother of former Labor premier and legendary member for Mackay, William Forgan Smith. I wonder if he would have voted for this or the late Edmund Casey whom I remember well as a young journalist growing up in Mackay or even Tim Mulherin, the former Labor member for Mackay whom my late mother once cared for.

We did hear yesterday from the current member for Mackay and I am disappointed she failed to even mention her home parish of St Mary's in South Mackay where I happened to start school and go to church in 1977 under Father Anderson and Father Hannifin. I do concede that she mentioned Father Don White and Bishop Michael McCarthy, the Bishop of Rockhampton, and listened to their concerns. However, it seems that it went in one ear and out the other. Let us all not forget that these parishioners are wondering what is going on in Brisbane right now, as is the strong Maltese community in Mackay which came together at Francis of Assisi nursing home last month to celebrate Our Lady of Victory. It is an important event on the Maltese calendar in our part of the world which I attended, as did the Labor member for Mackay.

We should not forget either that of the submissions that hit the inbox of the committee that examined the bill almost 80 per cent made it clear they wanted the bill to be voted down. Yes, the Law Reform Commission was all for it but it is stacked with lefties. The same can be said of the AMA which nowadays is calling for the termination of the coal industry, not just the termination of pregnancy. This is the same AMA that continues to pick on constituent and former AMA state president Dr Bill Boyd, who has delivered countless babies. He is a decent man still helping our community notwithstanding the rubbish coming out of the AMA, and I cannot believe their position on this nor can many other doctors in my part of the world.

In summing up here on what is a deeply personal issue for all of us no matter what we think, it is a matter of life and death, as we all know. Taking abortion out of the Criminal Code is one thing, and I believe there is growing community sentiment and support across the state for this to happen. As a father of two teenage girls not just as an MP, I cannot stand here today and think the obvious. No woman at all in this state should be fearing imprisonment for having an abortion. However, I cannot support abortion on demand, a free-for-all for any reason including social reasons, up to 22 weeks gestation. Our LNP membership does not want it, my constituents do not want it and I certainly do not want it.

As we have heard many times in this debate, after 22 weeks the approval of two doctors will be needed for a termination but this could well be box ticking. What defines 'consultation'? Where is the counselling? Where is the cooling-off period? What about the safe access areas? How can we say there is a genuine safeguard for the health and wellbeing of an expectant mother and her baby under those circumstances? Yes, the baby; let us not forget that. We all come into this place supposedly to speak up for our constituents no matter where we come from, but who is standing up for those who cannot speak? I know I am, and consequently I cannot and will not support this radical bill before the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Scenic Rim—LNP) (4.36 pm): I cannot in good conscience support this bill before the House. There are around 14,000 abortions in Queensland each year. While the present law is not perfectly constructed, largely because it has evolved through judge-made law in the courts, it has developed to allow abortions where there is a risk to the physical or mental wellbeing of the mother. The law as it stands is not perfect but the proposal in this bill will not improve it. The present law could be described in a colloquial sense as tinged with shades of grey. Indeed, many considerations around this debate are simply not black-and-white issues that have clear answers, not the issues of health, not of law, not of ethics and certainly not when it comes to the human emotion and feeling that is evoked by this issue.

Many people are torn between the various issues that are raised on all sides of the debate. Many people can understand very well the reasoning why this bill is being brought forward while at the same time acknowledge and understand the reasons for objections to it. Trying to legislate in a black-and-white manner on this topic can never reconcile all of the relevant considerations and important issues that arise in this debate.

I cannot support passage through this parliament of a bill that will give the imprimatur of blessing by this House and all of the members in it to a framework that could potentially facilitate late-term abortions. I understand that even under the existing law sometimes these procedures are carried out where the physical or mental wellbeing of the mother is at risk. It is one thing to have a framework where sometimes late-term abortions occur given the circumstances of individual pregnancies in the present legal framework which provides that abortions are lawful in some circumstances. The present law, as I see it, reflects parliament's view when it was legislated that the first principle—the starting point—is that the unborn child must be protected.

It is quite another matter to support this bill which would do away with that starting point that the unborn child must be protected by legislating in a positive manner a framework that enables termination of pregnancies without any conditions prior to 22 weeks gestation and with a lower bar of conditions after 22 weeks than presently exists. In particular, the fact that a post-22-week termination could take place on account of the social circumstances around the pregnancy is something that is very concerning given the potential for this provision to permit the termination of pregnancy of healthy children who could survive outside the mother's body.

In Queensland, the law dictates that a child born prematurely after 20 weeks of gestation must, if that child dies, be issued both a birth certificate and a death certificate. We have criminal law provisions that make it an offence to kill unborn children and civil liability provisions that recognise the unborn child. Why then under this bill is licence given to terminate the pregnancy of a child that is afforded such protection under other laws?

The LNP leader said yesterday that if a person is not moved by both sides of this debate then they have not considered it deeply enough. I agree with that. I consider there is room to improve the current law around termination of pregnancy, but for me the starting point for that improvement needs to reflect values that place the highest value on life.

As legislators, we should value life. The acts of parliament we enact in this parliament are not just technical and legal frameworks; they also should reflect the values, aspirations and ideals for Queensland. As a society, we should place the highest value on life: for every individual at all stages of life—young, old, in between—no matter your age, gender, ability, disability or other condition. Valuing the individual is a classical liberal viewpoint—one that has been rejected by communists, socialists and authoritarian regimes over the generations. We should not look down that path, let alone take it. For me, the starting point of the existing law places the highest value on life. I believe society is heading in the wrong direction and a dangerous one when that highest value on life is chipped away at, and these moves should be rejected.

I also consider that this position is generally the view of the Scenic Rim electorate. Over the past few weeks I have received many emails, letters and other feedback about this bill. The overwhelming view conveyed to me has been to oppose this bill, by a magnitude of approximately 40 to one. I table a petition signed by dozens of residents opposing this bill.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition opposing the late-term abortion bill [1664].

I also have concerns about the validity of provisions in this bill to establish safe zones of 150 metres around abortion clinics and its obvious impact on freedom of speech in our community. It has been highlighted that similar provisions to these are presently under challenge in the High Court because they potentially infringe the right to political communication in this country. This bill, with its safe zone provisions if upheld as valid by the High Court, sets a dangerous precedent indeed for freedom of speech. How far away from potential hotspots of disagreements will parliaments in Australia be permitted to banish protesters? We start with 150 metres, but then with some conflict on the fringe there will be calls for larger, bigger exclusion zones—500 metres, one kilometre. Where does it end? What is to stop such safe zones being legislated in respect of other subjects to limit people's ability to express their opinion? Restricting freedom of speech is a dangerous slippery slope. This bill should be rejected and I urge all members to do so.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (4.42 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018. I have listened to the debate, and at the outset I put on record my acknowledgement that sometimes abortion is necessary. There are many and varied reasons that make abortion the right action. Every aspect of this bill has been well canvassed in this debate. I do not intend to go over those aspects again. They are part of the permanent *Hansard* record of this parliament for all to read. I do want to reflect on a few of my own thoughts in recent times, and I note the contribution by the member for Hervey Bay. It is a very personal issue for him because he is the result of an unwanted pregnancy and may not have been here to be heard yesterday if these laws were in place back in that time.

I attended the funeral today of Des Cater OBE—that is, Over Blinking Eighty. Des was into his 81st year and his passing was expected by the family. The service included some wonderful contributions and celebrations of Des's life. One contribution reflected on the dash—that line on the tombstone between the date of birth and the date of passing. Des had a dash, and what a dash he had—rest in peace, Des—but a baby that is aborted does not have a dash and that saddens me and it should sadden all of us.

I turn now to a grave concern that I do have that was touched on by the member for Hill in his contribution yesterday. He used a specific example. We all know what infanticide and foeticide are. I fear that this bill could open the door in a domestic and family violence situation for a woman to be forced into foeticide by an abusive partner. What protections will be in place for these women, Minister? What sort of mental or physical torture could an expectant mother be subjected to in these situations from an abusive partner? Members, think about that when voting because it is a real, live situation now with the laws the way they are. Imagine what it could turn into.

I am going to finish my contribution by quoting from a submission to the committee from someone I hold in high regard. It is a one-page submission but I know there is a lot more to the story. Kerry Barham, one of my constituents, wrote to the committee and said—

I would like it registered please that I DO NOT AGREE with this tabled Bill. I believe the laws in Queensland relating to termination of pregnancy should remain as they are, thereby protecting (as much as is currently possible), the right to life of the unborn child. A late term termination of a healthy pregnancy being made lawful for any reason other than a medical emergency is abhorrent, and is in fact a backwards step, rather than a progression for women's rights and human rights in general.

I experienced for many, many years the heartbreak of not being able to have my own children, and being told that the waiting list for adoption in Queensland at that time was 10 years ... having our own family seemed impossible for us. The very thought of babies being killed for convenience sake is just so incredibly grievous that I can hardly find the words to express such a deep sadness for the would be mothers and for a society that would deem this acceptable, let alone lawful. I implore you to please, please, please consider these little lives, consider the devastation of those couples who are not able to have their own children but would dearly love them, and consider a society where it is deemed OK to 'terminate' the innocent.

I table that document.

Tabled paper: Correspondence, dated 3 September 2018, from Mrs Kerry Barham to the Chair of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee [1665].

I ask all members to consider their position on this very important and emotional issue. Think of the unborn children as well as their mothers. Think of the life, the dash, they will not have. Reform is necessary but this bill goes too far. I will not be supporting the bill. In all conscience, I cannot.

 **Mr BOOTHMAN** (Theodore—LNP) (4.47 pm): I rise here today to make a very short contribution to the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. Many times in this chamber I have voted for change to laws in the best interests of the individual. I have always believed in the right of the individual and the responsibilities of one's actions. Whilst life may develop unexpectedly and not proceed the way we would have hoped or expected, it is our values and our beliefs that define us.

Many of my community in the electorate of Theodore have contacted me personally through phone, email and letters. There have been a vast, vast number. Whilst I have a personal view on this matter, I must respect the wishes of residents who have taken the time to contact me, and I thank those residents for doing so. While some communications can only be classed as extreme and detrimental to the argument they are putting forward, it is an issue beyond politics and goes to our innermost beliefs. As a nation, as a state, we have come far in modernising our laws. As I have stated, I have supported change in conscience votes previously in this chamber.

I have listened to many of the contributions over the last few days, but one contribution affected me greatly and that was the contribution of the member for Hervey Bay. He is an example of an individual who could pay the ultimate price in this debate. The vast majority of my local residents who have contacted me have expressed their concerns about this bill. Whilst I may have a deep-seated belief in the individual's right, there is also the right of the unborn healthy child. Therefore, I respect and understand the wishes of the vast majority of the residents in the electorate of Theodore who have contacted my office and me.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.49 pm), in reply: I would like to thank all members for their contributions to the debate on the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. Before I reflect on the debate, allow me to read a response from the Attorney-General to questions raised by the member for Maroochydore. It states—

- Informed consent is required for all medical treatments, including terminations.
 - The general laws about consent to medical treatment, including consent of minors and persons with impaired consent, will continue to apply under the Bill.
 - That is, minors must have the capacity to give informed consent.
 - A child is capable of giving informed consent when the child achieves a sufficient understanding and intelligence to enable the child to understand fully what is proposed. This is also described as having 'sufficient intelligence and maturity to understand the nature and consequences' of the proposed medical treatment.
 - These issues are dealt with on a daily basis in clinical practice. There is no need to include specific provisions around consent in the Bill.
 - Any child who does not have capacity to consent to medical treatment, cannot give valid consent.
 - For a termination in those scenarios, the parent cannot give consent.
 - Only the Supreme Court, in its *parens patriae* jurisdiction, may authorise the termination. The Supreme Court, in making that decision, must act in the best interests of the pregnant child.
 - The Criminal Code contains a range of serious offences that protect children under the age of 16 from sexual abuse and cruelty. Other offences protect any person against sexual violence, assault and rape. If a child is in immediate danger or a person suspects a crime has occurred, the police should always be contacted.
 - Child protection laws also contain mandatory reporting requirements for doctors and certain other professionals.
- ...
- Termination is also a special health care matter under the *Guardianship and Administration Act 2000*
 - It is not a matter that a substitute decision-maker for the woman can give consent to. An application must be made to QCAT.
 - The Bill amends the Guardianship and Administration Act to provide that QCAT may consent to the termination only if satisfied a medical practitioner may perform the termination under the Bill.

Returning to the summary of the debate, this bill will recognise that termination is a health matter that does not belong in the Criminal Code. Women, their families and health practitioners should not be put under the strain of navigating the legal system when making a healthcare decision. In the course of this debate we have heard claims that the rate of late-term terminations will increase under this legislation. We have heard claims that women will carelessly abort healthy, late-term babies without a second thought. I do not—

Dr MILES: I do not believe any woman sees a late-term termination as a casual event to undergo without a moment's thought, but obviously plenty of those who spoke in this debate do. I welcome those members putting their thoughts about women on the record. If they think women cannot be trusted, that they do not know what is good for them, that they would seek late-term terminations for no reason, there is very little I can do about those members' views. They have bigger problems than I can address here. What does concern me is the number of—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Members, order.

Dr MILES: What does concern me is the number of members who made outrageously contradictory statements to avoid admitting that today they will make a choice to limit women's rights in Queensland. At least 12 members stood up during the debate and said, 'I support removing abortion from the Criminal Code. I believe termination of pregnancy is a health issue for a woman and her doctor, but I will not vote for this bill.' They should have saved their breath. When asked, 'Should women be treated with respect and dignity under Queensland law?', history will record that they voted no. They cannot have it both ways even though they have tried desperately to. The member for Nanango said—

Terminations supervised by doctors and carried out for medical reasons are entirely legal in Queensland.

She then went on to say—

There are other aspects of the current framework that could be reviewed, including amending the Criminal Code to explicitly protect medically supervised abortions for medical reasons.

Why would we do that if there is no problem to address? On the subject of the gestational limit, the member for Mudgeeraba said—

Women who have had a termination of pregnancy say it is not the easy way out. It is a painful and difficult decision made in consideration of what is the right thing to do for the mother and the child.

However, she went on to say—

... I am unable to support the bill as it seeks to allow 'on demand' or 'on request' termination of pregnancy ...

You either believe that women do not take the decision lightly, or you think they will do it on a whim. You cannot say both. The member for Nicklin, who was on the committee, said—

I am not here to second-guess the difficult decisions that families make in those ... situations.

However, he went on to say—

I am not comfortable with 22 weeks. In fact, I am not comfortable with the day before that or the day before that or the day before that ...

The member is very much second-guessing women's difficult decisions not based on the circumstances but based on the gestational limit.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members.

Dr MILES: The member for Buderim said—

... in my view the current legislation governing the termination of pregnancy in Queensland requires reform.

However, he will not vote for this bill. The member for Bonney said—

I am in favour of abortion reform in Queensland.

...

I believe that the framework around terminations needs change. I believe the abortion should be a woman's choice up until a certain defined point and, after that, only in specific medical circumstances on the advice of doctors.

However, he will not vote for it despite summing-up exactly what this bill does. The member for Toowoomba South said—

No-one in this House would hold the view that a woman should run the risk of going to jail for having an abortion ...

However, he will not vote for this bill even though it would ensure precisely that. The member for Moggill said—

I accept that terminations occur in Queensland and that terminations need to occur safely and be accessible in Queensland. I also have to say that I am not against reform, including decriminalisation.

However, he will not vote for this bill. The member for Pumicestone said—

... I support the provision of this bill that seeks to decriminalise the termination of pregnancy.

However, she will not vote for this bill—and on and on and on it went. Members said they wanted change but would not vote for it.

I want to acknowledge the members of the LNP who have said they will support decriminalisation and will vote to do so. I also want to single out the government members who I know have grappled with this bill and I thank them for the honest way with which they have engaged in the discussion on it.

This bill contains a sensible framework to ensure terminations performed after 22 weeks gestation are appropriate in all of the circumstances. Terminations after 22 weeks require two medical practitioners to agree that the termination should be performed. The QLRC recommended a single broadly expressed ground be adopted in the bill reflecting the complex and individualised circumstances that may arise. In deciding whether a termination should be performed after 22 weeks, the medical practitioners must consider all of the relevant medical circumstances; the woman's current and future physical, psychological and social circumstances; and the professional standards and guidelines that apply in relation to the performance of termination. There are already robust systems in place to deal with situations in which these very difficult decisions must be made. This will continue if the bill is enacted.

Debate, on motion of Dr Miles, adjourned.

MOTION

Queensland Rail; No Confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads

 Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (4.58 pm): I move—

That this House—

1. notes:
 - (a) in early 2016, GIRO and Indec warned Labor of a driver shortage once the Redcliffe peninsula line opened;
 - (b) on 30 September 2016, 48 services were cancelled and Minister Hinchliffe found out on Twitter;
 - (c) on 4 October 2016 the Redcliffe peninsula line opened with Labor employing fewer qualified drivers than in January 2015;
 - (d) on 21 October 2016, 12 per cent of scheduled services were cancelled with large scale disruptions to services occurring over the following weeks;
 - (e) on 24 October 2016, Labor announced a plan to recruit 200 train crew, despite an earlier EBA that blocked external recruitment for these positions;
 - (f) on 27 October 2016, the QR Chair and CEO resigned;
 - (g) on Christmas Day 2016, 261 or 36 per cent of all scheduled services were cancelled;
 - (h) numerous interim timetables announced by the government have been changed frequently and without warning;
 - (i) the Labor/unions MOU to pay multi-million dollar Commonwealth Games bonus payments;
 - (j) the RTBU taking Queensland Rail to the Fair Work Commission to block external recruitment based on Labor's 2017 EBA;
 - (k) on 4 October 2018, Labor accepted the resignation of QR Chair Phillip Strachan, handpicked by the Premier to fix the trains, and two other board members;
 - (l) Labor has paid millions of dollars in overtime to staff because of the RTBU's preference for a structural deficit of staff;
2. notes Labor's failure to nominate when rail fail will end and the 472 weekly services will be restored; and
3. expresses no confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads.

It never ceases to amaze me the differences between us on this side of the ditch and New Zealand when it comes to Westminster ministerial accountability. The Prime Minister of New Zealand had a member of her cabinet who was guilty of this. She used her personal email for a couple of emails but should have been using her official ministerial email account. However, the member for Miller continues to sit here under the protection of the left of the ALP and makes an absolute mockery of the whole essence of Westminster ministerial accountability.

Let's roll the tape with some of the evidence. It is almost like *Sesame Street's* Guy Smiley and Beat the Time. 'We have the minister here and the question is: guess the number of new drivers!' At the end of the day, why do we have 472 fewer weekly services—not more weekly services but 472 fewer? The missing-in-action member for Miller loves to get the stats and put them in the blender, put them through the mincer, and tries to rewrite history because, to be fair, he has only had four years to get this right. Well, he and a litany of other failed members.

The Deputy Premier had a couple of goes. Bing bong, she was out in left field. Then we had the member for Sandgate. We know what he did. At least he had the gumption to fall on his sword because he knew that he had done the wrong thing. The member for Miller really is special because no matter what he does, he has taken the best on-time running record of any passenger network in this country and absolutely run it into the ground. You have to be pretty special in this place to get your own rail fail tag. Now we have rail fail 2. You have to be very special.

We know that the member for Miller loves his Twitter, but there is only one problem. Given the amount of time he spends on social media—Twitter, Facebook and particularly his private emails—if he spent one-third less time on that and concentrated on his core mission, which is to run the Transport and Main Roads department, the people of Queensland would all be better off. This man presides over what was formerly a great institution: Queensland Rail. From what the little birdies who contact me daily have told me, he has killed it to pieces when it comes to morale.

We have a member here who knows that when he walks in he has the protection of the member for South Brisbane because he props her up, and we have three little sand mines starting to appear. We have the member for Miller, the member for South Brisbane, Minister Jones and Minister Dick—they have their own little fiefdoms—and then most importantly of all we have the queen courtier herself, the Premier of this state, who also is absolutely in the mix of it.

Only a couple of weeks ago a report came out. It was a fairly insignificant report. The report was Queensland Rail's annual report. The member for Miller had it on 14 September. What did he do with it? He sat on it. There must have been a call from somewhere further up the line—maybe the Premier's office—and a memo to the member for South Brisbane and a memo to the member for Miller, 'Please come forward. There is something you need to take account of. You have missed something on approximately page 70 of the report,' and that was bonuses. It was something that was obviously overlooked. 'Nothing to see here. Move right along.'

The member for Miller will get up very shortly and say, 'No, I was onto it.' Just as he was onto turning up to ABC and 4BC studios for radio interviews. He is missing in action. This man should resign. He should go right now. We have a member of parliament who presides over the third largest department on the books and what has he done with it? He has run it into the ground. Morale is in the gutter. On-time running times are now one of the worst in mainland Australia. You have to be very special indeed to go from being best in the country to absolute worst in four years. The question for the last time will be—through you, Mr Speaker—Minister, when will rail fail end?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you cannot say 'through the chair' and then direct your comments directly at a member.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (5.03 pm): What a screechy, desperate effort from the member for Chatsworth. Of course, he was Campbell Newman's assistant minister for public transport, but he does not like it when we remind him of that. His fingers are all over the events of October. This is the member who described the Newman government as having 'the best managed rail network in Australia'. They ordered trains that were built by overseas workers. They refused to begin training a single train driver for the entire year of 2014. They knew they had six new stations opening in 2016 and they knew we had the Commonwealth Games coming—the biggest sporting event in the country for a decade—yet they stopped training train drivers for an entire year in 2014. And he describes that as the best managed rail network in Australia? Oh, my God! Really?

This opposition has learned nothing from two election defeats. They suffered the most catastrophic loss of a large majority government in Australian political history. They lost and squandered the biggest majority in less than three years. They did not even get to three years. Why? They treated people arrogantly. They particularly mismanaged the rail network.

One of the key issues identified about why services in October 2016 had such substantial issues was because there were not enough drivers. Why were there not enough drivers? Because the LNP stopped training them. It took 18 months to train a train driver—we have that down to 13—and it flowed through to when the system expanded. That has been well documented. There has been no apology from the member for Chatsworth. There has been no apology from the opposition for substantially causing the rail fail. There have been no apologies from them. They are only trying to cover up their role and their culpability in damaging a rail system that is now taking years to recover.

Let us compare the two records. Under Labor how many train driver training schools are there? There are eight underway. How many were there under the LNP? Zero in 2014. Do we sack the workforce? No, we treat them with respect. The LNP attacked workers, they sacked workers and they despatched workers. They despatched 1,700 Queensland Rail workers. How dare they come in here and talk about respect for the workforce! Let us look at patronage. Under Labor we have patron up by 2.3 million trips since the Newman years of 2014-15. Patronage went down 2.38 million under the LNP between 2011-12 and 2014-15. In the last financial year we have seen an increase in patronage of 3.8 per cent for the rail system. This shows there is confidence returning. People are returning and patronage is up because we are stabilising and improving the system.

Over the last two school holidays we have seen a full timetable retained for the first time since October 2016. We are seeing overtime coming down. We have seen patronage going up. We have seen on-time running at above 95 per cent for four quarters in a row. I do not know what sort of imagination the member for Chatsworth has, but we have one of the toughest on-time running criteria in the country. We have been above 95 per cent for the last four quarters in a row. The Commonwealth Games plan was delivered: 600,000 trips. I remember those opposite doomsaying that we would have rail fail during the games. In fact, we had a transport plan that worked very well. Who presided over that? I did, as the minister. You have to do more than rhyme two words together and put them after a hashtag: you need a policy.

Under Labor we have a comprehensive plan based on the Strachan inquiry. Half of the recommendations have already been implemented. We are bringing in the smart ticketing that is used in Chicago, London and Vancouver so we can have a more efficient world-class system. There are no plans from the opposition. The opposition are more interested in segues than they are in railways. They sent train manufacturing overseas instead of keeping it in Queensland. Labor will have Queensland workers rectifying these trains because of the LNP's mess. Overtime is coming down under us, whereas it went up 25 per cent under them. This is a spurious motion and—

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I remind all members that if they wish to interject, which is not allowable under the standing orders, they should ensure they are in their allocated seat.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (5.09 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Chatsworth. What a lamentable list of Labor failure we heard! We sat in the House this morning as those opposite laughed along while half the alphabet's worth of failures were read out—complete arrogance in spite of the seriousness of this proverbial train wreck of a minister. What irony that we heard the member for Cooper break into song this morning, singing 'Get your motor runnin'. That is exactly what Queenslanders have had to do under this government as they completely lose faith in the rail system and get in their cars, clogging our already congested roads. With cancelled services and rising fares, commuters are paying more for less. Here is a line from another song they could add to the Labor playlist: 'On a warm summer's evening, on a train bound for nowhere', as the Christmas train services get cancelled.

In four days time Queenslanders will not be celebrating as the 'rail fail' reaches its second anniversary. In 2016, 167 services were cut from the timetable each week. That was just the start of worse to come. It was quickly followed by an interim timetable eliminating 209 scheduled services and an eventual revised down timetable on 23 January 2017. Labor then wasted \$160 million, throwing money at the problem. I say 'wasted' as things have not only not improved but deteriorated.

We often come into this House and hear Labor blame everyone but themselves for their failures. I think we got a whole four minutes into today's sitting before the Premier started to blame previous governments. The reality is that in 25 of the past 30 years Labor governments have been in charge. That is a generation of failure in a number of areas, but particularly with our train services.

Labor members like to talk about our five millionth Queensland, baby Elizabeth. About 30 years ago we would have been welcoming close to our three millionth Queensland. Let us call her baby Susan, born at Nambour Hospital in 1989. Incidentally, that cannot happen anymore—but I digress. In 2018 Susan should be able to get a decent train service from Nambour to Brisbane, but Susan cannot because of a generation of neglect. Let us hope that in 2020 baby Elizabeth can have a better outlook with the election of a Frecklington LNP government, which will work with the federal coalition government. By the time baby Elizabeth is 30 she will be travelling on a fast train, for under an hour, between Brisbane and the Sunshine Coast. With Labor's record of 'rail fail', though, baby Elizabeth's prospects of this government providing decent rail services are non-existent.

The minister cannot even hold the team together. The hierarchy are jumping off this embarrassing train. Labor's hand-picked chairman and two other directors have resigned, apparently unable or unwilling to continue working with the minister. Less than two years ago the previous chairman and CEO of Queensland Rail also resigned. Who can blame them? There has been a conga line of transport ministers since the Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015. None of them was up to the job. We all know the problem, because we all know who runs the rail system: the unions—union controlled staffing, union controlled training, union controlled blowouts in overtime. Each time this Labor government, which talks about election funding transparency, goes to the union ATM and withdraws its cash, it is compromised and beholden to them.

We all know who is running Queensland Rail. It is the unions, and the government is beholden to them. That is the problem. That is the issue. A rail system cannot be successfully managed by unions. Neither can the state of Queensland. Here is one last tune for Labor's song list when it comes to the unions: 'Here I am, baby. Signed, sealed, delivered, I'm yours.'

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (5.14 pm): I rise to oppose the motion. The hypocrisy of those opposite is instructive. I thank the House for the opportunity to correct the record by explaining how the Palaszczuk government is rebuilding Queensland Rail after it was decimated by Campbell Newman and his mates. Apart from the minister, you may not find a bigger fan of public transport in this House than me. I know that the much derided family-friendly hours have meant that I have been able to use public transport to travel from my house to this House.

Rather than dwell on the negatives that have defined the LNP's short but spectacularly poor attempt to govern this state, I would like to share the latest public transport figures with the House. The trend in patronage is actually very positive. Confidence in our South-East Queensland public transport system is returning, with more people catching public transport, taking millions of additional trips compared to the same time last year. TransLink data released just last week reveals that 3.1 million more trips were taken by South-East Queensland commuters between April and June 2018. From listening to those opposite, you would think that they were all empty and not there. Some 47.5 million public transport trips were taken during the most recent reported quarter. That is up from 44.4 million trips in the same quarter last year.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, there is too much general conversation. It does not even appear to be interjections. I ask you to keep your conversations to a minimum or take them outside.

Mrs McMAHON: For the full 2017-18 financial year, 182.83 million trips were taken in South-East Queensland. That is an increase of 5.4 million trips, or 3.1 per cent, on the 2016-17 patronage figures. What is more pleasing about the data is that it does not even include the 5.3 million event trips that occurred during the 2018 Gold Coast Commonwealth Games.

Let us compare that to the LNP's record. There are so many sorry milestones that we could focus on, but let us focus on patronage. I will restrict myself to just the rail services and public transport—the topics we are here to speak about. Between the 2011-12 and 2014-15 financial years, public transport trips actually dropped under the LNP by more than two million. Over the same period, trips on trains in South-East Queensland dropped by roughly the same number—2.38 million. The Campbell Newman effect was well and truly rolling—driving people to drive, because they were certainly turning away from public transport.

Since its first election the Palaszczuk government has turned the LNP negatives into everything that is positive for South-East Queensland commuters today. More people are riding trains, buses, ferries and trams. That passenger growth has gained momentum due to the introduction of the Fairer Fares policy in late 2016. By reducing the average adult fare by about 13½ per cent compared to January 2014 levels, Fairer Fares has encouraged more people to give public transport a go and saved families more than \$117 million. Fairer Fares has meant that each trip from the Beenleigh train station in my electorate to the city had a saving of \$3.70. That is a saving of over \$800 each year for our commuters. Thank you, Fairer Fares.

Concessions and discounts for veterans, jobseekers and asylum seekers also ensure that public transport is accessible by those who rely on it most. Next month, to support the centenary of armistice services on 11 November, the Palaszczuk government will provide free public transport for uniformed serving Australian Defence Force personnel and veterans and their families wearing service medals. This is a free travel initiative that will apply each year on Remembrance Day, as it already does on Anzac Day. This is a fantastic initiative. It is one that I know my family and friends will be using. Free travel for veterans and their families is just another way the Palaszczuk Labor government is supporting people to catch public transport. I urge all those opposite to get on board and give it a go.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (5.19 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion. The prolonged 'rail fail', in all its aspects, has gone on for far too long. Under this Labor government, frustrated commuters can be forgiven for wondering if there is ever going to be light at the end of the tunnel. The state has witnessed a revolving door of failed Labor transport ministers, each coming into office with an enthusiastic reassurance that they are going to fix the shattered system and get everything back on track. We are still waiting, and it appears we will continue to wait under Labor. It is not surprising that confidence is deteriorating to record lows under the current minister. He has overseen one dilemma after another, culminating in so much angst and uncertainty in the community.

Labor's track record of rail fails is growing faster and longer than Jack's beanstalk. Going back to the Premier's time as minister, we saw 15 per cent increases in public transport fares year after year after year. It is unacceptable that the patronage base for public transport is still recovering to this day. Then along came ministers Trad, Hinchliffe and Bailey. With each of them taking a turn at holding the wheel, the continued tradition of Labor failure in this vital portfolio has steered along its unaltered and disastrous course. There can be no denying that the system is still badly broken. Media headlines announce failure after failure and within the last fortnight it has been reported that QR chair Phillip Strachan resigned along with two other board members. Remarkably, these resignations—one being the Premier's hand-picked 'Mr Fix It'—have followed on from earlier departures by the then QR chair and CEO in October 2016. Such high-level partings of the way surely spell it out loudly and clearly to anyone who is listening that something is incredibly wrong.

It is well documented that Labor in its wisdom ignored the warnings of GIRO and Indec of driver shortages once the Redcliffe peninsula line opened. In fact, when the line opened in October 2016 there were fewer qualified drivers than in January the year before. It simply does not equate and it is far from rocket science to realise that the opening of an additional rail line with additional services is going to require an appropriate number of additional qualified staff to operate it. Most disturbingly, timetable changes and cancelled services have become part of the everyday life for long-suffering rail commuters, including my constituents on the Cleveland line. Who can forget Christmas Day 2016 when no less than 261 scheduled services were cancelled? People were forced to wait on platforms when they should have been enjoying the festivities with their families. This is just one example of the rail chaos under Labor that has had a huge impact on a very special day.

As I have mentioned before, the Cleveland line has been dubbed 'the misery line', with 42 cancelled services cut by Labor. Commuters are fed up with the unreliability of services, so much so that our roads are now heavily congested each and every day as people get back in their cars because of the rail uncertainty. It seems that Labor is all talk and no action when it comes to encouraging the use of public transport. Rail services have to be efficient, cost effective and, most importantly, reliable if there is going to be any hope of easing the current trend of increasing vehicle numbers. Locals know that Cross River Rail, which is being promoted as the solution by Redlands Labor members, will do nothing for many years, and that is if it is ever built! Commuters need and want services restored and more investment committed to upgrading the line and rail station parking facilities.

There has long been a plea to duplicate the line from Cleveland to Manly. Again in this House I call on the government to do so and to do it sooner rather than later. Not surprisingly, this important infrastructure project rates highly in every community survey undertaken. However, Labor continues to not be listening or, if it is, it is more content to put it in the too-hard basket. In contrast, the LNP cares about public transport needs. We care about ensuring commuters are provided with the services they so rightly deserve—services to get them to work, school, to attend business and appointments and to participate in everyday life.

Yesterday I met with departmental officers after seeking a Transport briefing because we care. We want to work towards solving the issues and do not accept the minister's poor excuses and constant playing of the blame game. The Leader of the Opposition came out to Cleveland station recently and spoke to people using the rail service. I thank the opposition leader for caring and showing her interest. Under the LNP, our rail network was considered the best managed in Australia with on-time running at 96 per cent. I support the motion.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (5.24 pm): I stand to counter this motion and label it as a great farce in front of us here tonight. I worry if the member for Chatsworth and other LNP members actually believe what they have in this alphabet-busting motion in front of us tonight, but they have to try it because they have nothing else. They can offer nothing else with regard to rail. I heard the member for Nicklin say what he will say to baby Elizabeth on the Sunshine Coast. I would say this to her: do you remember when the LNP only offered fifty-fifty funding on the Sunshine Coast rail? That is how concerned it was in terms of getting rail in that area when it was listed for 80-20 funding from the feds.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr WHITING: Those opposite do not want to hear about the great success we have had in rail. Who was it that built the Redcliffe rail line? It was Labor—a joint state Labor government with the federal government with the Moreton Bay council. The Redcliffe line has made a huge difference to our area. Public transport has improved remarkably since it was implemented as it revolves around the stations in our area. Locals can get the train to access a whole range of study and work opportunities.

It is Labor that is delivering Cross River Rail—only Labor. This \$5 billion project will transform South-East Queensland and public transport. In my area Cross River Rail will mean 5,400 extra seats and I calculate commuters will save an hour and a half each week if they are commuting back and forth to the city. It is very clear that it is Labor that invests in rail. Only Labor understands that rail opportunities create the work and education opportunities that working Queenslanders need. That stands in very stark contrast to what the LNP has done. The public knows what the LNP did to rail in the Campbell Newman government. It knows that it got rid of 1,700 workers—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, if you wish to make a contribution, rise to your feet and do so. Apart from that, cease your interjections, particularly those members who have already spoken on the motion. You have had your chance.

Mr WHITING: Members of the public know it was the LNP that got rid of the driver trainers. They know it was the LNP that abandoned driver recruitment, and in my area they know it was the LNP that chose a cheaper signalling option on the Redcliffe rail line—one that was not recommended by QR because it may not have linked in with existing systems, and it was absolutely right. That decision by the LNP led to a lengthy delay in the opening of the rail line.

We know one of the major casualties of LNP mismanagement was train driver training. QR requires a pipeline of driver recruits in training to ensure that if one retires or leaves for whatever reason that driver can be replaced with someone with a full suite of the skills required. How many recruits started the training process in the final 12 months of the Newman government? It was zero—absolutely none!

The Minister for Transport and Main Roads is now overseeing a rebuilding program that involves eight train crew training schools in 2018. More drivers commenced training this year than ever before in QR's history—more in one year than in the entire term of the LNP government. Since 4 October 2016, 105 drivers and 232 guards have been trained and are now fully qualified and working on the South-East Queensland network. This represents a net increase of 52 total qualified drivers operating on the Citytrain network. When recruitment was opened to external applicants with no previous QR driving experience in August 2017, there was an overwhelming response. More than 10,000 applications were received.

The numbers I have outlined do not represent a failure; they represent an overwhelming success that only Labor could deliver. As recommended by the commission of inquiry report, QR is now moving to an ongoing recruitment model and we will ensure the pipeline of train drivers never dries up again, as it did under the LNP government. It is very clear that, with Commonwealth Games trains running on time 95 per cent of the time and overtime coming down, this is what success sounds like when you run a rail network under the Labor government. I hope we never have to return to what we had to face during the time of the Campbell Newman government.

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (5.29 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Chatsworth, in particular that part of that motion that expresses no confidence in the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. I might be an optimist but, based on his performance, I suspect that there may even be members on the other side who support that notion.

The area that I represent lies just under an hour's drive from Brisbane—on the rare occasion that people get a clear run on the M1. That means that many of the people I represent can expect to work in Brisbane but still live in what is my opinion the best part of the Gold Coast. A survey that I have cited before from the *Gold Coast Bulletin* found that 77 per cent of people would rather take the train to Brisbane than drive on the M1, but they do not mainly because of the cost and the perceived lack of reliability.

This motion has been moved around the time of a very sad anniversary. It will be two years since the start of Labor's rail fail on 21 October. We have all heard the reports of this rail fail and experienced it ourselves. As such, our expectations of the quality of public transport that this government will provide Queenslanders are pretty low.

On the Gold Coast, leading up to the Commonwealth Games there were station refurbishments, but obvious failings have not been addressed at my local train stations. Helensvale station is the only station in the state that has bus, train and light rail connections, yet the number of car parks at that station has not kept pace with demand. The only thing stopping users from copping a \$157 in fines from the council is the council's reluctance to enforce the laws. Every day, easily 150 to 200 commuters have to park illegally on the verges or at the neighbouring Westfield shopping centre. On a workday, just driving around Helensvale shows the lengths that some people go to to get a car space.

With the M1 being in the condition that it is and the congestion that commuters face, I would have thought upgrading the park-and-rides at the Gold Coast a no-brainer. Yet, once again, this year's budget was all about Brisbane stations, with \$12.4 million for upgrades to their parking facilities and only a measly 150 car park spaces promised for the Gold Coast between Ormeau and Varsity Lakes. Further, reports that \$1.5 million was spent by QR during the games as a show-up-to-work bonus is completely outside of community expectations. The taxpayers who fund that money do not get paid any extra just for turning up to work.

The light rail has proven itself to be vital infrastructure for the Gold Coast. I am delighted that the minister notes my strong support for the trams at every opportunity, particularly for a future spur line to Harbour Town. However, with stage 2, the Gold Coast has its own rail fail of sorts, with the trams not following the rest of the timetable and instead finishing at midnight. I have had many people tell me of their experience of using the tram on a Saturday night only to find themselves stranded at GCUH where it terminates. From there, they are forced to get a taxi or Uber to their car, or take a dangerous walk home in the dark. That has turned many people away from seeing the tram as a viable mode of transport.

When answering why this is the case, TMR said that it looked at bus data before stage 2 was put in place. That is hardly a comparison for usage of the tram. Many people who never got on a bus are keen to use the tram and the bus routes TMR looked at did not run past even 11.30 at night. We have the line now. It was expensive to build, so why are we not using it to its full capacity? A petition that I have run over the past few weeks on the issue has had over 300 people sign it, clearly showing that there is a need for this service. We need our public transport system to be a viable option, but just yesterday many Gold Coasters were again delayed in getting to work.

Last night, I had the great pleasure of having the Rotary Club of Parkwood visit Parliament House.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr O'CONNOR: I recognise the member for Mermaid Beach for visiting. He was at their inaugural meeting. Last night, while we were in the lift, we ran into the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Being polite, I introduced my guests to the minister. One of the particularly cheeky members of the group had caught the train up to work in Brisbane that morning, leaving the Gold Coast at 7 am and arriving at Northgate just before 10 am. I can assure the House that he took the opportunity to provide the minister with some thoughts on his experience.

During the 2017 election campaign, Labor made a number of rail commitments to the Gold Coast, including a proposal for three new stations. Perhaps Labor meant to promise these stations during the 2020 election campaign, because the budget papers show that there is no money arriving until 2021. It is unfair to make these promises and force Gold Coasters to wait for these stations until Cross River Rail is completed in Brisbane. It is really a hollow promise. I commend this motion to the House.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (5.34 pm): This outrageous motion is a very broad attack on our government and our transport minister. I proudly rise to speak against it. Our fine transport minister and, indeed, our entire Palaszczuk government have, are and always will be committed to providing safe and reliable public transport for all Queenslanders, including those naysayers I am hearing from at the moment.

As South-East Queensland's population grows, we have to ensure that Queensland Rail's 152 stations on the region's network provide every person with equal access. Some of our stations are more than a century old, or were built well before modern disability legislation set the standards that we expect our stations to be measured by. Modernising our stations is an enormous task. It is a challenge that is also faced by rail operators in other states and across the world. I go back to my old industry where we would much prefer to build a high-voltage substation on a greenfield site rather than construct an alive substation or brownfield while keeping the power on. Similarly, upgrading a station while it is in use has to be a very well-considered project where public and commuter safety as well as keeping the trains running has to be front and centre. Owing to the nature of the network, building a new station is not always an option, so in most circumstances brownfield upgrades are what we face.

The work that I have done to secure the upgrade of Dakabin station at the last term is no secret to those in this place. I will be there through every step as that upgrade progresses through the planning stage to the design and construction phases. The shifting of the station was canvassed, but commuters who used Dakabin station were very clear about what they wanted and that is to have what they currently have there upgraded. I am sure that this decision was mostly due to waiting for so long to have some action on the station and bird-in-hand logic prevailed.

The Palaszczuk Labor government is investing \$300 million to upgrade 16 stations—not just Dakabin, although that is my priority. Queensland Rail's Station Accessibility Upgrade Program has already delivered important station improvements at the Graceville, Dinmore, Nambour, Alderley and Newmarket stations. Construction will soon start at the Morayfield, Boondall and, as my colleague will be very happy to know, Strathpine stations. Upgrades like that of Dakabin station are also planned for the Buranda, Albion, Cannon Hill, Auchenflower, East Ipswich and Loganlea stations. Queensland Rail is working closely with developers around Albion and Buranda and with the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority at Fairfield station to ensure the best facility outcomes for customers.

As part of the South Bank transit oriented development, platform 1 at South Bank station will be raised and the lift and platform works at Central station are included in the ongoing Central station upgrades. Thanks to the transport minister, work is planned or underway right across the south-east—from its busiest stations to its outer urban stops. The accessibility upgrades that I am talking about typically focus on new lifts, raised platforms to assist boarding, pedestrian overpasses, tactile floors, ramps, hearing loops and accessible toilets.

Queensland Rail is also seeking feedback from the Accessibility Reference Group, which is an important group that provides feedback from the sector to drive improvements and ensure that our rail services meet the community's expectations. The Accessibility Reference Group includes representatives from Guide Dogs Queensland, Vision Australia, Queenslanders with Disability Network, MS Society, Spinal Life, Arthritis Queensland and Better Hearing Australia.

Our government understands the challenges ahead in making our rail service more accessible. These upgrades will increase the number of independently accessible stations on the Citytrain network from 80 to 91. That means that, once these projects are complete, about 83 per cent of rail customers will travel to and from accessible stations. The station upgrade program demonstrates that we have a plan to gradually and systematically improve facilities so that the barriers to travel that have existed for people with a disability for decades are removed.

I want to touch on the rhetoric around driver training, internally and externally. I cannot leave that alone. It is hard to train new drivers when there is no-one to train them because they have all been sacked. I have spoken to many drivers and the strong opinions that I have received from them is that the complexity around the Citytrain network calls for a very rigorous and comprehensive—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, I would like to hear the member's contribution. The level of noise is unacceptable. I ask you to hear the member.

Mr KING: Their lack of desire to understand is disappointing. Sadly, it does take some time to progress through this rigorous training. In the few seconds I have left all I have to say is that this motion is a joke. It is spurious and I urge everyone to vote it down.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (5.39 pm): I rise to support the motion by the member for Chatsworth. What we have seen from this government over time is a litany of failures. If there is one exclamation mark amongst them this is it: the rail fail. We have heard all sorts of excuses. Typically they blame the LNP or it is the federal government's fault. It is anybody else's fault, everybody else's fault, but not this government's fault. Really? Labor has been in office for almost four years—in fact, 44½ months, more than 1,350 days.

Let us run through some of the timeline for the rail fail. More than a year after coming into office in early 2016 they were warned of a driver shortage once the Redcliffe Peninsula line opened. More than two years ago they cancelled 48 services. More than two years ago the Redcliffe Peninsula line opened and they had less qualified drivers than they did when they came into office in 2015. Two years ago they cancelled 12 per cent of scheduled services culminating in a huge disruption to services. Again two years ago, on 24 October 2016, they announced a plan. These transport ministers are good at planning to plan. It never goes anywhere, but they do plan to plan. The plan was to recruit 200 train crew. How is that going two years down the track?

Mrs Wilson: They can't answer!

Mr CRANDON: They cannot answer. This Sunday, 21 October, marks the second anniversary of Labor's rail fail where, on that day in 2016, commuters had 167 services cut from the timetable each week. That was just the start. This was followed by an interim timetable eliminating 209 scheduled services just four days later, on 25 October 2016. Then again more service cuts on 7 November which was followed by further cancellations and an eventual revised down timetable on 23 January 2017 cancelling a total of 472 services. That was two years after those opposite came into office.

When will they take responsibility for their litany of failures? When will they take responsibility for the rail fail? When will they answer the question? When will it be done? When will the rail fail be over? I will tell members when—when the Rail Tram and Bus Union say so. When the RTBU has extracted every ounce out of this fiasco. This government is under the control of the unions in this state. They say, 'Jump', the government says, 'How high?' They say, 'No.' The government listens to them. We have seen it in the mangocube emails. Remember those? They were all over it. The ETU were all over it. It is clear that the union does not want those jobs filled, they want overtime for their members at a huge cost to Queenslanders, not just in dollar terms but in the lack of services across the network. If this is a success, Minister, I would hate to see what you think is a failure.

What are some of the other fails? There is the fail in relation to the park-and-ride at Ormeau Railway Station. I am getting 70 new park-and-ride spots at Ormeau Railway Station. The problem is that where these 70 are going in, more than 100 people park there every day. I am actually going backward with the number of car parks that I have got for my people at Ormeau Railway Station. Where are they going to park? We are losing 30-plus car parks by putting in this formal car park. I need the security, I need the lighting, but where am I going to park my other 30- plus cars?

Recently at the park-and-ride at Coomera, just before Westfield opened TransLink went through and hit 50 park-and-ride patrons with a \$261 fine for parking safely but illegally. Why? Because there are no car parks available for them. That was \$13,000 worth of fines on that one day. The new Pimpama Railway Station that will solve some of these problems was a promise made by this government in the last election. When is it due for delivery? In 2023—five years from now, Minister! You are a joke!

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, you will direct your comments through the chair. That goes for future speakers in this debate. I have been very clear about my expectations.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (5.44 pm): I join my colleagues in opposing this motion. The Palaszczuk government is committed to restoring services to commuters and fixing the cuts from the LNP in Queensland. It was this government that established the commission of inquiry in 2016 to investigate the train crew and timetabling issues on the Citytrain network. This inquiry report was developed through 102 interviews with key stakeholders and analysis of available data and documents. The recommendations made by the inquiry provided the plan for restoring Queensland Rail services, a body of work that the government continues to follow and implement.

The Citytrain Response Unit was established by the Palaszczuk government on 8 February 2017. The response unit is the body that will monitor the implementation of the 36 recommendations contained in the inquiry's final report. It also oversees reviews of the governance, legislative framework and the structure of passenger rail service delivery in Queensland. Jacqui Walters has been appointed as the chair of the Citytrain Response Unit and reports directly to the responsible ministers for Queensland Rail. As at 30 June 2018 the Citytrain Response Unit reported that of the 36 Strachan inquiry recommendations 18 are complete, three are partially complete and 15 are in progress. The progress made in stabilising rail operations in South-East Queensland has resulted in a sustainable timetable with stress periods proactively managed with minimal impact to customers.

While the LNP was touting Queensland Rail as the best in the country, it was sacking workers and ignoring training and investment in infrastructure. Our government was left to pick up the pieces. The recovery of the region's rail system must be gradual and it must be sustainable. Over the past 12 months some of the highlights of that recovery have included implementation of the eight-week train crew management plan supported by a refined model to enable better management of timetable stress; development of communication tools and processes to ensure passengers receive advance notice of timetable changes and are kept informed during service disruptions; first stress period without taking a timetabled service downgrade for the July 2018 school holidays; opening of train crew recruitment to external candidates with no prior Queensland Rail experience; and a reduction of driver training duration from 18 months to 13.1 months. We have seen a significant increase in reliability and for 12 months Queensland Rail has delivered more than 95 per cent of its services on time. We know there is a long way to go to restore customer confidence and return to a full service timetable but progress is being made.

The Palaszczuk government committed to delivering on the recommendations of the commission of inquiry and ensuring that customers have the contemporary and reliable public transport system that they deserve. I want to finish by saying that at a local level Mount Ommaney has benefited enormously from investment in transport infrastructure in the local area. The Mount Ommaney electorate is preparing for the future with critical upgrades to park-and-rides—for instance, Springfield in the

electorate of Jordan—and in my electorate of Darra work is underway to build an additional 181 car parks at the Darra park-and-ride. We know that we cannot fix roads in order to fix congestion; we have to upgrade public transport facilities as well. I am proud to say I fought hard to secure over \$8 million to upgrade the Darra park-and-ride in addition to the \$65 million for the much awaited Sumner Road upgrade which is so desperately needed.

Mrs Lauga: A great local member!

Ms PUGH: Thank you! It was also fantastic to secure a total of \$20 million for the business case and early resumptions for the Centenary Motorway project which is much needed in our community. As members can see, when it comes to the future of transport it is all happening in Mount Ommaney.

The Minister for Transport and I have been lobbying tirelessly for the expansion of Oxley Road from two lanes to four. We have not had much luck. We have been trying to work with our colleagues in the Brisbane City Council but so far we have had no success. Let us hope that the Brisbane City Council can see the benefit of upgrading this rail bridge. We just need them to sign on the dotted line. We have been working hard and I commend the minister for his cooperation at every step of the way for these critical local projects for the people of Mount Ommaney. All members of this House should get on board.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (5.49 pm): As I rise to speak, yet again the 5.38 pm from Doomben is on bypass. That is a regular occurrence. Every Friday, my daughter does what the minister wants her to do and catches the train home from school. Almost as regular as clockwork, she will ring up and say, 'Mum or Dad, can you pick me up from a different station, because guess what? The Doomben line is cancelled yet again!' On a Friday afternoon, yet again the Doomben line has been cancelled.

That is just one small example and tonight other members have indicated failings that they experience because of this minister's complete and utter incompetence. I stand to support the motion, because how can anyone have confidence in this minister? How can anyone have confidence in a minister who cannot even keep control of his own emails? How can anyone have confidence in a minister who fails so frequently to discharge his duties?

I have been thinking about the problems with Queensland Rail and what is going on. We are now up to our fourth minister. Under the Palaszczuk government, we have had four ministers in four years. Under the LNP, we had one minister in three years and the trains ran on time. We had one minister in three years, and guess what? Trains actually fitted in tunnels! We had one minister in three years, and guess what? Trains actually had seats! Under the LNP we had one minister in three years and the trains had air conditioning that ran. We had one minister in three years and we saw a five per cent reduction—the first ever—in public transport fares. We had one LNP minister in three years and the rate of on-time running went from the worst in Australia at 84.5 per cent to the best in Australia at more than 95.5 per cent.

Our minister introduced the 15-minute on-demand service on the Ferny Grove line during peak times and an extra 1,000 services. He delivered services out to Springfield and made sure that those trains ran on time. He turned on the power for the Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 1 and made sure that it ran on time. He fixed the delays that had been experienced for years under Labor. We had a minister who was aware of what was going on with Queensland Rail and took an interest in it.

In contrast, we all remember Rachel Nolan, the former member for Ipswich. When asked, 'Is Queensland Rail for sale?' she stood over there—I still remember it—and said, 'No chance; this will not happen under a Labor government.' The following day, the former member for what was then the seat of Mount Coot-tha stood up and said, 'Guess what? We are selling Queensland Rail!' That was all courtesy of Labor.

I thought I had seen the worst of Labor transport ministers with Nolan, Wallace and Palaszczuk. I thought I had seen them all. The member for Inala, the now Premier, was so mean that she actually cut the provision of water bubblers at railway stations. The poor old commuter could not even bend over and get a sip of water on the way through, even though they were invariably thirsty as the trains were not running. If they got on them they could not get off them and the trains did not have loos. That was the legacy of the member for Inala. Of course, she was very angry—very, very angry—about it all. I saw a media release from her saying that she was very angry about it, but nothing happened.

In this state, under this incompetent, untrustworthy and failed minister, what is happening with Queensland Rail is like watching *Murder on the Orient Express*: the bodies keep falling. First of all the chairman goes. Then two directors go. That followed a previous chairman and a previous CEO. And all the way through, the assailant strolls the corridors, knifing everyone else and hoping to avoid responsibility. That is why this minister is incompetent and should heed the call and resign.

(Time expired)

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (5.54 pm): I am glad that the *Orient Express* was not an NGR train, because they would not be going anywhere. I rise to speak against this fraudulent motion. Having listened to some of the comments from those opposite, I think it is about time that some of them were shunted. This motion ignores the truth, and it ignores both the LNP's failings and the Palaszczuk government's significant achievements in this space.

Everyone in this House should be proud of the incredible success of the Commonwealth Games and the highly positive impression that they created of the Gold Coast and Queensland right around the world. One of the most impressive aspects of that success was the smooth operation of transport. Let us not downplay the size of the challenge presented to the minister: one million spectators, 6,600 athletes and 17 venues spread throughout the Gold Coast. It was a world-class event and the transport, planning and execution were world class to match.

During the games, more than 5.3 million public transport trips were made, representing more than 75 per cent of trips made on the entire South-East Queensland transport network at that time. On the coast, buses ran for 24 hours, seven days a week delivering 4,000 extra daily services. Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 2, developed and delivered by the Palaszczuk government in record time, carried close to 100,000 passengers per day during the games. Queensland Rail estimated total passenger trips on the Gold Coast line to be more than 600,000 people.

We were ready for the games and we delivered. We delivered it under this transport minister. The Minister for Transport and Main Roads rose to the challenge and the legacy of his stewardship deserves to be recognised—\$1 billion was invested in the Gold Coast transport network, which will support the city's growth and tourism into the future. That investment included the fast tracking of \$163 million for the duplication of the Gold Coast heavy rail line between Coomera and Helensvale, and more than \$160 million to upgrade local roads throughout the Gold Coast.

Those opposite hated the Commonwealth Games and they still talk about it today. They hated that it was a success and they look for every opportunity to criticise the Commonwealth Games. That criticism continues today with references in this motion to the cost of the overtime that was delivered to the workers. What an absolute joke. It makes me wonder if the LNP has any understanding of fairness for working-class people. Maybe they do not understand that, but for their benefit I will explain the concept of paying your workers appropriately for the contributions that they make and for the work that they do.

Like many industries that rely on shift workers, overtime is a standard part of working patterns for Queensland Rail train crews. Through Queensland Rail, the Palaszczuk government undertook significant planning to ensure that workers delivered a successful Commonwealth Games and that they were paid correctly for doing the work that they did. Critical frontline staff including train crews, train controllers, overhead linesmen, signal engineers and station operation staff went above and beyond to deliver and boost rail services on the Gold Coast line. Queensland Rail worked closely with their employees to ensure their extra efforts and flexibility were recognised by being paid appropriately. On this side of the House, we think that is right and we will not apologise for paying those workers.

There is something else those opposite do not get, and that is Cross River Rail. In contrast, the Palaszczuk government understands that this transformative initiative offers genuine opportunity for the network to reform and revitalise. It will unlock the bottleneck at the core of the South-East Queensland transport network, allowing more trains to run more often and it will enable a significant increase in the South-East Queensland rail network capacity, providing a basis for future expansion on the network.

Cross River Rail will make it faster and easier to use public transport across the Gold Coast and is on track to be delivered by 2024. Cross River Rail will unlock the bottleneck in Brisbane CBD, enabling turn up and go frequency across the whole of South-East Queensland. The motion before the House does not bear close scrutiny and I will not be supporting it. Instead of bringing up rubbish motions like this, you should all come over and thank the minister for the great job he is doing in Queensland and in this government.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Gladstone, I remind you to direct your comments through the chair. I have warned several members about that during this debate.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 39—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

NOES, 50:

ALP, 47—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Resolved in the negative.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2936, on motion of Dr Miles—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (6.05 pm), continuing in reply: Medical practitioners are guided by ethical considerations and best practice outlined in clinical standards and guidelines which do exist currently but which will be updated to reflect the new laws if they are passed.

Queensland Health has prepared a comprehensive plan for implementation of the bill. This includes establishing a women's health hotline so that all Queensland women will have access to trusted information from Queensland Health about their rights and the support and services available to them. Women requiring a termination at the later stages of pregnancy are and will continue to be treated with a multidisciplinary approach tailored to their specific circumstances. This multidisciplinary approach ensures women have access to counselling, social work services and pre- and post-clinical care.

The bill does not oblige a medical practitioner to perform a termination of pregnancy. It is open to the doctor to decide that the termination should not in all the circumstances be performed. There is no evidence to suggest that the number of later term terminations will increase as a result of the bill. Data provided by Victoria indicates that termination rates have fallen significantly since their act came into effect in 2008. The details of this data have been tabled in the House.

The member for Mermaid Beach said he supports reforms. He just wishes there was some kind of process, some way of getting all the experts together to consider all the factors and agree on a best practice framework. I have good news for him. The QLRC produces carefully researched, rigorous, quality and practical reports on a range of diverse and often unrelated contemporary topics which must be tabled in parliament under the Law Reform Commission Act 1968. The QLRC's termination of pregnancy report is the culmination of a year-long inquiry involving extensive consultation.

The member for the Moggill suggested the QLRC has not been independent or impartial in its deliberations on this matter. The QLRC is an independent body that makes recommendations to the Attorney-General on areas of law in need of reform. The QLRC is currently chaired by Hon. Justice David Jackson of the Supreme Court and is constituted by four other senior and highly qualified members of the legal profession. I would like to again thank the Queensland Law Reform Commission members and secretariat for their significant review. The result is a balanced, well-researched and healthcare focused bill.

The member for Caloundra has circulated a number of amendments to the bill in his name. The explanatory notes for the amendments provide little in the way of rationale for the proposed changes. They diverge dramatically from the independent, evidence based recommendations of the QLRC. The amendments would significantly impede women's access to health services and, for this reason, I do not support the amendments. I will outline why during consideration in detail rather than do so twice.

Right now I would like to note some of the amazing, moving, heartfelt contributions we have heard this week. I thank the member for Thuringowa, the chair of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee, for his contribution to the debate and for his tireless work as the committee chair in carefully considering the bill and the many submissions from stakeholders. As he noted, this is an historic moment for the women of Queensland. He has been involved in all three bills on termination, having been on the former health committee when it considered the two private members' bills in 2016, and has heard from women across the state. He noted his respect for the incredibly brave women who placed their experience on record.

The member for Thuringowa outlined his experience as a paramedic of 25 years, treating women in a range of dire situations, including rape victims who have gone on to have to make a decision about termination, victims of domestic violence, delivering pre-term babies that were not viable and failed self-abortion attempts. With his background in health care, the member for Thuringowa considered that the decision about termination should be a matter for the woman, her doctor and her family. He noted that the committee heard from women in regional and remote areas currently forced to travel great distances, even interstate, to access termination services.

The member for Pine Rivers reminded us what it was like to be a woman in 1899, a time when Queen Victoria still reigned, a time when women did not even have the right to vote. As she rightly points out, the 119-year-old legislation from this era does not reflect modern medical practice.

Having attended the committee hearings and read each and every submission on the bill while pregnant herself, the member for Pine Rivers believes that we should trust women to make a decision about when they have children and to give women agency over their own bodies. She noted the amazing strength and bravery of the women who appeared before the committee—Ashleigh, Zena and Melanie. I too would like to express my thanks to these women for their strength and dignity in sharing their experiences with the committee.

The member for Pine Rivers and her office have been subject to abusive phone calls and offensive material, as I am sure many of our offices have. In this context, she points out that staff should not be subject to abuse in their workplaces and that health practitioners should have the same right.

The Premier, the Deputy Premier, the Attorney-General, the member for Redlands, the member for Mount Ommaney, the member for Lytton, the member for Gaven, the member for McConnel, the member for Macalister, the member for Cooper, the member for Bulimba, the member for Ipswich, the member for Keppel, the member for Mackay, the member for Nudgee, the member for Jordan, the member for Waterford and the member for Algester are all brave women who have told their stories and the stories of other brave women, and I thank them for their contributions. We are better for the many women on our side of the House and the knowledge and experience they bring to this House.

I want to congratulate the Premier for her leadership in allowing this bill to come to the House. We would not have even debated this bill if it were not for the fact that this state is led by two powerful women in the Premier and the Deputy Premier or, indeed, governed by a cabinet with a majority of women.

I want to thank all members for their contributions, the QLRC and the parliamentary committee. I want to thank John, Kathleen, Kirsten and all the Queensland Health staff who have worked on this bill and the staff from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General. I want to thank the staff of my office for their efforts, especially Ali King, Danielle Cohen, Katharine Wright and Amy Hunter. On behalf of the Attorney-General, Deputy Premier and Premier, I thank the staff of their offices who have worked on this bill.

I want to thank the leaders and members of Labor for Choice, Children by Choice, Young Queenslanders for the Right to Choose and Fair Agenda for their campaigning. I especially want to thank Emily Brogan, Alana Tibbitts, Clare Manton and Cynthia Kennedy. I want to honour the work of all of our health professionals right across Queensland. I want to acknowledge all of the women who have campaigned for abortion law reform in Queensland. I sincerely hope you get your wish here tonight.

Queensland's current laws are out of step with almost every other state and territory. This bill before the House will significantly modernise and clarify Queensland's laws on termination of pregnancy. The bill reflects the evidence based recommendations of the Queensland Law Reform Commission. If members believe that termination of pregnancy is a health issue, they should vote in favour of this bill. I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 51—Bailey, Berkman, Bolton, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 41—Andrew, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dametto, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Katter, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Miller, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—



Mr McARDLE (6.24 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr McARDLE: I move the following amendments—

- 1 **Clause 5 (Termination by medical practitioner at not more than 22 weeks)**
Page 7, lines 3 to 4, '22 weeks'—
omit, insert—
16 weeks
- 2 **Clause 5 (Termination by medical practitioner at not more than 22 weeks)**
Page 7, line 6, '22 weeks'—
omit, insert—
16 weeks
- 3 **Clause 6 (Termination by medical practitioner after 22 weeks)**
Page 7, line 7, '22 weeks'—
omit, insert—
16 weeks
- 4 **Clause 6 (Termination by medical practitioner after 22 weeks)**
Page 7, line 9, '22 weeks'—
omit, insert—
16 weeks

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Termination of Pregnancy Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Mr Mark McArdle's amendments [\[1666\]](#).

These amendments deal with the reduction of a 22-week period to that of 16 weeks. A 22-week period relates to the right of a woman to have a termination and then beyond that 22 weeks with the consultation and consent of two doctors. I made the comment this morning that at page 94 of the commission's report it made this comment—

However, the Commission recognises that, as the fetus develops, its interests are entitled to greater recognition and protection.

The difference between 16 and 22 weeks is not significant in relation to a time line. However, it is significant in relation to the development of the foetus. At 16 weeks the foetus is 18.3 centimetres long and weighs 5.2 ounces. Hearing is beginning to form and the architecture of lung passageways is being formed. At 17 weeks the foetus is 20.1 centimetres in length and weighs 181 grams. At 18 weeks the ears are standing out and the foetus is beginning to respond to sound. At that point the foetus is 22 centimetres in length and weighs 223 grams. Structures are being formed within the brain of the foetus that will lead to the ability to walk.

At 19 weeks the ears, nose and lips are now recognisable. The foetus is 27.3 centimetres long and weighs 273 grams. At 20 weeks the foetus has fine hair and is developing an immune system. My point is this: the commission was right—22 weeks and 16 weeks are short in time but very lengthy in relation to the development of the foetus. It is my submission—and I urge members to think very

carefully about this—that 16 weeks is the starting time for an enormous spurt in growth of the foetus. It is at that point in time the commission's words, in my opinion, should be put into play. That is, it is in the interests of the foetus to gain greater recognition—

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: I rise to speak against the amendments moved by the member for Caloundra which would have the effect of shifting the gestational limit from 22 weeks to 16 weeks. The QLRC considered carefully what the gestational limit should be under this bill. It did not arrive at the 22-week limit by accident. The committee did not come up with 22 weeks on the run. Changing the gestational limit to 16 weeks ignores the independent evidence based work of the QLRC. In particular, those amendments portray women who receive a poor or fatal foetal diagnosis later in pregnancy. Foetal abnormalities of this kind are usually diagnosed at the 18- to 21-week morphology ultrasound scan. The member for Caloundra's amendment would mean that these women would have significantly less time to make their decision about whether to terminate.

For women receiving the most serious diagnoses of structural anomalies in the brain, heart or spine of their foetus, a term limit of 16 weeks as proposed takes women's very personal decision out of their hands. It would put them under additional pressure during an already stressful time. The 22-week limit gives a woman who has received a poor or fatal foetal diagnosis time to seek further testing and second opinions which can take days or even weeks.

The 22-week gestation limit allows women time to make a carefully considered decision. In some cases this extra time may lead a woman to continue with her pregnancy rather than rush a termination. Women facing these difficult situations told the committee that current earlier term limits left them feeling rushed to make a decision. The 22-week limit is even more important for a woman who needs to travel to access medical specialists or who is experiencing economic hardship or who needs to arrange care for existing children. These proposed amendments to the gestational limits of the bill are bad policy made on the run and in rejection of the evidence based expert opinion of the independent QLRC. They portray women in the most vulnerable and heartbreaking circumstances. I urge all members to reject these amendments.

Mr HART: As I outlined in my speech on this bill, this is a step too far that the Labor Party is trying to take us for political reasons. While I agree that abortion should be removed from the Criminal Code, I think that 22 weeks is completely unacceptable. I support the amendments being moved by the member for Caloundra, and any further consideration I have to supporting this bill will hinge on the outcome of this consideration.

Mr KATTER: The KAP will be opposing these amendments. We are opposed to the principle of the bill in its entirety, and this is a compromise on that timing. We see that in principle it still represents the same thing so we will be voting against these amendments.

Mr KELLY: I oppose these amendments. Like many people in my community, when I started this inquiry, I was uncomfortable with late terminations. I think I was instinctively uncomfortable with late terminations, but as a healthcare professional I have learnt to base my practice and decisions on evidence rather than instinct. This recommendation has been carefully considered. In the first two inquiries that I was involved in, we heard very credible evidence from specialists and also from women and families in these situations about the very difficult and heartbreaking decisions they were having to make. We did not find any evidence of people simply getting to 22 weeks or 23 weeks or any other point and saying, 'I don't want a baby anymore.' In all of these situations, the decisions that these people were making were extremely difficult and were not ones that I would ever want to have to make personally.

As a health professional, I have no experience in this particular area. My experience is much more at the other end of the life spectrum, but as a health professional I felt it would be wrong and unethical not to provide people in this situation with an option of termination so I reject this amendment. We heard evidence from specialists that said if you put a line on a chart and make the decision-making difficult on one side of the line, more people will terminate earlier. People in this situation are attempting to save pregnancies and find themselves in a situation where they are forced to make decisions by some arbitrary time line.

This amendment cannot be supported because the Law Reform Commission has come back after considering this very carefully. To suggest that this bill has not been consulted on and has not been thought through is a complete fallacy. I spent 12 months on two committees looking at this. We have had a subsequent 12-month period for the Law Reform Commission to consider this and we have had another thorough inquiry into this bill. I reject these amendments.

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

AYES, 10—Crandon, Hart, Krause, Lynham, Madden, McArdle, Molhoek, O'Connor, Power, Stuckey.

NOES, 80—Bates, Bailey, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crawford, Crisafulli, Dametto, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Mander, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr McArdle) negated.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have a couple of brief bits of information for the House. Firstly, members should be on notice that the media will be present on the floor. Television cameras will be on the floor for the remainder of this section, as per the arrangements during question time. As well, there has been agreement reached with leave of the House that in future divisions the bells will be rung for one minute only. I am giving all members fair warning and fair notice.

Debate, on motion of Mrs D'Ath, adjourned.

MOTION

Suspension of Sessional Orders

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (6.45 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That so much of the sessional orders be suspended to allow the House to continue sitting until the completion of all stages of the Termination of Pregnancy Bill to be immediately followed by the automatic adjournment in sessional order 2.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (6.46 pm): I move the following amendment—

5 Clause 6 (Termination by medical practitioner after 22 weeks)

Page 7, lines 13 to 15—

omit, insert—

- (b) the medical practitioner has consulted with another medical practitioner who—
 - (i) is fully informed of all the circumstances that must be considered under subsection (2); and
 - (ii) has sufficient medical knowledge and expertise relevant to the medical condition of the fetus to properly consider all relevant medical circumstances; and
- (c) the other medical practitioner also considers that, in all the circumstances, the termination should be performed.

This particular amendment deals with clause 6, in particular subclause (1). It deals with the circumstances where a woman is seeking a termination post 22 weeks. Under clause 6(1)(b) the practitioner in those circumstances must then consult with a second medical practitioner. In those circumstances the word 'consult' or 'consulted' is very loose. It could well be satisfied by simply requiring a doctor to talk to another doctor by telephone and obtaining the opinion of that doctor. That in my opinion is the interpretation that could be given to the word 'consulted'. My other concern is that that is not sufficient. The amendment moves that the doctor must be fully informed of the circumstances in relation to all matters with regard to subclause (2) of clause 6 and then form the opinion.

The other matter in clause 6(1)(b) is that it refers to consultation with ‘another medical practitioner’, but it does not define the qualifications of that medical practitioner. The amendment makes certain that the second practitioner must be fully informed. That requires a full passage of past information between the first doctor and the second doctor. The bill as it currently stands does not state that.

It also states quite clearly in the bill that there is no requirement that the second practitioner have any expert knowledge relevant to the medical condition of the foetus. It could be a doctor of the choosing of the first doctor. My submission is that if we are talking about the concerns of abnormality or illness or other matter with regard to the foetus, the second doctor should have the expertise to offer the advice so that they can then form in all the circumstances an opinion as to whether or not a termination should occur. The clause is lax. It does not give sufficient, firm direction as to what the consultation should be and it does not indicate that the second medical practitioner needs to have expert advice in relation to the foetus. In those circumstances it is my submission that the second doctor cannot properly be guaranteed in all the circumstances to deal with the matters within clause 6(1). That is why I have moved the amendment to deal with those very important issues.

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: This is another amendment proposed on the run with insufficient thought given to the consequences they impose. The proposed amendment requires that the second medical practitioner have medical knowledge and expertise relevant to the medical condition of the foetus to properly consider all relevant medical circumstances. This amendment fails to recognise that a woman may need a termination because her own life is at risk. What if the woman has a heart condition that means continuing the pregnancy will put her life at risk? In this case a cardiologist will be best placed to provide advice. However, if the amendment moved by the member for Caloundra was accepted, the cardiologist could not be consulted for the purposes of the clause. If the woman has a severe mental health issue a psychiatrist may be best placed to advise. In the case of foetal abnormality a foeto-maternal specialist would be appropriate. That is why the QLRC recommended against specifying in legislation who the second doctor should be. The QLRC said—

It is unnecessary for the legislation to impose additional requirements about the qualifications, expertise or experience of the second medical practitioner. These are matters properly to be determined on a case by case basis in accordance with good medical practice.

The amendment proposed would expressly require the second medical practitioner to be fully informed of all the circumstances that must be considered. This amendment says that we cannot trust doctors to ensure they have all the information they need before they make a decision about whether a termination is appropriate in the circumstances. This amendment would lead to delays in women being able to access care, resulting in later terminations. This amendment would put further hurdles in the way of a woman who is already in an incredibly difficult circumstance of considering terminating a pregnancy at a later stage. Women in rural, remote and regional areas would be worst affected. In many regional and remote areas a woman would not have access to two—or even one—relevant specialists of this kind. This amendment should be rejected.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I note that the member for Caloundra sought leave to move his amendments Nos 1 to 4 en bloc even though two of those amendments related to clause 6 and only clause 5 had been called. Nonetheless, the House allowed the member to so move. I simply make this note for the official record. There are no concerns with the process that we have gone through with the consideration in detail, but it is worth members noting and the record should reflect that.

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

AYES, 3—Boothman, McArdle, Molhoek.

NOES, 87—Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dametto, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Lauga, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McMahon, McMillan, McDonald, Mickelberg, Mellish, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, O’Connor, B. O’Rourke, C. O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negatived.



Mr McArdle: I move the following amendment—

6 Clause 6 (Termination by medical practitioner after 22 weeks)

Page 7, lines 19 to 20, ‘physical, psychological and social’—

omit, insert—

physical and psychological

This particular amendment deals with clause 6(2), which in essence sets out what a practitioner must consider in relation to clause 6(1). They need to consider all relevant medical circumstances, the woman's current and future physical, psychological and social circumstances and professional standards and guidelines. The concern that I have here is with regard to the phrase 'social circumstances'.

If one looks closely at the language of clause 6(2) it is clear, in my opinion, that a medical practitioner is not required to make a finding in relation to 6(2)(a) and (b) collectively; that is, all relevant medical circumstances and the woman's current and future physical, psychological and social circumstances. It is entirely possible that the practitioner may simply find that the termination should occur on social circumstances. That, in my opinion, is not the intent of clause 6(2).

The reason I make that comment is that 'social circumstances' is a term that has an extremely wide ambit and can in fact cover anything associated with the social environment of a person at any time of their life. That could include issues that stretch back a number of years. It would be an ever-expanding ground. The ground is too wide and, as it could be used in isolation, I cannot support it in the terms of this clause.

If it were the case that you were to accumulate the evidence under clause 6(2), then the wording would be drastically different. It would not be that the practitioner must consider, but it would be that they must find in relation to (a) and (b) grounds with regard to (a) and (b) that satisfy all the circumstances in which a termination may occur. That is not the case here. The language is such that it allows one of (a) and (b) or one part of (a) and (b) to alone form the basis of the circumstances under which a termination should occur. In that regard 'social circumstances' is too wide and may well form the basis of a termination of a child that is otherwise healthy.

In those circumstances, I move the amendment. I cannot support the clause or subclause as they currently stand.

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: Late-term terminations involve complex and highly individualised circumstances. The test in this bill was proposed by the QLRC based on expert evidence and careful consideration and is supported by peak medical bodies such as the AMAQ and the College of Obstetricians. It is designed to capture every combination of circumstances where a termination may be appropriate. It allows the doctor to consider if the woman is a victim of domestic or family violence. It allows the doctor to consider if the woman has fallen pregnant as a result of rape or incest. It allows the doctor to consider if the woman is homeless.

It is essential to note that the bill does not allow a doctor to decide to terminate a pregnancy after 22 weeks purely on social grounds. The woman's social circumstances are just one factor to be considered. Each doctor must consider all of the circumstances. The social circumstances must be balanced against all other factors. These include professional standards and guidelines, relevant medical circumstances and the woman's current and future physical and psychological circumstances.

It is entirely appropriate that we allow doctors to consider every possible circumstance that contributes to the clinical decision about whether a termination is appropriate. We owe this to doctors in their work and we owe it to women. If this amendment were passed, doctors could not take those factors into account at all. If this amendment were passed there is a risk that doctors will feel they cannot consider these factors, even if they are relevant. Restricting the circumstances where termination is available will reduce women's access to health services and restrict doctors from providing the best possible care. It will deny women the care they need and deserve.

This amendment would see us turn our backs on the most vulnerable women in our communities at the most challenging time of their lives—homeless women, women experiencing domestic violence, women who have experienced sexual assault. Women facing a range of complex and difficult circumstances will be excluded from accessing the services they need, and for that reason this amendment should be rejected.

Mr BERKMAN: I went some way to addressing this in my contribution to the second reading debate and I would like to take it just a little further, if I may. This appears to me to be very much in response to the sort of rhetoric we have heard about this bill allowing abortion to birth for purely social reasons. This was an issue that I was very much live to throughout the committee hearings.

In the interests of clarity I asked Professor Heather Douglas, a professor of law, for her expert opinion. I understand that the member for Caloundra, the mover of this amendment, has a legal background. I am a little surprised that he sees an alternative reading of clause 6(2). When I asked for

confirmation that all of the factors must be taken into account by a medical practitioner and that none of these—for example, social circumstances—can be considered in isolation as the basis for a decision, Professor Douglas said—

It says 'and', so 'all relevant medical circumstances and the woman's current and future'. It says 'and' in each point, so all of these things must be considered.

The section reads pretty clearly, from my perspective. There is no ambiguity about the 'and' at the end of each line. A medical practitioner must consider it—that is, the first and the second medical practitioners. As I suggested in my contribution to the second reading debate and as the minister just said, we do want medical practitioners to have all circumstances at their disposal to consider.

Let us consider it from the perspective of a woman who is seeking assistance with one of these decisions. They are clearly going to arrive with the full suite of their social, physical, psychological and economic circumstances at the front of their mind. To suggest that the doctor they are consulting with should not be able to take into account all of those factors I think sells them very short in the medical assistance they are seeking.

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

AYES, 6—Boothman, Hart, Krause, McArdle, Molhoek, Stuckey.

NOES, 84—Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dametto, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Langbroek, Lauga, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McMahon, McMillan, McDonald, Mickelberg, Mellish, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mr McARDLE (7.09 pm): I move the following amendment—

8

After clause 6

Page 7, after line 29—

insert—

6A Counselling services

- (1) As early as practicable before performing a termination on a woman, a medical practitioner must give the woman the contact details of an approved counselling service.
- (2) Subsection (1) does not apply to performing a termination in an emergency.
- (3) In this section—

approved counselling service means a service approved by regulation.

This particular amendment deals with counselling. Currently the bill does not propose any form of counselling in relation to a woman seeking a termination. The proposal simply offers counselling at any time in relation to a termination. It does not say that the counselling must be performed; nor is it mandatory that it be performed. It is simply a service that is offered by the practitioner. That practitioner must offer the service and it is then up to the woman and her family to make a determination.

In my opinion it is a matter, as I said, for the woman and her family to decide and if she then says 'no' then that is the end of the matter. It is, however, an offer that if a woman and indeed or her family has any doubts in relation to the termination it offers them the opportunity of discussing those doubts with an approved counselling service. What becomes of that conversation again is entirely up to the lady and/or the family involved. There is no requirement that any report be made back to the doctor nor is there a requirement that the doctor make any report on to any other entity in relation to the counselling.

The counselling would not apply if the termination were to occur as a consequence of an emergency. Indeed, the counselling service is one that is required to be approved by regulation, so therefore a check and balance will be put in place to ensure only services that are offered by a reputable counselling service would be put to a woman to assist her if she requires it. Again I repeat: this is mandatory to the doctor to offer; it is not mandatory to actually undertake the counselling. It is up to the woman and her family to make that call—no-one else. It is simply a proposal that offers in circumstances

where a lady may well be in some doubt or may well have issues she wishes to talk about to take up that offer. It is nothing more than that and undertaken by an approved counselling service oversights by way of regulation.

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: Counselling and other support services are already considered in clinical practice. There is absolutely no need to legislate for it. This amendment ignores the expertise of doctors and ignores the clinical guidelines that already exist to guarantee the best possible patient care. The clinical guideline has the need for counselling considered not once but three times. Imposing a requirement in the bill for a medical practitioner to provide contact details of an approved counselling service could create an additional barrier for women trying to access services.

What is important here is that every doctor be permitted to make a careful assessment of the clinical needs of each woman and provide advice, counselling or referrals based on the circumstances of the case. Seeking to mandate the ways that our doctors care for their patients is not evidence based and it does not occur in relation to any other medical procedure. This week I announced a dedicated women's health hotline that will provide women with unbiased, evidence based information about all of their options when facing an unplanned pregnancy. The hotline will also provide referrals to independent women focused support services such as counselling. If you support this amendment you are saying you do not trust doctors to make clinical decisions on behalf of their patients. Therefore, this amendment should be rejected.

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

AYES, 6—Bolton, Boothman, McArdle, Molhoek, O'Connor, Stuckey.

NOES, 84—Bates, Bailey, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, Dametto, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negated.

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—



Mr McARDLE (7.18 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 8 (Registered health practitioner with conscientious objection)

Page 9, lines 1 to 14—

omit.

This amendment deals with clause 8 and in particular subclause (3) thereof. The clause as a whole deals with the issue of conscientious objection. Subclause (1) states in essence that I am allowed to hold a conscientious objection, that I am not required to perform an abortion as a consequence of holding that objection and that I must disclose my objection to the woman who comes to see me. Subclause (3) however then in my opinion goes too far. It states that, despite my objection, I 'must'—and that is the wording used in the subclause—refer the woman to either a practitioner or a health service provider who does not have such an objection or can provide the service.

I cannot reconcile these provisions. I cannot reconcile how the law can say to a practitioner, who has a conscientious objection, that I am not obligated to perform a termination or other service in that regard, but I am obligated to refer the woman to either a practitioner or to a service provider who will or may perform the termination. To me, I am being told, as a practitioner, that I have the right not to do something, but then that right is trammelled by the fact that my obligation is to refer to another practitioner or a service provider who will perform the termination. To me, that is irreconcilable.

The person has an objection based upon their conscience. It means that they have gone to some length to assess where they stand in regard to the issue. That person's right of conscience should be acknowledged and protected. They should not then have to turn around and say, 'Despite my own objection, I now must refer a woman to a service provider who does not have that objection or to a doctor who may perform that termination.' Those terms are irreconcilable and, in my opinion, to put them into law places an even greater onus.

The AMAQ guidelines make it very clear in relation to what a doctor should do in those circumstances, but here we go one step further. We enshrine in legislation a right and then remove part of that right by requiring the practitioner to take certain steps.

(Time expired)

Dr MILES: This amendment would impede women's access to safe and reasonable health services. The requirement to refer a woman to another registered health practitioner does not mean that a woman will have a termination. It does not make the referring practitioner complicit in a termination. It simply means that the woman will get access to independent, non-judgemental advice about her options.

The AMAQ, the QNMU and the Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists support the conscientious objection provisions of the bill. The AMAQ was asked about this provision at the parliamentary committee's hearing in Brisbane. Dr Markwell advised the committee—

The conscientious objection provisions in the bill are consistent with national and international ethical guidelines on conscientious objection. The universal principle of that is that access to care should not be impeded. An individual can appropriately hold a conscientious objection but that should not affect their patient's ability to access care that they seek. The requirement for referral to another provider or to a health service that does not have the same objection is reasonable and appropriate.

As I outlined earlier, I have announced a new women's health hotline that will provide independent, unbiased and evidence based advice to women facing an unplanned pregnancy. The hotline will refer women on to the services they need, whether those be for counselling, testing or for termination of pregnancy. Nothing could be simpler than for a practitioner with a conscientious objection to inform the woman of their objection and refer the woman to the hotline. All they have to do is provide the woman with the number. Doing so will meet the practitioner's obligation under the bill.

Every practitioner's first duty is to provide care to their patients. A practitioner must not use their conscientious objection to impose their own views on their patient and deny care to a woman seeking a termination. In my second reading speech I outlined the tragic consequences of doctors denying women the health care they need. This amendment is bad policy made against the independent consideration of the QLRC and the advice of doctors. Therefore, it should be rejected.

Mr KELLY: I support this amendment. I have given this matter great consideration. I find it extremely difficult to support legislation that forces a health practitioner to do something that is fundamentally against their conscience. While I congratulate the minister for the helpline that he has outlined, there can be no denial that the legislation states clearly that you have to refer the person to another service where the requested service can be provided. I think that is the difficulty that I have with this provision.

There is no doubt that access to terminations in this state is difficult for a range of complex reasons. I spoke about that in my contribution to the second reading debate. I believe that Queensland Health has a whole range of things that it has to do to improve access for women across the state to a range of sexual health services, whether that is caused by a doctor who has a conscientious objection being the only doctor in town, whether that is caused by the fact that the women are from a group that is disadvantaged in our society, such as Indigenous people, people who are affected by domestic violence, or people who are affected by mental health issues—any of those groups.

I believe that we have the capability and the capacity to deal with that issue. Anybody who questions my commitment to access to healthcare services should perhaps come to the World Wellness Group in Stones Corner where I volunteer and work as part of a team that delivers healthcare services to some of the most vulnerable people in our community—undocumented refugees who do not get any access at all to the public health system or any other services in our state. I support this amendment and I encourage others to give it serious consideration.

Ms TRAD: Essentially, this amendment seeks to remove the positive referral element of the legislation that the QLRC has drafted on behalf of the Queensland government. I value the contribution made by the member for Greenslopes, but let me also say that the health system is a very difficult system to navigate for many individuals. That is why I am incredibly proud that this government has introduced specific positions such as the nurse navigator to help consumers navigate the very difficult and complex system of health within our state.

When a woman presents with a request for a termination and is met by a doctor with a conscientious objection, I believe it is fundamentally important that that health professional, or that health service, offer the woman some guidance in terms of her being able to access positively a service that will meet her health demands. It is not that complex.

If I were to go to a service that could not provide a level of health servicing that I requested for a whole range of issues, I would request a positive referral. It is something that happens each and every day within the Queensland Health system and we should continue to see it happen. Let us be clear. There will be lots of conscientious objectors within our system. This legislation acknowledges them and respects them, but it should similarly acknowledge and respect women and their right to choose. Therefore, they should be in a position to positively refer them to a service, a doctor—health practitioners—who will provide them with the health service they are seeking. This is what happens in all other health services within our community and we should extend the same courtesy to women who are seeking a termination.

In conclusion, I thank the health minister for his enormous contribution to this debate. It has been long. It has been emotionally charged. I want to thank him and his office for the excellent work that they have done.

Mr HART: I was not intending to speak to this amendment in support of the member's amendment, but I have to say that the minister's and the Deputy Premier's argument is just ludicrous. There will be doctors who have a conscientious objection to being involved in an abortion in any way.

Referring somebody on to somebody who is going to carry out an abortion will be against their conscientious objection. There will be doctors who will make a stand on this and this legislation will then penalise those doctors for making that stand. This amendment should be carried. This should not be part of this bill.

Mr BERKMAN: I was intending to refer back to the AMA's evidence before the committee that the minister has already read out for us. There seems to be confusion among some of the medical fraternity. We had this clear interpretation from the AMA that best practice guidelines on conscientious objection already require GPs or medical practitioners broadly to not impede access to medical services, but we heard from another anti-choice GP at the hearing who did not share this interpretation. We are all aware of the time sensitivity of getting abortion healthcare services. What this amendment would do is prevent codification of that existing requirement. It is entirely appropriate to codify this requirement, as the bill does, where the failure to refer can have such dramatic consequences on both the outcomes and the nature of the procedure that might be required.

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

AYES, 14—Boothman, Costigan, Crandon, Hart, Hunt, Kelly, Krause, Madden, McArdle, Molhoek, O'Connor, Power, Simpson, Stuckey.

NOES, 76—Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, Crisafulli, Dametto, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, King, Knuth, Langbroek, Lauga, Last, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Mander, McMahon, McMillan, McDonald, Mickelberg, Mellish, Miles, Millar, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Powell, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr McArdle) negatived.

Clause 8, as read, agreed to.

Clause 9, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 10 to 40, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (7.37 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

AYES, 50—Bailey, Berkman, Bolton, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Minnikin, Mullen, Nicholls, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Whiting.

NOES, 41—Andrew, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Costigan, Crandon, Crisafulli, Dametto, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Katter, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Miller, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

A further incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! I ask members and those in the gallery to please resume your seats.

Long Title

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (7.42 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

A further incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members in the public gallery!

ADJOURNMENT

Mary Valley

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (7.43 pm): Queenslanders were recently reminded of the disgraceful—

A further incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member, please resume your seat. Order, members in the public gallery! Members in the public gallery, please resume your seats. I appreciate your enthusiasm, but I ask you to resume your seats immediately.

Mr PERRETT: Recently Queenslanders were reminded of the disgraceful waste of money by Labor governments on the failed Traveston Dam fiasco. It was confirmed that what has been called the biggest bloodbath in the state's history is officially over. Newspaper reports claim that the cost was a loss of \$318 million, which represents a 50 per cent loss from the purchase and subsequent resale of properties. I have news for those who read that story: the cost is far greater. Two years ago, in an answer to me, the government admitted that it expected a \$320 million loss, which has now been confirmed.

A further incident having occurred in the public gallery—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! One moment, member for Gympie. Pause the clock, please. Order! Members in the public gallery, there will be silence. I understand it is an emotional time. Take your conversations outside. There needs to be silence within the public gallery. Thank you, members of the gallery. I call the member for Gympie for the third time.

Mr PERRETT: What was not added to the appalling waste of taxpayer's hard-earned dollars was the additional \$200 million that was spent on reports and investigations. In 2009, the Bligh government estimated that \$200 million was spent on wasted reports, strategies, impact statements, management costs, design works and investigations. That brings the total to half a billion taxpayer dollars wasted by Labor on the project.

Labor has form in Gympie. Everyone remembers that the Bligh/Fraser government sold HQ Plantations for \$600 million. They sweetened the deal of that asset sale by removing the obligation of the new owners to pay rates. A private company was given an exemption from its obligation to our local community. The wasted \$500 million on the Traveston Dam does not include revenue losses from businesses that closed down or moved away. The squandered money could have built 16 new schools or paid for 13,800 new police cars, 6,400 ambulances or 4,600 new nurses.

Instead, Labor ripped apart the social, economic and environmental fabric of the Mary Valley communities. It failed to suitably manage the properties, allowing noxious and invasive weeds to grow and assets to deteriorate. Families that had been in the community for generations packed up and left. Farming almost ceased, because there was no certainty that efforts would be rewarded later. Vacant houses and properties invited crime.

Mary Valley farmers and retailers Amber and Tim Scott said that the dam drama was about more than real estate. They said it showed all Queenslanders that no home was safe if a government wanted it for their own purposes. Amber said—

The thing that really struck me was the sense of insecurity ... We think that if we own our own property then we have absolute rights over it, but the dam (plan) showed that is not the case. All that investment of money, time and emotion doesn't mean anything if the government determines that your land is of more importance to their objectives ... It really did completely destroy the community.

The Traveston Dam remains an appalling example of Labor's insensitivity, incompetence, callousness and complete disregard for a community and taxpayer's money.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Gympie, in a trying situation. Members, joining us in the gallery are the former member for Redlands, Mr Peter Dowling, and Ms Jonette Waller, the granddaughter of a former chief Hansard reporter, Lou Waller. I welcome them, although I am not too sure whether they are still with us.

Redcliffe Electorate

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (7.48 pm): I rise in this adjournment debate to talk about the wonderful electorate of Redcliffe and what has been happening there. However, firstly can I say how wonderful it was to pass the Termination of Pregnancy Bill and make history in this state.

The last time I spoke on an adjournment debate, I was wishing the Redcliffe Dolphins good luck in their championships. Tonight I am very proud that the Redcliffe Dolphins brought home their sixth Intrust Super Cup title following a hard-fought grand final win over the East Tigers. In fact, it is the Dolphins' first premierships win for 12 years.

It was a great pleasure to cheer them on from the sidelines this season not only at Suncorp Stadium but also at the freshly expanded Dolphin Stadium at Redcliffe. The state government helped to build the second stage of the grandstand. I congratulate the team, coach and staff at the Redcliffe Dolphins for their fantastic work this season. I was greatly honoured to present the player of the grand final award at their recent presentation night at Redcliffe Leagues Clubs. I know that they did not get the result they wanted when they played the curtain-raiser to the NRL grand final, but they played hard, did their absolute best and did us proud.

I also want to acknowledge the 30th anniversary of Chameleon Youth Housing. Last week Chameleon Youth Housing celebrated 30 years of successfully providing accommodation and support to young people and families in need. I cannot praise this organisation enough. Thirty years of operation for any NGO is significant, but this organisation takes in really vulnerable youths. It takes in youth justice kids. Many say we do not want this sort of accommodation in our community, but this community welcomes this organisation. All their neighbours in the street welcome them being there and are absolutely supportive. Last year it provided 5,500 bed nights to young people and families experiencing homelessness. All were aged under 25 years. They do a fantastic job. I want to congratulate each and every one of the team at Chameleon Youth Housing, particularly Carmel Riethmuller.

I want to briefly congratulate Redcliffe Area Youth Space and Picnic Hill on their second anniversary. The training minister will be thrilled to know that Redcliffe Area Youth Space's Picnic Hill event is put on by the Skilling Queenslanders for Work kids. They design it and run it. They do everything. They do the full event management as part of their training. Well done for reaching their second anniversary.

Bonney Electorate

 **Mr O'CONNOR** (Bonney—LNP) (7.51 pm): In my limited time, I would like to fit in a few local shout outs from the last couple of weeks. Today every member received a pin that looks quite like a donut for 'Australia Says No More'. One of their campaigners Barbara is from my electorate. She is working hard to create cultural change to put an end to sexual assault and domestic violence and I am proud to support her. I thank all other members of this House who wore their pins today.

Tomorrow we are each going to receive a pin from Radio Lollipop to acknowledge the work they do and to acknowledge Radio Lollipop Day last week. I got to go along to the Gold Coast University Hospital and hear the radio broadcast to the entire hospital to help raise awareness of the amazing service that the volunteers do there for our sick kids. Well done to Tani Stubbs and Michael Gilbert on a fantastic day.

While I was at the hospital I also popped in to the incredible ArtBeat Festival. It was made possible by music therapist Maddie Bridgland and her hardworking team. Sam Hall and the Rotary Club of Griffith Gold Coast were on hand as well as our now decade old Southport headspace and many of our other fantastic local service providers in the mental health area. Maddie's mum also let me try on her pug pack which was a head-turning accessory, to say the least.

Last Saturday I was honoured to be a guest at the Navaratri Festival celebrating Hindu culture. Thank you to president Kartik Menon, past president Sothi and my good friend and local Griffith University academic Muthu for having me. The Gold Coast Hindu Cultural Association enrich our community and are an important part of our diversity.

On Friday I also supported Southport Special School's fun run, which was held in pretty much the only dry few hours we have had on the Gold Coast in the last week. To see all the kids running around and celebrating together in the Broadwater Parklands was great. A special shout out to all the teachers and parents who gave their time on the day, as well as what they do for our kids throughout the year. In particular I thank P&C president Cameron, Thea, Shelley, Kirsty and the Ashmore Lions for helping me on the barbecue.

We also recently celebrated International Tenants Day with Dan Bastick from QSTARS and his great team. In Bonney over 46 per cent of people are renters and International Tenants Day was a chance to celebrate them, as well as to hear about the issues they face as tenants and to make sure they are as informed as possible.

We also had a Speech Without Borders discussion. I congratulate Jack Hood who set up this group with his fellow students at Griffith University to engage young people in politics, no matter what side they fall on.

Finally, I note the fantastic work by another student at Griffith, Brittany Higgins, in petitioning to get agreement to allow political activity on campus, which is something that has been banned up until this point. Brittany worked very hard to get that approved so congratulations Brittany.

Women at the Wheel Program

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (7.54 pm): I rise this evening to celebrate a fantastic initiative in my own electorate which is empowering the lives of refugee and migrant women. I cannot think of a better story to tell in the adjournment debate following our historic win in legalising termination of pregnancy here in Queensland for all of our Queensland women.

Access Community Services and Transurban have partnered to deliver support and training to allow 30 women to obtain their Queensland driver's licence. The Women at the Wheel program provides training with qualified driving instructors to assist with developing the theoretical and practical skills required to drive. This is an incredible program giving migrant and refugee women the training and confidence to overcome so many of the barriers they face. It gives them independence. They can now take their kids to school and gain employment. This is changing their lives. I would like to thank the incredible work of Access for developing this program.

So many of us take the ability to drive a car and have that independence for granted. Women from these backgrounds face additional barriers such as financial constraints, social and cultural expectations, family commitments, language barriers and often a lack of personal confidence. It is heartwarming to see these women overcome these barriers and gain independence.

We know that by giving women increased mobility we can break the cycle of poverty and isolation as they are able to participate in the workforce and our wider community. Logan is such a success story when it comes to multiculturalism. Logan City is one of the most multicultural cities in Australia. There are more ethnic groups living in Logan than in New York City.

At a time when our politics is becoming increasingly polarised and intolerant, I think it is important to share stories of the incredible work in our communities to improve integration and the welcome that we have in Logan for refugees and migrants. One participant of the program that I had the pleasure of meeting, Behnaz, has an incredible story to share. She arrived in Australia with her three young children in 2016 on a Women at Risk visa. Participating in the program means that Behnaz can drive one of her children, who has a medical condition, to their specialist medical appointments. She also hopes that by completing the program she is able to gain a job and help provide for her young family. I wish her and the rest of the participants the very best of luck in their driving exams but also the very best of luck in their future in Logan.

Hannant, Mrs N

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (7.57 pm): We are all deeply saddened by the passing of Norma Hannant. Norma will be dearly missed and our heartfelt sympathies go to Gary, Sandra, Lindsay and their extended family. Norma supported the Hervey Bay, Hinkler and Wide Bay electorate campaigns at numerous elections. Even at over 80 years of age she would take responsibility for the Hervey Bay pre-polls for the LNP. Norma would take her cup of tea, coffee and lunch and never leave, no matter how much we tried to tell her to go home from the booth. It was hers and she stayed there right until the end.

Norma's knowledge of Fraser Island after 37 years of working and living there was astounding and beyond reproach. I would like to table Norma's story, 'My time on Fraser Island—1966 to 2003'.

Tabled paper: Document titled 'Norma's story ... my time on Fraser Island 1966 to 2003' [\[1667\]](#).

Norma was on a number of committees on Fraser Island for a number of years. She rallied support for better management of Fraser Island and particularly the Fraser Island dingo. She had a key role in the Save the Fraser Island Dingo group. Norma knew that the dingos were grossly misunderstood in government management strategies. She also had a keen insight into their behaviour all year round, including their behaviour in their whelping times and fought hard for them to be understood.

Norma knew nearly all plants on the island by their biological names and rallied hard for Fraser Island all of her life. She was, in my eyes, a true ambassador of Fraser Island in the state of Queensland. She also assisted her good friend and author Fred Williams with his latest book. Fred's book is really worth reading because it tells the whole history of Fraser Island. He did a great job.

Norma was one of those people who never give up right until the last. She had a stroke and she passed away very quickly. She was one hell of a lady. She always got her message across. She was wonderful for the whole region of Fraser Island. Norma, rest in peace.

Morningside State School

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (8.00 pm): How wonderful to be getting up to give a speech after passing such a fantastic bill, the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. I am so proud to be a member in this House.

Yesterday in the early hours of the morning, residents around Morningside State School were woken to the sound and sight of a massive fire which ravaged three of its historic buildings. I was at the school at 5.30 am with many others who love this school. There was David Furze, the P&C President. There was the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr Neil Laurie. There were so many devastated others who just could not believe their eyes. Also, there were the dedicated education department personnel—people from regional office, Acting Principal Sheryl Kennedy and her staff. They had been there for hours already and were already doing their best to attend to the No. 1 priority, and that was making sure our kids were looked after.

By 1.30 that afternoon, they had already organised for every single student from Morningside State School to be attending school from today onwards at the magnificent Balmoral High, which had so generously and immediately offered to open up its doors for them. They had organised for a shuttle bus to take students from the carpark at the Morningside Panthers to the school at the beginning and end of the day just in case parents could not get them there any other way. They had organised a special session for the kids at the beginning of the day today so they could get acclimatised to their new environment—thanks to Corey Oates for going there and revving them up. They had organised outside school hours care. They had organised for the ravaged buildings at the school to be demolished and for temporary buildings to be on the school site by Monday. They had organised counselling.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I cannot even begin to tell you what a difference this sort of professionalism and care has done to help that school community. I cannot ever thank my friend the education minister enough for her constant attention to their needs.

What has been the most astonishing is the response from our community to what has happened to our beloved local school. By 7 am I had literally hundreds of messages from local businesses, clubs and individuals asking how they could help. By the end of the day it was in the thousands—and it keeps on coming. Their messages of support alone have been what has strengthened the Morningside State School community.

A special shout out needs to go to the mighty Morningside State School P&C, led by President David Furze and his executive—Suzanne Newman, Keri Duncan and Dominique Runham. They worked like trojans all day yesterday. They had a seven-hour meeting last night, strategising for the days ahead. They worked like trojans today, and I know they will in the days to come, getting the kids back to school next week, planning for their fete on the 27th—please come and support them if you can. They will work like trojans until they do not need to any more.

This is a magnificent school that has suffered a terrible tragedy, but the example they have set of resilience, of support for each other and of refusing to let adversity take them down has been absolutely inspiring, as has the example of every single government employee—and I do not forget the

firies and emergency service personnel and the police who have been involved in helping them. To every single community member who has reached out, you are wonderful. I have always been enormously proud to represent my local community, but it is times like these that 'proud' is just too small a word.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Thank you, member for Bulimba, for your contribution and best wishes to the school.

Gold Coast Community Legal Centre

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (8.03 pm): Recently I had the honour of attending the Gold Coast Community Legal Centre 2018 AGM. It was also an occasion of conferring life membership on a number of longstanding supporters. I would like to acknowledge both the contribution of the centre and these dedicated volunteers on the public record.

Eve Baker joined in 2008 and was a member of the management committee for a number of years. Marj Buckle joined in 1987 and, in addition to her role on the management committee, she was also the volunteer coordinator and organised the volunteer rosters, recruitment and training at the legal centre.

Rae Devlin is their longest serving volunteer. She has been with the centre for 28 years. She has seen many people come and go over the years and has survived many changes, challenging clients and challenging situations.

Kaye Downton joined in 1985 and left in 2012. Kaye was a member of the management committee for many years and her tireless work on the community resource directory is unparalleled. Sue Douglas has been a volunteer since 2008. She is an absolute pleasure to be with and is a breath of fresh air at the centre.

Susan Garrett joined in 2002 and was a member of the management committee for over eight years. Barbara Price-Ellingham joined in 2008 and was also a member of the management committee. As well as volunteering on the front desk, she joined the volunteer group of people who researched, compiled and produced the first community resource directory.

Brian Rosier joined the citizens advice bureau in 1988 when the office was located in a small room at the Gold Coast City Council chambers at Southport. His first role was as a tenant adviser. His knowledge of the rental situation proved to be invaluable and he was of great assistance to clients.

April Vincent joined in 2002. She has had several roles on the management committee and is currently the president as well as a volunteer. Pat Williams signed up in 1984. She has worked with the centre for over 29 years before retiring from her role. Pat played an instrumental role in the expansion and development of the centre during its very early years.

The Gold Coast Community Legal Centre does an incredible amount of work. The number of volunteers there is just outstanding. It is great to see how the centre has continued to grow and thrive under the leadership of principal solicitor Victoria Shiel and co-ordinating solicitor Tanya Diessel. I stand in the House tonight to applaud their hard work, their self-sacrifice and the incredible contribution that all of these volunteers and both Victoria and Tanya make to the work of this service on the Gold Coast and in Southport.

Miller Electorate, Transport Infrastructure

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (8.06 pm): I would like to report to the House progress on the Palaszczuk government's investment in transport infrastructure and facilitating 5 new infrastructure in my seat of Miller. As I previously reported, my constituents have benefited enormously from the veloway that was completed last year, a bicycle freeway cutting off 10 minutes from Greenslopes and Tarragindi to Buranda. I am pleased to report that the next section of the veloway, the last substantial section—there are a couple of other areas that will still need to be done—from Gaza Road at Tarragindi all the way to Bapaume Road and over Marshall Road is underway. I know my constituents will be very happy to hear that. This section will have three bridges. It will be a separated cycleway—again, saving a lot of time and improving road safety. Motorists in the area benefit as well when a person gets out of their car and gets onto a bike for their commute.

The Ipswich Motorway project—a \$400 million jointly funded project facilitated by the Palaszczuk government—in my electorate and a number of other electorates is progressing very strongly, as anyone who has driven through there would know. The deck will be raised so it will be much more flood

immune. There will be extra lanes. There is a separated cycleway. When you build big road infrastructure, of course you should make sure active transport is catered for as well. This will be an entirely new route because you certainly would not cycle through there at the moment. You will be able to do so separated and safely in the future when the project is done. With the savings, we have been able to do the Boundary Road connection as well. Because it has been so well managed, we are getting more road and more efficiency in the network.

The design of the Fairfield train station upgrade is progressing very well. It has been very well received by local commuters and it will be a very well-used station, especially when Cross River Rail starts. We are seeing the ramping up this financial year of the Cross River Rail project. Let me be clear: this will be the first underground line in Brisbane. It is going to really transform the way this city looks at itself, in some ways a bit like how the CityCats opened up the river. We have never seen ourselves as an underground rail city, but we will when Cross River Rail opens.

With the Yeronga TAFE site, we have been doing a lot of consultation with the community and we are progressing very well. I have said to people that it looks a bit like the *Walking Dead* when you go through there at the moment because it is sad to see the old building so decrepit with vandalism and that sort of thing. I know the local community at Yeronga and Annerley will be very pleased to see that redeveloped, and to see new groups in there to work with our community. There is a lot going on in the Miller electorate by the Palaszczuk Labor government. I am proud to be the local member and we will keep working hard.

Forsyth Primary Health Centre; Traeger Electorate, Roads Funding

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (8.09 pm): I rise to talk about the Forsyth Primary Health Centre, and shortly I will table a petition with 250 signatures of people calling for extra services for that centre. Forsyth is a very remote town. If there is one thing we should be looking at improving when we are in government it is these very isolated remote communities. They do not have much, but they should at least have access to health services.

Tabled paper: Petition seeking the upgrade of staffing of Etheridge Shire primary healthcare facilities [1668].

On Friday, 25 May, as pointed out by Karen Norris, who led this petition, there were four medical emergencies—on that one day. The pub near there has been rejuvenated. Simon and Gaye Terry have done a magnificent job doing up the pub and doing up Cobbold Gorge, the big tourism attraction up the road. We have people coming in there, but we have a health centre that is open only during business hours five days a week. Sometimes the nurse or the DON is called out. We had a family coming in off their station with a sick child who had heavy breathing. There was no-one at the health centre. They drove 80 kilometres to Georgetown and there was no-one at that health centre. They drove back to Forsyth before they could get anyone on the phone. These people are already battling adversity. That is the sort of thing they have to put up with. We are calling on the minister to come and do something about this. These people need some attention here. The Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service needs to resolve this by sharing additional nurses in that area so they can have somebody there during those times of stress.

Another issue I would like to raise tonight is that of two particular roads. We are often told by the government if the rural industry is down, if mining is down, you can turn to outback tourism. The two jewels in our crown in the Traeger electorate are the Cobbold Gorge near Forsyth and the Boodjamulla National Park at Lawn Hill. They are wonderful attractions if you can get to them. The last time I was there with my wife a few months ago I got two flat tires in one drive. I got there and they accosted me saying, 'You had better fix this road.'

The Burke shire has had more land taken off it as national parks and there are less rates coming in, and it is put back on them—this tiny shire—to maintain 70 kilometres of dirt. They cannot keep up with it. It has gone from 4,000 tourists a year to 40,000 a year. They are doing a great job of promoting the national park and surrounding areas, but the government is not keeping up with it. There is only \$10 million in the bucket to be shared across all of Outback Queensland. This is a \$50 million project in time. We do not need all that money now. We just need to fix the road to Cobbold Gorge. We desperately need help with these issues. We are trying to keep things alive in these remote areas. We go without a lot. We need at least basic assistance on roads and hospitals. Forsyth hospital needs an extra full-time equivalent to be shared among the other health centres to resolve the gap that is constantly there and the roads need to be fixed so we can maintain a tourism industry.

Mount Ommaney Electorate

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (8.12 pm): My first year as member for Mount Ommaney has been full of highlights and special celebrations in my amazing community. Last Saturday night I headed along to the Oxley Girl Guides celebration of their hut that had been built in Oxley 60 years prior. I am honoured to also be speaking at their Women in Leadership event early next month. This forum will be addressing tough topics like quotas and why we do not have enough female leaders in 2018.

A few weeks ago the McLeod Country Golf Club celebrated its 50th anniversary with a gala dinner. It was a gorgeous event, but what makes McLeod so special is not the stunning views; it is the fact that it was the very first golf club not in Queensland, not in Australia but in the world owned and run by women, and it remains so to this day. They truly were and continue to be pioneers not just in Mount Ommaney but around the world. I was so touched looking over early photos to see that the club had a nursery—a creche—on site at the club on the golf course between holes. These women had thought of everything.

Two amazing women were instrumental in getting the club off the ground. It was fantastic to see this acknowledged at the celebration. I commend the foresight of the committee in creating a video of Hilda Reid OAM speaking about her passion to get the golf club off the ground 50 years ago. Sadly, Hilda could not attend but it was so poignant to hear her recording, as she knew she would not be able to make it along to celebrate. Well done to President Carolyn and the entire community for their tireless work.

Also celebrating 50 years in my community was the Scout Jamboree. The suburb of Jamboree Heights was so named because it was home to the second biggest scout jamboree in the world. Indeed, we are a community of awesome overachievers. We had a massive celebration earlier this year with many of the original scout attendees returning 50 years later to attend the celebration held on the very same site of the original jamboree. It was really something special to be part of and I want to thank the many scout leaders who organised the event, especially Penny.

Later this year all of Queensland will fall silent to commemorate the centenary of the armistice. My fantastic local RSLs are planning on hosting events and have been working to ensure a fitting tribute to our fallen Anzacs. The Sherwood-Indooroopilly RSL, under the leadership of Glenn with his amazing offsiders Kylie and Hayley, always put on a beautiful service. The Darra RSL has installed a stunning memorial ready to go, and under the guidance of Centenary RSL President Georges spoke at my first annual seniors morning tea alongside another local luminary. I must conclude by giving a massive shout out to our local Adopt-a-Cop Ben Harm, who was recently awarded the Neighbourhood Watch Queensland Liaison Officer of the Year. Ben, you are a legend; we all know it. Now the minister and commissioner have given you a trophy to prove it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Before we finish tonight may I thank all members from all sides of the House for the respect shown during the debate over the last two days during the Termination of Pregnancy Bill. I think it was outstanding from all members. My congratulations.

The House adjourned at 8.16 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson