



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

Tuesday, 2 April 2019

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	901
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 29 March 2019, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 29 March 2019.	901
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	901
School Group Tours	901
PETITIONS	902
TABLED PAPERS	902
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	903
Federal Budget, Funding Priorities	903
Advance Queensland	904
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Government: Report, undated, titled 'Building our Innovation Economy: Advance Queensland Strategy (Draft)'	904
Lord Mayor of Brisbane	904
Barty, Ms A	905
Federal Budget, Funding Priorities	905
Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding	906
Building our Innovation Economy	906
Private Health Insurance; Health System	907
Wage Theft; Federal Budget, Fair Work Ombudsman	907
Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding	908
Local Government, Voting	908
Biosecurity	909
Water Supply	909
TAFE Queensland	910
Climate Change	910

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 2 April 2019

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	911
Hospitals, Code Yellow	911
Hospitals, Code Yellow	912
Federal Budget, Funding Priorities	913
Queensland Health, ICT Projects.....	913
Floods, Recovery Assistance	914
Queensland Health, Digital Hospitals Program	915
Federal Budget, Funding Priorities	916
Public Hospitals, Waiting Times.....	917
Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding.....	917
Public Hospitals, Waiting Times.....	918
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 30 August 2014, from the former minister for health, Hon. Lawrence Springborg, titled 'New campaign says GP not ED'	918
Regional Queensland, Innovation	918
Hervey Bay Hospital.....	919
Federal Budget, Health Funding.....	920
Vegetation Management	921
Rail Services.....	921
Hospitals, Overcrowding	922
Federal Budget, Education and Industrial Relations.....	923
MOTION	923
Business Program.....	923
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Nature Conservation Bill'.....	924
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Justice Bill'	925
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Guardianship Bill'	925
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Amendment to Business Program Motion'.....	925
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	927
Resolved in the negative.....	927
Non-government amendment (Mr Bleijie) negative.....	927
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	927
Resolved in the affirmative.....	927
HEAVY VEHICLE NATIONAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL.....	928
Introduction	928
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2019.	928
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.....	928
First Reading	929
Referral to Transport and Public Works Committee	929
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	929
Second Reading	929
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Nonconforming petition regarding Townsville Youth Foyer.	931
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 6 March 2019, from the Mayor of Townsville, Cr Jenny Hill, to Townsville City councillor Cr Maurie Soars regarding the proposed construction at 32-34 Elizabeth Street, Aitkenvale.	931
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Brisbane Times</i> online, dated 29 August 2018, titled 'Council city planning boss worried state-led development will create "islands"'	932
DISTINGUISHED VISITOR	937
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	937
Second Reading	937
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	943
Health System; Quirk, Lord Mayor G	943
Road Safety	945
Correctional Facilities	946
Keppel Electorate, Big W Store Closures; News Contracting and Logistics.....	947
Racing Industry	947
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, undated, titled 'Harness races halted due to safety concerns'	948
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract, dated 28 March, from Twitter in relation to harness racing.....	948
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 5 May 2018, by the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission titled 'Identification mix up at Ipswich Greyhounds sparks inquiry'	948
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 18 May 2018, from the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission titled 'Greyhound mix-up investigation concludes'	948
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, undated, titled 'Racing justice on slow track'.....	948
Cook Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government.....	949
Parliament, Harmony.....	950
Townsville, Resources.....	950
Braun, Dr W	951
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of correspondence relating to complaints regarding Dr William Braun.	952
Townsville Electorate, Flood Recovery.....	952
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	953
Second Reading	953
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Queensland Times</i> , dated 30 March 2019, titled 'Formal submission must be made before federal cash'.....	954
<i>Tabled paper:</i> McGrathNicol report, dated 25 March 2019, titled 'Ipswich City Council-Ipswich City Properties Pty Ltd: Ipswich CBD redevelopment—cost analysis'.....	956

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 2 April 2019

Consideration in Detail	973
<i>Tabled paper: Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Cameron Dick's amendments</i>	973
<i>Clauses 1 to 231 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.....</i>	974
Third Reading	974
Long Title.....	974
QUEENSLAND CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	975
Second Reading	975
SAFER WATERWAYS BILL	983
Second Reading	983
<i>Tabled paper: Photograph, undated, depicting crocodiles.....</i>	985
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Cairns Post, dated 3 July 2018, titled 'Croc cull has clear support'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Cairns Post, dated 3 January 2011, titled 'Biggest rise in beach closures due to crocodiles in Far North in five years'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail online, dated 26 July 2017, titled 'Report confirms that Queensland's saltwater crocodile populations are rising'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Courier-Mail online, dated 4 April 2017, titled 'Crocodile kills and eats family dog on property near Innisfail'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from ABC News online, dated 4 June 2016, titled 'Crocodile caught and killed in Cindy Waldron search found to have human remains inside'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from ABC News online, dated 22 March 2017, titled 'Crocodile captured that killed spear fisherman Warren Hughes in far north Queensland'.</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Cairns Post, dated 6 June 2018, titled 'Babinda croc at large'</i>	991
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Innisfail Advocate, dated 25 April 2018, titled 'Bingil Bay turtle croc goes viral'.</i>	992
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Cairns Post, dated 18 January 2018, titled 'Beach empty as croc sighted'.</i>	992
<i>Tabled paper: Bundle of media articles regarding crocodiles</i>	992
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.....	995
Resolved in the negative.	995
VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (CLEARING FOR RELEVANT PURPOSES) AMENDMENT BILL.....	995
Second Reading	995
ADJOURNMENT	998
Toowoomba North Small Business Advisory Committee	998
<i>Tabled paper: Article from the Chronicle, dated 2 April 2019, titled 'Why my shelves are bare'.....</i>	998
Nudgee Electorate, Rail Services	998
Burrum Coast National Park, Fire	999
Mundingburra Electorate, Flood Recovery.....	1000
Toowoomba South Electorate	1000
Hall, Mr CJ	1001
Hughenden Irrigation Project Corporation, Alstonvale Dam.....	1001
St Catherine's Catholic Primary School	1002
Australian Surf Life Saving Championships	1002
World Autism Awareness Day.....	1003
<i>Tabled paper: Child's drawings [516].</i>	1004
ATTENDANCE	1004

TUESDAY, 2 APRIL 2019



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.

ASSENT TO BILLS



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

The Honourable C.W. Pitt MP

Speaker of the Legislative Assembly

Parliament House

George Street

BRISBANE QLD 4000

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

Date of Assent: 29 March 2019

A Bill for an Act to amend the Aboriginal Land Act 1991, the Cape York Peninsula Heritage Act 2007, the Explosives Act 1999, the Explosives Regulation 2017, the Foreign Ownership of Land Register Act 1988, the Land Act 1994, the Land and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2017, the Land Regulation 2009, the Land Title Act 1994, the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, the State Penalties Enforcement Regulation 2014, the Torres Strait Islander Land Act 1991 and the legislation mentioned in schedule 1 for particular purposes.

A Bill for an Act to amend the Biodiscovery Act 2004, the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Forestry Act 1959, the Fossicking Act 1994, the Land Act 1994, the Land Title Act 1994, the Mineral Resources Act 1989, the Mineral Resources Regulation 2013, the Nature Conservation Act 1992 and the Vegetation Management Act 1999 for particular purposes.

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

Yours sincerely

Governor

29 March 2019

Tabled paper. Letter, dated 29 March 2019, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 29 March 2019 [481].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the House this morning by students and teachers from Serviceton South State School in the electorate of Inala and Bardon State School in the electorate of Maiwar. In lieu of students being able to easily visit Brisbane, today I am wearing the tie from my old school, Gordonvale State High School in the electorate of Mulgrave.

PETITIONS

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

Anzac Street, Level Crossing Upgrade

Mr Andrew, from 94 petitioners, requesting the House upgrade the Anzac Street level crossing to a standard equal to Central Street, providing pedestrian maze and activated safety gates [482].

Moreton Bay, Artificial Reef

Mr Berkman, from 541 petitioners, requesting the House to re-use a small number retired electric passenger trains as a unique and historical artificial reef in Moreton Bay for future generations of Australians and tourists [483].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

The Clerk informed the House that the following papers, received during the recess, were tabled on the dates indicated—

29 March 2019—

- [435](#) Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee: Report No. 14, 56th Parliament, March 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled on 13 November 2018
- [436](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 33, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation between 31 October 2018 and 13 November 2018
- [437](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 34, 56th Parliament—Subordinate legislation between 14 November 2018 and 12 February 2019
- [438](#) Response from the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships (Hon. Trad), to an ePetition (3054-18) sponsored by the Clerk under the provisions of Standing Order 119(4) and a paper petition (3092-19), presented by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(3), from 349 and 45 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to ensure that a cycle connection is provided from the PA Hospital to the Boggo Road precinct as part of the Cross River Rail project
- [439](#) Response from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries (Hon. Furner), to an ePetition (2988-18), sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 1,290 petitioners, requesting the House to insert mandatory requirements in the Animal Care and Protection Act 2001 for adequate shelter for livestock kept outdoors
- [440](#) Brisbane Girls Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [441](#) Brisbane Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [442](#) Central Queensland University—Annual Report 2018
- [443](#) Griffith University—Annual Report 2018
- [444](#) Ipswich Girls' Grammar School and Ipswich Junior Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [445](#) Ipswich Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [446](#) James Cook University—Annual Report 2018
- [447](#) Queensland College of Teachers—Annual Report 2018
- [448](#) Queensland University of Technology—Annual Report 2018
- [449](#) Rockhampton Girls Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [450](#) Rockhampton Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [451](#) Toowoomba Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [452](#) Townsville Grammar School—Annual Report 2018
- [453](#) University of Queensland—Annual Report 2018
- [454](#) University of Queensland—Annual Report 2018: Annual Financial Statements—Volume 1
- [455](#) University of Queensland—Annual Report 2018: Annual Financial Statements—Volume 2—Subsidiaries
- [456](#) University of Southern Queensland—Annual Report 2018
- [457](#) University of the Sunshine Coast—Annual Report 2018
- [458](#) Education, Employment and Small Business Committee: Report No. 15, 56th Parliament, March 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 31 October 2018 and 12 February 2019
- [459](#) Transport and Public Works Committee: Report No. 17, 56th Parliament, March 2019—Personalised Transport Ombudsman Bill 2019
- [460](#) Response from the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning (Hon. Dick), to an ePetition (2989-18), sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 4,987 petitioners, requesting the House to review and improve planning laws
- [461](#) Queensland Theatre Company—Annual Report 2018
- [462](#) Response from the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games (Hon. Jones), to a paper petition (3091-19) presented by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(3), from 42 petitioners, requesting the House to oppose the granting of a second casino licence on the Gold Coast

1 April 2019—

- [463](#) Nature Conservation (Special Wildlife Reserves) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Leeanne Enoch's amendments
- [464](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 23, 56th Parliament, April 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 31 October 2018 and 12 February 2019
- [465](#) National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner—Annual Report 2017-18
- [466](#) Administrator National Health Funding Pool—Annual Report 2017-18
- [467](#) Response from the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport (Hon. de Brenni), to an ePetition (3070-19), sponsored by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(4) from 146 petitioners, requesting the House to support the government's purchase of the 37 affordable housing rental properties owned by the Downs Housing Company to be rented to the existing tenants at existing rents now and into the future.

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Motor Accident Insurance Act 1994, National Injury Insurance Scheme (Queensland) Act 2016:

- [468](#) Motor Accident Insurance and Other Legislation (Administration Fee and Levies) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 34
- [469](#) Motor Accident Insurance and Other Legislation (Administration Fee and Levies) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 34, explanatory notes

Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011, Public Health Act 2005:

- [470](#) Public Health and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2019, No. 35
- [471](#) Public Health and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2019, No. 35, explanatory notes

Education (General Provisions) Act 2006:

- [472](#) Education (General Provisions) (Westmar State School) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 36
- [473](#) Education (General Provisions) (Westmar State School) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 36, explanatory notes

Biosecurity Act 2014:

- [474](#) Biosecurity (Fees for Registered Biosecurity Entities) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 37
- [475](#) Biosecurity (Fees for Registered Biosecurity Entities) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 37, explanatory notes

Hospital Foundations Act 2018:

- [476](#) Hospital Foundations (Postponement) Regulation 2019, No. 38
- [477](#) Hospital Foundations (Postponement) Regulation 2019, No. 38, explanatory notes

City of Brisbane Act 2010, Local Government Act 2009:

- [478](#) Local Government Legislation Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 39
- [479](#) Local Government Legislation Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 39, explanatory notes

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Condamine (Mr Weir)—

- [480](#) Nonconforming petition regarding additional police officer to be stationed at the Cambooya Police Station

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Federal Budget, Funding Priorities

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.33 am): In tonight's federal budget I want to see Queenslanders finally receive a fair share from Canberra of the taxes they are paying. Around 80 per cent of taxation revenue goes to the federal government, and it is only fair to ask that the taxes Queenslanders pay be reinvested here in Queensland.

We are investing \$46.3 billion in infrastructure over four years, with \$7.4 billion over the same period from the Morrison government. The Queensland government is investing more than \$5 for every dollar received from the Morrison government for infrastructure. If Queenslanders are to receive a fair share, we need to see in tonight's federal budget funding for Cross River Rail—the biggest project in generations. The federal opposition has already committed \$800 million for construction and \$2.2 billion in total.

To match my government's commitment of \$200 million, we need to see \$800 million a year for the Bruce Highway to boost funding by \$1 billion a year. We welcome the Morrison government finally matching our \$36 million for the Townsville Ring Road stage 5. We want a fair share for the M1. If 80-20 funding is good enough for New South Wales, why is it simply not good enough for Queensland?

We want to see funding for all of the \$176 million for Rookwood Weir in the forward estimates this time, along with all of the promised funding for the M1, the Rockhampton Ring Road, Gold Coast Light Rail Stage 3 and the Beerburum to Nambour rail—not funding in the never-never. We want to see it in the forward estimates. We want to see the full \$20 million of funding for Bribie Island Road promised in the Longman by-election.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Pumicestone, you are warned under the standing orders. Your comments will come through the chair. That is a warning to all members today.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We want to see the federal government recognise climate change and match our \$20 million commitment for seawalls on five islands in the Torres Strait.

In relation to services, the funding Queensland is owed under the National Health Reform Agreement for Queensland hospitals is more than \$300 million. We want to see the reinstatement of the national partnership agreement for long-stay older patients in public hospitals to support the cost of supporting people who should be in aged care. We want to see ongoing funding for kindergartens and for the federal government to fund at least half of the costs of the NDIS, considering they increased the Medicare levy to pay for it. We want to see the \$245 million owed to Queensland for TAFE and training and the \$200 million owed under the National Partnership on Remote Housing.

Advance Queensland

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.36 am): Our \$650 million Advance Queensland fund is paying dividends. By the end of December, this forward-thinking, business-boosting fund was supporting 14,800 jobs—45 per cent of them in regional Queensland. Now we take the next step with the Building our Innovation Economy—Advance Queensland Strategy. I table the strategy.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government: Report, undated, titled 'Building our Innovation Economy: Advance Queensland Strategy (Draft)' [486].

When we started Advance Queensland we recognised innovation as the vital economic driver that it is. Today 19.7 per cent of Australian start-up founders are located in Queensland—more than Victoria, Western Australia and South Australia.

Our success stories include Brisbane manufacturer Tritium, who can charge a car in five minutes—now finding markets in the USA and Europe; Redback Technologies, who are making battery storage technology more affordable with a system that cuts energy costs and pumps renewable energy into the grid; and steel fabrication company Watkins Steel, which is using 3D laser scanners, robotics, augmented reality and animation that has allowed the business to double in size. There are more than 116 other examples I could give.

We have attracted 10 companies to establish or expand into Queensland, but we have also supported and grown Queensland businesses: \$34 million has been invested in Queensland small to medium enterprises and 60 per cent of those we back are in regional Queensland. We have successfully completed the start-up phase. The next step is to scale up, and that is what this strategy is all about. Unashamedly, this is to achieve one goal, and that is jobs for Queenslanders—high-paying, high-skill jobs.

Last night I had the opportunity to open QODE with the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development—our global conference for 3,500 entrepreneurs and innovators from around the world. Mr Speaker, I will tell you one thing: they are all impressed with Queensland and they are thinking about moving their businesses here. They are coming to Queensland because we are the innovation state. We are growing the industries we have and finding the ones we need to give Queensland and our children the future they deserve.

Lord Mayor of Brisbane

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): I would like to offer my thanks to Lord Mayor Graham Quirk for his service to the City of Brisbane over eight years as Lord Mayor and more than 30 years in council. Councillor Quirk has been a hardworking and dedicated

servant of the city and has been decent in his dealings with the government. I congratulate him for his achievements in office and I wish him and his wife, Anne, and his daughters, Sarah, Elizabeth and Charlotte, all the best for the next phase of their life. I also congratulate Adrian Schrinner on becoming the new Lord Mayor and Krista Adams as the incoming Deputy Mayor. I commit to working constructively with the new Lord Mayor until the council election next March.

Barty, Ms A

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.38 am): Queensland's Ash Barty is the first Australian tennis player in the world top 10 since 2013. Ash's win in the Miami Open on the weekend was her fourth singles title and her biggest so far. Her career has taken her from Springfield to the world tennis circuit, then a switch to cricket and then back to tennis where she has absolutely flourished. Congratulations to Ash, her parents, Robert and Josie, and her coaching and support team. She learned to play on the Richlands court in my electorate of Inala with Jimmy Joyce. As it happens, the last time an Australian was in the top 10 it was another Queenslander—Sam Stosur, who is also playing well and made the final in the doubles at Miami.

Federal Budget, Funding Priorities

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.39 am): Tonight the current federal government will hand down its sixth budget and the last one before the next federal election which is now only a matter of weeks away. Since the Palaszczuk government was elected, we have sought to work with the Commonwealth at every opportunity so that Queenslanders get a fair share of the money that they pay in taxes to the federal government. Sadly, we have not seen our cooperation reciprocated. Queensland has not received its fair share from the Abbott government, the Turnbull government or the Morrison LNP government.

In last year's budget the federal government trumpeted that they were spending \$75 billion on infrastructure over 10 years, but in their own budget documents only about \$5.2 billion, or seven per cent, was being spent on dedicated major projects in Queensland. For some of these key projects the funding will not materialise until after not this federal election but the next federal election in the 2022-23 federal budget. There have been subsequent announcements by the Commonwealth for other projects, but quite frankly it is a case of too little too late. Queensland is sick of waiting. We have had enough of not getting our fair share. Other states have had significant contributions to major projects like the \$5 billion allocated to the Melbourne airport rail link without a business case and without an alignment.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: From what we know so far about tonight's federal budget, that pattern is set to continue. Victoria will see another \$4 billion pumped into projects like high-speed rail between Melbourne and Geelong and various road projects in Melbourne. A further \$1.4 billion will be spent on Snowy Hydro 2.0 on top of the billions already committed to this project. South Australia and Western Australia will share in \$3 billion for transport infrastructure, but Queensland by comparison is being left behind. We have not seen one single cent for the congestion-busting project Cross River Rail, our No. 1 priority.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier has the call.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from both the minister for small business, training and skills and the Premier. Why do they hate public transport projects? Why do they hate Queensland? This is a very good question that we should find out the answer to.

We still have not seen any money for remote Indigenous housing for Queensland. We have not seen more than \$300 million in back pay that our health system is owed—our doctors, nurses and allied health staff who have all performed health activities in our tertiary hospitals. It is our back pay and it should be paid immediately.

We still have not seen any funding certainty for early childhood education or training and skills. We have not seen these things because Queensland is simply not getting our fair share from this LNP federal government. Tonight is a test for the federal government. It is a test for the new Treasurer, Josh

Frydenberg. We want to see real commitments to the things Queenslanders care about: health, education and infrastructure. We want commitments without strings attached, without fine print and without tricky accounting that means federal money will not be spent for years to come. If we do not see real commitments on these things tonight then it will confirm that under this LNP federal government Queensland will never get its fair share.

Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.44 am): Tonight in Canberra the LNP has the opportunity to fix a very serious wrong—that is, the federal coalition's chronic underinvestment in infrastructure in Queensland. Last year's federal budget was a complete fizzer when it came to infrastructure for Queensland.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr DICK: I will take the interjection. The only fair share the member for Everton wants is a fair share of One Nation preferences so he can get re-elected. That is what he wants—to have a fair share of funding from the Shooters Union. It was another coalition budget without a single dollar for Cross River Rail. Once upon a time the federal coalition did support Cross River Rail. They did support it once—

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are warned under the standing orders.

Mr DICK: But in last year's federal budget all Queenslanders saw was Scott Morrison allocating \$5 billion for a railway in Victoria that at the time it was announced had no alignment, no business case, is not needed before 2030 and has no funding from the Victorian government. While Commonwealth funding for M1 upgrades are long overdue, the decision to fund only 50 per cent of these upgrades when it funds 80 per cent of upgrades on the same highway in New South Wales demonstrates yet again how the Morrison government treats Queenslanders as second-class citizens.

Even worse, when Queensland projects have been funded much of that funding does not flow and will not support jobs in our state until the 2023-24 financial year. Queensland's peak motoring body, the RACQ, described Scott Morrison's 2018 budget as adopting 'some clever accounting to short-change Queenslanders in transport investment'. Frankly, Scott Morrison's last budget was all smoke and no mirrors. Scott Morrison may be Australia's third Prime Minister in five years but tonight he has one last chance to do the right thing by Queensland. He needs to deliver to Queensland our fair share of infrastructure funding, and that includes an 80-20 split of funding for the Beerburnum to Nambour rail duplication and for the Bruce Highway Trust; funding to deliver Cross River Rail; and funding a new national partnership agreement on remote housing after the federal coalition shamefully walked away from Indigenous housing. Tonight is Scott Morrison's last chance to do the right thing for Queensland. Queenslanders know that the Palaszczuk government will always fight for our state's fair share.

Building our Innovation Economy

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.47 am): As the Premier has announced this morning, today marks the next stage of our Advance Queensland agenda. Through our strategy Building our Innovation Economy launched today, we will continue to invest in Queensland's future and growing Queensland's jobs. We know that our Advance Queensland strategy is already delivering. To date our strategy has supported more than 4,450 investors, small and medium sized businesses, and helped drive more than 14,800 new jobs.

We recognise that particularly in the regions we must invest in the new skills and technologies of the new economy. Throughout our consultation, business and industry and our innovation ecosystem have identified five key priority areas that we must continue to work on to grow jobs. Firstly, we must back our key strengths—agriculture, mining, defence, life sciences and tourism. We must solve big challenges like the protection of our Great Barrier Reef. We must build in innovation in our regions and provide them with the support they need. We must scale up innovation by backing our small and medium enterprises to go to the next level and put them on a global pathway to create Queensland jobs. Finally, through our investment in training we will give Queenslanders the skills and jobs they need to participate fully in the economy of the future. That is why we have thousands of people—delegates from around the world and across Australia—here in Queensland this week as part of QODE.

At a time when experts are predicting that 860,000 Queensland jobs will be impacted through digital disruption—yet we know we can create up to a million jobs into the future—instead of investing in the innovation and skills of Queenslanders, we have seen Scott Morrison and Karen Andrews get rid of the innovation portfolio entirely. They have also cut critical funding for skills. Today I am calling on the federal government to reverse the decision in tonight's budget and match Queensland's commitment to grow new jobs through a half a billion dollar investment in innovation and growth. Labor is the only side of politics that is committed to investing in new industries to create sustainable jobs and grow Queensland's economy.

Private Health Insurance; Health System

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.49 am): Yesterday, 1 April, private health insurance premiums increased again. That is the sixth year in a row since the Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison LNP government was elected that premiums have increased. They are increasing far ahead of inflation and even further ahead of wage growth. Under the LNP, private health insurance premiums have increased far greater than everyday families can afford to pay. In fact, under the LNP the average cost of private health insurance for a family has increased 30 per cent—nearly a third. For most families that is an extra \$1,100 a year. As a result, tens of thousands of Queenslanders have been left with no choice but to abandon their private health insurance.

Under the LNP, hospital cover in Queensland has fallen by nearly 10 per cent. When they were elected, more than 45 per cent of Queenslanders had hospital cover. That is now around 41.5 per cent. In fact, 23,000 fewer Queenslanders have insurance now than when Tony Abbott took over, even though our population has increased. Fewer Queenslanders with hospital insurance cover means more people using our fantastic public hospitals. In fact, activity in our public hospitals has increased at twice the rate per year as it has in the private system. The growth in public hospital patients between 2013-14 and 2017-18 was more than 250 per cent greater than the growth in private hospital patients.

Right across Queensland, private hospitals have been forced to scale back services and in some cases close altogether—like in Gladstone, where the Mater have announced they will close their hospital there. Federal Labor has announced a rescue package to make sure Gladstone does not lose that facility. So far Scott Morrison has refused to match it. Federal Labor has also committed to cap increases in private health insurance premiums going forward, putting an end to the LNP's year-on-year price hikes that have led Queenslanders to desert private health insurance.

When it comes to health care, Greg Hunt and the LNP have failed on every front—failed on private health insurance premiums and coverage, failed on hospital funding, failed on Medicare. Tonight they have one last chance to reverse their failed policies or Australians will elect a Labor government that will.

Last week in this House a number of members referenced individual patient experiences. Out of respect for patient privacy and confidentiality, I am unable to address the individual claims made. However, I can assure the House that the matters raised have been referred to the relevant HHS, investigated and addressed where appropriate. A member also inquired what action I had taken to address matters raised by the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine. I would like to thank the president of ACEM for agreeing to travel from Sydney to meet with me on Thursday along with Queensland representatives.

Wage Theft; Federal Budget, Fair Work Ombudsman

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.53 am): I also acknowledge yellow for World Autism Awareness Day today.

Protecting the rights of workers is in the DNA of every Labor government. When high-profile cases of wage theft involving companies like 7-Eleven, Caltex and Domino's were brought to our attention, the Palaszczuk government acted swiftly and decisively. We tasked the parliament's Education, Employment and Small Business Committee to undertake an inquiry into wage theft in Queensland, and I would like to again thank the committee's chair, the member for Nudgee, and its members for their work. In its report, the committee made 17 recommendations aimed at eliminating wage theft, and the government has accepted in principle or fully all of the recommendations.

I have written to Minister Kelly O'Dwyer to inform her of our government's response to the inquiry and to seek a commitment from her for a national response to this issue. For example, we have called for the introduction of a national labour hire licensing scheme, more Fair Work inspectors on the ground in Queensland and a full, independent review into the Fair Work Ombudsman.

The federal LNP government has watered down laws and allowed employers to exploit workers. The members opposite voted against establishing the parliamentary inquiry, and just last Thursday those opposite described it as a political stunt, clearly not understanding the impact wage theft has on workers and their families. The report found that 437,000 Queensland workers were affected by wage theft last year, costing more than \$1 billion, but the LNP fought the inquiry every step of the way.

The Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government has been asleep at the wheel on the issue of wage theft. A recent audit of hospitality businesses in Fortitude Valley found that 60 per cent were complying with their requirements—only 60 per cent. Tonight's federal budget is their last chance to show that they take this issue seriously. Tonight's budget must include our fair share of funding for the Fair Work Ombudsman in Queensland. The number of Fair Work inspectors in Queensland has been slashed. There are currently just 38 inspectors in Queensland to cover over two million workers—compared to 71 inspectors in 2005 before the hostile WorkChoices takeover. Even the Australian Chamber of Commerce and Industry has called for more Fair Work inspectors to address what it calls the 'serious problem' of wage theft. It is very unusual for the union and employer groups to come together on this issue. A comprehensive national strategy, combined with a serious increase in funding and resources for the Fair Work Ombudsman, is necessary to ensure our fair share for Queensland and to ensure workers get a fair day's pay for a fair day's work.

Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding

 Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.56 am): Queenslanders are sick and tired of not getting their fair share from Canberra. Tonight's budget is Scott Morrison's final chance to show he will give Queenslanders what we are due and not short-change us for his mates in New South Wales. For more than half a decade, the chaotic Abbott, Turnbull and now Morrison LNP government has taken Queenslanders for granted. The Palaszczuk government is delivering a record \$45.8 billion over the next four years in infrastructure for Queenslanders. That includes \$4.9 billion this year for roads across Queensland. We are doing the heavy lifting, while Scott Morrison continues to spend billions of dollars in Sydney and Melbourne. Time and time again we have been treated like an afterthought by the LNP in Canberra.

After talking a big pre-budget game last year, they actually cut money from Queensland last year—a 6.2 per cent cut from our roads in Queensland. Tonight, we do not just need commitments; we need real funding for Queensland projects now. We have watched federal commitments on the Gold Coast Light Rail slip, from 38 per cent under federal Labor governments to 23 per cent under Malcolm Turnbull and now down to 16 per cent under the current Prime Minister Morrison. The Queensland LNP has already signed up for this terrible deal regrettably.

On the M1, the federal government is still dudding Queenslanders with 50-50 funding, while just down the road on the same road New South Wales gets 80-20. Why should Queenslanders be grateful for this appalling double standard? Queenslanders want to see fair funding for major road and rail projects we need today—not in 20 years time, like the Prime Minister's fast rail thought bubbles. We want to see them funded now, not four or five years down the track.

Of the \$3.3 billion in new federal funding for the Bruce Highway allocated last financial year, only \$15 million was within the federal budget's four-year forwards—less than 0.5 per cent of their promise was actually in the four-year forwards. Year after year, the federal coalition government makes announcements only for Queenslanders to end up waiting years and years to see any funding flow. We know that good things happen when all governments work together for Queensland. We have created almost 185,000 jobs since January 2015. Imagine what we could do with a fair share from Canberra. Queenslanders will be watching very closely tonight. Tonight's budget is Scott Morrison's final chance to show he knows Queensland exists and knows how to deliver a fair share for our state.

Local Government, Voting

 Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.59 am): Yesterday I provided Queensland's 564 local government mayors and councillors with an update on our local council reforms. The Palaszczuk government already has a strong record when it comes to delivering increased transparency and accountability in local government informed by the CCC's Operation Belcarra report. At the start of March, I announced a suite of proposed local government reforms for consultation. We have consulted and we have listened. The stakeholders have made it clear that there needs to be further consultation on some of the proposed reforms, and we have agreed to more discussions on these aspects.

We are moving forward with the introduction of compulsory preferential voting for mayoral and divisional councillor elections, starting from the 2020 local government election. This will align local government voting methodologies with state and federal elections. Feedback received on proportional representation demonstrated this change involved complexities such that its introduction was not recommended for the 2020 local government. As a consequence, further consultation will be undertaken on PR with the aim of introducing partial proportional representation for undivided councils at the 2024 local government election. Let me be clear—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Look it up. You will understand it then.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The minister's comments will come through the chair.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition!

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Let me be clear, as a key recommendation of Belcarra we will implement expenditure caps for councillors and candidates and public funding for elections. However, in consultation with councils, we accept that getting the detail of these reforms right in order for them to be effective for the 2020 election would be difficult. The government will legislate to have them in place for the day after the 28 March 2020 election so that councillors and future candidates can have clarity for an entire term. Further consultation will be undertaken on expenditure caps to ensure the dollar amounts are reasonable.

The stage 2 Belcarra reforms also include real-time disclosure of electoral spending, further tightening of conflict of interest and material personal interest provisions, definition of a group of candidates, mandatory training for candidates and councillors, dedicated campaign bank accounts and prohibiting the use of credit cards for campaign expenses, tightening of reporting of gifts and changes to mayoral powers. These are sensible reforms that seek a more transparent and accountable local government sector, as recommended by the Belcarra report.

Biosecurity

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (10.01 am): I am pleased to inform the House that the Queensland Palaszczuk government has committed a further \$12 million to control and contain Panama disease tropical race 4 in our banana production areas. This funding will support the development of a shared partnership agreement with the Australian Banana Growers' Council, the ABGC. We have contained the disease for just over four years now thanks to the collective action of Biosecurity Queensland, the ABGC, individual growers, research bodies and the wider community.

Right from the first detection in March of 2015 government and industry worked in partnership to ensure world's best practice in the management of TR4 to support our growers and protect the region's \$600 million industry. The August 2018 independent review of the TR4 response recommended that our efforts continue under a formal partnership with a jointly funded and delivered program between government and industry. Growers have also invested in on-farm biosecurity and their levies contribute to banana research and development. I would also like to acknowledge the industry purchased the first infested farm and the subsequent shutdown of all operations on that property has contributed to the containment of TR4.

The necessity of this coordinated approach highlights just how critical biosecurity is for the protection of our primary industries. That is why I really hope that the federal government does not drop the ball on this in tonight's federal budget. Already we have seen a 25 per cent cut in biosecurity staff by the federal government, which is a major threat when we consider the state's geographical position and climate put it on the front line of biosecurity threats to this country. The federal government likes to spruik that it is tough on border control, yet it makes a 25 per cent cut in the biosecurity staff that are supposed to be keeping our nation and its primary industries secure from these threats. Let's hope we will see these cuts rescinded and Queensland get its fair share in the federal budget tonight.

Water Supply

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.04 am): The Palaszczuk government is unlocking water to support economic opportunities for regional Queensland. Responsible governments seek to find a balance between the needs of

communities, irrigators, pastoralists, business, development and the environment, and that is what we are doing. We are taking steps now to help foster sustainable growth for these important areas. We listen to experts who identify real water allocations that can be accessed now.

More than 2.8 million megalitres of unallocated water is reserved in water plans across Queensland. To date, my department has made available over 500,000 megalitres of general reserve unallocated water. Of that, more than 200,000 megalitres of water entitlements have been granted. That is water to expand rural and regional businesses, boost production of food and fibre, and create jobs and business opportunities in regional communities.

The latest release is making almost 90,000 megalitres of water available for irrigators in the Banana Shire and Central Highlands council areas. This water, the equivalent of 36,000 Olympic size swimming pools, will be used to support a wide range of agricultural industries including cotton, beef, grains, cereals, trees and small crops. Irrigators will be able to access this water through recent changes to the Water Act that will allow temporary access to strategic infrastructure reserves.

The Dawson River reserve was previously quarantined for several years for the Nathan Dam and pipeline project. The release of this water means that up to 200 irrigators along the Dawson River have the opportunity to tap into additional water at a fixed price, allowing the region's cotton, beef, grain and fodder irrigators to grow and secure their operations. This is the first time the Queensland government has allowed the release of strategic water infrastructure reserves.

We also have a new water management program to improve how we measure water use, share information about water availability and support trading of water. It will enable optimal use of Queensland's unallocated water reserves and the ability to mobilise water that is being underutilised not only in the schemes supplemented by dams and weirs but also in unsupplemented surface and groundwater resources of Queensland. These initiatives are further examples of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to finding and implementing solutions that present real economic opportunities for regional Queensland.

TAFE Queensland

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.06 am): The Palaszczuk government's free TAFE is proving a winner with young Queenslanders. Last month I saw firsthand the difference free TAFE is making when I visited TAFE Queensland campuses at Southport, Nambour and Gympie. At just these three campuses we are supporting over 400 students gain valuable training for free.

In Nambour, Ben, who graduated last year from the Suncoast Christian College, is on the way to a successful career in our growing horticulture industry. He was considering setting up his own lawn-mowing business when his parents mentioned free TAFE. He grabbed the opportunity with both hands to upskill with TAFE to give his business dreams the best chance of success.

I visited the TAFE Queensland Southport Hospitality Hub with the member for Gaven and met Moana, who graduated from Beenleigh State High School last year. She is looking forward to a bright future in hospitality once she finishes her Certificate III in Hospitality and she hopes to work in a five-star establishment. This is something Moana said she could not do if it was not free. These are just a few of the thousands of young people taking advantage of the Palaszczuk government's free TAFE initiative. We want all young Queenslanders to have the opportunity to access quality training without barriers, and that is what free TAFE is all about. It is paving the way for young Queenslanders to pursue their dream job and, to quote the students, it is too good an opportunity to pass up.

Vocational education and training is so critical in so many industries and launches young Queenslanders into amazing careers. We are doing all of this without any assistance from the federal government. In fact, there has been a \$70 million cut to the training budget in Queensland, which puts the 7,000 trainees and apprentices at risk. In tonight's budget we want to see a fair share for TAFE in Queensland, for apprentices and for trainees.

Climate Change

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (10.08 am): Climate change is the most significant challenge facing our generation. Last week the UN Secretary-General, António Guterres, wrote to Paris Agreement signatories, including Australia, to urge countries to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 45 per cent over the next decade and to net zero by 2050.

Unsurprisingly, the Morrison government has stuck with the old targets of 26 to 28 per cent by 2030, which is clearly inadequate to meet the current challenge. In addition, the LNP federal government has made it clear that they plan to reach that inadequate target by relying on carryover credits from the Kyoto Protocol. Using Kyoto credits is, quite frankly, fake action on climate change. The only other country in the world to confirm they will do the same is the Ukraine. All states and territories have been calling for national leadership on this matter, and this week federal Labor has shown how it is done. Queensland has recently seen unprecedented fires, floods and cyclones, and scientists tell us that these are the direct result of a changing climate.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to strong targets around climate adaptation. Yesterday I announced that this year our government will host Queensland's first ever Climate Week. During the week of 2 June the Palaszczuk government will host former US vice-president Al Gore, who will deliver leadership training for business and community leaders from across Australia and the Asia-Pacific region. To align with that exciting event, the Queensland government will also bring together state and territory governments from across Australia for a climate action round table as well as subnational and small island state governments from across the Asia-Pacific region. In recognition of the long-held connection of first nations people to this country and the important knowledge they hold when it comes to climate and managing the land, we will also be supporting a first nation climate forum. Climate Week will also present an opportunity to harness and channel the enthusiasm of school students and bring the hopes and ideas of young Queenslanders into meaningful conversations. Now is the time to come together and show leadership with regard to action on climate change.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, question time will conclude today at 11.11 am.

Hospitals, Code Yellow

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.11 am): My first question is to the Premier. Labor's health crisis last week saw South-East Queensland hospitals at breaking point. Can the Premier tell the House how many times public hospitals have experienced a code yellow since the last state election?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. In relation to code yellows, it is a fluctuating code that happens from time to time across our hospital network system and it would have happened under the LNP—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. As I hear the Premier, she is being responsive to the question asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: What puts pressure on our hospitals and the services they can deliver for patients is when governments sack nurses and doctors. That is very clearly what happened under the LNP.

Dr Rowan: We did not have these issues.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. The member for Moggill was the head of the AMA when he backed in Lawrence Springborg, when he backed in Campbell Newman—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118 with respect to relevance. The question was only about code yellow under the Labor government, nothing else.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, I agree that the question was about all of those things, but there were also some broader preliminary statements made about the broader health system, and I hear the Premier's answer being responsive.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said, code yellow in hospitals would have happened under the LNP as they happen under Labor. That is the natural course of business in terms of when there are different issues—

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—that are placing pressure on hospitals. What I can say to the House is that I do have some further good news. I have been advised by the minister and the Director-General of Health that there is now cooperation from the federal government in relation to prioritising transitioning aged-care residents out of hospitals. I welcome that cooperation. That cooperation should have been

happening years ago, but the fact that it is happening highlights to me that the federal government does recognise there are people ready to exit into aged care. That is a federal government responsibility and that is being addressed.

My government has an ambitious capital works program to continue to grow our hospitals across our state. That includes expansions in Ipswich, Logan and Caboolture. When I travelled out west I went to Blackall and the mayor took me past the Blackall Hospital we are upgrading. In Roma I saw the Roma Hospital we are upgrading, and in the member for Nanango's own electorate there is an expansion of the Kingaroy Hospital happening under a Labor government. In Hervey Bay there is an expansion of a hospital happening under a Labor government. In Maryborough there is an expansion of the hospital.

We are planning for the future. We are making sure we have expansion. Just the other day I drove past the Herston redevelopment, once again providing over 150 extra beds for rehabilitation that is being done under a Labor government.

Hospitals, Code Yellow

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is also to the Premier. Labor's health crisis last week has undermined confidence in Queensland's public health system. Will the Premier implement real-time public reporting every time a code yellow is declared so that sick Queenslanders can have some confidence that when they turn up to a hospital there will be a bed for them?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said to the Leader of the Opposition, code yellow happened under the LNP and it happened under Labor. This is no different. It was those opposite who set up the independent hospital and health boards, and those independent hospital and health boards make their own decisions how to administer their budgets. I am more than happy to talk about health in this House because this is a government that delivers for the health of families throughout Queensland. Let's go through it. We have hired 5,270 more nurses and midwives and those opposite sacked them. There are 539 more paramedics under this Labor government. We know how much they hate doctors. We have hired 1,680 extra doctors. The health budget—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Order! I am having difficulty hearing the Premier's answer. The House will come to order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am happy to talk about health all day, because I will back our deliverables on health against those opposite. When I was sitting over there as Leader of the Opposition all I can remember is their savage health cuts and cuts to non-government organisations. What sort of government cuts a linen service? That is right: when it comes to nurses and midwives there was no planning, just sacking. When Campbell Newman's apprentice, the member for Nanango, sat around the CBRC table with the member for Clayfield she was so proud of her budget, but let's go through some more health news. In relation to admitted patients, in 2013-14 under the LNP there were 1,086,658—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118 on relevance. The Premier may wish to speak about health, but the question was about code yellow and the real-time disclosure of code yellow in hospitals under the Labor Party crisis.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for State Development, you are warned under the standing orders. Member for Kawana, the Premier is being responsive to the question; however, she has 35 seconds left. I would like to hear something about real-time reporting.

Ms PALASZCZUK: In relation to real-time reporting, we did that with political donations. Who was opposed to that at the time?

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance, standing order 118. The question was about real-time reporting of code yellow in hospitals under Labor.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Kawana, you just rose to your feet on a point of order. I ruled on that point of order. The Premier had barely begun a response and you rose again. I would like to hear the Premier respond both to my request and to your point of order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Tonight the federal budget will be brought down. Where is the \$300 million—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So rude—owed to Queensland? Will they back Queenslanders?

(Time expired)

Federal Budget, Funding Priorities

Mr KELLY: My question without notice is of the Premier. With the federal budget to be handed down this evening, can the Premier update the House on the funding priorities for Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Greenslopes for that question. Perhaps those opposite are not aware, but tonight the federal budget will be handed down. They do not want to talk about it, because they do not back Queensland. They have asked no questions about the budget. They have their heads in the sand when it comes to talking about the federal budget, because they know how depressing the federal budget story is. I know that all of the federal LNP members are in Canberra shaking their heads.

Mr Powell: To teach the Labor government a few things about budgets—surpluses, debt reduction.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, member for Glass House. Under a Labor government in this state we have seen surplus after surplus after surplus—four surpluses!

I read the *Australian* this morning. What did it say?

Mr Bleijie: You are misleading the House!

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, a point of order is the appropriate way for you to address the chair. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I find that offensive and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier has found comments offensive, member for Kawana. Will you withdraw?

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Every time you stand up in the House, we remember your record. You were the worst attorney-general ever—the worst.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, under standing order 247, I ask you to address your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I want to talk about what was said in the paper this morning. The federal government is going to spend \$75 billion on its 10-year capital works program. Ours is \$46 billion over four years; theirs is \$75 billion over 10 years for the whole nation. This is the interesting point.

Mrs Frecklington: Ha, ha!

Ms PALASZCZUK: You can laugh, member for Nanango. You will not be laughing when I finish with this.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier—

Ms PALASZCZUK: I apologise. It says—

It will include specific congestion-busting projects to address concerns over population growth in Sydney and Melbourne. It is expected these would be funded outside the budget.

When we talk about congestion busting, the No. 1 infrastructure project for Queensland is Cross River Rail. The member for Nanango is backing Sydney and Melbourne over Brisbane and Queensland. All we want is our fair share. It is not too much to ask for our fair share. Queenslanders pay their taxes, and we expect nothing less. Those opposite cannot even be bothered to ask a question about the federal budget.

Queensland Health, ICT Projects

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Last week the Australian Medical Association Queensland called on the Palaszczuk government to urgently stop the digital hospital IT rollout because patient safety was at risk. Will the Premier finally listen to doctors, start putting patient safety first and urgently stop the rollout of Labor's latest Health IT bungle?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Everton for the question about a project that was started under the LNP. It is absolutely crucial that digital records are rolled out. The health minister has asked for an audit of all of the ICT projects, and he will be reporting on that once the audit has been completed. How dare those opposite think we do not need to be brought into the 21st century? The Queensland government is committed to ensuring a safe rollout of this project. The health minister will oversee that and ensure—

Mrs Frecklington: Labor governments and IT don't mix.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will tell the Leader of the Opposition what does not mix: health and the savage cuts that the LNP made to doctors and nurses. That is what does not mix.

You have asked a question about the AMA. In your ranks you have a former head of the AMA who did not mind what was happening to the doctors—

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the member: sold out his own members.

Dr ROWAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find the comments personally offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, the member has found those comments personally offensive. Will you withdraw?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I withdraw. When the member for Moggill was the head of the AMA he went against the collective agreement of the doctors, who did not want those savage doctor contracts that were being imposed by the Newman government.

Dr Rowan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Moggill, you are warned under the standing orders. You will address your comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think, from memory, he stood down from that role.

Ms Jones: I think he was removed.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Removed from that role? Perhaps the member could clarify: removed or sacked? When the member for Moggill was the head of the AMA he did not mind when the doctors and nurses were being sacked by the LNP. Now he sits in this House. The member for Moggill should be standing up for the doctors in this state and thanking them for the hard work they do in delivering the best health services to the people of this state, no matter where they live.

We know that under the Labor government growth has continued in Health. Of course, we are investing to cater for that growth. We will see the expansion of those hospitals. Unfortunately, little planning was done under the LNP. All they were focused on was cutting, sacking and selling.

Floods, Recovery Assistance

Mr HARPER: My question without notice is of the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on any further funding support packages secured to help in the continued recovery efforts of north and north-west communities impacted by the floods?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Thuringowa for that question. As we know, the people of Townsville and the people of the north-west have been going through a very difficult time. We are all with them. We know that it will be a very difficult recovery. We also know that a total of 37 local governments were activated for disaster assistance, 105,000 people were identified as experiencing hardship, 3,300 homes in total were damaged, and 1,255 homes were uninhabitable. I want to share those figures with the House because they are indeed important. In relation to the scale of the damage to infrastructure, there have been challenges in terms of repair and some of that repair will take some time. This includes damage to 6,420 kilometres of state roads, 15,000 kilometres of farm roads and 307 kilometres of rail line, and impacts on pipelines and of course fencing.

Earlier I wrote to the Prime Minister about this extraordinary level of damage and talked about the funding that we needed for category C and category D. This is the exceptional circumstances package under the disaster recovery funding arrangements. I am pleased to report to the House that the Prime Minister has agreed to match Queensland's 50 per cent share of funding for the \$240 million joint package.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Sorry?

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, you have the call.

Ms Trad: You preferred Dutton though, I thought.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think so. I want to update the House about some of those issues that will be covered by that package, and I am pleased that the turnaround of those letters was less than one week. It would be great if we had the same cooperation when it came to capital infrastructure throughout our state, but in relation to this impact on people I am particularly grateful. The breakdown of some of this long-term recovery package includes \$33 million for a riparian and coastal recovery program, \$20 million for the clean-up and repair of community and recreational assets and facilities, \$14.5 million for restoration of damaged water and sewerage infrastructure, \$14.4 million for a resilient grants program, \$12 million for a north-west Queensland beef recovery package, \$10 million for business—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am sorry, but do you find this funny, member for Glass House?

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, will you please direct your comments through the chair under standing order 247.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Speaker. These are really important issues for the people who have been impacted in the north and north-west and the member for Glass House is laughing. I find that—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I find that extraordinary.

Mr SPEAKER: Order!

Mr POWELL: Mr Speaker—

Ms PALASZCZUK: Extraordinary!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Please resume your seat. There is only one second on the clock, Premier. Do you have anything further to add?

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. I will deal with your point of order in just a moment. Premier, order in the House is my responsibility and I will determine whether members are being disorderly.

Ms Palaszczuk: Unbelievable!

Mr SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order, member?

Mr POWELL: I take personal offence at the comments made by the Premier and ask that she withdraw.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, the member has found comments offensive. Will you withdraw?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I withdraw.

Queensland Health, Digital Hospitals Program

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Mudgeeraba.

Ms BATES: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Cooper, you are warned under the standing orders. I have asked for silence when members rise to ask their questions.

Ms BATES: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. On 19 March the Australian Medical Association Queensland wrote to Queensland Health exposing that Labor's digital hospital program had resulted in critical patient data such as heart rate, blood pressure and oxygen levels not being recorded during operations. Can the minister guarantee that critical patient data such as heart rate, blood pressure and oxygen levels are being recorded during all operations?

Mr SPEAKER: I call the minister. However, member for Mudgeeraba, that preamble was quite lengthy. I came very close to asking you to rephrase that question.

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Mudgeeraba for her question, which relates to the ieMR project that commenced under Labor, was progressed under the LNP and continues to progress under Labor successfully. The AMA wrote to me to raise the concerns that the member has raised. I then met with it to discuss those concerns. I then organised for it to meet with senior officers of the department and eHealth to work through those concerns. When it comes to the 40 alerts that the member refers to,

they are 40 occasions where the system was able to identify a loss of data. Do members know how often a clipboard can identify that it has lost data? It cannot! The reason we have these alerts is that a computerised system can tell you when data has gone missing. What would the member for Mudgeeraba do? Storm into the PA Hospital and take its computers off it—

Ms Jones: Hand out clipboards!

Dr MILES:—and hand out clipboards? We will never know when data goes missing now with our secret plan to replace all of the computers with clipboards!

The program to digitise our hospitals continues to deliver results: it continues to deliver reduced medication errors, reduced lengths of stays, reduced numbers of falls and better patient outcomes, and that is exactly why previous governments showed the foresight to invest in what is a world-leading hospital digitisation program that continues to rollout this week. I congratulate the clinicians at the Gold Coast Hospital who began implementing the iEMR at their hospital yesterday with very minimal disruption. The idea that we would not digitise our hospitals in this day and age tells us exactly what we have on the other side of the House—Luddites! They are worse than their predecessors. They are worse than Lawrence Springborg. They will not stand for modern hospitals. They want a system where we do not get alerts. They want to go back to clipboards.

Ms Trad: They don't want nurses.

Dr MILES: They want to go back to pens and paper. They certainly do not want nurses. They sacked plenty of those. We stand by this system, as Lawrence Springborg did and as we will continue to do.

Federal Budget, Funding Priorities

Mrs McMAHON: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier update the House on some of Queensland's funding priorities ahead of the federal budget?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Macalister for her question and note that as a representative of one of the fastest growing regions within the South-East Queensland corner, which is one of the fastest growing regions in the whole nation, it is incredibly important that we get a fair share out of tonight's federal budget so that we can deliver to Queenslanders no matter where they live, because fundamentally an injection of money in the priorities that we have articulated and that the Premier has articulated to the Prime Minister around health, around education and around infrastructure spending are critical to the quality of life that Queenslanders experience. That is why the Palaszczuk Labor government and every single member and every single cabinet minister will fight every day for our fair share.

When compared to those opposite, let us look at the breadth and depth—which is quite shallow, I might say—of representation coming from the LNP down in Canberra. If we wanted an indication of their effectiveness, all we have to do is look at how much they could return to Queensland on behalf of the people they represent. Let us look at what the 21 federal LNP members have delivered to their constituents. What about Warren Entsch in Far North Queensland? He has presided over one of the worst failures in federal funding priorities that we have ever seen, walking away from a 50-year tradition of funding new housing in remote Indigenous communities from the federal government and not a peep out of Warren Entsch. That is a rolled gold failure.

What about the member for Forde, who sees the most congested road in South-East Queensland run right through his seat? What has he secured? He secured funding, but not until he gets re-elected another two times—two more elections, four more federal budgets. Quite frankly, he is a joke. The whole federal LNP is a joke because it has been—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Ms TRAD:—singularly lazy and completely—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera.

Ms TRAD:—non-effective in securing outcomes for the people it represents.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera!

Ms TRAD: Let me make clear that come the next federal election they will be judged—

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera!

Ms TRAD:—on their lack of action and on their lack of delivery. I think it is time for the Queensland people to deliver a verdict. They want a government in Canberra that knows and understands them and delivers for them.

(*Time expired*)

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Coomera, you are warned under the standing orders.

Public Hospitals, Waiting Times

Mr HUNT: My question is to the Premier. Nambour GP and AMA councillor, Dr Wayne Herdy, has issued a public plea for one of his patients, saying that his patient must be seen within 30 days or she would die. When asked last Thursday, the Premier said that she was unaware of the issue and would look into it. Will the Premier tell the House what action she has taken on this case in the last week?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I asked the health minister to look into this matter and he did.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you are warned under the standing orders. I will wait for the House to come to order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Minister for Health addressed this in his ministerial statement. If the member would like to meet with the minister—because, in this House, we do not talk publicly about individual cases—the minister is prepared to meet with the member to talk about the details of that case.

Federal Budget, Infrastructure Funding

Mrs MULLEN: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Could the minister please update the House on how Queensland will go getting its fair share—

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Toowoomba South, you are warned under the standing orders. I asked for silence during questions being asked. Member for Jordan, will you please start your question again.

Mrs MULLEN: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Could the minister update the House on how Queensland will go getting its fair share of infrastructure funding from the federal budget and is he aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Jordan for her question. She has a right to be concerned about what may be in the budget for Queensland this year. The member for Jordan may remember the ‘State of Origin’ budget last year when the boy from Cronulla brought home the bacon for New South Wales and, once again, Queensland got dudged. One thing that will not be in the budget—we will wait with hope, but one thing that we think will not be in the budget—is any funding for Cross River Rail, the No. 1 infrastructure priority in Queensland. There will not be a single dollar for Queensland from ‘ScoMo’.

Of course, one thing the LNP gave Queensland was the return of One Nation. It was Malcolm Turnbull’s double dissolution that returned Pauline Hanson to the Senate. In the last election, it was the LNP in Queensland that preferred One Nation in 50 out of 59 seats, which led to the return of One Nation to this House. Last week, Scott Morrison was shamed into putting One Nation below Labor at the next election. Even Barnaby Joyce, speaking on a subject on which he has clear expertise, called One Nation ‘dopey’.

Exhibit A, Steve Dickson, One Nation leader in Queensland, said on Al Jazeera that Australia was being flooded by Muslims, including some really dangerous people, just before sharing his dream of moving into a drug dealer’s mansion and shooting up the water with a machine gun. It is hard to believe, is it not? Exhibit B is Pauline Hanson’s offensive and dishonest support for the conspiracy theory around Port Arthur. Exhibit C is this week Tourism and Events Queensland saying that One Nation is damaging our tourism industry. Exhibit D is everything else that One Nation has ever said or done, including Pauline Hanson, Senator for Queensland, saying that GST revenue from Queensland should go to Western Australia. That is their legacy.

After all of that, when it comes to preferences in Queensland, the Leader of the Opposition will still not put One Nation below Labor. How is that leadership? She cannot make a decision because her party room is split right down the middle. Every LNP member representing rural Queensland is craven in their desire for One Nation preferences, but she will not do anything about it. It is not leadership. The Leader of the Opposition should stand up for Queensland. She should stand up to Scott Morrison and put Queensland first and stand up for decency and do the right thing and put One Nation last.

Public Hospitals, Waiting Times

Dr ROWAN: My question is to the Premier. Three weeks ago the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine warned about unacceptable and intolerable delays, calling Queensland Health's emergency wait times inhumane. Last week, the Premier promised to look into the warning. I ask: given the Premier has now had nearly a week's notice, will the Premier tell the House what real action—other than a meeting—has the Palaszczuk government taken in response to this warning?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Moggill for the question. Of course, that letter was written to the Minister for Health and the Minister for Health is in the process of organising a meeting for this Thursday. Whilst I am on my feet, I am happy to talk a little bit about our investment in emergency departments. In 2013-14, the expenditure on emergency departments was \$944 million. By 2017-18, that figure had grown to \$1.3 billion—an increase of almost \$400 million, or 39 per cent. That investment is delivering results. The health care that we deliver is some of the safest and most comprehensive in the world and Queenslanders know that.

Mrs Frecklington: When they turn up and they can't get a bed?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection by the Leader of the Opposition. The government runs an awareness campaign in terms of making sure that people who turn up to emergency departments are those people who really need it. I will give an example, because this was reported in a release.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Members to my left, the Premier is not being provocative. I believe that her statement is factual. I would like to hear the answer. I ask you to cease your interjections.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Campaigns are run to improve emergency department wait times by encouraging patients to visit their GP instead of hospital emergency departments. For example, thousands of Queenslanders have presented with, and I quote—

... a toothache, finger strain or sprain, constipation, a headache, or neck pain.

Parents have ... brought in a child with nappy rash, and some people complain of not being able to sleep.

Others have simply come looking for a medical certificate to get off work or get their prescription refilled.

Who said these words? This was a press release issued by the Hon. Lawrence Springborg on 30 August 2014 titled 'New campaign says GP not ED'. Not only has this government run a campaign about emergency departments being only for emergencies; the former government also highlighted this campaign. In fact, it is a universal campaign. I table this release for the Leader of the Opposition so that she can familiarise herself with when she sat around the CBRC table when she was Campbell Newman's apprentice making the decisions to cut nurses and doctors and the then health minister ran a campaign, 'Go and see your GP, not go to ED'.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 30 August 2014, from the former minister for health, Hon. Lawrence Springborg, titled 'New campaign says GP not ED' [487].

There is no difference between the campaign that was run under the LNP and the campaign we run. But what we have—

Mrs Frecklington: The health system worked under the LNP.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. The health system did not work under Lawrence Springborg—

(Time expired)

Regional Queensland, Innovation

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister update the House on the importance of investing in innovation in our regions?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. The member for Maryborough is the very embodiment of innovation and the future. We know how important it is to grow innovation and jobs in regional Queensland. That is why, as a government, we have invested heavily in our Advancing Regional Innovation Program, which is all about supporting businesses in the region, including the Wide Bay-Burnett region, which the member represents. We understand that there are many bright, innovative people in regional Queensland, often many who have come off the land, who we want to support, particularly in some of the industries that we are working on through the agriculture portfolio and the State Development portfolio. Robotics, AI and data with a cross-section of agriculture will create—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms JONES: That is right. Campbell Newman is a great example. The apprentice over there keeps talking about him this morning. We know that there are going to be lots of jobs. That is why today, as the Premier has said, we have welcomed more than 3,000 delegates from across the world, our state and our country here to tackle some of these big issues.

Unlike those opposite, we will not put our heads in the sand. We know that these are real challenges that we need to confront. We will do it in lock step with ordinary Queenslanders to create the jobs of the future. While we are focused on creating the jobs of the future those opposite are on code orange, which is getting in bed with One Nation. They are like, ‘Oops, we are in a bit of trouble in Capricornia, we are in a bit of trouble in Leichhardt, we are in a bit of trouble in Flynn, so the only thing we know to do, which is in our DNA, is to get in bed with One Nation.’

It has been a week since parliament sat and here we are again. One thing has not changed, the Leader of the Opposition has not come clean and been honest with the people of Queensland about her position when it comes to One Nation preferences. We do not know if the Leader of the Opposition is LNP, NLP or ONLNP, but what we do know is the Leader of the Opposition is MIA—she is missing in action—when it comes to being honest about One Nation.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: I will be quiet if you want to stand up and say it now.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock!

Ms JONES: I will be happy to sit down. Or you could just go outside and call a press conference like normal leaders do.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you will put your comments through the chair. I have made repeated requests for that today.

Ms JONES: It is very, very easy for the Leader of the Opposition to state her position on whether she is willing to take One Nation preferences after the appalling behaviour of Senator Hanson on television saying that the Port Arthur massacre was some sort of conspiracy. We know why the Leader of the Opposition will not come out about her position, because she is a gun lobbyist and lover. She wants to relax gun laws in Queensland. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to make a contribution, go out there and say it.

Hervey Bay Hospital

Mr SORENSEN: My question without notice is to the Premier. The Hervey Bay Hospital recently discharged an 84-year-old woman at 3 am to catch a taxi home in the dark. Another ill patient fell over in the car park after being discharged too early. I ask: when will the Premier admit that the Labor health crisis has infected Hervey Bay Hospital along with South-East Queensland hospitals?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Hervey Bay for the question. In relation to the two particular issues he has raised I will ask the health minister to follow those up.

Mr Lister: You’re wasting your time with that.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am going to follow that up. I am asking the health minister to follow that up. It is an important issue but it is an individual case that the Minister for Health will follow up and report directly back to the member for Hervey Bay. What I will say to the member for Hervey Bay is that the Labor government is investing \$44.66 million in the Hervey Bay emergency department.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, the Premier is being responsive to the question asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There will be a new emergency department of 12 extra beds.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The former minister for health, Minister Dick, and I went to Hervey Bay and met with the nurses. We had a morning tea. Good, decent governments meet with the staff, talk to them and thank them for their hard work, unlike the sackings that we have seen. I have a question for the member for Hervey Bay. I have read reports that he may not be contesting the next election.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Broadwater, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As a good National Party member, the member might want to speak to his leader about what to do with One Nation and whether the member for Hervey Bay is going to put One Nation last.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance under standing order 118. The member for Hervey Bay asked about his local hospital and an 84-year-old patient, nothing about what the Premier is talking about. If she has finished the answer, perhaps she ought to sit down.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member. You will not give that sort of guidance to the chair. Premier, under standing order 118(b) I ask that you come back to the question asked. Do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: We will continue to deliver for Hervey Bay because we understand how important that growing region is when it comes to health. A very key question for the residents of Hervey Bay will be where One Nation is put on the how-to-vote card at the next state election. We have one position in the south-east, one position in the regions. If you are a Liberal you do not like One Nation, if you are a National you love them. What we need to know very clearly from the LNP—they are actually a merged entity—and the leader is where is One Nation going to be.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I asked if you had anything further to add regarding the question. You have nothing further.

Federal Budget, Health Funding

Mr BROWN: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on the health priorities for Queensland in the upcoming federal budget?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Capalaba for his very important question. Tonight the federal LNP has a chance to reverse its cruel cuts to our hospitals right across the state but also in metro south, which I know is of most interest to the member for Capalaba. The member for Capalaba has been a passionate advocate in support of Redlands and the other hospitals across metro south, as indeed have all of the members on this side of the House who represent electorates within the metro south area. That, of course, includes his strong advocacy for the expanded emergency department at Redlands Hospital and the expanded maternity ward at Redlands Hospital. That is in very stark contrast to the federal member, Mr Andrew Laming. Late one night, probably hoping that his federal Treasurer was not watching the chamber, Mr Laming got up and said, 'I promise I will pay half for a car park at Redlands Hospital if the state puts in the other half.'

Dr Robinson interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Oodgeroo, you are warned under the standing orders.

Dr MILES: I barely had time to say 'Show me the money!' before the member, Mr Laming, came out and said, 'I am sorry. I thought I had the money. I do not have the money.' It was a cruel hoax played on his local community that he hoped would never come out.

The member for Capalaba, the member for Redlands and other metro south members are delivering for their local hospitals and tonight Mr Laming and all of his other LNP mates in Canberra have a chance to deliver too. Will they deliver a fair share for our hospitals? Will they deliver half the cost of a Redlands Hospital car park that they promised and then changed their minds about? I suspect they will not.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Dr MILES: Fortunately we only have to put up with them for a few more weeks. We only have to put up with these kinds of lies, this kind of deceit, for a few more weeks. Soon we will have a government that when it says it will fund health care will deliver health care at Redlands, right across metro south, in fact right across this whole state.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Coomera, you are under a warning already. I have made it clear that when members are under warnings there will be no further interjections. You can leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

Whereupon the honourable member for Coomera withdrew from the chamber at 10.58 am.

Mr SPEAKER: Members who are on warnings, that is the final warning you will get. You will be asked to leave the chamber if you interject.

Vegetation Management

Mr ANDREW: My question without notice is to the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef. Can the minister explain why new land-clearing restrictions and run-off monitoring apply across the north of the state, yet these same regulations have not been replicated in Brisbane and the south-east corner in relation to private and public landholders?

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for his question. Queensland has been, unfortunately, the worst offender in terms of the amount of trees that we have seen cleared in this state. When you consider that all of the science and the research—

An opposition member interjected.

Ms ENOCH: We know that those opposite do not like to take on any truth in the science, but the science and the research—all the statistics—tell us that we have been seeing in the vicinity of 400,000 hectares a year cleared under the previous LNP's laws. The impact on the Great Barrier Reef in particular was of great concern to everybody in that field—from the scientists who have been doing a great deal of work in that space, to people who understand and accept the science on climate change, to those who enjoy and get their employment from the Great Barrier Reef. When you think that it contributes some \$6 billion to the economy and supports about 60,000 jobs, the concern about the health of the Great Barrier Reef is incredibly acute. That is why, among other things, the tree clearing laws have been particularly targeted at the fact that we need to support the Great Barrier Reef, curb emissions and ensure we are reducing the trees being cleared in this state.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Gregory and Deputy Premier, if you want to have a conversation, please take it outside.

Ms ENOCH: We on this side of the House accept the science on climate change. We have seen a complete lack of leadership from the federal government on this issue. In fact, the current Prime Minister of this country took a lump of coal into the parliament. That is their sense of leadership around climate change.

We know that the science is in on this. Unfortunately, One Nation's climate change policy does not accept the science on this. In fact, it says things like the earth's tilt could be responsible for the increasing amount of extreme weather events. It says things like there should be more research, rather than accepting the fact that there is science in on this. Those opposite still have not stood up and said where they place One Nation in terms of preferences. When you stand that close to that kind of climate denial, it washes off. I call on those opposite to make sure that they put One Nation last on their preferences.

Rail Services

Ms LINARD: My question is of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Will the minister update the House on the government's program to improve rail services in South-East Queensland?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the member for Nudgee for her question. She is a very strong supporter and advocate of public transport services in South-East Queensland. We are seeing confidence returning to our public transport system, in particular our rail system. We saw record patronage of 182.8 million trips in 2017-18. There was an increase of 1.7 million rail trips, from 51 million to 52.7 million. Let me say that again: an increase of 1.7 million rail trips. Confidence is returning to the rail system. That is on top of the 46,000 extra seats we added late last year.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left will cease their interjections. The minister is being responsive to the question asked.

Mr BAILEY: Some 212 train drivers were either trained or are being trained—the largest recruitment ever in Queensland Rail's history. That is a net gain of 73, so we are seeing that overtime is down, fares are down, on-time running is up, patronage—

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Glass House, you are warned for consistent interjections this morning.

Mr BAILEY: Patronage is up, on-time running is up, driver numbers are up and infrastructure is up. I have more good news for the chamber.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, what part of 'cease your interjections' did you not understand? The minister is providing factual information to the House. I do not believe he is in any way being provocative.

Mr BAILEY: I have more good news for the House and for Queensland commuters in South-East Queensland. I am pleased to advise the House that Queensland Rail will add 32 extra weekly services at peak times and add another 14,000 seats to South-East Queensland's network next month. Services will be added to seven lines during busy peak periods from Monday, 13 May. These additional services will put more trains back into service when customers most need them—morning and afternoon peak—on the following lines: Shorncliffe, Cleveland, Redcliffe peninsula, Ferny Grove, Springfield, Gold Coast and airport.

We employ drivers. We do not sack them; we back them. We do not attack them. We do not sack them like those opposite. There were 48 fewer drivers under the LNP by the time they were finished—when they knew there was a new line opening up, when they knew that the Commonwealth Games were coming up. They cut drivers and they stopped driver training for a whole year in 2014. They botched the system, but we are recovering. This is another positive step back to the full timetable. It is good news for commuters from an administration that invests in public transport, invests in infrastructure, invests in Smart Ticket and invests in better services. We will see more of it from this government.

(Time expired)

Hospitals, Overcrowding

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Premier. Given the critical overcrowding in Queensland hospitals and the revelation that Queensland Health charged private patients \$400 million for treatment last year while other patients went without beds and treatment, why is the government putting profits ahead of patients by keeping people with private health insurance in public hospital beds instead of transferring them back to private hospitals?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Burdekin for the question. This was addressed last week. Where there are not private hospitals—like in your electorate, Mr Speaker—people come in and use the public health system, and they are entitled to. They pay the premium—

An honourable member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. I say to the member for Burdekin that a record of \$980 million was invested in health in the Townsville region. At the same time, the federal government has cut \$20.7 million from the Townsville Hospital. I would like to see that money restored in the federal budget tonight. I know that it is very hard for those opposite to fathom that there is a federal budget tonight, because they have not asked one single question in relation to the federal budget. You would expect that it was not even happening tonight!

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: What federal budget? We on this side of the House will stand up for Queensland's fair share, because we are on the side of Queensland. We are not on the side of New South Wales or Victoria. We are not on the side where New South Wales gets \$9 billion in infrastructure and Victoria gets over \$7 billion in infrastructure—congestion busting for Sydney and Melbourne—but Brisbane does not matter, Townsville does not matter, Gladstone does not matter and Rockhampton does not matter.

Those opposite back the Prime Minister and back his investment in the southern states over Queensland. Every member on that side of the House should hang their head in shame for not standing up for our great state of Queensland and bowing down to New South Wales and Victoria. Will those

members opposite today stand up for Queensland and demand our fair share? We have had not one question on the federal budget—not one. Heaven forbid, what will happen to the state budget? We will continue to invest in Townsville. We have also invested \$4.7 million to provide a second MRI unit at the Townsville Hospital—something that is needed. We will continue to invest in hospitals while those opposite do not stand up for Queensland.

Federal Budget, Education and Industrial Relations

Mr PEGG: My question is of the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. Could the minister outline what education—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, I do not know which member it was, but I ask that you cease your interjections and commentary while the question is being asked.

Mr PEGG: My question is of the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. Could the minister outline what education and industrial relations related budget measures Queenslanders would like to see from the federal government and any alternative approaches?

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute to respond.

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Stretton for the question. At least he knows that there is a federal budget this evening. Those opposite do not seem to know. It is extraordinary when we sit in here and hear the Premier say that they have not asked one question on the federal budget that those opposite say, ‘Why would we ask you a question about the federal budget?’

They have no interest in education. They have no interest in early childhood education and care. They have no interest whatsoever in health. They have no interest whatsoever in roads and housing in the state. How many of the shadow ministers have called their federal counterparts and asked for money for Queensland? How many of them have actually picked up the phone and said, ‘Install that funding you have cut from Queensland in this budget because we need it in this state.’? Not one of them would have done it.

I doubt very much that they want to talk about the federal budget because we know that the LNP government federally wants to give \$17 billion to banks, but does not want to fund education and kindy in this state. We will fight for that money.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The time for question time has expired. I ask members who are leaving the chamber to please do so quietly.

MOTION

Business Program

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.11 am): In accordance with sessional order 2B, I move—

1. That the following government business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 3 hours to complete all stages;
 - (b) the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 3 hours to complete all stages; and
 - (c) the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 2 hours 30 minutes to complete all stages.
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in paragraph 1 apply:
 - (a) question on third reading to be put by 2 minutes before the expiry of the maximum time; and
 - (b) question on long title to be put by 1 minute before the expiry of the maximum time.
3. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by the allocated time specified in paragraph 2, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 4 April 2019, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call upon the minister to table any explanatory notes to government amendments to be put;
 - (b) shall then put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill or motion without further debate;
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion; and
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

The intention for this parliamentary sitting week is to schedule times for three bills. One bill is a continuation of debate from the last sitting week—that being the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. We will also be debating the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Health the Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Although we have allotted times in the business motion for those three bills, there is additional time in government business this week which will allow us to move on to other business on the *Notice Paper*.

In speaking briefly to this motion, because I do not intend to repeat myself every single week when it comes to this motion, I note that, without anticipating debate, the Manager of Opposition Business may be seeking an amendment to this motion. That amendment goes to wanting to have within the motion that the last half hour of the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be set aside for consideration in detail.

I absolutely welcome the fact that we are having a genuine discussion about how bills should be debated in this House. I would say to the Manager of Opposition Business that I do not believe the amendment is necessary. In fact, I would like to see this House get to the model that we see operating in the Victorian parliament which is that we do not actually allocate fixed times for individual bills, we just have the bills to be debated for the week and then at the end of the week if the bills have not been completed then the questions are put in relation to the bills. We should not need to get to the point where we set specific times for reply and consideration in detail because we should be managing our own business within that time.

If the opposition wants adequate time to put questions to the minister or to raise issues in consideration in detail, that can be achieved within the time that has been allotted. I can stand here today as the Leader of the House and give that commitment to the opposition. I have spoken to the health minister about this. We will work to ensure that there is adequate time, half an hour, set aside for consideration in detail without needing to amend this motion. We will do that.

That now puts the responsibility in the hands of the opposition. Can the opposition do the same? Can they manage their business to ensure that within two hours we finish the second reading so that they can be provided the time they want for consideration in detail? That can be done. We should not have to set a guillotine for the second reading debate to accommodate the opposition because they cannot manage their speakers.

I would welcome this sort of discussion at the business committee meetings on a Monday evening. It is still very difficult to allocate the appropriate and adequate time for these bills because the Manager of Opposition Business comes in, as he did last night, and says, ‘We are going to have 38 speakers on every bill.’ I could try to manage it around 38 speakers, but having said that we just got the speaking list for the economic development bill and there are 24 speakers from the opposition. Is it 38 or 24 speakers? Are they struggling to get every single one of their members to prepare a speech on every single bill that they are actually not going to speak on?

I say once again that there is adequate time and as Leader of the House I can assure the opposition that the health minister can sum up this bill in time to give 30 minutes for consideration in detail if the Manager of Opposition Business can manage the opposition business and ensure that they have allotted speakers within the time limit. They want us to guillotine them because they cannot manage themselves. The offer is there. Let us see if the opposition can be responsible and mature and manage the business so that we can give them the half hour they need.

(*Time expired*)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Before I call the member for Kawana, I remind all members that because Mr Speaker has left it does not mean that the warnings cease to exist. The following members are on warnings through until the lunch break: Pumicestone, Southern Downs, Chatsworth, Southport, Woodridge, Kawana, Moggill, Cooper, Coomera, Everton, Toowoomba South, Toowoomba North, Broadwater, Oodgeroo and Glass House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.16 am): The Leader of the House may not wish to repeat herself, but I am certainly not restrained by that constraint. This is an assault on democracy. It is a parliamentary week-by-week assault on members being given the opportunity to speak in this House on these important matters.

We saw last parliamentary sitting week that in terms of the three bills that were debated—the nature conservation bill, the justice bill and the guardianship bill—opposition members were guillotined from the speaking list. On the nature conservation bill we had four members guillotined. I table a copy of that speaking list.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled ‘Nature Conservation Bill’ [489].

On the justice bill we had nine MPs guillotined. I table a copy of that speaking list.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Justice Bill' [490].

On the guardianship bill we had two members guillotined I table a copy of that speaking list.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Guardianship Bill' [488].

The Leader of the House talks about managing the House and the opposition managing our speakers. When the Leader of the House talks about managing, what she means is cutting, guillotining, scrapping, gagging members from speaking. The Leader of the House talks about managing, but she did not manage the Minister for State Development very well last week because he was gagged on his feet when speaking to his own bill. He was summing up the entire debate and then like a deer in the headlights when he was called to order to sit down he seriously looked around and wondered what on earth just happened. The Minister for State Development was guillotined under his own Leader of the House's motion. He was gagged by his own government.

He looked around seeking answers as to what this was all about. Has he not been listening this parliamentary term? Does he not know what these business committee motions are all about? They ensure the Labor Party get their way without debate and without information being disclosed in the public realm.

The Leader of the House said that 2.5 hours is enough to debate the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. No, it is not enough time. In the Business Committee meeting yesterday, when asked about the times that I thought were applicable, I said that the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill should be six hours; the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill should be six hours; and the Health and Other Legislation Amendment Bill should be five hours. Do honourable members think I got that approved? No.

I will tell the Leader of the House something else: this is all just to say to the public, 'It's about efficiency. It's about managing timetables.' The dangerous thing about this is that for the last two sitting weeks the *Notice Paper* has been emailed to members prior to the Business Committee even deciding what bills were going to be debated during the week. The Leader of the House says she wants open discussion and dialogue—'Let's cooperate, Jarrod'—but that is rubbish. It is garbage. It is the government getting their own way with their majority. If they want to cooperate with the Leader of the Opposition and the Manager of Opposition Business, they would not send the *Notice Paper* out saying what the bills will be this week. They would have a conversation in the Business Committee, but that did not happen. That is the arrogance that is creeping in ever and ever more so with this government.

We want to talk about issues this week. We want to talk about, for instance, optional preferential voting. If they do not want people to vote a particular way, we say change the law. Where is the debate on that this week? We had the biggest health crisis last week and the Premier could not even mention health in her ministerial statements this morning. We had a code yellow last week and there has been nothing from the Premier about health this week. The Premier stood up this morning and asked, 'Why didn't the opposition ask any questions about the federal budget?' Why would we? She cannot even answer questions about her own budget and her own government. Why would we ask questions of the Premier about ScoMo's budget, for goodness sake!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Kawana, come back to the motion, please.

Mr BLEIJIE: Of course. Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for your guidance. I move the following amendment—

That the following words be inserted in 1(c) after 'to complete all stages'—

'with the question on the second reading to be put by 30 minutes before the expiry of the maximum time.'

I table a copy of that amendment.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Amendment to Business Program Motion' [491].

The reason for this amendment is that, for whatever unknown reason, in the health bill we are about to debate there is an amendment to the Retirement Villages Act dealing with freehold title. It has nothing to do with the health bill. The opposition wants to ensure that members can adequately address the issues in consideration in detail. That is why we are moving an amendment; otherwise the government will ensure that the 2½ hours is filled without consideration in detail, which is a gag on democracy.

(*Time expired*)

Hon. SJ MILES (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.22 am): Members will be pleased to know, although they are probably already aware, that I do not like repeating myself nearly as much as the member for Kawana. Let me be brief. The member for Kawana just gave us a five-minute speech where he railed against the evils of the guillotine and then moved an amendment to add a further guillotine to the motion that we are debating, so the debate on my bill will not have just one guillotine but two guillotines if the member for Kawana gets his way. Not only that, but he felt so strongly about it that he did not bother to suggest it yesterday afternoon in the parliamentary Business Committee meeting, which is precisely where we discuss these things.

Again, we come to the point that the Manager of Opposition Business is not empowered by his caucus to manage his business. Let me repeat: on behalf of the Leader of the House, we will work with those opposite to ensure that there is sufficient time for consideration in detail, provided those opposite can manage their speaking time to do so also. As a result, we will this week deal with the three bills related to this motion and allow ample time for a fourth bill to be considered and for everyone who wants to have a say on it to have a say. That is why this process is important. I commend the motion to the House.

Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (11.24 am): It gives me a great deal of pleasure to rise and support the Manager of Opposition Business in relation to his amendment. I find it completely ironic that here we are approximately 18 months or halfway through this term and, if I go back to the opening of parliament and the Governor's opening speech, it contained words—yet again—that the Palaszczuk government mark 2.0 will be super improved and more open, transparent and accountable than ever. How ironic! If we turn the clock back to 23 minutes ago, the Premier said words to the effect that she could talk about health all day long. There is only one problem with that: Premier, you cannot. For a start, you have to have the intellectual rigour to be able to speak for more than 24 minutes, which is more than we can say for the member for South Brisbane with her budget speech last year. I think that went for 24½ minutes. We will see whether she can do a bit better in a couple of months time.

Churchill said—we all know the old turn of phrase—'Democracy is the worst form of government, except for all the others.' I will say this: it is essential. We can listen repeatedly perhaps to the member for Redcliffe and also, with respect, to my great friend the member for Kawana, but this is my first crack at this and I will say this: at the end of the day it really does matter because we have four extra members in this parliament. We have gone from 89 members to 93 members of parliament. That is great. We have an increase in democratic representation. There is one problem. They actually have less time to speak.

Mr Hinchliffe interjected.

Mr MINNIKIN: If I had more time to contribute, I would normally take, with absolute glee, the interjection from the member for Sandgate. We will get to him very shortly. This is the member who thinks he is the Voldemort of Queensland parliament. He absolutely likes to conjure and think that he is smarter than everyone else in the sandpit. He comes from Sandgate but he really likes to play in the sand when it comes to the caucus. Some of us who were here last term know that he snuck in here—more sneakily than the member for South Brisbane normally does—and said, 'We're going to change the rules, folks.' We had 18 minutes notice.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Chatsworth, can you come back to the motion, please.

Mr MINNIKIN: With relish, Mr Deputy Speaker. Thank you for your guidance. I appreciate very much your guidance. It is essential that every single member here gets their fair chance to speak. If we look at the orders of the day on the *Notice Paper*, we have the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The recurring words there are 'and other legislation amendment bill'. Why would that be? There is a great example right across the chamber—exhibit A. I will get to exhibit B shortly—my favourite member. Exhibit A is the member formerly for Brisbane Central who is now the member for—help me out—

Mrs Frecklington: McConnel.

Mr MINNIKIN:—McConnel. Thank you. When it comes to amendments, she is the queen of bringing in amendment after amendment after amendment. She needed all the time that this place—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance to this motion.

Mrs Frecklington: It is relevant to other amendments.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I do not need the assistance. Member for Chatsworth, I ask you to come back to the motion.

Mr MINNIKIN: Certainly. Thank you very much for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. I believe, with respect, that it was relevant insofar as time—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chatsworth, we are not going to debate my decision. I am instructing you to come back to the motion.

Mr MINNIKIN: Absolutely, Mr Deputy Speaker. The reality is that, when we look at the speaking lists from this side of the chamber, the average speaking time for each member on the second reading debate is approximately 10 minutes—around nine minutes. We do not have a stopwatch on members opposite, but I can tell the House that the politburo send down speaking notes for the backbench. It is formulaic, apart from probably the member for Stretton. We normally get a bit of variation there. Generally speaking, they time their speeches to about three or four minutes and then sit down just so that they can get through their speaking list.

On this side though we want to make a genuine contribution. The reason has been tabled already. We have example after example of members who have wanted to speak on legislation but have been guillotined. The member for Coomera was curtailed. I think that was the first example we saw. It was embarrassing. We have members on the other side who probably need all the help they can get. They need more time than anyone. We saw the contribution from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads this morning. He needed all the time he could get. When it comes to democratic principles, they like to hark on about accountability and transparency but, if cut to the chase, all they want to do is simply guillotine us so that their city based members can get back to their electorates by 7.30 each night so they can try to prop up their Brisbane seats. We know exactly what the intent is here—exactly.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 2—Bolton, Costigan.

NOES, 47:

ALP, 46—Bailey, 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.

Pair: Boyd, Leahy.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Bleijie) negated.

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

AYES, 47:

ALP, 46—Bailey, 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.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 40:

LNP, 37—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, 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.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Pair: Boyd, Leahy.

Resolved in the affirmative.

HEAVY VEHICLE NATIONAL LAW AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.38 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Transport and Public Works Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2019 [484].

Tabled paper: Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [485].

I am pleased to introduce the Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Bill 2019. The bill amends the Heavy Vehicle National Law Act 2012. The Heavy Vehicle National Law provides a single national law for the consistent regulation of heavy vehicle operations across most of Australia. Operational provisions of the national law commenced on 10 February 2014. The national law regulates matters about the operation of heavy vehicles such as prescribing vehicle mass and dimensions, vehicle standards, and measures designed to safely manage driver fatigue. The national law also established the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator to administer the law.

Part 2 of the bill sets out the consequential amendments that are required to the national law following commencement of the Commonwealth's Road Vehicle Standards Act 2018, which replaces the Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989. In Part 3 of the bill, amendments are proposed to the national law to make a range of policy and maintenance amendments that reflect changes to the regulator's functions. These changes will better manage access for high-performance vehicles, improve roadside enforcement and the uniform application of national policy and safety objectives across participating jurisdictions.

These proposed amendments were endorsed by the Transport and Infrastructure Council in November 2018 and March 2019 after being developed by the National Transport Commission and the regulator in consultation with state and territory transport authorities, enforcement agencies and heavy vehicle industry associations. The approach taken to implement national heavy vehicle reform is through adoption of national scheme legislation enacted first by Queensland as host jurisdiction and then applied by participating jurisdictions. All Australian states and territories, except for Western Australia and the Northern Territory, participate in the reform and have applied the national law as a law of their jurisdiction. While Western Australia and the Northern Territory are not participating jurisdictions, they were consulted during the amendment process.

Consequential amendments are required to the national law following assent of the Commonwealth's Road Vehicle Standards Act 2018, or RVSA, which replaces the Motor Vehicle Standards Act 1989. The RVSA was assented to on 10 December 2018 and will commence on 10 December 2019. The RVSA related amendments make changes to definitions and references to vehicle standards in the national law to ensure they correctly reference the new RVSA and continue to recognise older standards made under the Motor Vehicle Standards Act. Members may recall that new primary duties provisions in the national law commenced on 1 October last year.

Every party in the heavy vehicle transport supply chain now has a duty to ensure the safety of their transport activities. Current powers and functions of the regulator set out in the national law do not expressly provide for the giving of advice to duty holders, such as parties in the chain of responsibility.

This bill proposes to amend the regulator's functions under the national law to specify that the regulator and its authorised officers can give advice, information and education to a person about complying with their duty or an obligation under the national law. This amendment is modelled on existing workplace health and safety laws and will align the national law more closely with those laws.

Jurisdictions agreed to a range of policy measures to provide improved access for certain specified semitrailer combinations up to 4.6 metres high where mass is not a constraint. An amendment will extend the current 4.3 metre height limit for specified semitrailers to a 4.6 metre height limit, but only to combinations that meet certain criteria. This amendment will reduce the administrative burden for industry and road managers, as specified semitrailers will be able to operate on the road network at 4.6 metres in height without additional authorisation, such as a notice or individual permit.

An amendment to the national law is required to fully implement certain provisions of the Heavy Vehicle National Law Amendment Act 2018, which commenced on 1 October last year. That act allows greater access to the road network for category 1 performance based standards vehicles operating at general mass limits. The proposed amendments will harmonise penalty provisions to ensure that a PBS

vehicle travelling ‘off route’—that is, on a road without authorisation under the national law—is treated the same for enforcement purposes as other overmass or overdimension vehicles on that road, as they pose the same risks to infrastructure and safety.

A further set of amendments in the bill seeks to improve consistency between vehicle defect notices and self-clearing defect notices. Each jurisdiction uses their own regulator approved defect notice forms, but in most cases jurisdictions have combined requirements for vehicle defect notices and self-clearing notices into the one form. However, inconsistencies exist between the requirements for issuing these notices, which makes using a single form confusing. Amendments in the bill will ensure the same requirements must be addressed when issuing a vehicle defect notice or a self-clearing defect notice.

Another issue addressed by the amendments in this bill is that vehicle modifications approved in non-participating jurisdictions are not currently recognised under the national law. Under a proposed amendment, modifications approved by a non-participating jurisdiction that complies with the regulator’s Code of Practice for the Approval of Heavy Vehicle Modifications will be deemed to have been approved under the national law. This will remove the need for an operator from Western Australia or the Northern Territory to have the modification reassessed and approved under the national law.

The national law currently requires a statement of reasons to be issued automatically by the regulator for access and vehicle standards exemption permits that are issued subject to conditions, or for a period less than that sought by the applicant. The proposed amendment will instead require the regulator to notify the applicant of their right to request a statement of reasons within 28 days, and if a request is made the regulator must provide the statement within 28 days. This reduces an unnecessary administrative burden on the regulator and industry as all permits are issued with at least one condition and, in general, the rationale for the permit condition is well understood. The regulator will still issue a statement of reasons where an access or vehicle standards exemption permit is refused. A related amendment will provide for applicants to request a statement of reasons up to 28 days from the date of the decision.

A range of minor or technical amendments that are administrative or machinery in nature will also be made to add clarity to the national law. I am confident that the proposed amendments to the national law will clarify existing requirements, improve consistency with national health and safety laws and further improve national laws and standards that apply to heavy vehicles. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (11.45 am): 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 Transport and Public Works Committee

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Transport and Public Works Committee.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 28 March (see p. 894), on motion of Mr Dick—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (11.46 am): I rise to address the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. At the outset, please allow me to state that the LNP will not be opposing this bill outright. However, I will be detailing a number of concerns we on this side of the chamber have with particular elements of the bill and with the overall agenda being driven by the Palaszczuk Labor government in this space.

The bill proposes to: amend the Building Queensland Act 2015; amend the Economic Development Act 2012 and other acts consequential to the operation of the ED Act; amend the Planning Act 2016; amend the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016; amend the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011; amend the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985; amend the South Bank Corporation Act 1989; and repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004.

Mr Deputy Speaker, you have got to love an omnibus bill. I know the Queensland Law Society continue to rally against them and expressed concern in their submission, suggesting it is a deeply regrettable decision to take such a wideranging legislative agenda that seeks to amend eight different acts and ram it into one omnibus bill. Let me address particular aspects of this bill and in turn the eight different acts that are rammed into one.

The bill makes changes to the Planning Act 2016 and the Planning Regulation 2017. These two pieces of legislation guide the vast majority of planning decisions made by local governments around the state. They also dictate which developments local governments can and cannot consider as assessable. It has been common practice that the development of public housing is not considered by local government authorities, even when inconsistent with the local town plan. However, the legislation also clearly states that this is based on a level of information sharing between the government, the local government and neighbouring landholders.

Sadly, it would be fair to say that the Palaszczuk government is not following the intent of these laws in the case of Aitkenvale residents in Townsville who are currently fighting against Minister de Brenni and his proposed five-storey youth foyer development in their quiet neighbourhood street. Using a planning loophole as an excuse for not consulting with residents and listening to their concerns is outrageous. When confronted by this, Labor's housing minister de Brenni thinks residents having a say about their own suburb is 'petty'. Minister de Brenni apparently believes consulting residents before steamrolling a five-storey development in a quiet neighbourhood is 'petty'. Furthermore, the local Labor MP, Coralee O'Rourke, has failed residents by allowing this proposal to go ahead without community consultation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Sorry to interrupt while you are on your feet, but can you refer to members by their correct title, please.

Mr POWELL: Certainly, Mr Deputy Speaker. The Labor member for Mundingburra has failed residents by allowing this proposal to go ahead without community consultation. The LNP recognises the need for and supports those developments for disadvantaged youth, but these developments must be balanced with community expectations. The LNP does not believe Aitkenvale residents' fight to have their say is 'petty'.

After mounting pressure from the community outcry, the member for Springwood, the Minister for Housing, was forced to go to Townsville to see the development site, a site that Labor had chosen and purchased without any effective engagement or consultation with residents. What the member for Springwood, the Minister for Housing, did not decide to do was meet with residents while visiting the site. Residents have reported that the minister arrived under the cover of darkness, did not meet with anyone and left after barely 15 minutes.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The bill has nothing to do with a specific development in Townsville; nor does it have much to do with the powers of the minister for public housing, which are quite distinctive powers under the Planning Act and the Economic Development Act, which this bill amends. We have just heard a long debate from the opposition about how they want to have more time to debate bills. I would ask the honourable gentleman to return to the long title.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Glass House I will take some counsel. Member for Glass House, I will give you a little latitude, but you need to demonstrate the clear link to the Planning Act that is part of the debate. Otherwise I will ask you to move on.

Mr POWELL: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your guidance. As I outlined at the start, the long title of the bill includes amendments to the Planning Act. Those amendments, specifically in clause 1, refer to changes to the Planning Regulation 2017. It is that regulation that gives powers to the minister for public housing to make decisions inconsistent with the relevant local instrument. There are other clauses—clauses 145, 159 and 165—that make changes to that Planning Regulation.

Residents reported that the minister arrived under the cover of darkness, did not meet with anyone and left after barely 15 minutes.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The amendments in the bill before the House do not go, as the Minister for Planning has pointed out, to the powers of the Minister for Housing and Public Works. I would invite you to refer the member for Glass House to his obligations to remain relevant to the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, Minister. I do not need your assistance to conduct my job. One moment please, member for Glass House.

Mr POWELL: What have you got to hide?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, this is not an opportunity to take swipes across the chamber. I make that very clear. If you are prepared to do that, I will ask you to sit down. Member for Glass House, just a reminder that we are actually debating the principles associated with this. We are not debating the individual clauses; that will come later. I will give you a little latitude, but I ask you to come back specifically to the bill being debated.

Mr POWELL: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I take your guidance. Whilst not wanting to debate the individual clauses, I have been asked to demonstrate how this bill is relevant to the contribution I am making, hence my reference to that individual clause. I point out that one of those clauses talks about clarifying that the assessment manager for a development application is prescribed in the Planning Regulation or is the assessment manager under amended section 48(3). In this instance we have a situation where the assessment is done by the minister for public housing, not by the local government. When the minister did visit Aitkenvale he did not meet residents—not one of the 1,400-plus residents who have signed a petition, which I now table, imploring the minister to conduct the simple decency of consultation.

Tabled paper: Nonconforming petition regarding Townsville Youth Foyer [492].

This is the type of flagrant disregard for Queenslanders that has become the status quo under Labor. It does not stop at the residents, as we will see through the submission made by the LGAQ. The LGAQ states that the Palaszczuk government does not seem to care for local councils, either. Leaving no doubt as to what the Labor government's underlying agenda is with the proposed bill, in his submission the chief executive officer of the Local Government Association of Queensland, LGAQ, stated—

... the LGAQ is concerned this legislation further erodes the ability of councils and their communities to have a say in the size, shape and pace of development in their region.

A common theme of the legislation introduced over the past four years by the Palaszczuk government is this consolidation of their own power at the expense of local decision-making. The wilful disregard of local decision-making is also on full display regarding Labor's Townsville Youth Foyer. I table a letter from the mayor of Townsville to division 8 councillor Maurie Soars.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 6 March 2019, from the Mayor of Townsville, Cr Jenny Hill, to Townsville City councillor Cr Maurie Soars regarding the proposed construction at 32-34 Elizabeth Street, Aitkenvale [493].

The letter states—

Despite writing to the Minister of Housing on 31 July 2018, seeking better design outcomes for public housing in our tropical climate, the proposed design is no better than previous public housing built in Townsville.

...

The current proposal does not meet the intent of the scheme i.e. insufficient car parking, balconies are too small, insufficient landscaping, basketball court located to the rear, concrete driveway hard up against boundary fencing just to name a few;

The Palaszczuk Labor government treats Townsville residents as second-class citizens not worthy of consultation. The Palaszczuk Labor government even treats its own Labor councillors and local governments with contempt, not worthy of consultation. If only Labor cared as much about North Queensland as it does about South Brisbane.

This bill proposes to decrease the community's ability to hold the Labor government to account. It also further restricts localised decision-making. The proposed removal of the 'overriding economic or community need' test and the requirement for provisional priority development areas and provisional land use plans to not compromise the implementation of a planning instrument—clauses 22 and 23 of the bill—are a direct dilution of localised decision-making. This move is a shameful attempt to circumnavigate local community development concerns, and the LNP will be opposing those specific clauses.

Above any political or personal motivators, the first and foremost reason that each and every one of us is here is to represent the people of our electorates. The proposed bill as it stands fails to include a requirement for the minister to consult with and obtain the agreement of each relevant local

government area in planning for, or developing in, a PDA in establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate. Let me give an example where the Palaszczuk Labor government is circumventing both the relevant local government—in this case, the Brisbane City Council—and members of the surrounding community, and that is the Oxley PDA, a 19.28-hectare site with substantial native vegetation and green space.

Mr Dick: Still developing the website?

Mr POWELL: How is the government's website going, the Lady Cilento name change or the minister's attempt to now goad the members of the Aitkenvale community around the Townsville Youth Foyer? This Oxley PDA is a 19.28-hectare site with substantial native vegetation and green space nestled near the banks of the Brisbane River. When the Labor government first proposed to sell and develop the site in 2016 the community outcry was enormous. In response to the deafening outcry of a community that did not want yet another intensive development in one of their few remaining green spaces, the government commenced a 'consultation' process. Unsurprisingly, the overwhelming consensus from the community feedback received, as published in Economic Development Queensland's report, was that residents did not want the site to be intensively developed.

What happened next is a damning indictment on the way this Palaszczuk Labor government operates. As Oxley resident Brian Fuller stated to the *South West Satellite*, what happened next was—

The Government went quiet for a year and when they had Jess Pugh—the member for Mount Ommaney—

elected as an ALP member they come back with a plan that ignores the opinion of the people of Oxley.

What is more, not only did the Palaszczuk government ignore the opinions of the people of Oxley but they ignored the local councillor, who also happens to be the chair of the Brisbane City Council's planning committee. Councillor Bourke is quoted in this article from the *Brisbane Times* of 29 August 2018, and I table it for the reference of the minister.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Brisbane Times* online, dated 29 August 2018, titled 'Council city planning boss worried state-led development will create "islands"' [494].

He said—

Obviously the state has the ability to use both of these instruments but what it does do is it takes large chunks of the city out and creates islands, where you have development going on that doesn't have the significant necessary infrastructure.

If you want an example of significant necessary infrastructure, in this instance you need only look at the impact the Oxley PDA development will have on Seventeen Mile Rocks Road.

Labor continues to disgracefully ignore local planning concerns and ram through regulations that only serve to further their own self-interest. The Palaszczuk government owns this site, and its consultation process was a sham and the outcome a foregone conclusion. Labor's push for development on urban infill sites is changing Brisbane for the worse. The Palaszczuk Labor government's horrendous planning policy is in desperate need of fixing. Planning in Queensland needs to be fixed with more consultation and community input—not less—as this bill sets out to achieve.

As I stated, the prosed bill as it stands fails to include a requirement for the minister to consult with, and obtain the agreement of, each relevant local government area in planning for or developing in a PDA, establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate. Further contributions from the LGAQ submission to the committee attest to this. It states—

Providing for a regulation to categorise development is a new feature for the ED Act and could result in a local government not being afforded the opportunity to review and provide comment on the proposed regulation that categorises development for land that is in its local government area. Local government is not merely 'another stakeholder' and must be regarded as a genuine partner and level of government when considering the operation of the regulation.

On exemption certificates the LGAQ submits—

... that the proposed new section 71A of the ED Act be amended to require the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to both consult and obtain agreement with local government prior to issuing a PDA exemption certificate.

On the cessation of PDA arrangements the LGAQ submits—

... that Economic Development Queensland commit to engaging with local government and the LGAQ in the drafting of the revised Economic Development Regulation requirements, including provisions related to the making of cessation agreements for individual PDAs.

That led the committee to recommend the following—

The committee recommends that the Government amend provisions relating to the making of a PPDA to include the establishment of a local consultative committee that includes a representative from local government to better support localised decision-making.

I think the minister has been led by the nose and forced to agree. On reading the amendments circulated in the minister's name, we now see the introduction of a local consultative committee that will include representation from the local council and the local community. It is a shame it had to come to this in the first place and that they could not consult in good faith without requiring it, but I am pleased to see this. The fact that these are amendments demonstrates the incompetence of this minister to overlook such basic fundamentals when drafting legislation in the first place.

I now move to changes to the Building Queensland Act. In yet another example of the Palaszczuk government saying one thing and doing another, this bill looks to further water down the transparency and accountability of Building Queensland. In direct contrast to Premier Palaszczuk's commitment to open and accountable government, this bill will see reporting requirements for Building Queensland halved. This latest reduction in transparency will only amplify the difficulty for communities to hold this Labor government to account on the infrastructure delivery times they have been promised. It is concerning that it is already common practice for Building Queensland to consistently change the format of the pipeline report, making longitudinal comparisons difficult at best. Halving the publication frequency of the pipeline report will do nothing but make it more difficult for Queensland communities to track the Labor government's promised project delivery dates. The LNP will therefore also oppose clause 13.

Hidden within the 224 pages of the bill are some of the most concerning amendments that seek to provide substantial increases in the powers of investigation and enforcement for government inspectors, which can only currently be exercised by the Queensland police under the authority of a warrant. I commend the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee for identifying this. The committee reports that beyond a reference to the similarity in the two legislative schemes—the Planning Act and the Economic Development Act—the bill's explanatory notes do not provide much material to justify these extensive powers and how they are required to meet the objectives of the Economic Development Act. The committee continues—

As noted, the amendments give significant powers to inspectors, including powers to enter into premises, stop vehicles, seize and dispose of things, and require information and documents.

The committee therefore recommended that the minister 'clarify the powers for investigation and enforcement of PDA development offences under clause 102 and outline the need for such powers'. I do note that in his second reading speech the minister gave a justification and concluded with the following—

The Planning Act investigation and enforcement provisions were reviewed by the former Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee in its inquiry into the planning bills in 2015. The parliamentary committee, local government and industry stakeholders did not raise any objections to the Planning Act investigation and enforcement provisions which are now proposed to apply to the Economic Development Act.

I acknowledge the explanation of the minister, but the LNP will monitor the use of these powers and make sure they are consistent with how they are justified by the minister.

In conclusion, let me return to the plight of residents in Aitkenvale. Only this morning in the *Townsville Bulletin* we have yet another new plea from residents. Councillor and Labor Party member Maurie Soars was quoted in this morning's paper as saying that should Labor's five-storey development go ahead it 'will have an overpowering influence on nearby residents that does not consider their quality of life.' I will repeat that: 'does not consider their quality of life'.

That statement from one of their own perfectly summarises what this Palaszczuk Labor government has become: a government that does not consider the wants or needs of Queenslanders; a government that only considers their own self-interest above all else. Councillor Soars continues with a plea for the member for Springwood, the Minister for Housing and Public Works, and local Labor member for Mundingburra to listen to residents.

While Labor may have turned its back on Townsville, I can assure residents that this is not the case with the LNP. The LNP does not think consultation with residents is petty. We will always stand up and fight for Queenslanders against a Palaszczuk Labor government that does not consider their quality of life. Only an LNP Frecklington government will deliver, govern and respect all Queenslanders.

 **Mr WHITING** (Bancroft—ALP) (12.08 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will begin by addressing a couple of issues raised by the member for Glass House. In this House we have seen that one of his chief jobs seems to be backing up his LNP mates in the Brisbane City Council, protecting Mayor Adrian Schrinner's team and all their bad planning decisions. If that is the member for Glass House's job then he is on a hiding to

nothing. Performing hatchet jobs for his mates will not end well. He had the wherewithal to raise the issue of the Oxley PDA. He talked about this great community concern, but who was the author of the website? The great web developer himself, the member for Glass House!

It will not end well for him if he is going to spend his time protecting the Brisbane City Council. Here is a hint: if you are going to talk about consultation and doing things in a true partnership, make sure you are a not a former Campbell Newman government minister when you do it. Honestly, we are going to be asking for years, ‘What is the depth of the process of consultation and partnerships?’ Between 2012 and 2015 those opposite could not even say the word ‘consultation’. They ran away from it. Consultation? I think not. The member should not go there; it will not end well for him.

I want to focus on the amendments to the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011. I want to talk about this particular part of the bill because Queensland is the most disaster impacted state in Australia. Since 2010 our state has been impacted by 70 natural disaster events, resulting in loss of life and billions of dollars of damage to infrastructure. That includes nine events that assailed the state in 2018 and 2019—bushfires, floods and cyclones. We all saw the devastation of the 2019 floods in Townsville and on farms out west. Let us not forget that in November and December 2018 the Central Queensland bushfires devastated 35 communities and burnt out 1.4 billion hectares of land.

Through the QRA Act, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority is responsible for coordinating and managing the rebuilding and recovery of communities affected by disasters such as these. The QRA was established as a temporary entity following the 2011 floods and Cyclone Yasi. Its role has expanded remarkably since then. In 2016 the Palaszczuk government endorsed the appointment of the QRA as the state’s lead agency responsible for disaster recovery, resilience and mitigation policy in Queensland.

In light of the 70 natural disasters since 2010 the QRA Act has been reviewed, and we have identified amendments required to reflect this new and expanded role for the QRA. These amendments will ensure the QRA can undertake resilience, mitigation and betterment activities outside of disaster events. They will allow the QRA to support areas in Queensland to build resilience, to make infrastructure and services stronger and for Queensland to be better able to withstand disasters.

The QRA assists and supports the delivery of reconstruction projects through the ongoing assessment of eligibility—it provides grants payments—but the QRA Act currently limits the scope of the QRA’s reconstruction functions to only facilitating flood mitigation, recovery and resilience. Communities impacted by other natural disasters such as bushfires are potentially not covered. That certainly needs to be addressed.

While ensuring the QRA can undertake resilience activities in a wide range of settings, it is important that this is not limited to communities affected by a previous disaster event. The proposed amendments will allow resilience activities to be undertaken pre-emptively across the state, before a disaster occurs. Further, to effectively implement its mitigation and resilience responsibilities, the scope of the QRA’s functions should capture betterment. That means the repairing, rebuilding and replacing of community infrastructure to a standard that will mean it is less impacted by future events. In infrastructure terms, this may mean making significant improvements to the asset—making it stronger, more elevated or perhaps in a different location. It is very clear that we need the QRA to have that legislated mandate to make the appropriate decisions in these cases.

Our communities also need funds to build their own resilience. The QRA Act currently includes a function for the QRA to coordinate and distribute financial assistance for only affected communities—those directly impacted by a disaster event. This bill will enable the QRA to manage the distribution of funds for locally led community resilience outside of disaster events, as well as for communities impacted further afield by a disaster event.

The roles and responsibilities of state agencies in relation to disaster management have been defined and captured in the Queensland State Disaster Management Plan. The proposed amendments to the QRA Act will reflect these definitions.

There have been questions about the QRA’s engagement with local government. The QRA Act already includes explicit requirements in relation to consulting with and giving information to local government.

Overall, the amendments to the QRA Act will ensure the QRA can undertake an all-hazards approach to its responsibilities, lead the coordination of resilience and recovery policy in Queensland and facilitate the delivery of mitigation and betterment activities outside of disaster events. Queensland is the only state in Australia to maintain a permanent disaster recovery agency and is the most

advanced in the disaster resilience space nationally. The QRA Act as amended by the bill will reflect the role the QRA has in the recovery, resilience and mitigation space, and the improved QRA Act will help ensure Queensland continues to be the most disaster resilient state in Australia. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (12.15 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 as a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee. The bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly and referred to the committee on 19 September 2018, and the committee was required to report to the House by 8 November 2018. Fifty-three submissions were received.

According to the explanatory notes regarding the preparation of the bill, the department consulted with other agencies and relevant stakeholders in the community and within industry, and stakeholders were generally supportive of the bill's amendments. However, during the inquiry the Environmental Defenders Office Queensland expressed disappointment and surprise at not being consulted in regard to the proposed amendments to the Economic Development Act 2012.

The committee learned from the submissions that the consultation process for the amendments to the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 created uncertainty and confusion, as was evidenced by the number of submissions expressing concern with the proposed amendments. This led to a significant number of submissions being outside the scope of the bill. The committee noted this, with the comment that 'the committee encourages a more robust and sincere dialogue with a broad range of stakeholders within the Queensland community'.

This bill is yet another large, omnibus bill. In this case it amends eight different acts and, as stated by the Queensland Law Society, is some 224 pages long. Given that committee members have had their time to speak to committee reports cut in half, I will be able to speak to only some of these amendments during my allocated time. I will start with amendments to the Building Queensland Act 2015.

Despite the Palaszczuk government's claim to be an open and accountable government, this amendment would reduce the reporting requirements for Building Queensland by half. A twice yearly report would be reduced to an annual report. What could possibly be the purpose of that? Would it be because the Building Queensland reports are continually full of time delays and overruns? We saw in the last report that the business case for the Bundaberg Hospital has been delayed by six months. Likewise, the business case for the south-west pipeline project to boost water supply to Beaudesert and Logan has been delayed by six months. The business case for the Somerset Dam safety upgrade was delayed by three months. There would appear to be a trend here. Why would the minister not want to hide this level of incompetence?

The amendments to the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 were the subject of a large number of submissions—

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The words the honourable gentlemen used are entirely offensive—that somehow I am dishonestly trying to hide things. I ask him to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): The minister has taken offence. I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr WEIR: I withdraw. The Sanctuary Cove Resort Act will be amended to include a retirement facility and residential care facility as potential uses under the Sanctuary Cove act and introduce the ability to approve a use on a site-by-site basis in the resort. The department stated that at the time it was written the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act did not include either retirement facility or residential care facility use. This means that this type of development cannot currently occur at Sanctuary Cove Resort. The proposed amendments will not automatically approve such developments. A request for the use to be included in a zone will still be required to be made to the planning minister and consultation undertaken with the community, as required under the act.

Some submitters were concerned that a retirement village would not be in keeping with the resort and could impact negatively on property values and the Sanctuary Cove community. The department stated that any proposal would still need to be supported by the body corporate in the usual manner. It stated—

The Act does not specify that the relevant body corporate must submit development proposals to the Minister by special resolution (i.e. a resolution passed by not less than 75% of all voting requirements) and the Bill does not change this arrangement.

The bill proposes a number of amendments to the Planning Act 2016 with regard to infrastructure charge notices under the repealed Sustainable Planning Act 2009. One such amendment will correct the oversight in the transition of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 to the Planning Act by requiring infrastructure charge notices to include the date of the notice, the appeal rights the recipient has in relation to the notice, and include or be accompanied by any information as required by the planning regulation. The department explained the need for this amendment, stating—

A recent Planning and Environment Court decision which found certain infrastructure charges notices invalid prompted a departmental sampling of infrastructure charges notices issued by a number of other councils which were found to be potentially similarly deficient. The proposed amendments to the Planning Act respond to a risk that the issuing of invalid infrastructure charges notices may be systemic across many local governments. This may place the financial sustainability of local governments at risk and create significant uncertainty for councils, industry and the community as beneficiaries of the infrastructure.

Some submitters raised concerns that it was an inappropriate use of legislative power to amend the Planning Act to retrospectively validate the challenged ICNs—that is, those that have been declared invalid by the Planning and Environment Court. The department's response was—

If there was to be some degree of escalation in developers challenging infrastructure charges notices because they may not have met a technical requirement, that leads to questions around the impact of all of those charges coming before the courts and the costs that may be involved to council, to developers and to the community of those challenges being continued to be brought.

It continued—

The financial risks and uncertainty for local governments, industry and community are considered too great not to progress the proposed amendment ...

In submissions to the inquiry the Local Government Association of Queensland and a number of local governments raised concerns about the proposed amendments to the Economic Development Act 2012, submitting that it would reduce control by local government in planning matters, particularly in relation to priority development areas. The LGAQ suggested that full agreement by the local government should be obtained before declaring a PDA, explaining—

The LGAQ understands there is a general requirement for the Minister for Economic Development Queensland to consult with each relevant local government in planning for, or developing in, PDAs ... generally, but is disappointed that the proposed legislative amendments have not extended to provide for obtaining full agreement by a local government in planning for, or developing in, a PDA.

The LGAQ opposed the removal of section 34(3) of the ED Act, stating—

... the removal of these additional requirements, broadens the powers of the MEDQ—

the Minister for Economic Development Queensland—

and could result in a PPDA—

a provisional priority development area—

being used or implemented inappropriately to circumvent local government planning scheme requirements and would also override State planning instruments.

The department responded by stating that under this section of the act the minister is required to consult with local government, further stating—

It would be a constraint if the minister needed a local government's approval to exercise the powers that are in the act, so that has not been included in this bill ...

The LGAQ made a very good point that—

... given the land in a PDA is ultimately returned to a local government to manage, the LGAQ maintains its position that local government should be afforded the opportunity in these circumstances, to agree to the terms of an infrastructure agreement and if necessary, request amendments to the infrastructure agreement before it is entered into ...

Some local government areas have struggled with maintaining the character and local individuality that sets them apart since council amalgamations under the Beattie government and any interference by government without local council approval would be seen as a further loss of that identity as a result of overarching government decision-making. This is particularly the case in regional Queensland. It was with these concerns in mind that the committee has recommended the government amend provisions relating to the making of a PPDA to include the establishment of a local consultative committee that includes a representative from local government to better support localised decision-making.

Once again we have seen this Palaszczuk government granting powers of entry to departmental inspectors that the police do not have. Under amendments to this legislation, inspectors will be granted a general power to enter places, including by consent or on warrant. Note that wording: 'including by

consent or warrant', not only by consent or warrant. Part 8 sets out various powers exercisable when the inspector exercises a power of entry. These include powers to search, inspect and film, and other general powers associated with entering and inspection. Part 8 sets out other powers of inspectors, including powers to stop and move vehicles, seize and forfeit seized things, dispose of things, and require information and documents. These are very strong powers that police officers do not have, so what could possibly justify a departmental officer having them? As I said, this is a very large omnibus bill and time restricts me from commenting further.

Interruption.

DISTINGUISHED VISITOR

 **Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Stevens): Order! Before calling the member for Ipswich West, honourable members, I wish to acknowledge in the Speaker's gallery the presence of Her Excellency the Hon. Dame Annette King, New Zealand's High Commissioner to Australia. On behalf of this parliament, I welcome Her Excellency and Mr Raymond Lind to Queensland.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed.

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (12.25 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The Economic Development Act 2012, otherwise known as the ED Act, established a streamlined planning and development assessment framework that applies to declared priority development areas, commonly referred to as PDAs.

An important PDA for the city of Ipswich is the Ripley Valley PDA that was declared on 8 October 2010 and covers a total area of 4,680 hectares. This PDA is located approximately five kilometres south-west of the Ipswich CBD and south of the Cunningham Highway. The Ripley Valley PDA will provide approximately 50,000 dwellings to house a population of approximately 120,000 people. To put that into perspective, that is a population greater than the population of Rockhampton and approaching the population of Cairns. Consequently, the development will see a new state primary school, a new state high school and a Catholic primary school being constructed.

Another PDA that will greatly benefit the residents of my electorate of Ipswich West is the Albert Street Cross River Rail PDA that was declared on 14 December 2018 and an interim land use plan given effect. This PDA was declared at the request of the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority to assist with the delivery of the Cross River Rail project. The Albert Street Cross River Rail PDA is approximately 3,858 square metres in area and comprises core land areas separated by the Albert Street road reserve. Cross River Rail is a 10.2-kilometre railway line from Dutton Park to Bowen Hills that includes 5.9 kilometres of tunnel under the Brisbane River and the Brisbane city centre. The Albert Street CRR PDA interim land use plan will provide a planning framework for development above and adjacent to the new Albert Street underground railway station at the intersection of Albert Street and Mary Street in the Brisbane central business district.

The benefits of the Albert Street CRR PDA were outlined in a public hearing held yesterday by the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee on behalf of the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning by Ms Desiree Houston-Jones, Executive Director of Planning Services, and Mr Tom Leach, Planning Manager of Planning and Urban Design, from Economic Development Queensland, as well as on behalf of Cross River Rail by Mr Peter Silvester, Director of Interface Operations, and Ms Tooey Elliott, General Manager of Planning and Economic Development.

The benefits they outlined included an underground railway station at Albert Street that will not only greatly benefit the residents of my electorate of Ipswich West but also assist students and staff at the Queensland University of Technology. The Albert Street CRR PDA also allows for a partial or complete green spine linking the botanic gardens with King George Square, bringing more gardens and more open space to Brisbane's CBD. Other benefits for the residents of the Ipswich West electorate that will come from this project include direct rail access from Ipswich railway stations to the iconic Woolloongabba cricket ground, as well as the hospitals at South Brisbane, which include the Mater Hospital of Brisbane and the Queensland Children's Hospital.

I am sure Economic Development Queensland—EDQ—would have included these matters when it undertook a review of the ED Act that gave rise to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. That review was in response to a number of operational issues that affect EDQ's ability to deliver government objectives. Some of these issues relate to the current processes for declared PDAs, preparing and updating development scheme use to assess the development of PDAs, as well as the processes for changing the boundaries of PDAs. Currently, the EDA Act does not allow a minor boundary change to fix an error or make a minor adjustment. Also, a PDA cannot be replaced with a new PDA if a larger or different shaped PDA is planned.

The bill also includes amendments relating to local consultative committees to report to the Minister for Economic Development. Overall, the proposed amendments will improve the operational effectiveness of the EDA Act and other related acts, improve relationships between the EDA Act and the new Planning Act, and introduce greater flexibility for planning and developing PDAs to assist in delivering projects aimed at generating growth and job opportunities across the state.

Before I sit down, it would be remiss of me if I did not say that I will not be lectured by those opposite on reporting and transparency. When the Palaszczuk government came into power, there was no pipeline left for us for infrastructure projects. The member for Clayfield made a virtue out of cutting infrastructure projects. He even said that delayed capital delivery was a good thing, because it improved the budget position. When the LNP was in office, not a single cent of new funding was made available for the M1. When we came into office, industry was crying out for new investment and projects and we have delivered. Building Queensland's *Infrastructure pipeline report*, combined with our state's infrastructure plan and budget papers, clearly conveys our funded priorities and priorities under consideration. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (12.32 pm): I rise to speak to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018—another omnibus bill that amends numerous acts. It is another complex bill that has been pushed through a rushed committee process, which is not unlike the situation with many other bills that have been presented to this House over the past 12 months. Like its predecessors, this bill would have benefited from a longer time frame for consultation and consideration through the committee process. Such a process would have allowed the committee to more fully hear concerns, identify issues and investigate alternatives. Given the consistent failures of this Palaszczuk Labor government in managing the business of running the state, it is a familiar refrain.

As mentioned by previous speakers, this bill is an omnibus bill that has the objective of providing for increased operational efficiency of legislation under the administration of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. I note that the opposition will not be opposing the bill. However, the LNP has issues with certain aspects of it.

As a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee tasked with reviewing this bill, I would like to recognise the work of the committee secretariat, led by Dr Jacqui Dewar. I would also like to recognise the contributions of my fellow committee members—the members for Bancroft, Condamine, Bundaberg, Ipswich West and Mount Ommaney.

Regrettably, it is disappointing and concerning that the Palaszczuk Labor government continues to ignore the concerns, wishes and rights of local Queensland communities. Time and again we have seen this government say one thing and do another. We often hear the familiar refrain of government transparency and accountability—and we just heard it from the member for Ipswich West. Yet this bill seeks to further water down the transparency and accountability of Building Queensland.

Indeed, under questioning from the member for Bundaberg, we saw the farcical situation where representatives from Building Queensland refused to answer reasonable questions about the compilation and presentation of data in the *Infrastructure pipeline report*, despite the fact that this bill amends the frequency at which that report will be presented. The issue at the core of the questions asked by the member for Bundaberg was the fact that it is common practice for Building Queensland to change the format of the *Infrastructure pipeline report*, which makes comparisons year on year very difficult. Changing the report's format is a deliberate ploy to make it more difficult for Queenslanders to scrutinise infrastructure investments funded by their taxes. It is simply not good enough for this government or departmental bureaucrats to seek to hide from scrutiny. Both would do well to remember that it is the people of Queensland whom they serve.

I note that the minister has addressed the recommendations of the parliamentary committee in his circulated amendments and in his second reading speech. However, concerns remain. I draw the attention of the minister to correspondence received by Mr James Ireland of HopgoodGanim Lawyers,

who raised concerns in relation to the technical application of the provisions relating to the validation of infrastructure charges notices. The concerns that Mr Ireland expressed relate to proposed section 342 of the bill. Mr Ireland submitted that—

... the drafting of section 342 be amended to clarify that the section also applies to preliminary approvals to which section 242 of the repealed SPA ... (including those mentioned in section 808 of the repealed SPA) that were in effect immediately prior to the repeal of SPA.

I ask that the minister review this correspondence that was received from Mr Ireland and provide assurance that his concerns have been addressed. This bill will restrict localised decision-making. As the Local Government Association of Queensland stated—

... the LGAQ is concerned this legislation further erodes the ability of councils and their communities to have a say in the size, shape and pace of development in their region.

Many residents in my electorate of Buderim are concerned about overdevelopment on the Sunshine Coast and the associated lack of infrastructure. Local residents in my electorate are concerned about increasing traffic congestion on roads such as the Sunshine Motorway and with the gridlock that exists around school zones on school days. They are concerned about the additional pressure that an increasing population will place on their hospitals and local schools, which are bursting at the seams. The local residents know better than anyone the impact that planning decisions and population growth have on their way of life. They deserve to have their voices heard. Put simply, it just makes sense. Our local residents are right to hold local councillors and mayors to account in relation to planning decisions and issues such as local development but, unfortunately, this bill further removes the ability of local communities to have their say in the size, shape and pace of development in their region.

Another issue raised during the consideration of this bill was how priority development areas are utilised and the requirements that must be adhered to when a PDA is declared. PDAs such as the Maroochydore City Centre Priority Development Area have caused concern for both the commercial sector and local residents. During committee hearings into this bill concerns were expressed in relation to a potential conflict of interest that exists in a local council authority being both the developer and involved in the approval process for the same development. I note that, in response to community concerns about this conflict of interest, Economic Development Queensland is the assessment manager for any development application within the Maroochydore City Centre PDA. However, it is clear that the Sunshine Coast Council is used to inform and advise the assessment manager—or, as it was described by the department, is operating in a ‘very collaborative working relationship’.

That collaboration in and of itself could be a perceived conflict of interest if it feeds into the decision-making process of a local government authority that is in and of itself the developer. That highlights the legitimate concerns that exist with respect to PDAs, particularly in circumstances where the developer is a government entity. The Palaszczuk Labor government used potential conflicts of interest and corruption in the development sector as the justification for its politically motivated developer donation laws, but it is silent on the community’s legitimate concerns about the council acting as a developer and its potential conflict of interest in the case of the Maroochydore City Centre PDA.

On a separate matter, I note that this bill, like others, continues the erosion of individual property rights in the form of increased powers of investigation and enforcement. Such powers should be exercised only by the Queensland police and other law enforcement authorities utilising longstanding warrant processes. As I have stated in my contributions to debates on other bills that have contained similar provisions, it is lazy public policy to erode individual property rights. The government should utilise the longstanding warrant processes that are already in existence.

In conclusion, while I note that the LNP will not be opposing the bill, it is clear that legitimate issues exist which should be addressed. It is deeply concerning that the Palaszczuk Labor government continues to ignore the concerns, wishes and rights of Queenslanders.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (12.39 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will do so by addressing once again the lacklustre contribution from the member for Glass House. I note that the member tabled a petition. It was not the petition that he started last year about the Oxley PDA. I do wonder what became of that petition. I suppose I will have to wait and see. Just a few weeks ago we had another round of community consultation about the Oxley PDA. There were many members of the Oxley community there, but you would not know, member for Glass House, because once again you were not there.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stevens): Order! Member for Mount Ommaney, please direct your comments through the chair and not across the chamber.

Ms PUGH: Yes, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr Powell interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Glass House!

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Ms PUGH: Your interjections are not being taken, member for Buderim. Thank you kindly.

Mr LANGBROEK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Can I draw your attention to standing order 247, which says that members' comments should be directed to the Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Surfers Paradise. I just highlighted that very fact to the member for Mount Ommaney. There was further comment from a member on my left, and I did not hear who particularly said that, and then the member for Mount Ommaney responded inappropriately. Member for Mount Ommaney, I will not advise you again. Next time I will have to sit you down. Please direct your comments through the chair.

Ms PUGH: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There are people arguing with the chair's decision on that matter? No? Thank you.

Ms PUGH: I was at the community consultation and the independent councillor for Tennyson was there. As I said, guess who was not there? The member for Glass House! It was a good thing because he is not very popular in my neck of the woods because of his cruel and baseless attacks on community members. My good mate Bill Thirkill was there and, of course, the chair of our community consultation panel was there, Theresa Rich Hoyle. I once again want to take this opportunity to commend Theresa. She never misses an opportunity to represent the views of the Oxley residents and our community.

Our community will never forgive the member for Glass House for his disgraceful attacks on her last year. It is not right to see apolitical members of our community attacked by politicians. It should be noted that two of the community members who met with the member for Glass House last year in parliament were, in fact, members of political parties. That is something I did not mention. In fact, one of the people was the 2017 candidate in the state election for One Nation.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Ommaney, I would like you, under standing order 118, to become relevant to the particular bill. Please tie up any comments you have to the long title of the bill.

Ms PUGH: Thank you for your guidance. I will speak about the PDA as it pertains to the bill. It is good to see the LNP leadership making a play for those preferences. I will give members a bit of history on the PDA of Oxley. Contrary to the member's assertion about the site being green space, it is actually not green space. It is an abandoned school. This site has been built on for quite a long period of time. The history of the site has been up in the air since 2014 when the then premier, Campbell Newman, evicted the tenants on the site. As recently as 2014 we saw this site not used as green space but as a functioning workplace for the fire ants workforce and there was a ballet school on the site. The residents of Oxley know this. These tenants were booted off at that time, no doubt in preparation for asset sales.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Ms PUGH: Thank you for your protection. The final outcome of the PDA site includes a community hub and the relocation of our beloved Yuringi childcare centre to higher ground so it no longer floods as it so sadly did back in 2011. We will see sports and playing fields for the local community and approximately 74 large-lot residential home sites on an average block size of 800 square metres. This is in keeping with the other local home sites and developments like Edenvale and the Verandah, places that residents in Oxley know and love.

It should also be noted that, as I mentioned earlier, the local councillors have been consulted every step of the way by me because that is my job. It is great to see that so many members of the House have such an interest in this site.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PUGH: I will wait for silence.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Mount Ommaney, please, through the chair.

Ms PUGH: But I was not directing my comments at anyone.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do not argue with the chair, member for Mount Ommaney, please. Otherwise I will be forced to sit you down.

Ms PUGH: I would also like to make some brief comments on the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 which establishes the Sanctuary Cove Resort. I found it interesting that this piece of legislation, the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act, is exactly as old as I am: 33 years. I think that is interesting to note because 33 years ago many of the residents of Sanctuary Cove were probably not thinking about retirement. I think it is apt at this time that we take the opportunity to evaluate the needs of this community. Having visited this beautiful area, I think it would in keeping to allow residents to age in place within their communities. With those brief comments, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (12.47 pm): As a member of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee I rise to make my contribution to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Although I will not be opposing the passing of the bill, I do oppose several clauses which I will be outlining today. I would like to thank the members of the committee and also the secretariat staff for their work on this bill. The Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning introduced the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, EDOLA, into the Queensland parliament on 19 September last year and it was referred to our committee. The committee made five recommendations and it is pleasing to see the minister has taken note of the recommendations, especially recommendation 2, which says the committee recommends that the government amends provisions relating to the making of a PPDA to include the establishment of a local consultative committee that includes a representative from local government to better support localised decision-making.

The bill seeks to amend seven acts and repeal one, proposing to amend the Building Queensland Act 2015, the Economic Development Act 2012, the Planning Act 2016, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011, the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985—which we have heard was enacted 33 years ago—and the South Bank Corporation Act 1989, and also to repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004.

This bill is a perfect example of this government's style of governing. As the Queensland Law Society raised in its submission, it is a deeply regrettable decision to take such a wideranging legislative agenda which looks to amend eight different acts all at once. Labor is once again looking to minimise scrutiny in order to further its own agenda. With over 230 clauses proposed, outright opposing the bill based on a handful of concerns is perceived as an overarch by key stakeholders.

While we do not oppose the bill as a whole, I and my fellow LNP members of the committee have provided a statement of reservation. The statement outlines our concerns with the process, reduced transparency, dilution of localised decision-making and overextension of investigation and enforcement powers. It is deeply concerning that this Labor government continues to ignore the concerns, wishes and rights of local Queensland groups and communities.

In yet another example of Labor saying one thing and doing another, this bill looks to further water down the transparency and accountability of Building Queensland. In direct contrast to the Premier's commitment to an open and accountable government, this bill will see reporting requirements for Building Queensland halved. This latest reduction in transparency will only amplify the difficulty of communities holding Labor to account for the infrastructure delivery times they have been promised. Not only does the bill propose to decrease the community's ability to hold the Labor government to account; it also further restricts localised decision-making, leaving no doubt as to the Labor government's underlying agenda. The CEO of the Local Government Association of Queensland said 'that the LGAQ is concerned that this legislation further erodes the ability of councils and their communities to have a say in the size, shape and the space of the development in their region'.

A common theme of the legislation introduced over the past four years by this Labor government is the consolidation of their own power at the expense of local decision-making. The proposed removal of the overriding economic or community need test and the requirement for provisional priority development areas and provisional land use plans to not compromise the implementation of a planning instrument is a direct dilution of localised decision-making. In addition, the failure to include a requirement for the minister to consult with and obtain the agreement of each relevant local government area in planning for or developing a PDA, establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate is an outrageous attempt to circumnavigate local community development concerns.

I will finish my contribution with one of the most disturbing parts of the bill. Hidden within the 224 pages of the bill are some of the most concerning amendments seeking to provide substantial increases in the powers of investigation and enforcement for government inspectors that can only be exercised by the Queensland police under the authority of a warrant. The bill's explanatory notes provide no outline of why such amendments are needed or any proof that they are in the interest of the public. The minister has responded to the committee's recommendation on the issue, but to me it remains an issue. Powers for inspectors to enter premises, stop vehicles and seize or dispose of information are considerable and should only be granted in the most serious cases.

As I mentioned at the start of my contribution, I will not oppose the bill but I do have reservations with several clauses and where this government is moving with its powers in its continual adding to bills throughout this term of government.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (12.52 pm): I support the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and, like the Queensland Law Society, I will confine myself to speaking about just a few clauses. The amendments that deal with the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011 are to be supported, particularly for their focus on resilience. As a health professional I always focus on prevention rather than cure. Anticipation and mitigation of problems is much better than responding to problems, so these amendments should be supported. I am also particularly pleased with the Planning and Environment Court amendments. The power to refer matters to a private mediator will certainly reduce costs, and I believe that mediation leads to better and more sustainable outcomes. I think this amendment also gives light to the fact that the Palaszczuk government is a government that listens, consults and works with people. These changes were requested by the court, and the minister has worked to incorporate those changes into this bill.

I would also like to talk to the Sanctuary Cove amendments. As recently as six or seven years ago there was no retirement living in my electorate. I am pleased to say that now we have a significant number of retirement options for people. What used to happen was that when people who had raised their families and made a significant contribution in our community reached an age when they needed a retirement living option, they would have to move a very long way away. This was a great loss to our community. Now when you go to your local schools you see nannas and grandads there and you see more people volunteering. We really have a much more well rounded community and society because of those changes. I can only see these benefits flowing through because of the Sanctuary Cove amendments in this bill. I support them for that reason.

I now turn my attention to the LNP statement of reservation. Sadly, this statement of reservation epitomises the style of opposition provided by the Frecklington LNP. It is lazy and poorly thought through and shows no real understanding of the issues in this bill. Those opposite say that they support this bill but then turn around and are oppositional for the sake of it. I can see no real policy agenda being advanced here.

The member for Condamine has either misquoted or misrepresented the statements of the Queensland Law Society's submission. I have read the statement of reservation and it seems to me that the member has done this simply to suit the LNP's political agenda. No doubt many other speakers in this debate will simply parrot those words, as we have heard done many times before. I ask the member to justify the statements he attributes to the Queensland Law Society and point out where these statements were made. I cannot find the words 'it is a deeply regrettable decision to take such a wideranging legislative agenda that seeks to amend eight different acts and ram it into one omnibus bill'. What I did find when I read what the Queensland Law Society had to say was: 'Given the wideranging scope and complexity of the amendments, the Queensland Law Society has limited its comments to certain specific issues.'

Those two statements to me are very different statements. Sadly, that is the first paragraph of the statement of reservation. I can assure those who have not taken the time to read this 'very good piece of work' that it is not worth reading at all. Clearly, it is a piece that has been prepared by somebody who was asleep during the committee hearings, did not bother to read the bill, did not bother to read the explanatory notes or has not engaged in the process—or they simply found someone who was not capable of writing the piece to do their homework for them. I encourage all members who have not read the statement of reservation to spare themselves time and simply support this bill.

This bill is a good bill. It improves efficiency across eight pieces of legislation. That is what we do in the Palaszczuk Labor government. That is why we are creating jobs. We listen to the community, we work with the community, we create jobs and we build a community. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (12.57 pm): The assurance of efficiency is undoubtedly a necessary issue to be addressed in a rapidly developing state and is a key requirement for Queensland's successful economic development. On these grounds, many reforms in the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 are sensible. However, there are reservations as the proposed bill does attempt to make amendments to eight acts.

Amendments to the Building Queensland Act propose a reduced publication rate of the industry pipeline report, from biannual to annual publications. While this is an initiative of efficiency, doing so also hinders the ability of local communities to track development rates. This report, and I quote from its foreword, is designed to 'provide government with an informed evidence base to support infrastructure investment decisions'. Halving its publication rate may only slow the process of making evidence based approvals and make it more difficult for stakeholders to hold decisions to account.

There were ongoing concerns with regard to the Planning and Environment Court and amendments to the Sustainable Planning Act 2012 that had previously allowed the court to extend costs to parties seeking appeals. Those previous amendments had led to the burden of local councils and residents, obliging them to pay significant fees in order to defend their established planning scheme from appellants who may consistently change their proposal, leading to expensive and stressful years in court, as we have seen recently in Noosa. To mitigate this, it has been suggested that it would be appropriate that, when the Planning and Environment Court identifies that a matter is of significant conflict, costs be awarded by the judge. The cost of changing proposals should also be the responsibility of the appellant, particularly where the changes are made not in response to mediation but just prior to or during a trial. Notwithstanding these concerns, the current Planning and Environment Court Act amendment to allow referral to private mediators is most welcome, with the potential of saving considerable time and court costs and easing court obligations on overstretched cases.

The final concern with this bill, as has been heard before, is in regard to the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act. Proposing the potential to construct a retirement or residential care facility at Sanctuary Cove represents a valid opportunity in creating communities with diverse and necessary living options. However, according to section 23 of the Sanctuary Cove Act 1985, 75 per cent of residents must support this proposal, and due process relating to this amendment should maintain this guarantee to constituents to retain integrity in our legislation.

In summary, I support this bill; however, I emphasise concerns raised about the need to acknowledge the specific needs of local communities and the necessary broadening of Planning and Environment Court exceptions to ensure efficiency, fairness and decreasing costs to ratepayers and taxpayers.

Debate, on motion of Ms Bolton, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Health System; Quirk, Lord Mayor G

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): Queenslanders expect their health system to care for them when they are sick, but last week the sick were turned away from emergency departments. Queenslanders turned up to hear that their hospitals in the south-east corner were full. Our health system in Queensland was plunged into a full-scale crisis. It was unprecedented, but it was simply not a surprise.

Labor's health crisis has been building since the day the member for Inala was elected as Premier in this state. We have seen corridors crammed with patients on stretchers because there are no beds left. We have seen doctors forced to give mothers DIY birthing kits because Labor has shut maternity services in the bush. We have seen cancerous transplant tissue given to four children. I have stood side by side with the mother of a child who had chemo in the kitchen of the Lady Cilento Children's Hospital. Regional towns are crying out for more doctors and more nurses. Ambulance ramping has jumped to 25 per cent. Nothing is worse than Labor telling Queenslanders that their hospitals are full. Nothing could be worse than that.

Labor then blamed patients for the hospitals being full. The hospitals ran out of beds, but the Premier never runs out of excuses. The Premier first of all blamed the federal government. Then she blamed the winter flu, but no it was the summer flu. Then the Premier blamed the elderly. It was a national embarrassment. No other state is experiencing any form of health crisis like what we are seeing in Queensland.

Simon Judkins, the president of the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine, called it a crisis. We had Beth Mohle of the Queensland Nurses' Union call it a crisis. But the Premier said, 'No, they are wrong. There is nothing to see here.' The Premier in fact said, 'The system was working just as it was intended.' It may be how the Palaszczuk government intends the health system to work, but it certainly is not how the LNP and every Queenslander expects their health system to work. It is an arrogant government that blames everyone but themselves. Now everyone in Queensland knows what a code yellow is thanks to the Labor government.

We then had the health minister come out and say, 'The hospitals have returned to normal. Nothing to see here.' What did we see of the health minister? He finished last week by posting on social media that he was having a cup of coffee. It was like, 'I've had such a big day. I need to sit, give myself a pat on the back and have a coffee.' What the health minister should have been doing was thanking the hardworking doctors, nurses and administration staff who had to battle this crisis. He should have thanked the patients for having patience and for waiting for the Palaszczuk government to fix up the crisis made by the Palaszczuk government. They are the people who need a break and not this health minister giving himself a nice little pat on the back and having a cup coffee.

Queenslanders deserve a government that is going to put the health of Queenslanders first. The only priority of those opposite when it comes to health is ripping the name of Lady Cilento down off the children's hospital. The LNP would never waste taxpayers' money. We are the ones listening to the concerns of front-line health workers.

I am sure I speak on behalf of the whole House when I pay tribute to the Lord Mayor of Brisbane, Graham Quirk. They say nice guys always finish last. Graham Quirk proves that they do not. He is a gentleman, humble, kind and honest. I congratulate Councillor Adrian Schrinner on being chosen as his successor. I also congratulate the future deputy mayor, Councillor Krista Adams. They have a tough act to follow.

Graham Quirk will be remembered as one of the city's best ever mayors. Mayor of Brisbane is the biggest job in local government and Graham Quirk was born to do it. Just look at his legacy: Clem7 tunnel; Airportlink; Go Between Bridge; Legacy Way tunnel; and \$4 billion worth of road upgrades. The mayor and his LNP team knew Brisbane had to build infrastructure for the future. Lord Mayor Graham Quirk got to work. If only the Palaszczuk Labor government had some of that 'Quirk ethic'.

The only mark Labor have left on Brisbane is tearing down the Lady Cilento hospital sign. That is their landmark project for Brisbane. Lord Mayor Graham Quirk has shown Queensland just how bad the Palaszczuk government is. His achievements have put this Labor state government to absolute shame. He did not just build infrastructure; he delivered: 40 all-ability playgrounds, CityHopper ferries, the City of Lights project and the South-East Queensland City Deal. He would have started building Brisbane Metro by now if this government had got off its behind.

When it comes to transport infrastructure the Palaszczuk government is always late, just like our trains. This week we have seen even more excuses, more finger-pointing, more delays from the transport minister over the M1. The federal government has put down another half a billion dollars to upgrade the M1 between Daisy Hill and the Logan Motorway. This opportunity should be grabbed with two hands, Minister.

What have we heard from this transport minister? It is the same whining that we have heard for last four years. No-one is listening and Bill Shorten definitely is not. He thinks that Queensland should pay for half the cost of the M1. Now I appreciate that the Treasurer in Queensland has not given the transport minister enough money to spend on infrastructure, but if he was not paying \$422,000 a week in overtime for QR he might have some money to spend on roads.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Miller. Member for Broadwater. You don't need to wink at me.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I appreciate that the member for South Brisbane, the Queensland Treasurer, has not given the transport minister enough money to spend on infrastructure. If he was not paying almost half a million dollars a week in overtime for QR drivers, he might have more money to spend on the roads. Queenslanders are sick of excuses from the Labor government over the M1. The LNP built the M1, and we are the only ones who will guarantee the extra investment that it needs.

It has been 30 years since the Fitzgerald report was published. The report recommended that compulsory preferential voting be scrapped in state elections—and for good reasons too. No-one should be forced to vote for a party that they do not want to vote for, but that is what Labor brought about when they teamed up with the Katters to change the voting system in the dead of night.

I was appalled by the statements made by Pauline Hanson and her One Nation sidekicks. John Howard's gun laws are not for sale and never will be, but we have heard nothing from those opposite other than fake outrage. We all know the truth. Never forget that the Palaszczuk Labor government is only here because of One Nation preferences. It is those opposite who have brought in this system—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members, you do not need to be shouting across the chamber. You will not quarrel across the chamber, as the Speaker has already indicated. Member for Nanango, you have 18 seconds.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Labor has created this system. It is time to scrap CPV and bring back just vote one. It is time to give democracy a go and bring back just vote one.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Members, joining us in the public gallery today are students from Woodcrest State College in the electorate of Jordan. We welcome them to parliament.

Road Safety

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (2.11 pm): Perhaps it is time to stop being appalled and start putting the One Nation party last.

As a nurse I take road safety extremely seriously. I have witnessed the impacts of traffic accidents of all sorts. I have seen the journey of patients in the emergency departments, the orthopaedic wards, the ICUs and the rehabilitation wards. Injuries can have devastating effects on individuals and intergenerational impacts upon families. I have not witnessed situations where people have died due to motor vehicle accidents, but I have no doubt that those situations are just as devastating. That is why I work with the local community whenever the opportunity presents to improve road safety, particularly around schools.

I see it as a very important part of my role to improve and maintain safety at schools. I have attended P&Cs and P&Fs. Many of these groups also have road safety subcommittees. They raise issues all the time around road safety at schools. By working with those communities and by talking to the minister, we have been able to get improvements to road safety at Coorparoo State School, Cavendish Road State High School, Loreto College, Greenslopes State School, Nursery Road State Special School, Holland Park State High School, Villanova College, Our Lady of Mount Carmel and Mount Gravatt State School.

The parents from Holland Park State School also contacted me with concerns about the entrance at Victor Street. I visited the school several times before and after school to talk to parents about the issues and to have a look for myself. What we found was that an increase in density was leading to more people using that entrance, which had previously been little used. I spoke to the minister and the minister's office and made representations. I was pleased that the outcome was that we received an additional school crossing guard. When I drive past there now I am reminded how important it is to listen to your community, to work with your community and to have ministers who actually listen to you and work with you. The minister understands road safety. The minister understands road safety.

I would not have thought that road safety around schools would be a contested issue. I would not have thought that I would walk into this place and argue about road safety around schools. Sadly, the shadow spokesperson responsible for road safety around schools—the person responsible for putting forward an alternative vision of keeping kids safe around schools—does not agree. The member for Chatsworth chose to play politics with the efforts of the Queensland police to enforce speed limits near Whites Hill State College. He put petty politics ahead of the safety of children around our schools. He put political point scoring ahead of kids and their families. The police were catching up to 40 motorists an hour—40 motorists an hour—exceeding the speed limit. If there is someone who I would have thought would have understood the issues around this school it would have been the member for Chatsworth because, while this school is now in my electorate, it was previously in the member for Chatsworth's electorate.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, you have had your go.

Mr KELLY: It was previously in the member's electorate, and he represented this school and this community for six years.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! We do not need you shouting across the chamber.

Mr KELLY: You can imagine the reaction of the school community and the broader community. There was widespread condemnation that this member, who supposedly represents road safety for the opposition, was prepared to put politics ahead of the safety of children. The member is totally unsuited to be the spokesperson on road safety. I would suggest that this member step down from this role immediately and perhaps, if those opposite can, they should find somebody who will put the safety of kids before petty politics.

I am pleased to be part of the Palaszczuk government which puts the safety of children first. I am pleased that we have a minister who gets road safety and puts the safety of children first. I am pleased to attend P&Cs and P&Fs.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Nanango, I have given you fair warning. Next time you will be placed on a warning under the standing orders. Member for Greenslopes, you have 10 seconds.

Mr KELLY: I will always put the safety of kids first in my electorate.

Correctional Facilities

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.16 pm): There is nothing that infuriates Queenslanders more than when taxpayers' money is wasted. There was no greater example of that than last week when the Minister for Corrective Services announced that they were going to close down the private control of prisons at the cost of \$111 million over the next four years. Let us talk about the problem they used as an excuse to do this.

Our prisons at the moment are at 136 per cent capacity. Is it any wonder that prison officers are being assaulted on a daily basis? Is it any wonder that prison officers are being treated like punching bags when they go to work? What was the response to prison officers being assaulted in prisons right across this state? This government has used the privately run prisons as an excuse to make sure that its union masters win once again.

Not one extra prison cell will be added due to this \$111 million commitment. Their response to overcrowding is to spend \$111 million and not get one extra cell. This once again shows the control that unions have on this government. The unions have been protesting for the last 12 to 18 months. It has been an orchestrated campaign. This is how they do it. Slowly, month by month, they leak stories, building the case that these privately run prisons are not efficient. Nothing could be further from the truth. The unions pulled out their big guns when they brought out Minister de Brenni, Chief Government Whip Don Brown, Deputy Government Whip Nikki Boyd and the member for Redlands to protest against a minister's decision. It is absolutely unheard of.

Here they are with protesters and banners saying that the minister has blood on his hands. The protesters are saying that the minister should be up for manslaughter if there is a death of a prison officer, but the ploy worked. Once again, we know where the loyalty of these members opposite is. Their first loyalty is to their union masters. The union secretary gets on the phone to Minister de Brenni, whip Brown, deputy whip Boyd and the member for Ipswich and says, 'Get down here now. You do what you're told or you will not be preselected at the next election.'

This is a classic example of how much unions cost Queensland taxpayers—\$111 million. They do have a policy with regard to increasing the number of cells. They are building a prison in the Capricornia area for \$241 million with an extra 290 cells—close to \$700,000 or \$800,000 per cell. Compare that to the LNP's commitment at the 2015 election, which was to build 650 extra beds at the price of \$61 million. That side of government wastes money. The LNP is cost effective in the way that it spends taxpayers' money.

Another message from this debacle is that, if you are a member of the Labor Party or the Labor government, if you are a minister and you are not happy with a decision that the government is making at the time, let us rally a couple of comrades, go outside William Street, get a couple of banners and protest because that is the union way. They are run by the unions.

(Time expired)

Kepel Electorate, Big W Store Closures; News Contracting and Logistics

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.21 pm): Firstly, I want to acknowledge all employees of Big W in North Rockhampton and Yeppoon after Woolworths announced these two stores are being targeted for closure. It is very sad news which will no doubt affect hundreds of local staff and their families. I really hope they do not close because it would have a huge impact on our local economy. If they do, I hope that all Big W employees receive their entitlements and employees are supported throughout the closures.

I rise today to talk about News Contracting and Logistics, a local welding and fabrication company based in Yeppoon which, together with Rockhampton based labour hire company Champ Resources, travelled to the Philippines recently to bring sheet metal workers from the Philippines to Central Queensland. News' corporate manager, Matilda Chapman, appeared on a promotional video for the Philippines recruitment company where she said—

I have probably been a bit disillusioned in the recruitment sector over the past three or four years in Australia with work attitudes, ethics and sense of entitlement that comes from a lot of the Australian workforce, which is a negative thing to say, but it's a reality.

It is one thing to justify the use of foreign labour with a skills shortage, but it is completely un-Australian to say that our workers are self-entitled, that they lack work ethic and to then try to fill Australian jobs with foreign labour because you have a problem with Australian workers. How dare she tar all workers with the same brush? I for one will not stand for this. How dare this woman stereotype and slander our local workers. If she is not prepared to give local people a go, I suggest that she pack up and leave. Why isn't this company investing in training and development of local people—of Australian people—to support them into jobs? I guess they are of the same mind as the federal government, which does nothing to develop our local workers except slash money for TAFE and training. They are cheating local apprentices, trainees and experienced tradespeople of further training and job opportunities.

Another similar case is when rail giant Aurizon sacked hundreds of Central Queensland workers, including train drivers, and then gave permanency residency to 11 foreign train drivers, refusing Australian workers the opportunity to take those positions. What a rort! We need good Australian jobs for the benefit of working people, their families, local businesses and local communities.

I am proud that the Palaszczuk government led the way in 2017 by becoming the first jurisdiction to introduce a labour hire licensing scheme. Those opposite argued against this, regurgitating the rhetoric of big business and dodgy labour hire operators—rhetoric which attacks workers' rights and entitlements. They said in their dissenting committee report to these laws that action was not warranted or efficacious. I can tell the House that every single day I hear stories from local workers, whether it is about dodgy labour hire operators or the thousands of cases where local workers cannot afford to have time off sick or spend Christmas with their families because, despite working for months or years, the boss will not make them permanent. A national licensing scheme for labour hire would be the best outcome, but there is continued absence of national leadership on this matter. In fact, because of Senator Hanson's deal with the Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government, federal laws to act on this issue have been voted down.

Central Queensland has some of the highest levels of casualisation and dodgy labour hire in Australia, so one may wonder where the member for Capricornia is on this issue. One would think that the Nats would be standing up to the Libs in Canberra on this issue. She is in complete denial that 457 visas are even an issue, declaring that it is naive to suggest that the 457 skilled migration program is flooding the national labour market. When she is in Queensland Michelle Landry says that she is standing up for battlers, but in Canberra she stabs them in the back. She has done it on penalty rates. She has done it on pensions. Now she has done it on labour hire. Her time in Canberra is about to come to an end, because I will be fighting every day to ensure that the people of Central Queensland have a Labor government in Canberra that will work with the Palaszczuk government to restore job security and dignity in workplaces across Central Queensland.

Racing Industry

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (2.26 pm): We have heard today from the opposition leader and the deputy opposition leader that Labor will always spend more on health and prisons, yet they will always deliver less. Today I turn to the portfolio of racing where the story is exactly the same. Under Labor's system, costing nearly \$27 million per year for the Queensland Racing Integrity

Commission set up in 2016, the industry is beset by crises in integrity, safety, infrastructure delays and even in day-to-day management, causing our codes of greyhound, harness racing and thoroughbreds to be mocked by other states.

A litany of issues in the last week begs the question: where are Minister Hinchliffe and Premier Palaszczuk? The hands-off minister has failed and been removed from numerous portfolios—Transport and Main Roads, Commonwealth Games, Planning in a previous government and now he has local government in uproar. By anyone's standards, last week has been a horror one for racing.

Our thoughts go out to the Whitaker family—Gary and Joedy and their infant children—who were involved at the Redcliffe Paceway when the mobile starting barrier arms slammed into them. We hope it is not too long before Gary is doing what he does best, driving winners, and that little Lara is on the improve. Harness racing is a tight-knit community and there was time out last week at Albion Park to show support for them in thought and also financially via a GoFundMe site.

Queenslanders deserve answers from Racing Queensland and/or the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission as they are the bodies Labor has tasked, appointed and funded to administer safety and integrity as well as programming. There are questions to be answered about the incident at Redcliffe, now the subject of a workplace health and safety inquiry, and the subsequent meetings held last week at Albion Park in the wake of that incident at Redcliffe. Why will the minister not advise how the postponed Tuesday meeting held at Albion Park on Wednesday was allowed to run with mobile starts, but mobile starts were stopped at the next Albion Park meeting on Thursday night but only after a number of races had been run? Has the fleet of Racing Queensland mobile barriers passed safety standards? When were they checked? Was it before the Albion Park race meetings of Wednesday and Thursday last week? When were they passed and by whom? I am concerned that, because of Labor's failure to act, racing continued at Albion Park last Wednesday and Thursday using an unsuitable, uncertified mobile starting barrier for nearly two completed meetings until after seven races on the Thursday. On Friday, 29 March Robert Craddock said in the *Courier-Mail*—

Queensland's harness racing industry has shuddered to an embarrassing halt because its mobile barriers don't meet local safety standards.

The decision was part of an investigation into an accident at Redcliffe Harness Racing Club on Sunday when driver Gary Whitaker and his daughter Lara were struck by the arm of a mobile barrier while standing at a trackside podium.

I table a copy of that article.

Tabled paper: Media article, undated, titled 'Harness races halted due to safety concerns'. [495]

I now table a photo of the subsequent way that races have been run this weekend using a walk-up start where some horses are getting up to a 15-metre advantage because they are not all in line with the stewards at the start.

Tabled paper: Extract, dated 28 March, from Twitter in relation to harness racing [496].

It is not the Stawell Gift where handicaps are the norm. The other codes of greyhound racing and thoroughbreds are not immune from embarrassing mistakes and delays. Where is the new greyhound track to replace Parklands at the Gold Coast, promised in 2008 with \$10 million quarantined? Last year there was an incorrect greyhound presented at Ipswich races and QRIC announced that there would be more stringent examination of animals subsequently. I table a copy of their media release about their mix-up and the investigation.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 5 May 2018, by the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission titled 'Identification mix up at Ipswich Greyhounds sparks inquiry' [497].

So much for the new pre-race identification procedures. Last week at Rockhampton races a horse called Plain 'N' Simple, which was scheduled to run in race 7, ran in race 6 instead, leading to the disqualification of Authadane, the horse meant to have run. I ask plainly and simply: are we back in the era of Fine Cotton—Queensland's most notorious substitution scam, when a \$27 million organisation set up by Labor cannot even get racing animals identified properly? I table an editorial from the *Courier-Mail* which states that 'QRIC is proving to be a toothless tiger and Queensland racing integrity is laughed upon by other states'.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 18 May 2018, from the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission titled 'Greyhound mix-up investigation concludes' [498].

Tabled paper: Media article, undated, titled 'Racing justice on slow track' [499].

This follows on from the debacle at Eagle Farm last Saturday week when on a stinking hot day horses and riders for a race remained at the barriers for over 30 minutes due to an ambulance delay. Then, because of the delays, the threat of the last race being run as darkness descended was exacerbated by two horses being presented to race with transposed saddles, with a jockey identifying

his saddle on another horse. Imagine the drain on punters' confidence in Queensland Racing across the nation when there is so much competition for the punters' dollar. What about Ipswich gallops meetings abandoned regularly after just a few millimetres of rain?

What do we have from Labor? We have the highest point of consumption tax, a strike over prize money on Cox Plate day and the loss of millions of dollars of turnover. Just remember that the LNP is Queensland's racing party. You bet it is.

Cook Electorate, Palaszczuk Labor Government

 **Ms LUI** (Cook—ALP) (2.30 pm): The Palaszczuk government will continue to stand with the people of Queensland no matter where they live. This government believes in providing the best services and infrastructure for all people. Based on our track record, communities are better off with the support of this government to deliver vital projects and initiatives. In the Cook electorate we have the track record to prove this because we are a government that believes in taking action. We make things happen. Not much can be said about the current member for Leichhardt, Warren Entsch, and the Morrison LNP government because they are taking no action. In fact, they are stopping action being taken for all the wrong reasons.

This government makes no apology when it comes to supporting communities. In December 2018 the Palaszczuk government announced a \$25 million support package to Far Northern Milling in Mossman in the Douglas shire. This is an industry that was at risk of closing its doors for good, and the impact on this small community would have been devastating. The Mossman Mill supports local jobs, businesses and services in the region, and saving an industry meant saving a community for future generations to come.

I want to put on the record that this government made every effort to work closely with industry and key stakeholders to ensure a strong business case was put forward to support their bid for funding. I note that the federal government's commitment of \$20 million was conditional on a strong business case. Unlike Warren Entsch and the Morrison LNP government, we did not sit back to wait for the business case to be developed; rather, we worked in partnership with all key stakeholders to achieve a positive outcome.

The Palaszczuk government believes in economic growth and development to support communities into the future. That is why just last month the Palaszczuk government announced a \$5.7 million funding package to commence construction of the first seven kilometres of the 94-kilometre Wangetti Trail in the north Mowbray section of the Douglas shire. The Palaszczuk government will not sit around and wait for the Morrison LNP government to get their act together. We on this side of the House understand how important this project is for the future of the region, and we are getting on with the first stage of this wonderful project. This section of the trail will create 30 jobs, 11,000 additional visitors and \$6.1 million in overnight tourism expenditure.

Wangetti Trail is worth a total of \$25 million. Once completed, we will see \$300 million injected into the local economy, 150 jobs created and 43,000 additional visitors to the region. One can only hope that the current member for Leichhardt is as enthusiastic as I am about this project. I call on Warren Entsch and the Morrison LNP government to put their money where their mouth is and get behind this important project to support their community and future growth in the region.

The Palaszczuk government wants to see local businesses thrive. Mareeba manufacturer Homefab is set to make its mark in Far North Queensland and create more jobs. I had the pleasure of visiting Homefab recently with Minister Crawford and was impressed with the calibre of their work. Homefab is an award winning manufacturer of steel framed building components. It is tested to cyclonic wind loadings, it is termite and borer proof, and it is not combustible. Thanks to a \$425,211 grant from the Palaszczuk government's Made in Queensland program, Homefab will now be able to introduce new machinery and improve the company's productivity and competitiveness.

The Palaszczuk government is doing outstandingly in delivering for Queenslanders in my electorate—from committing funds to building a new primary healthcare centre on Mer Island in the Torres Strait, to building a new airport terminal in Lockhart River, to funding Aurukun's brand-new Ngooyngk Min seniors units, which is a complex of six two-bedroom apartments that I recently had the privilege of officially opening. I make no apology when it comes to advocating for the needs of my communities. I call on Warren Entsch to do the same—no more cuts and stop walking away from your responsibility. Communities in the Cook electorate deserve their fair share of funds. It is about time Warren Entsch and Scott Morrison awake from their slumberous, inactive state and actually deliver for their community.

Parliament, Harmony

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (2.35 pm): There are so many conversations we need to have, yet there seems to be much reluctance to have them. Is it because it makes us confront and consider perspectives and perceptions other than our own? Within my own electorate, I continue to encourage discussions that may be at times contentious and burdened by bias. However, they can invigorate, resolve and identify common ground to provide solutions. Sadly, many of our Queenslanders do not engage and put forward their views for fear of reprisals, of being labelled, of being prejudiced against or of being discounted, especially on social media.

The topics I bring into the chamber from my electorate are not borne from judgement or criticism. They are to encourage a culture and space for inquiring minds, including our next generation who seek, as we all do, a future free from fear or from the difficulties encountered from an underpinning framework of systems developed some 200 years ago that could not foresee the present day.

One conversation that we need to have, as uncomfortable as it may appear, is that of our morning rituals here in this chamber. This should not be taken as a negative, in anger or as one to fear. Through bills passed, speeches on debates, the development of policy and statements to media, we clearly articulate that we are a multicultural, inclusive and compassionate Queensland. As parliamentarians, should we then not lead by example and discuss how to be more inclusive at the start of each sitting day?

Expanding rituals that accommodate and reflect our community's diversity in beliefs and spirituality does not detract from current practices. Rather, it enriches and breaks down the barriers and fears that promote uncertainty, angst and, sadly, at times, acts of violence. As a parliament, what would a modernised version of our morning rituals look like—one that encompasses but does not detract, one that accommodates our diversity, one that honours and acknowledges our traditional custodians as well as those who have given so much, at times their lives, to create the freedoms we enjoy today?

There are so many aspects to consider in this conversation. All that I ask is that it be had—with respect and foresight to promote healing and encourage further discussions on celebrating being united as Queenslanders and as Australians. The Harmony Day celebration here at the 'big house' was a wonderful event, and in my own electorate it was movingly beautiful, with Tewantin State School's featured song 'I am, you are, we are Australian' also sung in Gubbi Gubbi, or Kabi Kabi. This did not negate or detract through translation; it broadened and expanded to everyone's delight. Many cultures were represented and united with genuine warmth and vibrancy, and this is both our current reality and our future.

We are all proud to be Queenslanders and Australians. We want to celebrate that together every day, without recriminations, without divisions. In all of our heritages and faiths, we have moments in history not to be proud of. However, we need to be able to celebrate who we are now and what we are aspiring to. We must learn from but not judge on the past, nor succumb to fears driven by the behaviours or atrocities of a minority of individuals and groups that clearly do not represent what we right here and the majority subscribe to.

We are one mob and we all belong. As MPs let us lead the way by saying it is okay and acceptable to have differing beliefs, perspectives and opinions that respect and abide by the social contract we have with each other to live peacefully and safely, respecting our Queensland and Australian laws, legislation and regulations. Looking at our own rituals each morning is a progressive, positive step forward in this.

To finish, we all know these lyrics so well. In any translation, they say it all—

We are one, but we are many

...

We'll share a dream and sing with one voice

I am, you are, we are Australian

Townsville, Resources

 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (2.39 pm): Obviously I had some effect last week when I got up and yelled and screamed about Canberra not listening because, as we know, yesterday was April Fools' Day and I thought surely the LNP Morrison government would not try to fool Townsville by delivering the news yesterday. I heard a whisper they were going to drop the story of the ring-road to the *Townsville Bulletin*, as reported today. You know, Mr Deputy Speaker, that Townsville will not be taken

as fools. We have heard it before; just like with the Townsville stadium, the announcement was made at the eleventh hour. It is an act of pure political desperation by a government about to go to an election. Malcolm Turnbull did it at the 11th hour and 59th minute with the North Queensland stadium and, again, they did it at the eleventh hour with the channel widening at the Townsville port where we only got the co-funding.

I ask: why could they not have made the announcement in June last year when I got \$36 million for the Townsville Ring Road? Why have they waited until now to announce this funding? It has put a significant development, a half a billion dollar development, behind by a year; it is putting politics before people. We will not cop that in Townsville because we know that we need to create jobs. Now with the announcement of the Townsville Ring Road, that Riverstone residential development can get underway. It could have been started last year, but no, we will wait as the federal government plays politics with the people. They will not cop it and we will see that come the federal election. We will not be taken for fools in Townsville.

This is not good enough for Townsville. As I have said before, I have a record of delivering. Last week—it feels like just yesterday—I was here yelling and screaming about delivering \$7.6 million for Harvey Range Road and \$36 million for the Riverway Drive duplication, which is a catalyst for development. The Townsville Ring Road will be—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr HARPER: Did the member say police? I take that interjection—excellent—because we also have a record of delivering more police in Townsville. The legacy of the LNP under Sam Cox and the likes of the member for Broadwater left us with half a Rapid Action Patrol hub; it was half staffed with 20 officers. It took a Labor government member to go and fully fund that and deliver a further 20 officers. We got that done, and I am also just weeks away from opening a brand-new police facility in the Upper Ross with an additional 10 officers.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr HARPER: I take the member's interjection. We also have a commitment of 53 additional officers coming to Townsville. Only recently we saw an 18 per cent reduction in property offending and an 18 per cent reduction in stolen motor vehicles. We are getting on with the job of delivering more police for Townsville and making our community safe. We know we have more work to do, but we are doing a hell of a lot better job than the LNP did, whose only legacy was a failed boot camp and helicopter rides. All they had to show from that was increased recidivism. They could do a hell of a lot better because it is Labor governments that deliver for Townsville. We deliver on infrastructure, we deliver more nurses, we deliver more paramedics and we deliver more police. We are getting on with the job. They seriously have nothing. The LNP have nothing but a bad record of letting Townsville down. They are absolute fools.

We can talk about health cuts. Let's hope the \$20 million owed to the Townsville Hospital is mentioned in tonight's federal budget; \$300 million is owed to the people of Queensland for health. We are getting on with delivering more nurses.

Ms Bates: Sign the national partnership agreement.

Mr HARPER: The member for Mudgeeraba has a terrible legacy of cutting, sacking and selling. All she did was sack nurses. We are getting on with delivering. We are getting on with the job of putting more funding into our emergency departments. We are getting on with the job of funding our hospitals. I say to the Leader of the Opposition that she should pick up the phone and get the federal Morrison government to pay back the \$300 million owed to Queensland Health.

Braun, Dr W

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.45 pm): Last week I updated the House about a significant issue of public interest in the health system. I also tabled correspondence from the Royal Darwin Hospital in 2006 to the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons, which raised serious concerns including—

All permanent consultant surgeons and seniors in the Department of Anaesthetics and E.D. are sufficiently concerned about his behaviour as documented above to formally notify the Medical Board that he was possibly a danger to the public.

...

In particular it is his inability to show any insight into his own behaviour which makes him a potentially dangerous medical practitioner.

It is fair to say that we have been inundated with more and more issues about the conduct of Dr Braun from former and current patients as well as other doctors over many years. I am pleased that action from both Ramsay and Queensland Health in removing Dr Braun's clinical privileges while he is under investigation has finally happened. While it has taken far too long for something to be done, at least it seems these allegations are finally being taken seriously. It does, however, beg the question whether anyone within Queensland Health knew about these issues before I raised them in February.

Last week we were contacted by a former patient of Dr Braun who wants to remain anonymous. The patient did, however, provide documents, which I table for the benefit of all members and the public, about serious allegations raised against Dr Braun with the former minister for health Cameron Dick in 2017 and the current Minister for Health, Steven Miles, in 2018.

Tabled paper: Bundle of correspondence relating to complaints regarding Dr William Braun [500].

These complaints that were sent to ministers would also have been alerted to Queensland Health and yet, despite that, Dr Braun continued to practise medicine in Queensland and perform surgeries right up until the scandal broke in February this year. On 2 July last year the patient wrote to the current health minister to outline his frustrations about the continual bureaucratic buck-passing of his concerns. Once again, it highlights significant flaws in the system that has failed to protect patients.

When the former minister for health Lawrence Springborg introduced the Health Ombudsman Bill in June 2013 he said—

... on 16 April 2013, a public interest disclosure about the conduct, regulation, registration and discipline of medical practitioners in Queensland and three subsequent reports arising out of those initial allegations do not instil public confidence in the way in which complaints about health services and providers are managed in this state.

He went on to say that the Health Ombudsman's functions include dealing with systemic health service issues and receiving complaints and taking action to deal with them under the act. These sweeping changes were needed after systemic failures were missed in a number of cases—the most high profile being Patel. Key outcomes of the bill also included strengthening the way in which serious allegations against registered health practitioners are managed in Queensland and enabling immediate action to be taken to suspend or place conditions on registration where there is a serious risk to the public. In the case of Dr Braun, this did not happen.

Private hospital operators across the country need to ensure Dr Braun is not given any clinical privileges until all current investigations are finalised. I am calling on the Minister for Health to explain to Queenslanders what action he took in relation to complaints he had previously received about Dr Braun. In doing so, the minister needs to outline what action he is taking to ensure the Health Ombudsman is actually doing the job it was designed to do. He also should be ensuring that AHPRA is doing the job it is supposed to do. Its website includes examples that AHPRA can consider, including concerns that a practitioner is working or providing patient care in an unsafe way such as serious or repeated mistakes in carrying out procedures, in diagnosis or in prescribing medications for a patient; a failure to examine a patient properly or to respond reasonably to a patient's needs; and serious concerns about the practitioner's skill, knowledge or judgement in their profession. AHPRA can also look at concerns about the way a practitioner behaves, including acts of violence, sexual assault or indecency, or any other behaviour that is inconsistent with the practitioner being fit and proper to be a registered health practitioner.

Queenslanders deserve to have confidence in our public health system. By far the majority of health practitioners do the right thing, but we cannot let a few bad apples of the ilk of Dr Braun undermine confidence in the profession. The minister needs to stop putting politics ahead of patient care and do his job. The buck stops with this minister.

Townsville Electorate, Flood Recovery

 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (2.50 pm): I would like to update the House on Townsville's flood recovery, but I would like to kick off my speech by thanking each and every person who came along to the Premier's flood relief fundraiser on Thursday evening. If you came along, if you brought someone with you or if people from your communities attended, I thank you so much on behalf of all of us from North Queensland. I am sure I speak on behalf of the member for Thuringowa and the member for Mundingburra. From what the Premier has told us, over 550 people attended that event. It would have been great out on the Speaker's Green, but unfortunately due to the rain we had to move it inside. We were also told that over \$150,000 was raised from that event. Thank you, everyone. Thank you for your support. I would also like to give a shout-out to Spencer Jolly, who coordinated everything. Within 24 hours he had it all organised. It ran like clockwork until we got to the auction. We all wanted to talk rather than place bids, but it all went successfully on the night.

I would like to update the House on what is happening in Townsville, particularly when it comes to social housing. There were 163 public housing properties that were uninhabitable after the floods. I was in Hodel Street, which is in my electorate, with Minister de Brenni and the member for Thuringowa, and BAS were there working to repair units and properties. From what we saw the turnaround rate was absolutely phenomenal. Of the 163 public housing properties that were deemed uninhabitable as a result of the floods, every single one of those properties except one now has people back living in them. I think that is outstanding. It really shows the strength and commitment of BAS to ensure that people in public and social housing were able to get back into their homes. This is the thing we hear all the time. Everyone says to us, ‘The media shower of kindness was absolutely fantastic, but it has moved on to something else.’ We cannot be forgotten about. Each time I stand up in this House I will continue to talk about what is happening in Townsville and wholeheartedly thank everyone for the support they have given time and time again, particularly tradies. We will continue until the very last person is back in their home, Townsville is back on its feet and we are the great city we have always been.

I have some statistics: 3,299 properties were assessed by QFES, and of those 1,236 were deemed uninhabitable; 2,063 had minor damage; a billion dollars in insurance claims have been processed; 440 claims are now closed and 1,000 remain open. Some of those are in my own street. My neighbours are still getting their houses stripped out and work is being done on our streets. Probably one in three properties has residents in it, which is a bit tough when you see residents coming back and seeing their houses.

It is also great to see businesses reopen, particularly down in the most affected areas. We saw the images of the tiny flotilla down around Fairfield Central Shopping Centre. Whenever we have a Sunday morning off my wife and I go to Cafe Bambini—it is our favourite haunt—and they were absolutely inundated. Steve Law and Tara McDonald spoke to me when I was there, and they basically said that while they were not able to be open they continued to pay the wages of all their people. That is the commitment of small business back to their people. That is the strength of our community. I do not care what side of the chamber you are on, if that does not tear at your heartstrings about how good people in our communities are I don't know what will. This is what it is about. I give a big shout-out to Steve and Tara. They moved back in and their business is open again. Steve and Tara, we haven't got back there yet but we certainly will.

I also have an update from one of the big insurance companies. They received over 5,600 claims; 91 per cent of those claims have been assessed; \$78 million in home claims have been paid out already; 21 per cent of home claims have been finalised; more than 500 local trades, companies and suppliers are currently being sourced; 1,059 customers have been provided with temporary accommodation to date; \$52 million contents claims have been paid; and 99 per cent of motor claims have been assessed and completed. There were over 3,000 cars destroyed in that event.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 943, on motion of Mr Dick—

That the bill be now read a second time

 **Dr ROWAN** (Moggill—LNP) (2.55 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Everything that you need to know about the Palaszczuk Labor government's arrogant attitude towards governing in their own self-interest and not in the best interests of the people of Queensland and the constituents of the electorate of Moggill is contained right here in this bill. Let us look at just what it is this Labor government is really trying to achieve with respect to this legislation.

Under the guise of providing for ‘increased operational efficiency of legislation under the administration of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning’, this bill seeks to amend seven acts and repeal one, including elements to amend the Building Queensland Act 2015; amend the Economic Development Act 2012; amend the Planning Act 2016; amend the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016; amend the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011; amend the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985; amend the South Bank Corporation Act 1989; and repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004. In doing so, those opposite are proposing more than 230 clauses that are steeped in poor processes, reduced transparency, weakening of localised decision-making and, for reasons that continue to remain unexplained, an overextension of investigative and enforcement powers.

At the very heart of this bill is the continuation of Labor's efforts to consolidate their own power at the expense of local community decision-making, all the while failing abysmally to plan for and deliver local infrastructure and services. It has been the hallmark of the last four years of this Palaszczuk Labor government, and sadly it only looks set to continue into the future. In particular, it is outrageous in the extreme that this Labor government would seek to bring this bill to the House and deliberately fail to include a requirement for the minister to consult with, and attain the agreement of, each relevant local government area in planning or development in a priority development area, establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate all so they can sidestep local community development concerns. This is a recipe for disaster, and I predict it will only lead to further Labor induced frustration and heartache in my electorate of Moggill and across the broader western suburbs of Brisbane.

Under the Palaszczuk Labor government's watch, overdevelopment has become the norm. Local families and communities in the electorate of Moggill and surrounding areas continue to suffer while this Labor government fails to provide the necessary infrastructure to match such an increase in urban development. In the electorate of Moggill in particular such a failure will only mean: greater traffic congestion for local motorists, particularly on Moggill Road, the Western Freeway and the Centenary Motorway; insufficient access to bus and train services; ongoing lack of capacity in our local schools; and further pressure on already strained emergency services, including police, fire and ambulance stations.

Labor certainly has a failed South East Queensland Regional Plan. Without the matching infrastructure required to meet population growth, not only in my electorate of Moggill but more broadly across the western suburbs of Brisbane, this will lead to further traffic congestion. We need an integrated road and public transport plan which services not only my electorate of Moggill but more broadly the western suburbs of Brisbane. It will require the cooperation of all three levels of government to implement solutions that will ease traffic congestion on Moggill Road, which will ease traffic congestion on the Western Freeway and Centenary Motorway, which will deliver enhanced public transport services for people in many suburbs in my electorate of Moggill.

There is also failed planning by the state Labor government when it comes to high school capacity. Kenmore State High School certainly is suffering significant issues with respect to providing the necessary resources for students at that school. There is also a requirement for an additional high school to service residents particularly in the areas of Mount Crosby and Karana Downs. This requires adequate planning processes. When we are talking about urban population growth, there certainly needs to be matched infrastructure to service those populations.

In the eastern part of the adjacent electorate of Ipswich West we are seeing issues to do with the Warrego Highway-Mount Crosby interchange. There has not been an upgrade of that interchange. Interestingly enough, a petition tabled in the parliament by the member for Ipswich West and initiated by local resident Sandra Clarke—I have to congratulate her for doing this work on behalf of her local community—called for an upgrade to that interchange. With the volume of traffic there are serious safety concerns, particularly with respect to residents of my electorate and residents of Ipswich travelling through that interchange. Interestingly, an article in the *Queensland Times* of 31 March states—

A business case and formal submission will need to be submitted by the State Government before the Federal Government stumps up cash, Shayne Neumann believes.

Mr Neumann, the federal member for Blair, said—

The worst intersection on the Warrego Highway is the Mount Crosby interchange.

He also said—

The State Government hasn't put in a request. How about they actually put the plans in place, put the business case on the table.

Even the federal member for Blair, Shayne Neumann, believes this needs to be upgraded. He is calling on his own state colleagues to work together to ensure that is delivered. That is extremely important. I table the article for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Queensland Times*, dated 30 March 2019, titled 'Formal submission must be made before federal cash' [501].

Failing to adequately plan for such essential services and infrastructure has meant that this Labor government operates in a perpetual state of playing catch-up. Recently we have seen the consequences of Labor's health system—a system that is in crisis, that has had no fewer than 10 hospitals declaring that they had been at capacity, that has seen multiple code yellows being called and patients having to wait in emergency departments. Patients are not being serviced properly and

there are longer waiting lists. Clearly, when it comes to health this government is failing patients in Queensland, not only here in the south-east corner but also right across Queensland. It is failing on rural maternity services and on surgical wait times.

We have heard excuses peddled by the Premier and the health minister which were, frankly, pathetic and bordering on the farcical as to how this could have happened. I heard the Premier talk this morning about some of the issues to do with old medical doctor contracts. I can tell members: without industrial reform we will not get productivity and efficiency here in Queensland. That is certainly what many within the profession are saying.

We are seeing a failure by this Labor government to match infrastructure and services to ever-increasing development. That can only lead to one thing: a strain on services and infrastructure that is already in place and already under pressure.

Recently we also saw Labor playing catch-up in the western suburbs of Brisbane. This time it was the Premier and the transport minister—it must have been a light bulb moment for them both—announcing the calling of tenders for the design of a new Centenary Bridge at Jindalee after a single accident on that section of road that involved more than 20 vehicles, causing hours of traffic chaos across the western suburbs. To be frank, that announcement was more about diverting attention away from Labor's disastrous and failed infrastructure planning than about delivering real congestion-busting solutions for motorists and public transport users in the western suburbs of Brisbane.

There is no doubt that the LNP will always have plans to bust congestion in the western suburbs of Brisbane. We understand the importance of proper planning processes taking place whereby infrastructure will match urban development and population growth. We know that there are significant population increases in Springfield, in the electorates of Mount Ommaney, Moggill and Maiwar and more broadly in the western suburbs of Brisbane.

It should not have taken the recent terrible traffic incident on the Centenary Highway, as well as the traffic chaos on Moggill Road from a burst water main the following day, for this Labor government to suddenly realise that traffic congestion and proper transport planning are significant issues in the western suburbs of Brisbane.

Since I was first elected in 2015 I have consistently and repeatedly called on Labor to deliver an integrated road and public transport plan and solutions for the entire western suburbs of Brisbane to ease traffic congestion, and I will continue to do so. The passage of this bill only strengthens that call and highlights the need for such a plan, as Labor's relentless pursuit of reckless urban development at the expense of sufficient infrastructure and services only looks set to continue. I take this opportunity to call upon the state Labor government to start acting in the best interests of constituents in my electorate of Moggill and fund local infrastructure.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (3.05 pm): I rise to speak in favour of and to support the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I make that clear at the outset because, as we have heard so often in the contributions of those opposite—the member for Moggill just exemplified that—one would not know where those opposite really stand. All we heard was negativity from the member for Moggill, but I assume he will end up voting for this bill. One would have absolutely no real understanding of that, given the contribution the member for Moggill just made.

I congratulate the members of the committee for putting together another fantastic report, report No. 18. I congratulate all committee members on a cogent report. In fact, they did such a thorough job that they even found a minor typographical error. Quite clearly, this committee has done a very thorough job.

As the explanatory notes state, the objective of the bill is to provide for increased operational efficiency of legislation under the administration of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. The bill proposes to make a series of amendments to the Building Queensland Act 2015, the Economic Development Act 2012 and a range of related acts.

I just said that I thought the committee had done a really good, cogent job in relation to its report. I exclude the statement of reservation from that. This is where it gets really interesting. The member for Glass House used the words 'under the cover of darkness', and there is some really interesting rhetoric in the statement of reservation which I will address point by point shortly.

Honourable members would be really interested to note that normally statements of reservation are signed by all of the LNP opposition members of a committee. In this particular case, the statement of reservation is on the letterhead of the member for Condamine. I found that really interesting so I flicked over to see who signed the statement of reservation. The LNP members of this committee are

the member for Condamine, who is the deputy chair, and the members for Buderim and Bundaberg. Guess what? There is only one signature—that of the member for Condamine. The member for Bundaberg talked about a statement of reservation that he supported, but the members for Bundaberg and Buderim did not sign it so it is not their statement of reservation; it is the statement of reservation of the member for Condamine.

It made me wonder whether there is a pattern. I looked at the statement of reservation, because I was trying to get it clear in my mind which of the honourable members had what view in relation to this committee. The statement of reservation to the report on the fisheries amendment bill had only one signature—that of the member for Condamine. Where was the member for Buderim? He is not normally short of a word in this place. When it comes to giving his signature, I do not know what is going on with his signing hand. The pattern continues. The statement of reservation to the report on the vegetation management bill has one signature—that of the member for Condamine. I do not know what is going on amongst those opposite.

When members actually read this statement of reservation, I can understand why the member for Buderim did not sign it, to be honest, because it is some really poor words put together. The member for Condamine talks about saying one thing and doing another. The member for Condamine has clearly forgotten about the record of the Newman government. It came into office and sacked 14,000 people. Those opposite did not mention that.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McArdle): Member for Stretton, though your words might be of great joy to the House in general, I indicate to you that I fail to see the relevance of them to the long title of the bill. I ask you to try to make some connection between the two.

Mr PEGG: I can.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you very kindly.

Mr PEGG: Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker, and for your reference I was referring to the first line of paragraph 2 of the statement of reservation which I am sure you will have in front of you. I also draw your attention to paragraph 3 of the statement of reservation where there is a reference to 'reduction in transparency'. For the member for Condamine, who is a member of a party whose track record in government was nobbling the CCC, to talk about reduction of transparency—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, again I will bring you back to the long title of the bill. I accept the word 'transparency'. Please relate that to the long title of the bill.

Mr PEGG: Thank you for your direction, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is not a very long statement of reservation, by the way, and I am down to the second last paragraph on page 1. Can I take you to that, Mr Deputy Speaker?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, I will control the House and you control what you say, and we will get on famously.

Mr PEGG: Again in terms of the theme of this statement of reservation, he talks about the consolidation of power in decision-making. Surely he is talking about the previous government.

Finally, to finish off, the first paragraph on page 2 of the member for Condamine's statement of reservation—his second and final page—states—

Hidden within the 224 pages of the Bill are some of the most concerning amendments that seek to provide substantial increases in the powers of investigation ...

He goes on to say that 224 pages is not overly extensive. I do not know what kind of argument the member for Condamine is possibly trying to make. After reading this entire statement of reservation, in the last paragraph the member for Condamine goes on to finally say that the LNP does not oppose this bill. I will start where I finished: I am completely confused by the contributions of those opposite. They are saying one thing and doing another. I commend the bill to the House.

Mrs MILLER (Bundamba—ALP) (3.11 pm): I rise in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and bring to the attention of the House an audit report, which I will table in a minute. It is an audit report titled *Ipswich City Council—Ipswich City Properties Pty Ltd: Ipswich CBD redevelopment—cost analysis* which was undertaken by McGrathNicol dated 25 March 2019. I table this for the benefit of the House because this is a lesson in how not to plan and undertake economic development in any city because Ipswich City Properties was an economic disaster for the people of Ipswich.

Tabled paper: McGrathNicol report, dated 25 March 2019, titled 'Ipswich City Council-Ipswich City Properties Pty Ltd: Ipswich CBD redevelopment—cost analysis' [502].

I say that because in spite of the fact that our Labor state government back then between 2009 and 2012 tried to do the right thing—or it was talked into doing the right thing—it also was part of the mess, because I can remember that there was a community cabinet meeting at Ipswich. Ken Smith, who was then the director-general of the Premier's department, was asked to brief Wayne Wendt and me on what was about to happen—that is, approval for the state government to get involved with the redevelopment of the Ipswich CBD. I can remember it like it was yesterday. It is like one of those snapshots that you keep in your head because it was so outlandish at the time. We were told that the council was going to be allowed to buy the Ipswich CBD and it was going to be allowed to borrow, I think it was, \$50 million through the QTC. We were told that it was all going to be redeveloped, that everything was going to be wonderful and that the Ipswich CBD would come back to its glory. What we have instead is a \$78 million loss. One wonders how that could occur. The *Queensland Times* last week reported—

No action will be taken against the directors of Ipswich City Properties who oversaw a \$78 million loss in the city's botched CBD development.

As I understand it from Greg Chemello, the administrator of Ipswich City Council, the CCC, ASIC and the Queensland Audit Office have all been made aware of this shocking maladministration and incompetence, but it is up to them whether any action is to be taken and, as I understand it, all of the directors are going to get away with it scot-free. How disgraceful is that! The directors were Paul Tully, Paul Pisasale, Andrew Antonioli, Wayne Wendt, Jim Lindsay, who was a staffer, Andrew Roach and Daniel Best, who were staffers as well. I know what you are going to say, Mr Deputy Speaker McArdle; I am aware. What I am trying to get to here is that sometimes in the name of economic development things can get right out of hand if the wrong people are in those directors' positions. They used and abused the money that was loaned to them, quite genuinely by QTC. They spun around the world in private jets only to leave our city with a \$78 million loss. I say to every MP here, including those sitting around the cabinet table, because some of them sat around the cabinet table back then, that you always have to be very careful of what you do in the name of so-called economic development. It was a lesson that everyone in this House should be aware of. The idea that local governments should go into the private sector and buy up shopping centres is wrong. It was wrong then and it is wrong now and I advised Ken Smith that it was wrong and I would never, ever support it. It was a big mistake.

What has become of the economic development of the Ipswich CBD? The administrator, who I believe is doing a good job, and the people of Ipswich want a revival, but it has lost its heart and soul. It is as simple as that. My prediction is that the Ipswich CBD will no longer be a CBD—a central business district. It is going to morph into an IHD—an Ipswich Hospital district. With little else going for the centre of Ipswich and the hospital's plans to grow, that is what I believe will happen and it will be a great shame, because every city needs to have a CBD. Due to very poor policy decisions, this is what I think will happen. By concentrating the hospital and health services in that location, one might be able to argue in some way that it might be economic development, but it is not. It is actually health development. It will be a great disservice to the community, particularly those whom I represent down the eastern suburbs, to have all of the hospital and health services conglomeration in that Ipswich CBD area. We want an emergency department at the Mater Hospital in Springfield just like they have at Ipswich's St Andrew's. We would also like to have that bulk-billed, particularly after-hours. That would be a good service.

In relation to economic development, the announcement that Claypave was going into receivership was a great shock in my community because many people—in fact, most people in Ipswich—have Claypave pavers somewhere in their gardens. This company going into receivership was not because, in my view, Claypave was not a good business. It was innovative in terms of its range and its cost awareness. It also sold many pavers overseas, particularly to Japan. It was a very good and much loved local business in our area. I must pass on the sentiments of the people of Ebbw Vale, because Claypave had a secret garden in Ebbw Vale where we used to have an annual barbecue. It was a place where people could plant a tree for their loved ones of Ebbw Vale after they had passed away and also to have plaques in that site. I know that State Development has contacted the Claypave company. As I have said before, we are going to walk the walk with everyone at Claypave.

In conclusion, I would like to say that my local area needs a lot of infrastructure. I call on Prime Minister Scott Morrison to do the right thing by my electorate and the people of Ipswich in the name of economic development. We need Queen Street, Goodna to be upgraded. At the moment, it is taking 20 to 30 minutes to get from Goodna Special School down Queen Street to the Ipswich Motorway turn-off. Who would ever have thought that? I can tell members why. Over the years, the council has approved willy-nilly all of these subdivisions without upgrading that road and that is now having an impact on everybody.

Every morning and afternoon the Centenary Highway is a car park. It is a shocker. It needs to be upgraded. More and more people are travelling along that highway from five o'clock in the morning. No matter what time people drive on there from 5.30 am until about 9 am, that highway is a car park. There also needs to be an upgrade of the interchange on Centenary Highway at the Logan Motorway. That needs to be upgraded urgently. The big one we want is the expansion of the railway through to Redbank Plains, Ripley and Ipswich. I do not care whether the funding comes tied or not tied, I just want that to happen, because we need to get the cars off the road. In terms of economic development, I think that would be just great.

Costco is going to be opening—we hope—very soon in Bundamba. Rheinmetall has started work on construction and it will be coming into my area. There may be fewer cattle coming to the meatworks, so in that regard there might be a few employment issues. Australia Post is also coming into Redbank. I call on all of these companies that are coming into the Redbank peninsula area, which is a hotbed of economic development, to stop using the local roads of my electorate with their B-doubles and trucks, because it is driving my constituents crazy. I say to them to get out on the motorway, which is where they are supposed to be, and do not skittle my people.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (3.21 pm): I rise to speak briefly to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill aims to make a number of amendments to various acts. It has impacts on legislation relating to building, bodies corporate, local government, the environment, housing, liquor, exhibited animals, water distribution and retail restructuring, neighbourhood disputes, biosecurity, coastal protection and management and valuation.

This bill typifies the Labor government's approach to governing. It shows the insincerity of this government in how it administers this state by ramming amendments to eight different acts into one omnibus bill. The Labor government's form of governing seems to be about how many changes can be shoved through with little accountability and transparency. This bill is yet another in a long list of bills that are criticised by the Queensland Law Society. This bill highlights the lip-service that the government pays to local decision-making, to scrutiny, to accountability, transparency, and true and honest consultation.

In relation to this bill Greg Hallam, of the Local Government Association of Queensland, wrote—

At a time when the community is acutely aware of the need for transparency and accountability in government decision making, this Bill strikes a worrying chord.

He stated further—

... all levels of government need to ensure that community trust is always front of mind.

It is clear that the government is more interested in media spin than a real commitment to transparency and accountability. In some of the amendments the government, once again, ignores the concerns, wishes and rights of local communities. This government follows a long tradition of previous Labor governments that have a history of ignoring the input of local communities, especially in the regions.

In direct contrast to assurances from this government and the Premier of their commitment to open and accountable government, this bill will further water down the transparency and accountability of Building Queensland. Reporting requirements for Building Queensland will be halved. That means that it will become harder for communities such as Gympie to hold this government to account on the infrastructure delivery times that have been promised. It is not as if the current system is reliable. Already, it is commonplace for Building Queensland to constantly change the format of pipeline reports, making longitudinal comparisons difficult. Halving the frequency of the publication of pipeline reports will clearly reduce transparency and make it harder for local communities to track delivery dates. It will decrease the ability of local communities to hold the government to account and further restrict local decision-making. The government is attempting to draw a curtain across accountability and answerability to local communities.

In its submission the LGAQ stated that it is—

... concerned this legislation further erodes the ability of councils and their communities to have a say in the size, shape and pace of development in their region.

That should concern everyone. The government should not undermine or negate the importance of the role of a local government to provide and drive the vision for its region because, as the LGAQ further submits—

Councils are the level of government closest to community and best placed to understand their aspirations. Ensuring that a genuine open partnership exists between the State and Councils when making decisions on priority development, should be paramount if the communities needs are to be met.

As a former Gympie regional councillor and deputy mayor, it is clear to me that successive Labor governments have a problem with the role of local government. This government is no different. Local government should drive their region's vision for the size, shape and pace of development of that region.

In an address to Gympie regional councillors last month, I highlighted to them the urgent imperative to update the GRC's soon-to-expire economic development strategy as it provides the blueprint and vision for our region. If it is to be used properly as the foundation for infrastructure and funding allocations, that strategy needs to be current. The Gympie region not only has businesses either struggling or shutting up shop but also has to cope with the systemic problems of low average weekly earnings and high unemployment, including youth unemployment. Every dollar spent, every plan, every strategy should not be an ad hoc, or piecemeal solution; it should be relevant to growing the region and creating new opportunities. This government should not be putting handbrakes on local industries with increased red and green bureaucratic tape that does nothing more than make it harder for businesses to value-add, borrow, invest, grow and create new jobs.

This legislation highlights the Labor government's addiction to centralised control. We are now into the fifth year of this government consolidating power at the expense of local decision-making. Clauses 22 and 23 of the bill demonstrate a direct dilution of localised decision-making. In these two clauses, the government proposes to remove the overriding economic or community need test and the requirement for provisional priority development areas and provisional land use plans to not compromise the implementation of planning instruments. To compound the issue, there is no requirement for the minister to consult with and obtain the agreement of a relevant local government in planning for, or developing a PDA, establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate. With this government's history, there is no other conclusion than that this amendment is a deliberate attempt to circumvent local community concerns about development.

This government has an addiction to increasing investigative and enforcement powers for departmental officers—powers that are not available to even police without a warrant. We have seen this addiction to increase powers over and above those secured with a police warrant already being given to departmental officers in changes to fisheries laws and vegetation management laws. Now those increased powers are being given to planning officers. The government has provided no justification as to why these increased powers are either necessary or how they are in the public interest. Powers for inspectors to enter premises, stop vehicles, seize and dispose of information are regressive and significant. They should be granted only in the most serious of cases and not given as a matter of course. Although the LNP does not oppose this bill, it has serious reservations about the real agenda of this government to ignore the concerns, wishes and rights of local Queensland communities.

 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (3.28 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The bill proposes several amendments to the Building Queensland Act 2015 to improve the operation of Building Queensland, which is an independent statutory authority. Through its act, Building Queensland is responsible for preparing robust business cases to inform investment decisions and for developing a pipeline of infrastructure proposals that it considers to be priorities for the state. In delivering on those responsibilities, Building Queensland works with Queensland government agencies, government owned corporations and nominated statutory authorities. Building Queensland was established as a statutory body in 2015. As with many newly established bodies, the government decided that there should be a review of Building Queensland's operations after 12 months to ensure that it was being effective.

A national infrastructure advisory firm, E3 Advisory, was appointed to conduct the review and the report was completed in May 2017. The review considered Building Queensland's functions and activities, its compliance with legislative requirements and its governance arrangements. The review report stated that Building Queensland has been effective and that improvements could be made. The findings suggested a more strategic approach to deciding which business cases are led by Building Queensland. The findings also recommended the frequency of full updates to the Infrastructure Pipeline Report. Other recommendations included operational matters, such as board proxies.

The report and recommendations were carefully considered by the government and Building Queensland, including the Building Queensland board. On 6 August 2018, the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning published both the report and the Queensland government's response to the report's recommendations on its website. All eight recommendations are supported or supported in principle. Most of the recommendations have already been implemented or are in the process of being implemented. The amendments to the Building Queensland Act in this bill are primarily to implement the outcomes of the review.

The first amendment changes the thresholds determining which business cases are led by Building Queensland through removing high-cost but low-risk road infrastructure proposals. In practice, this will mean some road transport projects will be led by the Department of Transport and Main Roads instead of Building Queensland. Road transport infrastructure projects frequently have a high capital cost even when the business case has a low risk and less complexity. Excluding road transport projects up to a higher threshold of \$500 million from Building Queensland's lead role would mean that, for example, several projects which are part of the Bruce Highway Upgrade Program would fall into Building Queensland's assist role instead. If the business case is considered complicated, it can still be led by Building Queensland. The minister responsible for the Building Queensland Act still has the power to issue a direction to Building Queensland which requires them to lead the preparation of a business case for a particular infrastructure proposal.

The second amendment to the Building Queensland Act proposes to change the frequency of the report's publication from bi-annual to annual. This aligns it with the state budget process and ensures the report captures budget announcements. Currently, the administrative effort for both Building Queensland and delivery agencies to develop a full update to the Infrastructure Pipeline Report every six months is significant.

The third amendment is regarding government board members who are members by virtue of their position within the government. This amendment makes it clear that any nomination of a proxy does not need to be a permanent nomination and the government board member may nominate the proxy for any period of time, including a single meeting. A further complementary amendment steps up the monetary value for the business case thresholds so that they increase by 10 per cent every five years. While it was not a recommendation of the E3 Advisory report, this will ensure that the monetary values keep pace with the producer price indexes for building roads and bridges in Queensland and for other heavy and civil engineering construction in Australia. The amendments proposed to the Building Queensland Act will assist Building Queensland to continue to develop robust business cases and provide a high level of independent advice to government.

I make reference to comments made by the member for Glass House in relation to the youth foyer in Aitkenvale. I can assure the member that the member for Mundingburra has met with neighbours and listened to every single one of them and did not leave until she had spoken with everyone and heard each of their concerns. Targeted consultation programs started on 12 March. There was a four-week consultation program to hear directly from residents. There have been 161 visits to the community engagement website. Fifteen people have directly contacted the project team for an appointment. There have been 359 petition letters sent. Forty-two neighbours did not sign the petition. Two hundred and forty-one petitioners were from the local area, 73 were from neighbouring suburbs and 200 were from broader Townsville regions. The consultation and engagement website has been open for two weeks and I encourage anyone in the Townsville area who might be concerned about this to register for a face-to-face meeting with the project team. They can do that through www.yoursayhpw.engagementhq.com/townsville-youth-foyer.

The member for Glass House comes into this House and makes some really bold statements about the Palaszczuk government not listening when, in fact, we do the absolute opposite: we listen to the people of Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (3.34 pm): In rising to talk to the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 I found myself reflecting upon the first South-East Queensland regional plan and the discussion around its implementation and subsequent amendments. I reflected on how important it was to get it right in respect to planning, particularly in South-East Queensland where there is tremendous pressure through population growth. Accompanying that discussion at the time, and ever since, about the plan to cater for growth was the need to cater for it effectively with the right infrastructure. There was supposed to be accompanying infrastructure plans that provided a pipeline of works so that we did not just have a land based planning document that indicated where the growth would go and the timing per se of that growth, but there would be the infrastructure to not only enable but also ensure that all the planning principles were not blown out of the water.

That was great in theory. Tragically, it is not what has happened. We have seen a high-growth planning model with a complete failure in relation to accompanying infrastructure that is needed, such as roads, hospitals, schools and in particular public transport. In the first term of this state Labor government we saw this taken to another low, with \$9 billion cut out of the infrastructure budget compared to previous years. That is \$9 billion, or \$3 billion a year, at a time when there was high

population growth still occurring in Queensland, in particular in South-East Queensland. This incredible cut to the infrastructure budget has had a direct impact upon the congestion that we see on our roads today, the failure in our public transport systems, with rail not being upgraded to meet the needs of those communities or busways where they need to be, and the failure to see planning enabled with the right infrastructure. I need to call it out in this debate. We all support economic development and good planning, but it is a farce unless it is accompanied by action. There has been a complete failure of timely action to meet the needs of our state with the planning instruments and all the best intentions and policy documents that come forth in the name of economic development.

Recently we saw criticism from engineers in regard to how this state government threw all its eggs in one basket with its commitment to Cross River Rail. It said it could fund it without anybody else, it could gung-ho go it alone, even though indications were that the business case was showing that this particular piece of infrastructure in this format was not needed in the time frame that the government had committed itself to. There are many worthy infrastructure projects that can deliver more effective outcomes prior to needing a cross river rail of this magnitude. There are many other infrastructure mechanisms that have been identified by learned engineers to get more efficiency out of the existing rail networks. Today we heard the transport minister announce some more peak hour services, but it does not go anywhere near putting train services back to the level that they were a few years ago. Those opposite have chopped nearly 470-plus weekly services from the rail network. They have thrown back a few, but they are still in deficit. The point I am making is that we need the right infrastructure but we also need competent government to ensure the maximum use of the infrastructure. A prime example is the rail fail that we have seen.

I want to see the upgrade to the Sunshine Coast rail line, one that was supposed to start after the 2009 election when Anna Bligh, prior to that election, promised that it was going to happen. Cynically, after the 2009 election, despite the fact that the contractors who had worked on the previous section were fully expecting from the industry briefings that the contracts were to go out for the next stage, that was ripped up and they had to pull the workers off the site because there was no other contract to be let for the work that had already been commenced with the planning to enable the next section of the Sunshine Coast rail line upgrade.

Also, it is quite clear that you can duplicate the rail line to the Sunshine Coast before you need to build the Cross River Rail solution that has been mooted. It is a complete fallacy of this government that is used as an excuse to deny the need for this project today. It is amazing what they built in the 1880s, but it is still an 1880s alignment through those pinch points on the Sunshine Coast. This Labor government thinks that is good enough. That is not smart, it is not good planning and it certainly does not support economic development. We now have a situation between the Sunshine Coast and Brisbane—a population of 350,000 on the Sunshine Coast and another 390,000 with the Moreton Bay regional shire; that is a substantial cohort of people largely north of the Pine Rivers bridge on the north side of Brisbane—where we do not have a rail system north of Brisbane providing for that growth. Growth has to be supported by appropriate infrastructure or else all the planning documents in the world fail.

I am concerned with the state Labor government's commitment to high levels of growth in their planning without it being matched by the appropriate infrastructure. The state is still playing catch-up to that \$9 billion cut in this state Labor government's first term of government. It is hurting all of Queensland. We hear from our colleagues from the vast areas of the state where water infrastructure needs to be invested in, where roads need to be invested in and where the enabling infrastructure to support economic growth throughout the regions is simply not getting timely investment from the state government, which likes to blame other people. The figures clearly show that with their own investment in infrastructure they have dropped the ball. It is their responsibility to drive the delivery of these projects in Queensland.

There are a number of issues raised about PDAs. I have the Maroochydore PDA in the heart of the Sunshine Coast. This is a project that I want to see succeed. It has commenced. It was started by local governments previous to the one currently in charge. There is a significant commitment of ratepayers' money to that project, and we want to see it succeed. I am very keen for the council to ensure that debt gets off their books and they can get on with the business of meeting the needs of the Sunshine Coast, but it is an important project that is underway in the middle of my area. We also want to see that enhanced with infrastructure such as a Sunshine Coast arts and exhibition convention centre, which would be not just a jewel in the crown but also much needed infrastructure to enable a deepening of our economic base. Everywhere in Queensland is doing it tough in respect of the retail

sector, but retail, tourism and construction continue to be major parts of our local economy. We want to see a deepening of that economy with other industries that can not only value-add but also see an evening out of the economic cycle that can be pervasive in some of those particular industries.

A convention centre as infrastructure is so important as it gives the tourism industry a facility that provides an opportunity to tap into markets outside of those peak holiday times, to bring more dollars into the region and to provide more certainty for the businesses that want to set up in our wonderful area. The heart of Maroochydore is the place for that particular infrastructure as it is the only regional centre in Australia that does not have a proper convention centre of this type.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (3.44 pm): I find it absolutely astounding that the member for Maroochydore rose in this place today to talk about this government not investing in infrastructure. In terms of those opposite, just ask Mayor Margaret Strelow about the zero dollars Rockhampton Regional Council received through the LNP's Royalties for the Regions program. Should I call it perhaps the LNP's slush fund? Zero dollars were invested in the Rockhampton Regional Council through Royalties for the Regions in the entirety of the LNP's term in government. We on this side of the House are invested in building infrastructure in Queensland, and we put our money where our mouth is.

I should also turn to the contribution of the member for Glass House. I am reminded of his own goal a few weeks ago when he moved a disallowance motion about the Oxley PDA, a motion that was a spectacular and transparent attack by the LNP on a first-term Labor member, my good friend the member for Mount Ommaney. The member for Glass House—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McArdle): Member for Keppel, I am finding it hard to relate your current comments to the long title of the bill. Could we try to bring it back in some manner to the long title of the bill, please?

Mrs LAUGA: I am referring, of course, to the spectacular and transparent attack that occurred as a result of a PDA proposal in the member for Mount Ommaney's electorate. Of course, we are here talking about priority development areas. In this particular PDA there was an incredibly dodgy online petition that extraordinarily underestimated the hard work of the member for Mount Ommaney, Jess Pugh, and so many in her community. The Mount Ommaney community has put him well and truly in his place.

The Planning Act 2016, which commenced on 3 July 2017, provides a framework for land use, planning and development assessment across the state. This framework balances economic development, the environment and the wellbeing of our communities in an effective, efficient and transparent way. The Planning Act has been in place for some 18 months now and stakeholders have identified operational matters which the bill proposes to address. As a proud member of the Planning Institute of Australia, I have had a number of colleagues in the PIA raise these operational matters with me as well. I am pleased that today we are addressing a number of those operational matters and fixing the bill. The government has listened to what industry, councils and the community have to say, and this bill demonstrates this government's commitment to continuous improvement of the planning framework. Planning frameworks, we know from experience, do need continuous improvement because things are ever changing. Technology plays an integral role in our planning system. As technology improves, so too do we need to continuously improve our planning framework.

A key concern raised by stakeholders is the current requirement whereby a submitter who chooses to appeal a development decision must notify every other submitter in the appeal. In practice there can be hundreds, if not thousands, of submitters with respect to an application, so the requirement for the submitter appellant to notify every other submitter is causing uncertainty and delays in court proceedings. The bill removes this requirement and in doing so removes the unnecessary administrative burden and also the cost on submitter appellants during the appeals process. The bill does not change any rights to initiate an appeal or join an appeal in the Planning and Environment Court. Similarly, this government recognises the importance of ensuring legislation enables the appropriate use of technology as expected in contemporary business practices.

The bill provides that, as part of an exchange of documents between two parties under the Planning Act, information and documents can be viewed and downloaded electronically. For example, a council may receive thousands of submissions in response to a development application. The amendment in the bill would allow the council to save time and money by providing this information

online instead of potentially sending reams of paper to each submitter. It is just crazy that that would need to happen, so this bill fixes these provisions and essentially says that the submitter would still be informed about council's decision and have access to relevant documentation. If a submitter prefers to receive a card copy of the documentation, a request can of course be made to the council.

Finally, the bill addresses uncertainty about the infrastructure charges framework by responding to recent concerns about the validity of certain infrastructure charges notices. Infrastructure charges are used by councils to contribute to new and upgraded essential infrastructure required to service our growing towns and neighbourhoods. It is routine for councils to issue infrastructure charges notices to developers if the development is a type that incurs a charge under council's publicly available infrastructure charges resolution.

To levy a charge the council must give an infrastructure charges notice to the applicant. Information regarding levied charges are publicly available in a council's infrastructure charges register. Infrastructure charges are not calculated on the whim of council. The Planning Act clearly sets out the specific methods for calculating charges and any related offsets and refunds. The Planning Act also provides the ability to seek a negotiated infrastructure charges notice and dispute resolution processes. The proposed amendment to the Planning Act will validate infrastructure charges notices issued under the former Sustainable Planning Act 2019, but only to the extent the notice did not provide reasons.

Communities need to be assured that the essential infrastructure they expect is delivered. Communities also need to be assured that their rates are not being used by councils to defend court actions by developers seeking to have their charges notices declared invalid or recoup charges already paid. It is important to recognise this amendment has the broad support of councils, developers and other industry stakeholders, like the Planning Institute of Australia. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (3.50 pm): I rise to speak on the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I want to address some serious concerns we in the electorate of Burnett have, especially around economic development or should I say the lack thereof. Firstly, I refer to the government's political games being played around the Hinkler regional deal. Can members believe that after years of negotiation and consultation the state minister responsible did not even turn up to the signing. It was at around the same time as the city deals were signed in Brisbane. This is an extraordinary example of political arrogance and contempt. City deals got signed in Brisbane, but there is nothing for the regions.

For years this project was discussed. Everyone knew the geographical area incorporated in the proposal and our communities understood that a quarter of a billion dollars was on the table for the region—an important economic driver—if all three levels of government worked together. Sadly, this Labor government stops at nothing to attempt to gain political favour and advantage at the expense of the people in our region.

I know the poor old member for the area is not in the chamber, but he got on board calling it a dud deal and saying he was left out. The member for Maryborough's electorate includes the areas of Burrum Heads, Toogoom, Howard, Torbanlea, Aldershot, Nikenbah, which are all within the regional deal geographic boundary. This regional deal that is not being supported by the member even has an extension of Urraween Road from where it stops currently. This is another project that would help the member for Maryborough's electorate. His electorate is being let down.

The Fraser Coast Regional Council has signed up and is working on the economic benefits, that will benefit the entire region—the good people of Hervey Bay and Maryborough—but Labor would prefer to exploit their arrogance and majority in this place. The Bundaberg Regional Council has signed up and is getting on with the job. Let us not forget that this Labor government can pork-barrel the seat of Maryborough with hundreds of millions of dollars, but cannot step up with a \$200 million transformational project designed at regional development. Nasty political games are being played.

Let us talk about economic development in the region. Thank God for the federal coalition government. It is doing the heavy lifting with local government. There is \$19 million for Bundaberg Brewed Drinks to create an extra 200 jobs; \$4.68 million for Macadamias Australia for their processing plant and tourism expansion; \$7.4 million for IWC health service's new building providing capacity for all, including Indigenous Queenslanders; \$1.5 million for Austchilli for their new facility; \$3.75 million for stage 2 of the Mon Repos Turtle Centre; \$8 million this financial year for financial assistance grants; \$2.9 million for the Burnett Heads town centre redevelopment; \$6 million for the Pacific Tug marine industry precinct—this is another project that is being stalled by this government; people want to get on with the job in the state development area at the port, but nothing is happening—\$14.9 million for the

roadworks at Apple Tree Creek; \$19 million for the Regional Growth Fund; \$23 million for the Building Better Regions Fund; \$9.65 million in regional jobs and investment; and \$2.5 million for Isis Central Sugar Mill's rail expansion.

There are many more projects that have resulted from the federal coalition's good advocacy and good government. I thank Keith Pitt for continuing to fight against the failures and funding shortfalls of the state Labor government. The minister has acknowledged that in the planning rules he has significant responsibilities, including the rarely used reserve call-in powers. This response is important to the future of my region. I would like to provide examples of the possible consequences if we get this wrong. If the minister's call-in determination is that the Jewel development should be constructed to no higher than five storeys, it will not go ahead.

Mr DICK: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Burnett has had a pretty good go about matters, including the glorious reign of Keith Pitt. It has nothing to do with the long title of the bill. Now he is moving on to a call-in which is not relevant in any way, shape or form to the long title. I would ask you to refer him back to the long title.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McArdle): Member, I caution you to stay within the long title of the bill. You are straying, shall we say, upon the bounds of the common sense of the language.

Mr BENNETT: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. I am referring to the call-in powers because the minister administers the Planning Act. The local planning rules come under the Planning Act which is to be amended in the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

An opposition member: There's quite a few things.

Mr BENNETT: That is right. Omnibus bills give us a fair bit of latitude. Thank you for the interjection. I hope I am on safe ground talking about town planning issues and the act administered by the minister. I remind the House that issues around town planning and the rules around the minister's call-in powers could have a detrimental effect on my region. There are future opportunities for economic development at Burnett Heads, Moore Park Beach and Woodgate Beach. A current application before the council, which is affected by this bill, sees a five- to 10-storey development as an option. If there is a negative decision around the Jewel development we could see the Burnett Heads marina development project shelved and investors and developers go elsewhere. The project was repeatedly advised that there was no state interest. We ask for sensible consideration.

Our community has fought for decades for investment and opportunity that is now becoming a reality. This call-in decision is pivotal to our future. It is confusing to many to see such an opportunity being determined by an external influence when our elected council shares a vision and passion for planning and economic development.

In terms of the amendments to the planning scheme for Burnett Heads, we would remind the minister that in his role as the state planning minister that that town plan has been through seven years of consultation and we need progress. Talking about the Esplanade, the Jewel development and other tangible development opportunities leads me to state development areas, which are part of bill, and in particular the state development area for the Bundaberg port. The reason I raise this is that there has not been one sod turned over the years in this priority development area.

Mr DICK: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. There is nothing in the bill that is relevant to state development areas. This is just a tour of the globe by the member for Burnett. He is from a party that complains about not having enough time to talk about bills and does not talk about it. It is entirely irrelevant. I would ask you to refer the gentleman back to the long title of the bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Again, member, I do ask that you constrain your comments to the long title of the bill. The particular purposes are stated in the long title. Please constrain your language to that.

Mr BENNETT: In the development area not a sod has been turned. We now have a federal government putting in a conveyor. As per the state of the regions report, the Wide Bay is the most disadvantaged region in Australia. We ask for more assistance not hindrance from government at any level. I need to acknowledge the member for Toowoomba North who was desperate to talk on this bill and the Toowoomba rail yard project—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member has the call.

Mr BENNETT: In conclusion, it is important that we talk about economic development and planning issues and the future of our great state. Quite frankly, the only one doing the heavy lifting in my electorate is the federal government and our local government.

 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (3.58 pm): I rise to support the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. In particular, I would like to focus my contributions on the proposed amendments to the Economic Development Act 2012 and how they affect priority development areas. I do have a particular interest in this, as there is a declared PDA within my electorate of Jordan—the Greater Flagstone Priority Development Area.

The review of the Economic Development Act 2012 has been timely and in response to a number of operational issues that affect the ability of Economic Development Queensland to deliver the government's objectives. Some of these issues relate to current processes for declaring PDAs, preparing and updating development schemes to assess development and the process for changing the boundaries of PDAs.

The bill also includes amendments to allow more than one plan to be made for different parts of a PDA. This flexibility is particularly important for those PDAs that are complex or may cover more than one site such as Greater Flagstone. The amendments also seek to align ED Act processes with some of the planning and development assessment reforms that were achieved with the new Planning Act which commenced in July 2017. These amendments will update processes in the ED Act and allow both local governments, with delegated development assessment powers, as well as the development industry to operate more efficiently both inside and outside PDAs.

These are not simple development applications. The Greater Flagstone PDA, declared in 2010, covers a total area of 7,188 hectares and once fully developed will provide approximately 50,000 dwellings to house a population of up to 120,000 people. We know that it will be absolutely necessary, with approximately 75,000 new residents expected to call South-East Queensland home each year as the region's population grows from 3.5 million to 5.3 million over the next 25 years. Projections indicate that this will result in more than 30,000 new dwellings every year and the creation of about one million new jobs.

The Greater Flagstone PDA is complex, involving approximately eight to nine different developers or landholders, a local government, numerous state government departments with interests and an existing community that will see significant change over the next 20 to 25 years. Economic Development Queensland is overseeing the delivery of key infrastructure such as water, sewerage and roads; emerging services including public transport, new schools and health services; and social infrastructure in the form of community development. I, for one, am very pleased to see EDQ overseeing this work. I do not believe it is fair or feasible to expect local government to take on this complex role which is why we need state planning in the form of PDAs.

It must be said that, despite a rough start, EDQ and the Logan City Council are now working closely together on the Greater Flagstone PDA, and the council has even committed resources in the form of specific place managers for both the Greater Flagstone PDA and the Yarrabilba PDA to provide even better coordination from the council's perspective. Logan City Council should be commended for this and for understanding the importance that these PDAs play in the future of Logan.

It was interesting to read the committee report on this bill and the statement of reservation from the deputy chair that this bill further restricts localised decision-making. The truth is that we have seen some fairly ordinary localised planning decisions. The original Flagstone estate, approved by the former Beaudesert shire council, is an example of development approved out of sequence, without due regard for any infrastructure or services. These irresponsible approvals have been repeated in many areas of South-East Queensland—usually by local governments who were struggling financially and believed that approving out-of-sequence development was the meal ticket to an increased rate base.

I speak to residents in Flagstone who tell me that they were promised infrastructure 20 years ago when they first settled in the area. It was cruel to do this to people—to promise things council was never going to deliver. The Greater Flagstone PDA, and the approved development scheme, sets a proper plan in place that will enforce critical infrastructure and services in these areas—like upgrades to roads, public transport, new schools and health services.

Importantly, infrastructure charges collected from new developments within the PDA will remain in the PDA and be used to pay for much of this infrastructure—again, something that does not always happen in localised decision-making. This will be done in line with population growth, not out of sequence. EDQ and its officers are experienced in managing this work, and these amendments that

are being proposed to the Economic Development Act will allow them to continue this important work under a streamlined planning and development assessment framework. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (4.02 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 and report No. 18 of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee. I will say at the outset that, although we on this side do not oppose the bill in its entirety, we have reservations around the preparation of infrastructure pipeline documents and the watering down of community consultation and we have concerns with the increased powers for inspectors, as does the committee, at recommendation 4. Recommendation 4 states—

The committee recommends that during the second reading speech the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning clarify the powers for investigation and enforcement of PDA development offences under clause 102, and outline the need for such powers.

In September last year, the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning introduced the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, known as the EDOLA Bill, into the Queensland parliament. This bill is an omnibus bill and, as stated in the green, seeks to ‘provide for increased operational efficiency of legislation under the administration of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning’ by amending seven acts and repealing one. The bill proposes to amend the Building Queensland Act 2015, amend the Economic Development Act 2012, amend the Planning Act 2016, amend the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016, amend the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011, amend the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985, amend the South Bank Corporation Act 1989 and repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004.

The Palaszczuk Labor government’s style of governing is epitomised by the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As the Queensland Law Society raised in its submission, it is a deeply regrettable decision to take such a wideranging legislative agenda that seeks to amend eight different acts and ram it into one omnibus bill. In a nutshell, once again this government is seeking to minimise scrutiny to further drive its own agenda. It is of deep concern that this government continues to ignore the concerns, wishes and rights of local Queensland communities.

In another example of the Palaszczuk government saying one thing and doing another, this bill looks to further water down the transparency and accountability of Building Queensland. In direct contrast to Premier Palaszczuk’s commitment to open and accountable government, this bill will see reporting requirements for Building Queensland halved. This latest reduction in transparency will only amplify the difficulty for communities to hold the Labor government to account on the infrastructure delivery times they have been promised.

Concerningly, as I noted earlier, it is already common practice for Building Queensland to consistently change the format of the pipeline report, making longitudinal comparisons difficult at best. Halving the publication frequency of the pipeline report will do nothing but make it harder for Queensland communities to track the Labor government’s promised project delivery dates.

Not only does the bill propose to decrease the community’s ability to hold this government to account; it also further restricts localised decision-making. Leaving no doubt as to what the government’s underlying agenda is, the Chief Executive Officer of the Local Government Association of Queensland stated—

... the LGAQ is concerned this legislation further erodes the ability of councils and their communities to have a say in the size, shape and pace of development in their region.

On that note, I must say that I have seen some outstanding muck-ups as far as other infrastructure is concerned. For example, we talk about the developments around Yarrabilba. The road infrastructure getting in and out of that area is absolutely diabolical.

A common theme of the legislation introduced over the past four years by the Palaszczuk government is the consolidation of their own power at the expense of local decision-making. The proposed removal of the ‘overriding economic or community need’ test and the requirement for provisional priority development areas and provisional land use plans to ‘not compromise the implementation of a planning instrument’ is a direct dilution of localised decision-making.

In addition, the failure to include a requirement for the minister to consult with, and obtain the agreement of, each relevant local government area in planning for or developing a PDA, establishing an infrastructure agreement and issuing a PDA exemption certificate is an outrageous attempt to circumnavigate local community development concerns.

We have a list of all of the PDAs that are running at the moment. Some of them have been running as far back as 2010. Some 17 were put in place by the Beattie and Bligh governments, nine by the Newman government, two in the last term of the Palaszczuk government and four in this second term of the Palaszczuk government.

Inspector powers are another concern. Hidden within the 224 pages of the bill are some of the most concerning amendments that seek to provide substantial increases in the powers of investigation and enforcement for government inspectors that can only be exercised by the Queensland police under the authority of a warrant. The bill's explanatory notes provide no outline of why such amendments are necessary or how they are in the public interest. Powers for inspectors to enter premises, stop vehicles, and seize and dispose of information are considerable and should only be granted under the most serious of cases.

In closing, I remind members of the lack of any direction when it comes to exits 41, 45 and 49 or the second M1, which is a sad indictment on this government. I look forward to seeing some construction funding in the next state budget, but I will not hold my breath.

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (4.10 pm): I am happy to speak in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and to speak specifically about amendments related to Economic Development Queensland. The Economic Development Act 2012, brought in by the former government, established a planning and development assessment framework that applies to declared priority development areas, known as PDAs. Economic Development Queensland, or EDQ, has undertaken a thorough review of the ED Act which focused on the planning and development assessment processes. This was in response to a number of operational issues that affected EDQ's ability to deliver government objectives. It is worth noting that in February 2013 the Urban Land Development Authority Act 2007 was repealed and replaced with the Economic Development Act 2012. From then on, land areas identified for priority development were referred to as PDAs, not UDAs, and existing UDAs were transitioned under the ED Act.

The amendments today address a range of matters. The bill will improve development assessment processes in relation to advising the community about development applications and asking the applicant for more information about a request; clarify provisions about infrastructure agreements under the ED Act; and include a more comprehensive approach for revoking PDAs when they are no longer required.

I wish to speak specifically on the bill regarding a priority development area that is in the Carseldine area within the Aspley electorate—that being the Fitzgibbon PDA. There was much discussion in the lead-up to the last election and ongoing regarding the Carseldine component of the Fitzgibbon PDA. I acknowledge those people who have spoken to me over the last 18 months regarding the project. My door has always been open, and I have been working with the community to ensure the best outcomes we can get locally from the project. It is worth pointing out the hypocrisy of the former government, now the opposition, regarding this project. They made an eleventh-hour claim that they opposed the project at the last election. This was in stark contrast to their actions when they were in government.

As I mentioned earlier, in February 2013 the ULDA Act was repealed and replaced with the ED Act by the former Newman government. At that point, the Newman government transitioned the Fitzgibbon UDA into the Fitzgibbon PDA. Should the former government and the former member for Aspley have wanted, they could have easily removed or amended the Fitzgibbon PDA in any reasonable way they saw fit, but of course the LNP only started vaguely opposing the project when they became the opposition in 2015 for purely political reasons. This vague opposition only sharpened up with two weeks to go in the 2017 election campaign—a campaign where I had been very up-front with people about the Palaszczuk government's intentions regarding the site.

I note the opposition have been highly critical about the operation of Economic Development Queensland in declaring and administering priority development areas. As indicated in the minister's second reading speech, the bill does not make a fundamental change to the operation of the Economic Development Act. This is legislation that was introduced and passed by the Newman government and wholeheartedly supported by so many on the opposition benches.

It is also unfortunate to see the local LNP BCC opposing the development. I heard the earlier contribution from the member for Jordan, where she said that she is able to work constructively with the local council down there. That is certainly not something we get at all times in Aspley. I of course in no way begrudge those locals who have genuine concerns regarding the Fitzgibbon project. I reiterate that I have met on numerous occasions regarding its development. It is through these discussions that

we are able to ensure improved outcomes locally. After representations to me and others, I was very pleased that the minister was able to rule out future urban development on the western side of the site—that is, the side adjacent to Dorville Road. This will please many residents whom I have spoken to throughout the last 18 months, including those at my mobile office last weekend. I thank the minister, his office and EDQ for their great work on that.

We are in discussion with the community about traffic congestion. I am talking to the community about the state of the current Beams Road rail crossing. We had a feasibility study at the last election and consultation through all of this February. I am very keen for all levels of government to step up and make sure this project keeps moving forward.

Also on the site we are currently consulting with sporting groups and organisations to determine the best future use of the \$6.5 million sporting precinct being constructed on the Fitzgibbon PDA. This precinct includes 120 car parking spaces, three new rectangular sporting fields, two volleyball courts, two tennis courts, a turf cricket pitch and practice nets, LED and sports lighting, fitness and play zones, seating areas, exercise equipment, barbecues, shelters and open space. This will be a great community hub when completed and I look forward to being at the opening.

I am also in discussions with Minister Dick and Minister Grace regarding a pedestrian bridge over Cabbage Tree Creek going from the Carseldine part of the PDA through to Aspley State High School. This will increase community links to the PDA site which will make the whole facility much better for the entire community. In closing, I support the bill. I support the local iterations of the bill as it affects the Aspley electorate.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (4.15 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. As always, I would like to acknowledge the work of the committee which studied the bill. I thank them and those who contributed to the bill to further our understanding of it. I have to say that the ‘other’ part of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is the big part of it. It is not the biggest omnibus bill we have seen, but it still encompasses eight or so acts. It is another case of a bill with vast implications being sprung on the community with very little time for the community to digest it and provide meaningful feedback to the parliament.

The bill seeks to provide for increased operational efficiency of legislation under the administration of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. The bill seeks to amend seven acts and repeal one. It proposes to amend the Building Queensland Act 2015, the Economic Development Act 2012, the Planning Act 2016, the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2016, the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act 1985 and the South Bank Corporation Act 1989. It proposes to repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004.

We are looking here at collectively about 230 clauses. The LNP acknowledges that there are necessary and good parts of this bill. When it is so intricately tied up, it is not necessarily in the public interests that we oppose it outright, but we do have very serious reservations that a number of my honourable colleagues mentioned earlier in the debate. This bill is one virtuoso exercise in the things that the government have been doing so well lately—that is, harming the rights of property owners and springing major changes on the community with inadequate consultation. It is a cynical attempt to conceal their mistakes and hide their failings in future by making the disclosure of their progress in economic development harder to ascertain.

The Queensland Law Society made a contribution which is very telling. I think it says quite well what was felt by a number of those who were offended by the little time available to consider this bill before the committee made its report. The Queensland Law Society said—

The Bill was introduced on 19 September 2018 and submissions are due 3½ weeks later on 12 October 2018. The Bill is 224 pages long and amends 8 other Acts.

Given the wide-ranging scope and complexity of the amendments, QLS has limited its comments to certain specific issues.

It is possible that there are issues relating to fundamental legislative principles or unintended drafting consequences which we have not identified due to the timeframes for response.

By omitting to comment on the full scope of provisions in the Bill, QLS does not express its endorsement of these.

I have said in the past that I do not agree with everything that Bill Potts says, and I know that he does not agree with everything I say, but on that point I think the Queensland Law Society is spot-on.

It is an example of another rushed committee process, and we have seen so many of those. One such bill that was dear to my heart was the Vegetation Management Bill, but we have seen so many others. It is a recurring theme that bills of this kind are pushed through with inadequate consultation.

I turn to the response of the Local Government Association of Queensland. It was particularly concerned about aspects of this bill. One might wonder why the government might limit the amount of time a body like the LGAQ, which is a respected and powerful group in our community, had to make a response. The committee's report states—

The LGAQ's primary concerns relate to the proposed amendments to the ED Act that appear to broaden the powers of the Minister for Economic Development Queensland and could result in circumvention of local government planning scheme requirements and State planning instruments. Although acknowledging the purpose of the ED Act "*to facilitate economic development, and development for community purposes, in the State*", the LGAQ maintains this should not be at the expense of transparent and accountable processes and the local decision making of democratically elected councils. This is particularly a concern at a time when the community is acutely aware of the need for transparency and accountability in government decision making.

Transparency and accountability—I have heard those words before. I am sure our Premier has mentioned them many times before to try to describe her government. However, here we have a respected institution in the LGAQ effectively saying that this bill weakens that commitment. The LGAQ has good reason to be upset because these priority development areas and the advent of the provisional ones could be seen to circumvent their rights as the local government authority to have input and control over these matters. It is no secret that the LGAQ knows that these PDAs eventually result in something that has to be handed back to local government and they have to live with the consequences. They have to live with how it operates. It follows, therefore, that they should have a seat at the table and should not be circumvented. Any process which allows that to happen, whether it actually happens or not, is alarming to local government. I do sympathise with them on that matter.

In regard to PDAs, the report states—

The LGAQ is concerned that the removal of these additional requirements, broadens the powers of the Minister for Economic Development Queensland and could result in a PPDA being used or implemented inappropriately to circumvent local government planning scheme requirements and would also override State planning instruments. In addition, the changes could also allow/encourage out of sequence development, which is currently controlled by the South East Queensland Regional Plan and local government infrastructure plans.

That is pretty scathing criticism. I think the House really should take that on board.

There are other impacts of this bill. We heard a number of speakers before me eloquently describe the risks of having reduced disclosure of progress in Building Queensland. The infrastructure pipeline reports, which Building Queensland currently produce biannually—twice a year—are now going to be produced only once a year. We also heard speakers who have attempted without avail to get departmental officers to explain the basis for the continual changing of the reporting format for these reports, making it difficult for the Queensland public and the opposition to hold the government to account for their progress. It contributes to that theme that I talked about of a government that is progressively building a wall around itself to thwart accountability and conceal from the public what is actually going on.

We saw confusion and uncertainty, particularly regarding the amendments to the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act. I have heard Labor speaker after Labor speaker say things like, 'Yes, but that is all right. They're going to need a nursing home and an aged-care facility and so forth.' That is not an appropriate attitude for a government to adopt in dealing with people who have legitimate concerns about the environment in which they live and the erosion of the protection they felt they had under the act. That is another example of the arrogance that we are seeing. I have not heard anybody say that they wanted those things; it is just something that has come up that the state has imposed with little or no consultation.

We also see persistent Labor attacks on the rights of property owners around the state. We see in this bill another example of inspectors being granted powers which exceed those of police, which is quite extraordinary. Police need a warrant in almost all circumstances, but inspectors can enter a property, they can move vehicles, they can seize documents or items—all of that can happen without a warrant. I think that is a worrying continuation of the erosion of the rights and liberties of good Queenslanders. We have seen that in other acts such as the Vegetation Management Act, the Fisheries Act and the land and explosives legislation, which we saw previously. I am very concerned about that.

I heard other Labor members such as the member for Greenslopes talking earlier about the 'style' of opposition. This is a government bill. We are holding the government to account. I can tell him what we are not interested in, and that is the style of this government: it is the systematic avoidance of

scrutiny and the foisting of bills like this upon the community without adequate consultation. It is a theme which comes up again and again. Having said that, I say again that we support the bill, but we have grave reservations about the matters which I have canvassed.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (4.25 pm): I rise in the House to make a contribution in support of the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. The bill proposes amendments to a number of acts: the Building Queensland Act 2015, the Economic Development Act 2012, and acts that are important to the operation of the Economic Development Act such as the Planning Act 2016, the Planning and Environment Court Act 2016, the Queensland Reconstruction Authority Act 2011, the Sanctuary Cove Resort Act and the South Bank Corporation Act. These acts are an important part of shaping Queensland's future.

Last year the government released its response to the recommendations from the administrative review of Building Queensland's operating arrangements report. Part of the response to three recommendations requires amendments to the Building Queensland Act. The recommended amendments proposed in this bill will enable the adjustment of the threshold for business cases that Building Queensland is required to lead. The other amendments to the acts are minor and administrative in nature. The Planning Act and priority development areas drive strategic growth in Queensland. The Economic Development Act will implement amendments—improvement opportunities that have been identified over the course of the six years that the act has been in operation. The amendments will improve interactions with other acts and, importantly, align the Economic Development Act with the new Planning Act.

Amendments in relation to the making of statutory planning instruments for priority development areas, or PDAs as they are often referred to, introduce greater flexibility to manage diverse and emerging circumstances surrounding the development, and I have certainly seen that in one of the PDAs in my area. The amendments will allow minor amendments to the boundary of a priority development area in limited circumstances where it is necessary to make a minor correction or to achieve better management or coordination of the PDA. Amendments are also proposed to allow for major changes to a PDA boundary through a process of replacing a priority development area with a new priority development area. This is needed in situations where there are different development outcomes proposed or there is a new or extended purpose for the PDA. This amendment is also linked with the proposed refinement of the existing provisions that manage the revocation of priority development areas and transition of land back into a local government planning scheme under the Planning Act.

The bill also amends act provisions that provide for provisional priority development areas to improve their effectiveness. Land use plans for provisional PDAs take effect immediately and the priority development areas cease after three years. Amendments will also see the establishment of a local consultative committee for provisional PDAs.

Additionally, the bill provides for operational improvements to the PDA development application process including allowing for lapsing of development applications and substantial compliance with notification requirements improving accountability. These amendments also introduce PDA exemption certificates that allow PDA assessable development to proceed without development approval in limited circumstances. The bill strengthens enforcement and offence provisions consistent with the Planning Act and amends other acts to achieve interaction equivalent to the Planning Act.

Economic development is imperative for the survival of all cities and regions across the country. Roads and transport are the connectors that ensure thriving cities and regional economies continue to grow. We all have to move with the times and work together. We have not seen this in my community from the Morrison federal government, yet they claim to be congestion busting for Queenslanders. I wrote to the federal member for Bowman last month on behalf of my community requesting that his government provide funding for an upgrade to Cleveland-Redland Bay Road to dual lanes to help with our economic development. If the Prime Minister and the federal member for Bowman are genuine about congestion busting and improving my community, I say they should get behind Redlanders; help us to deal with congestion that is impeding economic development. I will be listening carefully tonight to see if Andrew Laming and Scott Morrison really care about our Redlands community.

The Southern Moreton Bay Islands act is also being repealed, and this is important to Redlands coastal island communities. The proposal to repeal the Southern Moreton Bay Development Entitlements Protection Act removes some constraints. By repealing the Southern Moreton Bay Islands Development Entitlements Protection Act 2004 we are paving the way for more contemporary planning frameworks for our beautiful island communities. The changes will see planning on Russell, Macleay,

Karragarra and Lamb islands fall within the Redlands City Plan. Previously, this legislation created confusion around how development on the Southern Moreton Bay Islands could proceed. By repealing these outdated laws, planning requirements for my local community will now be certain and set out in the Redlands City Plan. Our south-east is one of Australia's fastest growing regions, and as a government we want to make sure this growth is being managed responsibly and appropriately.

I want to talk about the Southern Moreton Bay Islands and their classification federally. They were reclassified over 18 months ago as rural and regional. In terms of looking at the funding arrangements and the benefits that derive from that, federally we have yet to see a cent come from the Morrison government to deliver for those island communities as they continue to grow at a rapid rate. The Southern Moreton Bay Islands were originally subdivided in the seventies and the population has continued to grow substantially. In 1971 there were 248 residents; in 1981, 540 residents; in 1991, 2,001 residents. In the next decade it doubled from 3,857 and now, in 2019, we sit at over 10,000 residents across those island communities. This is a dense population for islands with constrained service delivery. Even now there is a flurry of more development.

These changes will give the Redlands coast and our islands greater planning certainty. It will strike the right balance between development and environment in our community. This contemporary framework will ensure the Redlands coast's unique island lifestyle is protected and preserved, and growth on these islands will be better managed. This change will better reflect what our community expects in terms of planning framework. Currently, an outdated piece of legislation is creating confusion about how development can proceed. Repealing outdated legislation will mean certainty for land owners. They will have to abide by zoning requirements set out in the Redlands City Plan. This will ensure that the planning framework for our community is contemporary and helps us grow into the future. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (4.31 pm): I rise to make a contribution in the dying moments of this debate on the Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I have made clear in this place on any number of occasions now my views and those of Maiwar residents on our planning system and its shortcomings. I constantly hear the same issues arise again and again about lack of public infrastructure, height limits ignored and lack of consultation. The list goes on. Public consultation is often cursory and all too often ignored. Residents are sick and tired of being shut out of meaningfully contributing to the shape of their city. Perhaps even worse, where community consultation is properly taken into account and reflected in planning schemes or local plans, our euphemistically named 'performance based planning systems' mean that these often count for nothing when local or state governments make final approval decisions.

This bill clearly goes nowhere near addressing the plethora of issues with the Planning Act, but there is one significant improvement for which I applaud the government. Specifically, I applaud the amendments to remove the requirement for a person challenging a development—called a submitter appellant—to serve a notice of appeal on all other submitters to the development application. The requirement that the bill seeks to remove is burdensome and unnecessary. It is a requirement that creates the greatest impost for those individuals or community groups who are willing to take on the challenge of running an appeal against those projects that face the most severe opposition from the community. It means that the more people who oppose a project, the harder it is to lodge a court challenge.

In the last few weeks I have watched this play out in my community in relation to the Brisbane City Council's proposal to build a zipline tourist attraction at Mount Coot-tha, which is a deeply unpopular proposal with locals in the western suburbs and across Brisbane. For more than a year now I have been assisting the local community to get information about this proposal, help them coordinate their efforts and express their opposition through the formal avenues. The proposal is fundamentally flawed, and residents can see clearly through the expensive advertising campaigns and greenwash that have been rolled out by the now former lord mayor Quirk. In a community vote that I held last year, 78 per cent of participants said they did not want the project to go ahead.

Mr NICHOLLS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. While this is all very interesting, it does not seem very relevant to the purpose of the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Member for Clayfield, thank you for your point of order. Member, can we return to the long title of the bill?

Mr BERKMAN: What I am really getting to that is absolutely relevant to the bill is that the culmination of this effort was about 3,600 submissions that were lodged against this development application, which is a huge number of submissions by any measure. I think that a lot of us here know the outcome of this process. The council cynically approved its own development application and,

unsurprisingly, a local community group has launched an appeal against the ziplines in the Planning and Environment Court. Anyone who has ever been involved in a P&E Court appeal will agree that it is a huge undertaking. I would suggest that is particularly the case in a circumstance like this where the proponent, the council, is defending not only the interests of its own project but also its own decision.

In taking on this challenge the Mt Coot-tha Protection Alliance, or MCPA, is doing a huge service to the community. It would be unnecessary if the planning system required decision-makers to listen and respond to the voice of the community. I understand that it came as something of a surprise to the MCPA that they would need to send a letter to each of the more than 3,600 submitters who had their say through the public consultation process on the council's development application. This is a tiny community group with no paid staff whatsoever. Despite having the support of such a massive majority in the community, it fell to this small but dedicated group of people to get the appeal underway. I know there was considerable anxiety about whether they would be able to meet this requirement and send the necessary information to each of the submitters.

To their credit, I understand the MCPA did satisfy this requirement, but they did so at great personal effort and investment of time. I am sure that each member of MCPA and other community groups like them would be grateful to see this amendment pass. They would no doubt have appreciated it if they did not have to comply with the requirement in the first place. It is certainly a sensible change to the Planning Act and it is one that I welcome. In this context and with your indulgence, Madam Deputy Chair, I will just take this opportunity to congratulate the newly nominated lord mayor, Adrian Schrinner, and strongly suggest that he act on widespread community concern by canning the zipline project.

I will turn briefly to the amendments to the Economic Development Act. Arguably, some of the significant problems with the Planning Act are magnified in the Economic Development Act. Some of these issues are well summarised in a submission on the bill which refers to 'significant concern in the community that the ED Act does not provide for good quality decision-making in development and planning'. That criticism was based on the following features of the Economic Development Act that were set out in that submission: it locks out community appeal rights that are recognised to be essential in improving the quality of decisions and minimising the risk of corruption around decision-making; it can allow for public notification and community submission rights requirements to vary greatly between priority development areas; and it overrides normal Planning Act provisions and local planning schemes that have undergone extensive public consultation and ministerial review to ensure that they are the best plan to meet the community's needs and expectations and under our Planning Act requirements. By overriding normal planning provisions, the proposed clearing of vegetation is not assessed against the normal planning and Vegetation Management Act provisions, removing certainty for the community that clearing will be appropriately regulated. Finally, it overrides the regulation even of areas outside of declared PDAs where they are declared to be PDA associated development, further locking out the community and providing significant discretion around development assessment and planning decision-making.

While the changes to the ED Act proposed in this bill are arguably improvements, they are made in the context of a deeply flawed and very powerful act. This is nothing more than tinkering with an act that was vehemently opposed by the Labor Party in opposition when the Economic Development Bill was introduced by the Newman government. Clearly, an omnibus bill like this is not the appropriate vehicle for the route and branch reform of the planning system this state needs. I call on government again to take bold steps to return the community's voice to our planning system and revisit its opposition to unacceptably broad powers over development and the risks that come with this. Thanks, as always, to the committee for their inquiry into the bill and the secretariat who supported them. I will not be opposing the bill.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (4.38 pm): We have just heard why the Greens and the Labor Party get on together—no development and no advancement for this state.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): In accordance with the business program agreed to by the House—

Mr NICHOLLS: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I got in everything I needed to say!

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Just resume your seat, member. In accordance with the business program agreed to by the House, the question is that the bill be now read a second time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail



Mr DICK (4.40 pm): I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Economic Development and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018, explanatory notes to Hon. Cameron Dick's amendments [503].

Question put—That the minister's amendments Nos 1 to 6, as circulated, be agreed to and clauses 1 to 231 and schedule 1, as amended, stand part of the bill.

Amendments as circulated—

1 After clause 65

Page 94, after line 28—

insert—

65A Insertion of new ch 4, pt 3A

Chapter 4—

insert—

Part 3A Local consultative committees

159A Establishment

As soon as practicable after a declaration regulation is made under section 34(1), MEDQ must—

- (a) establish a committee (a **local consultative committee**) for the provisional priority development area declared under the declaration regulation; and
- (b) decide the terms of reference for the committee, including how the committee must operate in performing its functions.

159B Functions

(1) A local consultative committee for a provisional priority development area has the following functions—

- (a) to advise MEDQ about the following matters within the scope of the committee's terms of reference—
 - (i) the impact, or potential impact, of proposed development in the area, including, for example, the impact or potential impact on the environment or public amenity;
 - (ii) community needs and expectations in the area;
- (b) to report to MEDQ, in accordance with the committee's terms of reference, about the committee's performance of its functions under this Act.

(2) A local consultative committee may do all things necessary or convenient to be done for the performance of its functions.

159C Membership

(1) A local consultative committee for a provisional priority development area consists of the following persons (each a **member**)—

- (a) the chief executive of the department or a senior executive nominated by the chief executive;
- (b) the chief executive officer of the relevant local government for the provisional priority development area or a senior executive nominated by the chief executive officer;
- (c) at least 1 person MEDQ considers can appropriately represent the interests of the local community;
- (d) if MEDQ considers that 1 or more entities are likely to be affected by development in the provisional priority development area—at least 1 person MEDQ considers can appropriately represent the interests of the entity or entities.

(2) A member mentioned in subsection (1)(c) or (d) is an **appointed member**.

(3) An appointed member is appointed by MEDQ.

(4) A local consultative committee must not consist of more than 3 appointed members.

(5) A member of a local consultative committee holds office on the terms and conditions MEDQ considers appropriate, including terms about remuneration.

(6) The chairperson of a local consultative committee is the member mentioned in subsection (1)(a).

159D Dissolution of local consultative committees

- (1) A local consultative committee for a provisional priority development area is dissolved on the earlier of the following—
 - (a) when MEDQ dissolves the committee;
 - (b) when the provisional priority development area ceases to be a provisional priority development area.
- (2) MEDQ must not dissolve a local consultative committee for a provisional priority development area before the provisional land use plan for the area is made.

2 Clause 71 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))

Page 104, after line 13—

insert—*local consultative committee* see section 159A(a).**3 Clause 71 (Amendment of sch 1 (Dictionary))**

Page 107, after line 6—

insert—

- (3A) Schedule 1, definition *committee member*, ‘committee.’—

omit, insert—

committee or a member of a local consultative committee.

4 Clause 190 (Insertion of new pt 10, div 2)

Page 190, line 12, after ‘mentioned’—

insert—

in

5 Schedule 1 (Legislation amended)

Page 208, after line 17—

insert—**6A Section 169(1)(g)—***omit, insert*—

- (g) a member of a local representative committee;

6 Schedule 1 (Legislation amended)

Page 209, lines 9 and 10—

omit, insert—**13 Section 174(2)(a), from ‘the board’ to ‘committees’—***omit, insert*—

the board, local representative committees and local consultative committees

Motion agreed to.

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 231 and schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Question put—That the bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill, as amended, read a third time.

Long Title

Question put—That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

QUEENSLAND CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Debate resumed from 15 November 2018 (see p. 3617).

Second Reading



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (4.41 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

This bill is a significant step forward in protecting the rights of Queenslanders by improving fairness and providing greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle. On 15 November 2018 I introduced the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill into the parliament. The bill was initially referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee; however, the Committee of the Legislative Assembly subsequently referred the bill to the Transport and Public Works Committee for detailed consideration. I would like to thank the Transport and Public Works Committee for its consideration of the bill. I note that the committee tabled its report on 14 February 2019 and made just one recommendation: that the bill be passed.

I would also like to thank all of the individuals and organisations who made submissions to the committee about the bill. Submissions were made by individuals and organisations with an interest in how the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, known as QCAT, operates. Submissions were also made by consumer advocates and community stakeholders who are truly passionate about justice for Queenslanders who have purchased lemon vehicles. I am pleased to see such strong community and parliamentary support for the bill. Being a responsive government is a priority for the Palaszczuk government, and this bill will enhance access to justice through QCAT for Queenslanders from all walks of life.

The bill makes a number of modest amendments to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009 which were identified in a review of that act and will improve the operational efficiency of QCAT. Importantly, this bill also delivers on the Palaszczuk government's election commitment to improve fairness and provide greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle. The purchase of a vehicle, after all, is usually the most significant investment a family or individual will make outside of buying a home.

In 2015 I asked the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to hold a parliamentary inquiry into lemon laws, an inquiry into consumer protections and remedies for buyers of new motor vehicles. The committee heard many stories of the emotional toll and financial stress of dealing with having a lemon motor vehicle. A remedy is only as good as the ability to enforce it. That is the key principle of this bill. While I believe that further reforms need to be made to the Australian Consumer Law to provide for further consumer protections specifically for purchase of new motor vehicles—I will be continuing to push for these further reforms at the national level—there are a number of consumer guarantee provisions under the ACL that consumers can use right now, including guarantees that an item is fit for its purpose and that the item is of acceptable quality.

Unfortunately, what has become clear is that the process of enforcing these rights is difficult for consumers. As Caxton Legal Centre submitted to the 2015 inquiry, while there are remedies available under the ACL, in practice ‘it is clear that purchasers often have difficulty enforcing their rights’, ‘especially when there is an argument about whether or not a defect is a major defect under the ACL’. As a result, consumers end up being stuck in a cycle of repairs, being without their car for weeks or even months on end. Consumers spend years of their life going back to dealers and manufacturers each time there is an issue. It is very stressful and takes a real toll on individuals. That is what we are aiming to fix here today.

The bill achieves the Palaszczuk government's commitment by lifting QCAT's jurisdictional limit on motor vehicle claims as defined in the bill from \$25,000 to \$100,000. This will mean that consumers who believe there has been a breach of their consumer guarantees under the Australian Consumer Law can have their matter heard by QCAT where the matter relates to new or used motor vehicles, motorhomes and caravans for claims up to \$100,000. The bill also reinstates the statutory warranty for class B older second-hand vehicles sold by motor dealers and chattel auctioneers through amendments to the Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014. Where there has been an alleged breach of a statutory warranty under the motor dealers act, affected consumers will be able to pursue a remedy through QCAT up to the value of \$100,000.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to improving access to justice for Queenslanders, and the bill absolutely delivers on this, giving consumers greater access to QCAT for most motor vehicle claims. QCAT provides an accessible and inexpensive alternative to court proceedings. QCAT aims to resolve disputes and make decisions in a way that is fair, just, accessible, quick and inexpensive. As QCAT is a tribunal, its proceedings are less formal than a court, but it still makes final decisions which can be enforced. Expanding QCAT's current jurisdiction to allow it to hear motor vehicle claims up to a value of \$100,000 will mean that consumers with claims over \$25,000, who would previously have needed to go to the Magistrates Court, will now have a simpler and cost-effective remedy available to them through the tribunal.

Given the increase in QCAT's jurisdictional limit, motor vehicle claims captured by the bill will no longer be heard in QCAT's minor civil dispute jurisdiction. However, to ensure QCAT continues to be able to deal with motor vehicle disputes in a way that is fair, just, accessible, quick and inexpensive, the bill provides QCAT with flexibility in the way that it hears and determines motor vehicle matters. First, QCAT will have express powers to conduct expedited hearings if the claim is not more than \$25,000 or if the president considers it appropriate having regard to a number of factors, such as the complexity of the proceeding. Second, and as I will discuss in more detail shortly, to remove the possibility of costs being awarded against consumers seeking a remedy in relation to a motor vehicle, the bill provides that the only costs order QCAT can make is to order a respondent to pay the applicant an amount of any prescribed application fee. Consumers will have the benefit of a sliding scale of fees, from \$26.35 to \$338.20. Third, the bill enables an adjudicator to hear and decide motor vehicle proceedings for claims of not more than \$25,000 or where the matter is conducted as an expedited hearing.

In relation to submissions made on the bill and evidence provided to the committee, I was pleased to see the overall support for the increase in QCAT's jurisdictional limit for motor vehicle claims up to a value of \$100,000. However, some submissions sought further legislative reforms. In particular, a number of submissions sought a further increase to the new \$100,000 limit for QCAT or even for no limit to apply. Overall, the government considers that the \$100,000 claim limit reflected in the bill is a reasonable and balanced approach. It means that QCAT can consider disputes about most vehicles typically used by families such as SUVs, sedans and most caravans and motorhomes. Any further increase in QCAT's jurisdictional limit for these matters could be at odds with the established jurisdictional limits in the courts. In this respect, I note that the Magistrates Court has a limit of claims up to \$150,000 and the District Court up to \$750,000. Many submissions on the bill also supported the proposed limit. The Caravan Trade & Industries Association noted that the new limit will save consumers and suppliers from having to spend precious time and money attempting to resolve any disputes through the courts and agreed that QCAT delivers fair and just outcomes for consumers and suppliers via an independent and objective process. This is not just fair and equitable for consumers; it will help industry, too.

While there were mixed views on the issue of legal representation in QCAT proceedings, the bill does not change the position that currently applies in relation to legal representation before QCAT more generally. Section 43 of the QCAT Act essentially provides that parties should represent themselves unless the interests of justice require otherwise. However, there are some exceptions and a party may be represented as of right either by a legal representative or someone else if they are a child or a person with impaired capacity, if the proceeding relates to disciplinary action, or if an enabling act provides that the person may be represented. In addition, a party, including a party to a dispute about a motor vehicle, may be represented if the tribunal has given the party leave to be represented and the tribunal is satisfied that the interests of justice require it.

Section 43(3) provides a list of factors for QCAT to consider in deciding whether to give a party leave to be represented, including whether the proceeding is likely to involve complex questions of fact or law. This means the need for legal representation is considered in the individual circumstances but also in the context of the QCAT Act's objectives—that is, to carry out its functions in a way that is fair and just, economical, informal and quick. The Palaszczuk government is acutely aware that allowing legal representation as of right has the potential to significantly disadvantage consumers and would undermine the objective of this bill. The main objective of this bill is to reduce costs to consumers by providing a hearing that is fair, just, economical, informal and quick. If consumers were to be put into a position where they would need to obtain legal representation because the respondent, particularly manufacturers and large retailers, has retained legal representation, this would significantly detract from the objective of this bill. This government's position is not to commit to legal representation at QCAT as

of right. QCAT was established as a low-cost jurisdiction to allow persons to resolve disputes in a timely and cost-effective manner. The existing provisions for legal representation in QCAT are adequate to allow legal representation in appropriate matters.

The possibility of having costs awarded against a consumer can act as a significant disincentive to making a claim. Accordingly, the position under the bill is that QCAT may make an order relating to costs only against a respondent only where there has been a final decision and only to order the party to pay the amount of any prescribed application fee. While a number of different views were expressed on this issue to the committee, the bill essentially extends the current cost order arrangements for consumers making claims in QCAT's minor civil dispute jurisdiction to motor vehicle claims captured by the bill. Consistent with existing cost order arrangements, consumers will only be able to claim the costs of their QCAT fee. It means that consumers can make their claims in the knowledge that costs cannot be awarded against them for respondents' legal fees or the costs of respondents' expert reports. This gives claimants certainty and consistency, something which is valued given the potential stress of legal proceedings. Many of QCAT's procedures and processes can be distinguished from those of the courts. It is QCAT's relative informality that will continue to make this jurisdiction an accessible one for consumers.

I note non-government members of the Transport and Public Works Committee expressed their support for the bill but made a statement of reservation regarding the demand pressures on QCAT with this expanded jurisdiction. In particular, I note the opposition members' statement that QCAT has an already overexpanded jurisdiction. My question—and what I look forward to hearing from the opposition members in their contributions to the debate on this bill—is what do the opposition members of the committee mean by this statement? What matters come before QCAT now that they believe should not anymore because the jurisdiction is, in the opposition's words, overexpanded? What areas of rights, including consumer rights, does the opposition propose people should not be able to enforce through QCAT? Does the opposition propose to remove jurisdiction to hear certain matters from QCAT and create new tribunals for those matters and at what cost, or is the opposition proposing that people will need to take these matters to a higher court?

QCAT covers an increasingly wide range of jurisdictions—from minor civil disputes through to complex guardianship decision-making. Each year around 60,000 Queenslanders access QCAT services. I am pleased to advise that this financial year the Department of Justice and Attorney-General has reallocated an additional \$530,000 to QCAT to assist in addressing workloads. The one-off allocation will provide additional funding for sessional members and support staff of the tribunal. QCAT will also benefit from in excess of \$2 million in capital funding for refurbishment work to its premises at 259 Queen Street. These works will deliver functional improvements to public facilities including hearing and mediation rooms and improve the general work environment for members and staff. Since the Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015, QCAT has received an increase in its operational budget of nearly \$3 million. This contrasts with QCAT's operational budget under the LNP which had remained stagnant and had actually received a cut in the financial year 2014–15.

Importantly, I want to note that amendments in this bill arising from the review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009 will contribute to improving the operational efficiency of QCAT. I want to thank the QCAT president, deputy president, members, adjudicators and registry staff for their hard work and dedication in continuing to deliver accessible civil justice, including our justices of the peace.

I also want to deal briefly with the committee's description of a small drafting point on page 38 of its report. As part of the reforms to increase QCAT's operational efficiency, the bill will add new subsection (3) to section 97 of the QCAT Act to allow QCAT's principal registrar, on the application of a party, to give a notice requiring a witness to attend or produce a document or thing. At the moment only the tribunal may give a notice under section 97(1). Section 97(2) provides that in addition to being able to give the notice on the application of a party the tribunal may give the notice on its own initiative. The committee commented in its report—

... as the intention is that the registrar cannot give a notice on their own initiative, it might be preferable that this be put beyond any doubt, for example by adding the word 'only' in section 97(3), so it reads:

(3) The principal registrar may give a notice under subsection (1) only on the application of a party to a proceeding.

While careful consideration has been given to whether such an amendment should be made to section 97, I do not think such an amendment is necessary. The proposed power of the principal registrar to give a notice under section 97(1) is a discretionary power which is conferred in express

terms and limited by the proposed new subsection (3) that provides this power may only be exercised on application of a party. I thank the committee for querying this issue but propose no amendment to section 97(3).

Finally, I foreshadow that I intend to move amendments to the Civil Proceedings Act 2011 and the Supreme Court of Queensland Act 1991 during consideration in detail to facilitate the increased use of referees in civil proceedings. The amendments, which will provide referees with the same immunity that is currently given to assessors and allow court rules to be made for the use of referees in court proceedings, are being progressed in response to a request received from the Chief Justice and the Supreme Court Rules Committee.

Again I want to thank the Transport and Public Works Committee for its consideration of the bill and acknowledge the valuable contribution of all stakeholders who made submissions and participated in the public hearings. I particularly want to thank those advocates who I know will be attending the gallery tomorrow and others who could not be here who have advocated for these important reforms for so long and I look forward to continuing to work with them in the next stage, being further reforms to our Australian consumer laws. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (4.57 pm): I rise to speak to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The opposition will not be opposing the bill. In July 2018 a statutory review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal, QCAT, was revealed. The review outlined a number of issues with QCAT which formed the basis of many of the amendments present in this bill. The objectives of the bill are to amend the QCAT Act to improve the operational efficiency of QCAT to better achieve the objects of the QCAT Act and to implement the government's commitment to improve fairness and provide greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle and address issues concerning lemon laws.

The bill seeks to enhance operational efficiency. It does so in a number of ways, but most significantly by clarifying that QCAT's tenancy jurisdiction is limited to claims of not more than \$25,000; changing the scope, timing and operation of stay orders; broadening the scope of the principal registrar so that it can now issue notices to parties or require a person to produce a document; broadening QCAT's powers to permit QCAT to reinstate proceedings dismissed in error; clarifying that an adjudicator sitting alone can constitute QCAT; and providing a legislative framework to enable QCAT to undertake conciliation, in addition to other alternative dispute resolution processes currently available.

The bill improves fairness and provides greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle by increasing the jurisdictional limit from \$25,000 to \$100,000. In effect, this is an extension of QCAT's jurisdiction to hear motor vehicle disputes under the Fair Trading Act and the Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act. This increased jurisdictional limit will apply to disputes about consumer guarantees under the Australian Consumer Law for the supply of goods or services where the action relates to a motor vehicle, including a caravan or a motorhome, as well as the Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014 in relation to statutory warranties for used motor vehicles, including motorhomes but not caravans. These amendments mean greater access to justice for consumers who have spent a considerable amount of money on purchasing a new car or caravan but which, unfortunately, have defects. The bill also reinstates limited statutory warranties applying to used vehicles that are older than 10 years and have travelled more than 160,000 kilometres, referred to as class B second-hand vehicles. These statutory warranties had existed in previous legislation.

I note that the proposed reforms do not amend any of the consumer guarantees under the Australian Consumer Law, which are already built into Queensland law. Accordingly, there appears to be no provision under the bill that would grant Queensland consumers any further warranty than that which consumers already benefit from in other Australian states. I also note that the government appears to be preparing to advocate for additional amendments to the Australian Consumer Law in relation to lemon laws, which the Attorney-General has confirmed.

To put these amendments into plain English, as we all know, cars are expensive and most likely will be the second most significant asset that Queenslanders will ever purchase apart from their family home. If a new vehicle breaks down, it can result in some despair, especially if it is accompanied by associated job stress. Currently, Queensland consumers who have purchased a new car that has broken down can seek only \$25,000 in damages against the manufacturer at QCAT. It is no surprise that such an amount is generally well short of the cost to replace a faulty vehicle. This is not even counting for interest that may be paid on a loan and the potential of bearing significant car rental costs. Alternatively, and probably more appropriately, a consumer may sue the car dealer in the Magistrates Court under the Competition and Consumer Act 2010, where claims may be made of up to \$150,000.

By expanding QCAT's jurisdiction, that will allow consumers to apply through QCAT for an increased damages amount from \$25,000 to \$100,000, which will save motorists from attending court and the associated legal expenses. While it will save consumers and suppliers from having to spend time and money attempting to resolve any disputes through the courts, it will mean that QCAT can expect to receive a significant amount of work arising from this new jurisdictional limit and will only place more pressure on overworked staff. I will return to those concerns later.

The majority of the stakeholders who made submissions to the bill were welcoming of it. I note that the Queensland Law Society and Community Legal Centres were broadly supportive of the bill increasing access to justice, such as an increased engagement in alternative dispute resolution. The Queensland Law Society supported the proposed reforms to facilitate increased engagement in alternative dispute resolution where appropriate. However, it recommended that there needs to be more guidance about when a matter may or may not appropriately be referred for conciliation. The Queensland Law Society advised that this may include the consideration of matters where there is an obvious power imbalance between the parties. The Queensland Law Society also highlighted its concern about the inability of solicitors to appear at QCAT to assist consumers in presenting their case. The main reason for this was to assist in rectifying the power imbalance that consumers likely face when appearing before QCAT against dealers who are generally equipped with greater knowledge and legal resources.

Community Legal Centres Queensland recommended reversing the onus of proof, requiring a manufacturer to prove that the vehicle does not have the defect alleged by the consumer. It argued that this amendment would remove the need for consumers to obtain costly expert reports to substantiate their claims. The Motor Trades Association of Queensland, Lemon Laws 4 Aus, Lemon Caravans & RVs in Aus, and the Caravan Trade & Industries Association of Queensland were all supportive of the bill. They all supported increasing the amount that can be claimed through QCAT from \$25,000 to \$100,000 for disputes made under the Australian Consumer Law consumer guarantees for the supply of goods that are vehicles. Lemon Laws 4 Aus recommended that the bill should allow for inflation for future new vehicle purchases and to review the claim limit at intervals of three years so as to reflect the increasing costs of purchasing a new vehicle.

Lemon Laws 4 Aus stressed that the general culture within the new car retailing sector needs to significantly improve, indicating that the government should be proactive in ensuring that the motor vehicle industry upholds the highest standards. Recommendations were also made relating to further enforcement with possible criminal charges for misleading and deceptive conduct that may be necessary to improve industry practice.

I now turn to the question of QCAT resourcing. In December 2009, QCAT commenced operations to undertake the work of 18 tribunals with 23 jurisdictions, the minor debt claims jurisdiction of the Magistrates Court and almost all the administrative review jurisdiction of the courts. I acknowledge the impressive commitment that QCAT members and staff have for their cause in delivering access to justice, but there are no doubt concerns about QCAT's expanded jurisdiction and the associated additional costs that will be brought into being because of this expanded jurisdiction.

In this regard, I would like to refer to the comments made in the public hearing by Queensland Law Society president, Bill Potts, who noted that QCAT was already 'in a very poor position financially' and that members and registry staff had been 'stretched beyond all reasonable and proper levels of tolerance'. It is worth reflecting on the path of QCAT from 2009 to today. In 2017-18, QCAT settled over 31,000 matters before it. Over the duration of its existence, we have seen QCAT get across-the-board a one per cent increase despite there being a 14 per cent increase in cases lodged. The appropriate resourcing of QCAT has long been an issue. I will return to the comments of the Queensland Law Society president, Bill Potts, in one of his contributions at the start of the year. He said that the government appeared to be deaf to the needs of the resourcing of QCAT.

I hear what the Attorney-General promised in that there would be a one-off allocation of \$500,000-odd to the operations of QCAT going forward. Now, all I hear is a one-off. It is obvious from the contribution of Mr Potts, the president of the Queensland Law Society—and I am yet to come to the comments of the president of QCAT, Justice Daubney, in relation to the resourcing of QCAT—that a one-off allocation of funding may address in the short term some backlog of matters but in no way will it ever address the longstanding, long-running trend towards additional jurisdictional expansion in QCAT and the need to appropriately resource this growth. It must always be remembered that QCAT is on the front line, at the coalface of most Queenslanders' interaction with the law. It deals with a range of civil matters, whether that is chasing tenants for rent, or matters relating to people in particular professions, such as doctors or lawyers. QCAT offers an adjudication process through all of these

professions and professional standards. QCAT deals with blue cards. It deals with dividing fences. Together with the Magistrates Court, QCAT is on the front line, at the coalface of the legal system in Queensland and, currently, it is under resourced.

I turn to comments of Mr Justice Daubney in his annual report for 2017-18. He made the comment—

It is not hyperbolic to say that many of these proceedings are literally life-changing.

These are the issues that I referred to in relation to that front line of Queenslanders' interaction with the judicial system.

Justice Daubney went on to say a number of other things that should be sounding alarm bells but, as Mr Potts has said, it appears the government is deaf to the alarm bells that are being sounded by Justice Daubney and Mr Potts. Justice Daubney in his message in the annual report commented that—

A lack of appreciation in some quarters of the true ambit of QCAT's diverse jurisdictions has led to an unfortunate underappreciation of the resources necessary to provide the broad and important range of justice services which fall under QCAT's remit.

That does not sound to me like Justice Daubney just wants a one-off allocation to deal with a short-term backlog; that to me sounds like a cry for help for additional resources for one of our most important jurisdictions in the Queensland legal system. Justice Daubney goes on to say—

I am hopeful that the Executive Government will recognize and urgently address these resourcing issues.

I do not hear anything from the Attorney-General here today that would convince me that the executive government has heard this cry for help from Justice Daubney. I have just heard about a one-off allocation and a fresh lick of paint on a building. That is not going to be sufficient to deal with the long-term trend towards the ever-expanding jurisdiction of QCAT. That will continue to be a major problem. In the words of Justice Daubney—

QCAT has grown and must continue to mature in order to meet the demands of its ever-increasing workloads and the legitimate expectations of access to civil justice by the citizens of Queensland's burgeoning population.

Those expectations are not met by underestimating the importance of the role played by QCAT in the civil justice system of our state. In a direct message to the Attorney-General and to the arm of executive government that, in the words of Bill Potts, are deaf to the demands and requirements of delivering justice in Queensland, the Attorney-General must fight harder for the resources that are necessary to support this jurisdiction. To finish with the words of Justice Daubney in relation to community expectations—

Nor can they be met unless and until QCAT's resourcing issues are adequately addressed.

The opposition is very happy to support the bill. These are necessary reforms to lemon laws and, indeed, to the operational efficiency of QCAT and the operation of the jurisdiction administratively throughout Queensland.

Mr Minnikin: Show us the money!

Mr JANETZKI: I will take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth, there is a need to show us the money because it is not good enough to expand ever more the jurisdiction of QCAT but to underresource it so grievously.

 **Mr KING** (Kurwongbah—ALP) (5.12 pm): I rise today to make a small contribution to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The purpose of this bill is twofold: firstly, it delivers on the implementation of recommendations from the review of the QCAT Act; and, secondly, delivers on the Palaszczuk government's promise to introduce laws to help purchasers of lemon motor vehicles.

I will firstly highlight the amendments to increase QCAT's operational efficiency. These amendments, which implement the conclusions of the QCAT Act review, include clarifying that QCAT's tenancy jurisdiction is limited to claims of not more than \$25,000; changing the scope, timing and operation of stay orders, for example, to allow QCAT to stay the operation of part of a decision; allowing the principal registrar to issue notices requiring a party to attend a hearing; allowing the Attorney-General to appoint members and others to a pool of persons who can act as senior members from time to time; and providing a framework to enable QCAT to undertake conciliation.

The second part of the legislation, and the part which has attracted most interest, is the provision of greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle. This is to be achieved by lifting QCAT's jurisdictional limit on motor vehicles from \$25,000 to \$100,000; redefining the term 'vehicle' to include

motorhomes and caravans; reinstating the statutory warranty for class B older second-hand vehicles sold by motor dealers; and continuing to advocate for national laws to specifically protect new car buyers, including purchasers of lemon vehicles.

The purchase of a lemon vehicle can impose a lot of unfair stress on an individual or a family. A vehicle is often a large expense to a family budget—some of us have more than one and love playing with them and get in trouble for it. It is sometimes bought using finance. When the vehicle constantly plays up and exhibits defects it becomes more trouble than it is worth. I can attest to that wholeheartedly. The requesting of repairs, diagnosing of faults and gathering the proof of sometimes intermittent faults can be time consuming. I commend long-term advocate for this reform, Connie Cicchini, who has been strongly pushing for the changes that we are bringing about in relation to these lemon laws. Her patience and persistence has helped alleviate the frustration of many vehicle owners.

During the public hearing one of the topics discussed was the \$100,000 limit which would appear to exclude vehicles just over that limit. We interrogated that idea and asked Mr Chris Mackenzie, director of the office of regulatory policy, Liquor and Gaming Regulation and Fair Trading in the Department of Justice and Attorney-General, if, for example, it is a part of the vehicle, say the motor or gearbox that is faulty and the replacement cost comes to \$40,000, and if this gearbox or the engine or a combination of three faults of, say, \$40,000 add up to \$120,000, is that \$120,000 claim recognised because it is over the limit. Obviously the vehicle is a lemon if it keeps having gearboxes, engine or major component failures. Mr Mackenzie replied—

Each individual replacement on that situation could continue to be a new claim each time ... We will try to conciliate and fix those complaints long before it hits that limit. A complaint such as that where a gearbox might be replaced on a LandCruiser would be considered one claim. If that was successful and that was replaced and it happened again, that is a whole new claim, a whole new complaint and a whole new set-up. Ultimately it might be \$120,000 if three gearboxes were replaced, but it would be an individual asset each time. We would hope that we could intervene or try to conciliate and negotiate a successful outcome on that long before it got to that point.

I will not go too much further into it as there are many people still to speak, but that was a key issue that came up and I liked that response.

I thank the members of the Transport and Public Works Committee: Bart Mellish, the member for Aspley; Jo-Ann Miller, the member for Bundamba; Kim Richards, the member for Redlands who filled in at our public hearing; our deputy chair, Ted Sorensen, the member for Hervey Bay; Colin Boyce, the member for Callide; and Robbie Katter, the member for Traeger; and, as always, our hardworking secretariat staff, Deb, Margaret and the team, for all their efforts on this report. The committee made one recommendation and that was the bill be passed. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (5.17 pm): I rise to speak on the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The policy objectives and the reasons for the bill are to amend the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009; to implement conclusions from the report titled *Review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009* aimed at improving the operational efficiency of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal to better achieve the objects of the QCAT Act; to amend the QCAT Act, Fair Trading Act 1989 and Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014 to implement the government's commitment to improve fairness and provide greater rights for Queenslanders buying a vehicle; and address recommendation 7 of the lemon laws inquiry prepared by the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee. I believe this is a step in the right direction. I put in a statement of reservation in relation to the funding of QCAT.

The president also warned of the impact under-resourcing issues are having on the staff and asked the government to address the resource issue urgently. As detailed in QCAT's 2017-18 annual budget, QCAT staff are already stretched beyond all reasonable and proper levels of tolerance. The expansion of QCAT's jurisdiction to deal with lemon laws is likely to cause inflexibility and, at times, lengthy delays in tribunal proceedings. If we do not resource QCAT properly, this issue will only extend further. That is the problem that I see with this bill. It is not about the bill but its funding. As the Attorney-General said, there is a \$500,000 one-off. Well, a one-off will not solve this problem, as was mentioned by a number of people. At the end of the day, I do not believe that \$500,000 will solve the problem. Once that threshold is increased from \$25,000 to \$100,000, more people will make claims through QCAT. I think this is a really good idea, especially with vehicles becoming more expensive all the time.

The Queensland Law Society and the Legal Community Centre support the changes. I think this is really good, because when you talk about consumers' expenses in court cases where they need lawyers and so on for simple things like fencing, it makes it very difficult. The Townsville Community

Legal Service expressed concerns about the onus of proof on motor vehicles. The onus to prove that a motor vehicle is not of an acceptable quality remains with the consumer. The consumer has to foot the bill for the expenses. A few years ago I had a situation with caravans. Those caravans were faulty, but it was up to the owners of those caravans to engage with an engineer and get an engineer's report before they could appear in any jurisdiction. If somebody builds something, it should be built to a specification. It should not be up to an owner to get engineers to decide whether or not it is built properly. Those designs should be approved.

Community Legal Centres Queensland recommended reversing the onus of proof, requiring manufacturers to prove that a vehicle does not have the defect alleged by the consumer. It argued that the amendments would remove the need for consumers to obtain costly expert reports and sustain their claims. It just pushes some people right out of the equation, because they cannot afford to get an engineer's report, similar to what I saw in terms of caravans.

The Motor Trades Association of Queensland, Lemon Caravans & RVs and the Caravan Trade & Industry Association of Queensland support the bill. There was also support for increasing from \$25,000 to \$100,000 the amount for disputes made under the ACL consumer guarantee for the supply of goods that are vehicles.

Most complaints in relation to this bill related to finances. I know that QCAT are behind the times and that, from talking to some people who work in QCAT, they are not happy. During submissions to the inquiry, Bill Potts said that QCAT must be sufficiently resourced and that legal representation may also better facilitate the efficient use of existing QCAT resources. It is timing. If we let the arguments go on and on, they just get worse. Having been in council years ago I can say that if there was a neighbourly fight and something was not done about it quickly, it would escalate and get worse. Some of these disputes just go on and on. If QCAT could deal with it very quickly and if it had the finances to do it quickly, it certainly would make a big difference in the community. I thank the committee. I thank Shane King for chairing the meetings—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Member, use the member's correct titles, please.

Mr SORENSEN: The member for Kurwongbah. I thank the committee, the staff for their expertise and the people who wrote the 13 submissions to the inquiry. I express my thanks to all those people and I hope these changes bring the intended outcomes.

 **Mr MELLISH** (Aspley—ALP) (5.26 pm): I am happy to speak in support of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 in relation to lemon laws. Put simply, this bill will increase the consumer protections of people sold new and old motor vehicles that are duds—also known as lemons. These are vehicles with numerous defects that reoccur despite multiple repair attempts or where defects have caused a motor vehicle to be out of service for a prolonged period of time. This is delivering on a Palaszczuk government election commitment. This bill increases QCAT's current jurisdictional limit from \$25,000 to \$100,000 for matters involving motor vehicles with either a major fault or multiple minor faults. If a consumer cannot obtain a suitable remedy in negotiation with a dealer or manufacturer under Australian Consumer Law, they have the option of seeking a remedy through QCAT or the courts.

This bill will also reinstate statutory warranties to older second-hand cars, meaning there will be a requirement for motor dealers to provide a warranty if a car is more than 10 years old or has clocked up more than 160,000 kilometres. In addition to the lemon laws, this bill also seeks to implement conclusions from the report titled *Review of the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009* aimed at improving the operational efficiency of QCAT to better achieve the objectives of the QCAT Act. In November last year the Transport and Public Works Committee conducted a public briefing involving the department, and on 29 January this year the committee held a public hearing.

The lemon laws come out of report No. 17 of the previous parliament and its inquiry into consumer protection and remedies for buyers of new motor vehicles in 2015. Submissions to that legal affairs committee inquiry highlighted concerns about QCAT's low monetary threshold for remedies, which excludes many new motor vehicle disputes from QCAT's jurisdiction. However, the then legal affairs committee was unable to agree on a recommendation for QCAT's jurisdictional limit for matters involving new motor vehicles with major defects. The government members of that committee recommended that the limit be removed so that no cap applied, whilst the non-government members recommended that the limit be increased to \$40,000. It is good that this parliament can see the bill with its limit of \$100,000 go through. I note that the statement of reservation does not touch on a figure for the cap, so we can only assume that those opposite support the proposal in the bill for a \$100,000 cap.

I thank those at the public hearing who spoke on the lemon laws for their insights into what these laws will mean on the ground. These include the dealer principal of Supamerc, the Motor Trades Association of Queensland, Lemon Laws 4 Aus and Lemon Caravans & RVs in Aus. I quote Ms Connie Cicchini from Lemon Laws for Aus. She stated—

Thank you very much for having me here today. I am the principal petitioner who put in the e-petition for the removal of the QCAT limit and also the reinstatement of the statutory used car warranty. I am really happy to be here and see this bill going through parliament at the moment.

To sum up the intent of the lemon laws component of the law, a car is a significant expense for many people. It is often purchased with finance. The purchase of a new car is usually the biggest purchase a person will make in their lifetime, other than a home and, as we know, many people never own their own home. If the car has persistent and ongoing defects an owner can spend significant time requesting repairs, refunds or replacements, visiting or negotiating with a dealer and their vehicle servicing department, writing to the manufacturer back and forth and seeking reports from independent mechanics and specialists. Trying to do that whilst holding down a job or going to TAFE or uni or raising a family or all of the above—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Member for Aspley, could I please ask you to adjourn the debate.

Debate, on motion of Mr Mellish, adjourned.

SAFER WATERWAYS BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 26 March (see p. 703), on motion of Mr Knuth—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (5.30 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Safer Waterways Bill 2018. As the name suggests, the bill was written in a bid to make North Queensland waterways safer. In North Queensland we do things a little differently because the environment we live in is like no other. The people who settled in this part of the world were extremely determined and they pushed into harsh, untamed country. The fruits of their labour would one day be the rewards of freedom and the ability to prosper.

Some of these great pioneering families settled on land allocated to them after the Great War. They lived in tents and cleared the land by hand. During this time, one of the battles the pioneers faced was crocodile—a man-eating monster that grew to several metres in length and would take a man without hesitation; the kind of beast that lies undetected under the water's surface for hours waiting for its next victim.

Without the correct legislation in place, the crocodile was hunted as an infinite resource. Hunting crocodile went from a need to protect human life to developing a very lucrative trade in crocodile meat and skins. In Queensland we got this wrong. By the 1970s we had hunted the crocodile to the point of vulnerable species. In 1974 the crocodile became a protected species.

Nature is an amazing thing. Cut a tree down and it will grow back. Protect a species and it will return. The crocodile is a resilient animal, surviving in its current form since the end of the dinosaur era. It is a sleek, well-equipped hunter and its stealth like ability is only equalled by its explosive speed and deadly bite. The crocodile is an apex predator never designed to share the location it lives in with another.

I more than anybody understand the need to find the balance between conservation and sustainability. I acknowledge the failings of our predecessors. The way crocodiles were dealt with in the past was nothing short of reckless. A balance needs to be found where humans and crocodiles can coexist in Queensland. We need to reduce the risk of crocodile attacks on humans while allowing the species to be sustained.

This is how the Safer Waterways Bill was born. The KAP worked tirelessly to consult with people who actually understand crocodiles—people working with them who understand the animal in its natural habitat and understand what they require. Out of this extensive consultation it was agreed that the best way to manage the species was to establish a Queensland crocodile authority. The authority would be located in Cairns. The function of the authority would be to manage crocodiles.

It might be a bitter pill to swallow for some, but when humans inhabit an area they make a conscious decision to displace the flora and fauna to a point that allows them to function in that area. If we want to build a building, we knock down a tree and build a building. If we want to farm in an area, we displace the animals and plants in order to make room for us to use an area. We also need to manage the risk of animal attacks in the area we are living in. Crocodile numbers have grown to a point where they are no longer under attack or threat. Their number has grown to a point in North Queensland where visitors and Queenslanders are now threatened by the imminent danger of a crocodile attack.

During the committee process we heard from two main types of witnesses—those who wanted to protect the animal at all cost and those who simply wanted their waterways back. At no time did anyone condone the bringing back of the ways of years gone by—the non-discriminate hunting of this animal. Even those who opposed the bill for whatever reason acknowledged that we have seen crocodile numbers rise to a point where we are unable to enter our waterways safely.

That could not be said for those opposite. From some of the comments that have been made during this debate, I highly doubt they have even read the bill. I challenge anybody in this House to walk the streets of Townsville, Cairns, Port Douglas or Airlie Beach and ask the people, ‘Do you think the waterways are safe and free from the risk of crocodile attacks?’ The answer every time indicates that the number has grown to a point where people believe it is unsafe to enjoy our waterways.

A generation of North Queenslanders are seeing crocodiles in places they have never seen them before. They are showing up on popular beaches, in river systems and in swimming holes once considered safe to swim in. Locals are demanding their lifestyle back. We live in North Queensland because we enjoy living, working and playing in the outdoors. All we are asking for is the right to feel safe in these areas once again.

The Queensland crocodile authority would be located in Cairns. If established it would be given the opportunity to manage the problem we are facing in the north by the north. With no disrespect to our South-East Queenslander cousins—

Ms Pugh: None taken.

Mr DAMETTO: I will take that interjection. It is very hard to manage a problem from 2,000-plus kilometres away. The authority would assess and manage the permit system to remove crocodiles in these high-risk areas. The authority would be given the power to take the necessary measures to minimise the risk of injury from crocodile attacks. The authority would also take on the responsibility of overseeing the crocodile farming industry in Queensland. This would also take in the egg-collecting component of the operation which would be based on science and evidence.

It was refreshing to hear the state government had adopted part of the Safer Waterways Bill by slipping through regulatory changes that now allow crocodile egg collecting in Queensland. The fact that this has happened indicates to us that the Labor government acknowledges that crocodile numbers are at a safe level. I was disappointed to later learn that the maximum number of eggs allowed to be collected in one year is only 5,000—a mere drop in the ocean compared to the Northern Territory’s 100,000 eggs per annum.

Now that we have seen crocodile numbers return to a sustainable level, I see no reason why we cannot be harvesting this resource like any other animal in the fishery, like fish, crabs and prawns. This bill would make an emerging industry accessible to our First Australians. An opportunity is staring them in the face to take on a role that would see economic development in their communities. From egg collecting to the harvesting of live crocodiles, our first nations people are crying out for opportunity, and this bill would help deliver that.

Another group finding themselves and their livelihood under pressure are graziers and farmers. They have the problem of crocodiles on their properties. As waterholes become inundated by an overspill of crocodiles from our rivers, graziers are left with the cost of the loss of livestock due to crocodiles feeding on their herd. All they are asking for is the ability to apply for a permit so that they can remove these crocodiles. If they had a wild dog or a problem with another Australian animal they would be able to apply to have that animal removed so they can continue their business.

This bill has been portrayed by some as open hunting season where we would see Queensland go back to the pioneering days. It is far from that. This bill sets out to deal with a problem that has arisen from years of neglecting to manage a species. Crocodile hunting was outlawed in 1974, which makes it almost 45 years since any management of this species or effective control measures have been put in place. It is time the Labor government took their heads out of their handbags and stopped doing nothing. That way they would see this problem solved.

During the committee process we heard from our local tourism industries who feared that a death on our beaches would send shock waves through the industry no different from the airline strikes in the 1980s which nearly crippled the tourism industry. Can you imagine, with camera phones and social media these days, the effect on the industry if just one tourist was lost along one of our postcard beaches—‘perfect one day, eaten the next’.

One of the arguments from self-proclaimed experts is that removing large crocodiles from ecosystems is dangerous due to the way large crocodiles protect their patch and keep small crocodiles out of the area. A story run on ABC online on 14 June highlights what happened in the Northern Territory when crocodiles were left to self-manage. The article states—

“I just flew the drone and they just kept coming,” fisherman Wade Kelly, who filmed the clip, said.

“I see a fair few crocs around all the rivers up here at low tide on dry season mornings, but I’ve never seen that many all together like that.”

I also table a screenshot of the crocodiles in the Daly River.

Tabled paper: Photograph, undated, depicting crocodiles [504].

In the north we do not want a Cross River Rail system; we just want our river systems back. We want to be able to enjoy the things we did when we were young. We want to go waterskiing and fishing. We want to get out there and show our children the lifestyle we enjoyed when we were growing up. I am asking our fellow North Queensland MPs to vote in favour of this bill and to show their support for a sensible solution to a burning problem in our electorates.

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferry Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (5.40 pm): I rise to oppose this bill and the reasons will become quite obvious later on in my contribution. The Katter party has introduced this private member’s bill, and I understand that there are some legitimate concerns out there from some individuals, some community groups and commercial entities who interact with crocodiles on a regular basis. I have had similar concerns raised with me in my capacity as Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries as I have travelled the many kilometres around our beautiful state. In fact, two canefarmers provided evidence to the committee and these statements are contained in the report. Vince Vitale, a canefarmer from Herbert River, summed up his opposition to the bill stating—

As far as I am concerned, there is not a problem with crocodiles: there is a problem with people. Politicians, newspapers and other people like that cause crocodiles more trouble than anyone else. If politicians did not look for votes all the time they would not be bragging and bashing our ears about crocodiles.

He summed it up well. Another canefarmer from the Herbert River, Raymond Venables, agreed, advising that he was happy with the current management program and that the current bill is an ‘abomination’ and ‘should not even be considered’.

The issues raised in this bill have been through a comprehensive analysis. I acknowledge the committee and the hard work that they do in terms of not only this bill but other bills before this House. They made one recommendation, and that is not to pass the bill. I commend the government members—in particular, the committee chair, the member for Stretton—and also the non-government members on the committee for their examination of the evidence in detail and in respect of the report.

In particular, I acknowledge the great efforts the committee made in travelling around Queensland to have hearings on this bill. I know that many members in this room will speak to this particular issue from their own experiences either directly or through family and friends. Like many members, I have family in Far North Queensland and have had for many years. In fact, I will be up there in a couple of weeks spending time with them. Many of my agricultural stakeholders, at all stages of the primary industry supply chain, are in that region also.

The government has taken positive steps in crocodile management. In fact, in 2016-17 the government allocated \$5.8 million over three years to improve crocodile management in Queensland. This funding is being used to deliver 12 wildlife officer positions and a three-year crocodile monitoring program. The three-year crocodile monitoring program is assessing estuarine crocodile population and distribution trends in waterways from Gladstone to the Northern Territory border—the first such survey in Queensland in over a decade. Wildlife officers from the Department of Environment and Science have systematically surveyed more than 2,400 kilometres of waterways since the crocodile population monitoring program began in April 2017. We are also focusing and delivering on education. The Queensland government’s Crocwise program provides information on the risks of living in crocodile habitat and the measures they can take to minimise those risks.

Let us turn to the evidence on the possible effects of the bill. It is important that we listen to the experts on this. My greatest concern with this bill is that it promotes unsafe and concerning ideas about what constitutes 'safe conduct' around crocodiles and potential crocodile habitats. I have seen these conditions myself. Queensland is fortunate to have some of the world's leading crocodile experts and conservationists based right here at Australia Zoo and in North Queensland. I have been very fortunate—over 11 years—to have a long association with the Irwin family and their mission to promote, protect and preserve our magnificent Australian animals. I know that the member for Glass House has also been in the same position as I have. He is privileged to have that association and to have them in his electorate. I look forward to listening to his contribution in the chamber tonight on this bill should he arrive.

Later, in my role in that other place in Canberra, I came to appreciate the good work that the Irwins and their foundations were doing to promote and influence conservation policies at a national and international level. For those members who are unfamiliar with it, the Steve Irwin Wildlife Reserve is a wetland conservation property and a tribute to the 'Crocodile Hunter', Steve Irwin. The property sprawls across 135,000 hectares of the Cape York Peninsula and is home to a set of important spring-fed wetlands. These wetlands provide a critical water source to threatened habitat, provide a permanent flow of water to the Wenlock River and are home to rare and vulnerable plants and wildlife. I have had the absolute privilege of being up there on several occasions. I have jumped a 10.5 feet long crocodile myself with Terri and Bindi, so I do understand the challenges involved with managing crocodiles. I have enjoyed a long association with that family.

The Wenlock River has the strongest population of crocodiles in Queensland and, with crocodiles being listed as a threatened species, this area is an ideal site for research. When it comes to research, I do not think that there is anyone better in this world and in this country than Professor Craig Franklin from the School of Biological Sciences at the University of Queensland. Each year he joins the Australia Zoo croc team in this location. He does the research, captures the data and sends it back so that people can have a complete analysis of what crocodiles mean to our environment, the ecosystem they live in and the effects as a whole. I want to quote from Terri Irwin's submission. She opened her submission by saying that this bill—

... is a misnomer in name and intent. Rather than making waterways safer for people in Queensland, this Bill will increase the risk of more crocodile attacks on people.

While on the subject of safety, I note that the objective of this bill is to 'eliminate from our waterways all crocodiles that pose a threat to human life' and that this removal 'may involve killing'. I believe that one of the greatest threats in our society these days is the misuse of firearms. The last thing we want to see is irresponsible and reckless culling. In the last government, in a desire by One Nation and the member for Gympie for a relaxed approach to firearms control, we saw the member for Gympie join with One Nation and cross the floor in support of firearms. A wild and uncontrolled approach to firearms control and culling associated with this bill is not the management solution that the people of Queensland want or expect. I encourage members to follow the evidence and science and vote against this bill.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (5.48 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Safer Waterways Bill 2018. This private member's bill was introduced into the 55th Parliament by the then member for Dalrymple before it lapsed due to the House being dissolved due to the calling of the state election. The bill was reintroduced by the now member for Hill in 2018. I was a member of the committee that inquired into this bill in the former parliament. The committee held public hearings here in Brisbane and visited a crocodile farm owned by John Levers and his family outside Rockhampton.

There is no doubt that crocodile numbers have increased dramatically in recent times. As we have heard, crocodile numbers were decimated due to hunting for skins throughout the forties, fifties and sixties. This led to them being protected in Western Australia, the Northern Territory and Queensland during the 1970s. Since then, crocodile numbers have increased to the extent that they have now spread into heavily populated areas in the north and have resulted in an increasing number of crocodile attacks on humans. Due to the large size and power of a crocodile, the chances of surviving such an attack are very low and the result is almost always fatal.

There is no argument that the numbers need to be controlled, particularly in populated areas. Unfortunately, this bill is not the vehicle to achieve this without its fair share of risks. While well intentioned, this bill is another case of overreach.

During our hearing on the bill, there was even a suggestion of trophy and safari hunting of crocodiles, but that was more likely to result in wounded crocodiles inhabiting our waterways and increasing the danger, not decreasing it. The professional shooters who hunted crocodiles in the past

mostly hunted at night with spotlights so they could get very close to them so they could be shot in the brain with a very high-powered rifle. Crocodile management should be left in the hands of those who specialise in that field, as stated by Mick Burns, Chair of the Crocodile Farmers Association of the Northern Territory. He said—

Crocodiles need to be identified. Problem crocodiles need to be identified and removed. It is important that we do this in a smart way. We need better data. We need to be very conscious, as one of the earlier presenters mentioned, about the indiscriminate killing of crocodiles. That is going to do Queensland damage on a range of fronts, and we have to be very careful that that is not one of the outcomes.

It is the role of the government to protect our citizens from harm, and that should include the control of dangerous animals such as crocodiles and sharks. The Palaszczuk government needs to take notice of the LNP's policy regarding crocodiles. The LNP does have a plan to control crocodile numbers which includes removing crocodiles of any size from urban areas by whatever means it takes by professionally trained and licensed operators. Control will also include commercial egg harvesting. The LNP recognises the problem that crocodiles are causing in the north. We are committed to addressing this problem, but as I stated this bill is not the solution.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (5.51 pm): I have to say that doing nothing about the control of crocodiles is worse than actually doing something for them. The reason I state this is that, when the community take things into their own hands, crocodiles are killed—just like some of the things I said with the platypus. One of the reporters said to me, 'Mr Andrew, how do you know that platypuses are dying in the wild?' No-one is actually going to show a photo of a dead platypus that comes out of an opera house pot. They throw it in the grass and discard it because of the shame it brings upon them and also it is against the law.

The best thing for crocodiles is to actually make them worth something and then they will be conserved through commerce, rather than being lost to a backyard where someone puts out a hook and catches them and lets them die or shoots them because they think they are a risk to their livestock, their family or their dogs that are working the banks that the crocodiles live on. It would be different if people knew that they were worth something and that they were protected through a scheme like the one the Katter party are proposing. With any other native animal, we use mitigation permits that are looked at by departments or the people in the authority that is running it.

We do have the research so we know what is happening, as Minister Furner pointed out, and we are putting money towards research. Why wouldn't we use that research to conserve these reptiles through commerce? In that way, we would get the best out of them for Queensland and we would know there was no vigilante activity happening in the background where these animals are killed off without anybody actually realising it is happening. This is the shameful part of it. You can all sit here and think, 'That's not a problem. We'll do nothing and leave it as the status quo,' but what actually happens in the wild and in the districts is the total opposite.

People are destroying too many of these reptiles and then we are losing the understanding of the numbers and what is going on and we are not conserving anything because we do not know what is being done. People think there are some problem crocodiles, but rather than taking one or two that may pose a problem, they think, 'Let's just get rid of the lot.' When that happens, we do not know what is going on. Is that the right way to handle things here? Let us legislate to make it sensible. We do a mitigation permit system now for other native species. This should be extended to the crocodile. It is just common sense and it would also allow the species to go on.

I have so many stories I could tell the House. One of the biggest crocodiles that was ever caught was in the Pioneer River. It was shot off the Leichhardt Hotel with a .600 Nitro Express, a Martini-Henry. It was 32 foot long; it was a massive creature. It was no doubt related to the ancient Sarcosuchus that actually roamed way back in the prehistoric times. That animal was shot because it stalked the people who were going on horseback across that river over to Cremorne every day and it scared one of the girls and took one of the kids off the back of a horse. If the locals had actually wanted to live with the crocodile, it probably could have lived. If it was worth something to someone and we knew about tourism in those times, it probably would still be alive. Who knows?

Instead, no consideration was given to it and people just turned a blind eye on the issue and said, 'Don't worry about it. They'll look after themselves. They'll just keep growing in the populations as they're doing.' That is not going to happen. Let us be realistic. It will not happen. They will be killed behind the scenes and the poor animals do not even get a chance. I am a shooter myself, and the last thing I would ever consider doing is shooting a crocodile because I think they are great because I know what they do for the environment. I know the leavings that they put in the swamp look after the barramundi fingerlings and they do everything else for the different ecosystems where they live. It would

be a way better option to make this structured, rather than just turning a blind eye and thinking it will not happen, or they will not reduce their numbers or we will not see a decline in the population down the track because people start taking it into their own hands.

I will say that there is a great potential for Queensland to invigorate a sleeping resource that we have not tapped into. A lot of the traditional owners gave evidence in Mackay at the crocodile hearings. Eddie Ramsamy was there, John Lever was there and one of the other traditional owners, George Tonga, was there. They all said the same thing: 'This would be great for us up here and it would be great for the people to know that we're looking after this resource and we're bringing export dollars back into Queensland.' I think that has heaps of merit.

As I said earlier, it is conservation through commerce. That is an important thing we should be looking for, especially with an animal like that which does not scream out when it gets caught. Crocodiles can stay on the end of a hook and die from exposure because someone wants to get rid of them. We are not allowing these people to have the rights and to understand what they should be doing as a person who wants to conserve this resource.

As we know, 90 per cent of the eggs are eaten by either goannas or wild pigs, so egg harvesting should be a big thing that we look at. Again, if people on the land could make money out of even spotting or finding these egg clusters, it would give these animals more of a place in the community and they would be looked after rather than destroyed. We have to understand this, rather than just say, 'No, we're not doing anything.' Using the private enterprise skills of people like John Lever and Eddie Ramsamy, who have been in the game for years, we can train and use mitigation permits to be able to work within the framework of what the Katter boys are actually saying. That would be a win for the people and also a win for the crocodiles.

Egg harvesting places that crucial value there and that understanding. If there is a dangerous animal, we could watch it, take it out of the system and give it to John or John could come and grab it. Then people would not say, 'There was a problem crocodile. Now we've taken it away and everything else gets left behind.' There would be none of these vigilante shooters going out and thinking, 'We've got to make sure we get the right crocodile so let's just shoot them all and make God the judge.' We do not want that.

Honourable members might think it does not happen but it does. I know that in the old days that was the way it was done. Being who we are, being restructured the way we are and knowing the research that has been done, we should take a different approach and add that value to them. In that way we could conserve their future so that they are in the waterways.

I have been to New Guinea. People say that there are big crocodiles there. However, they will not be seen because they have been hunted so much that they are flat out even laying eggs. If we do nothing crocodiles will not even have their own place in the waterway because they are pushed by people we do not know who have bad intentions in the name of making things better and safer for people. As I said, we should take it upon ourselves to do these things through mitigation permits and through scientific research that Minister Furner mentioned earlier. Then we could have a really good outcome that gives Queensland export dollars, that gives us a safe waterway for people to work within and guess what? It would be free of problem crocodiles. The ones who want to live there and do their thing would be left alone to keep working throughout their life span and be able to give back to their own community.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—Ind) (6.00 pm): This is the first time I have risen in the House since becoming the Independent member for Whitsunday to speak on a bill. It is an issue that is certainly polarising for a lot of people. I would like to cut to the chase. This bill was introduced by the member for Hill, formerly the member for Dalrymple. It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge that whilst we have not always agreed on everything, the member for Hill has been patient—and then some—in waiting to see this bill come before the House. No matter who they vote for, a lot of people in North Queensland have been waiting to see where this lands on George Street. There is no doubt in my mind that what we have here is a North Queensland solution to a North Queensland problem.

I was on that committee that travelled around North and Far North Queensland. We heard from Mr Ramsamy, as my neighbouring colleague the member for Mirani has alluded to; Mr Tonga; and Mr Lever, who is one of the foremost authorities on crocodile management in the nation and perhaps second only to Professor Grahame Webb from Crocodylus Park in Darwin, whom we also visited as part of our deliberations in examining the bill before the House. There is no doubt that people are becoming more and more scared of a fatality, of a rogue croc taking a tourist or a local.

No matter where we sit on the political spectrum, surely the first job of anyone coming into this place is to look after the citizens of Queensland and visitors to our state, to protect our citizens. I appreciate the economic considerations, and we have heard that from different people in the crocodile farming sector in terms of our responsibilities internationally to CITES. It is a bit like comparing our obligations to Paris. What about us? What about our kids? What about our tourists?

I can tell honourable members in the House tonight that the chairman of Tourism Whitsundays, Al Grundy, told me some time ago that they have even seen crocodiles at Blue Pearl Bay on Hayman Island, and nobody wants to talk about it. I am going to talk about it in the chamber tonight because it is in the public interest to do so. Those investors are pouring millions and millions into rebuilding our tourist resorts in the Whitsundays, the place that I call paradise, yet there is a growing menace out there. No-one wants to knock out an entire species. I do not want to do that.

Mr Katter: No-one wants to do that.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the leader of the KAP, the member for Traeger. No-one in their right mind wants that. As we all know, they were shot at almost until extinction until things turned around in 1974. Consequently, my generation grew up in North Mackay not even thinking about crocodiles and, Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure that resonates with you, with due respect.

Mr Andrew: McCreadys Creek.

Mr COSTIGAN: I heard the interjection from the member for Mirani, McCreadys Creek, which forms part of the southern boundary of my electorate. I heard what the member for Mirani had to say about that crocodile that is part of folklore that was shot from the banks of the Pioneer River many, many moons ago. There are people in my electorate today who remember the two girls going to school at Pindi Pindi many moons ago and the tragic consequences on that particular day. A lot of time has passed since then; we have moved into a new century and a new era and we have an industry there that we need to consider and foster.

I go back to what was said by those who came before the committee. In their overview in their submission, Tourism Tropical North Queensland, the regional tourism body, said that the current approach is not working for our community. With great respect to the Minister for Agriculture, that came from the regional tourism body. Remember between the Whitsundays and the far north, we are basically it when it comes to the Great Barrier Reef with all due respect to other destinations, and honourable members can look at the numbers. There is no doubt that if there is an incident, whether it is at Four Mile Beach at Port Douglas in the electorate of Cook, Palm Cove, Mission Beach, The Strand in Townsville or in Airlie Beach, it will lead to catastrophic consequences for the tourism industry in our state.

Anyone who follows the tourism industry in Queensland—and I would have thought that is just about everyone in this chamber—would know that the value placed on the Great Barrier Reef recently was something like \$60 billion. I come back to what I said a moment ago. Imagine a crocodile not in an estuary, not even at the boat ramp, but swimming at Blue Pearl Bay on Hayman Island where people go diving looking for Nemo and Dory. Imagine the shock if those people saw a crocodile coming at them. I do not want to have to take a phone call from the BBC or CNN as we go into damage control. We would never ever hear the end of it.

What did the local tourism body in the far north that is Tourism Port Douglas and Daintree, TPDD, have to say to the committee? They said—

... negative publicity surrounding crocodile sightings and attacks in the mainstream and social media, contributes to a perceived increasing risk and resulting diminishing safety of our beaches, which poses a potentially devastating impact on our tourism industry through lost visitation and reduced length of stay.

It is about conservation through commerce. I do not want to see people taken by crocodiles; no-one wants that. No-one wants that at all. Back home the people of Tourism Whitsundays probably will not like what I have had to say tonight in this debate. I do not want to scare the tourists, but recently we have had crocodiles sighted again off Cannonvale Beach. There are more and more sightings, so we cannot just sit back and do nothing.

This committee did good work. It conducted public hearings in Port Douglas, in Cairns, in Townsville and in Mackay. All North Queensland members in this chamber, particularly those members north of the Tropic of Capricorn, should be putting public safety at the top of their priorities in this debate. I look forward to seeing how the member for Burdekin in particular votes on this, and I would not be the only one.

I have to say that before the last state election the member for Clayfield—and the crossbench would be particularly interested in this—the then leader of the LNP, came to my electorate to hear the concerns of John Galea, co-patron alongside myself and his wife, Gaye, of the Eimeo Surf Lifesaving Club. Mr Galea made it very clear that these concerns are real. Do not drop the ‘C’ word—no culling. I have not advocated a free-for-all at all. I never have and never will.

Mr Andrew: No-one has.

Mr COSTIGAN: No-one has; I take the interjection from my crossbench colleague. I come back to public safety being of paramount importance. Surely it is the first job of anyone who comes into this place.

Mr Katter: People’s lives are at stake.

Mr COSTIGAN: There are a few crocodiles on George Street, but these are the ones that really concern me. As the member for Traeger has just said, people’s lives are at stake as well as our much vaunted tourism industry.

I want to thank everyone who came to the public hearings in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Port Douglas. It was interesting that the Whitsunday Regional Council did not take any interest in this. As I recall, they did not provide a submission; they did not turn up. Recently they started talking about crocodiles in the Proserpine River on the back of me trying to save the Wilson Beach swimming enclosure. Our lifestyle has been turned upside down. We have lost what we used to enjoy. I am not suggesting for one minute that this provides an ironclad guarantee.

Mr Dametto: No-one is.

Mr COSTIGAN: No-one is suggesting that either. I take the interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. The risk is going up and up. What are we going to do? Are we just going to sit around and do nothing? Are we just going to sit on our gluteus maximus and come up with a big fat zero? I do not think so.

Mr Andrew: Preserve the species through commerce.

Mr COSTIGAN: I take the interjection from the member for Mirani. Through commerce we can preserve the species. The crocodiles are there to be respected. Our first Australians are concerned. We heard the comments from Mr Ramsamy at the public hearing in Mackay. There are so many people expecting us to do something about it. Needless to say, I support the bill.

 **Mr KNUTH (Hill—KAP) (6.10 pm):** I am very, very proud of the KAP for the work they have done on this bill. I would love to see this bill turn into an act. We visited many communities: Cairns, the Daintree and Mareeba. Robbie visited communities up in the gulf. We spoke to many Indigenous representatives to get their views, and we took the issues that were raised in those regions and put them into this legislation.

We have not seen any other legislation before the House. It is quite disappointing that we have heard a lot of speakers who do not understand because they were not brought up in North Queensland and never had the opportunity to swim in places like Stewart Creek or Saltwater Creek, or ski in the Johnstone River, or somersault off the pontoon at Lake Placid or ski in the Tully River. These are activities that we could once do. We enjoyed our quality of life in that region because of those activities, and that has been taken away from us because of crocs. All we are trying to achieve is to claim back our waterways; that is very simple.

After hearing the language used here today and at the previous sitting, I can understand the frustration that North Queenslanders in particular have with parliamentarians. Some members here have basically said that this is virtually an illusion and we do not have a croc problem. Back in 2017 we had 177 croc sightings but within the last two months there have been close to 170. By the end of the year that would equate to about 1,000. Last year there were almost 800 sightings. Government members say that people are reporting the same croc twice, but the formula is still the same from 2010 to what it is now. Nothing has changed.

I will read out a few articles. This is from the *Cairns Post*, ‘Croc cull has clear support’. It does not have support here—we just noticed—but it has clear support in North Queensland where we have the problem. We do not have a problem here; we are going to vote against this bill. But there it says that it has clear support. In the *Cairns Post* the deputy editor said—

To cull or not to cull?

That is a question we asked our readers: Do you support a cull of crocodiles? The response was an unequivocal 77 per cent—

supported a cull.

This grassroots feedback reflects a community that wants more action and that a sensible culling program is warranted.

We appreciate and understand the value of crocodiles to the environment, to tourism and as part of our special wildlife assets, but they are becoming a threat to our lifestyle.

Crocodiles are no longer endangered and are encroaching into urban living.

They are a risk at our beaches, creeks and drains. They are moving further inland. They are found in places never seen before.

Crocodiles are no longer wary of and will stalk people.

Instead of them being afraid we are afraid.

I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Cairns Post*, dated 3 July 2018, titled 'Croc cull has clear support' [505].

I will table another one titled 'Biggest rise in beach closures due to crocodiles in Far North in five years'.

I will also read this out. It states—

Surf Life Saving Queensland North Queensland regional manager Col Sparkes said the recent crocodile alerts were a 'wake-up call' for local politicians in terms of the change that has occurred to aquatic recreation in Cairns in recent years.

'We've had these wonderful swimming holes like Ross and Locke, but we can no longer swim at them,' he said.

'The people of Cairns just want their swimming holes back. But (the State Government's) advice is "this is croc country—don't go in the water".'

We used to swim in Ross and Locke and we used to swim in Lake Placid, but we do not now. The government says that this is their territory, but the people up there say 'This once was ours.' It continues—

He said the Government's crocodile removal program needed to be stepped up in order to protect swimmers.

'We need to be making sure that we're getting rid of these (crocodiles) out there,' he said.

I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Cairns Post*, dated 3 January 2011, titled 'Biggest rise in beach closures due to crocodiles in Far North in five years' [506].

I table an article titled 'Report confirms that Queensland's saltwater crocodile populations are rising'.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail* online, dated 26 July 2017, titled 'Report confirms that Queensland's saltwater crocodile populations are rising' [507].

Another article is titled 'Crocodile kills and eats family dog on property near Innisfail'. That croc came out of the water beside where a five-year-old girl was walking. It took the dog right beside her; it could have been the girl. The parents are still traumatised over this. I table the article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail* online, dated 4 April 2017, titled 'Crocodile kills and eats family dog on property near Innisfail' [508].

Mr Andrew: He's supposed to be educated.

Mr KNUTH: Supposed to be educated. 'Crocodile caught and killed in Cindy Waldron search found to have human remains inside'; I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from *ABC News* online, dated 4 June 2016, titled 'Crocodile caught and killed in Cindy Waldron search found to have human remains inside' [509].

I table an article titled 'Crocodile captured that killed spear fisherman Warren Hughes in far north Queensland'.

Tabled paper: Article from *ABC News* online, dated 22 March 2017, titled 'Crocodile captured that killed spear fisherman Warren Hughes in far north Queensland' [510].

I table an article titled 'Hungry crocodile stops swimmers at Far North beach'. Another article is titled 'Babinda croc at large'. No-one would have ever believed in their wildest dreams that with the crystal clear water at the Rotary Park camping grounds they would ever swim up that far. Thousands of tourists come up every year to swim in that region because they are told they are going to be safe. Now three-metre crocs are in those beautiful swimming holes. I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Cairns Post*, dated 6 June 2018, titled 'Babinda croc at large' [511].

'Bingil Bay turtle croc goes viral'. This article states—

... a 3.5m metre croc swimming towards a beach where two children were swimming.

Mr Flaherty got the kids out of the water before filming the reptile with his drone and saw it had a turtle in its mouth.

That is one of our favourite swimming places. I table that.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Innisfail Advocate*, dated 25 April 2018, titled 'Bingil Bay turtle croc goes viral' [512].

I table an article titled 'Beach empty as croc sighted'.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Cairns Post*, dated 18 January 2018, titled 'Beach empty as croc sighted' [513].

I have another inch of A4 papers I could read out, but I do not have time because there are that many of them. You would say, 'This is an illusion. It is not reality. They are just dodgy figures. We only have one croc every kilometre.' No wonder the people of North Queensland lack trust in the politicians and MPs who are supposed to represent them. I table those documents.

Tabled paper: Bundle of media articles regarding crocodiles [514].

I want to read out a loaded question from the member for Stretton to the chairperson of Tourism Tropical North Queensland at the Cairns public hearing on 27 August last year. This is a loaded question from the chairman of the environment committee to the chairperson of Tourism Tropical North Queensland. He said—

We will now move on to questions. Mrs Morris, this issue—

meaning the crocs—

has been the subject of a lot of debate. You talked about the impact on tourism and the need to look at strategies. It is the job of this committee to analyse this bill and report to the parliament. Although some people may skirt around the issue, the reality is, in my view, that this bill would undoubtedly lead to the killing of a lot more crocodiles than currently is the case. I want to get your view on what kind of impact you think that would have if there was large-scale killing of crocodiles in Far North ...

The chairperson of the environment committee is asking this. He is putting a question to Tourism Tropical North Queensland and he says—

... a lot more crocodiles than currently is the case. I want to get your view on what kind of impact you think that would have if there was large-scale killing of crocodiles in Far North Queensland in terms of the potential tourism impacts.

He is asking for his view on large-scale killing of crocodiles and its impact on tourism. He went on—

I am thinking about measures that were introduced a few years ago in Northern Territory to try to control the camel population—camels are an introduced species obviously; saltwater crocodiles are native to Australia—and the international attention that garnered. I am wondering what impacts and what kind of commentary the large-scale killing of crocodiles could cause.

This is the chairman of the committee asking a question about the tourism industry. This is an absolute disgrace. The member for Stretton clearly tried to bully the spokesperson for the peak tourism body in North Queensland. He should be removed from the committee.

What the member for Stretton should have asked was: 'What would be the impact on the tourism industry from worldwide media generated if a child was taken by a crocodile in Far North Queensland?' He tried to set the course of the public hearing by sensationalising and misinterpreting views that suit him in Brisbane but do not suit the people of North Queensland. That would be far more damaging to the industry than any culling program ever would be. Losing a child would be far more damaging to the tourism industry than the culling of crocodiles would be.

As I said, 75 per cent of North Queenslanders want to see crocodiles culled. Why? It is because they have had enough. As I said, there were 177 sightings in 2010, 800 sightings in 2018 and 158 sightings in the last two months. That extrapolates to 1,000 by the end of the year. Government members will say that people are reporting the same crocodile. The majority of people are not reporting sightings anymore because they know that it is an utter waste of time.

I have good news. I appreciate the fact that the government has endorsed one of the components of this bill—that is, egg harvesting. We appreciate that. We believe that it needs to increase from 5,000 to about 100,000 eggs per year. I also note the opposition's support for removal of crocodiles in populated areas. The KAP put this on the agenda. We met with the federal Minister for the Environment, Josh Frydenberg. To ensure that Queensland could manage its own biodiversity, we wanted to make sure the federal government would not step in. We had acceptance from Josh Frydenberg that the federal government would not interfere if Queensland wanted to cull crocodiles.

I will quickly refer to comments made in respect of the crocodile authority. Members talk about shooting and culling. Then they say, 'We will do nothing because of this culling. We will just leave everything the way it is. Let's promote our tourism industry in North Queensland and encourage people from America and elsewhere to come and swim in our pristine waterways but say to them when they get here, after they see signs about crocodiles everywhere, "If you go out there, there is a really good chance that you will die." That is the reality. This was said by every other member who spoke in the House tonight. It is about an authority playing a part. The explanatory notes state—

The bill achieves the ... objectives ... by creating the Queensland Crocodile Authority.

They continue—

... the Queensland Crocodile Authority is based in Cairns—

not Brisbane. Where are the problems? They are in North Queensland and not in Brisbane, where there are no crocodiles.

The bill states that the Queensland crocodile authority would be responsible for authorising persons to farm crocodiles in the state and for deciding the number of crocodile eggs that may be harvested each year in any part of the state. Members on both sides of the House do not know. They propose 5,000. Indigenous communities are saying that to get a return they need 100,000.

The bill states that the authority would also authorise persons to harvest crocodile eggs in any part of the state, decide the number of crocodiles that may be culled each year in any part of the state and authorise persons to carry out the culling of crocodiles in any part of the state. Who is authorising it? The member for Stretton said that it would be all-out blasting. It would be the crocodile authority that authorises it—not Shane Knuth but a government department.

The bill states that the authority would ensure the prompt management of rogue crocodiles by authorising persons to kill or relocate rogue crocodiles in any part of the state and would ensure that the carcasses of all crocodiles killed under an authorisation granted by the director are dealt with so that, as far as possible, no part of a carcass is wasted. This bill is about putting a value on crocodiles and ensuring a return to the local economy, from which all Queenslanders benefit. It is not a free-for-all.

The bill states that the authority would coordinate research into, and the routine surveying of, crocodile population numbers and distribution in the state, and crocodile egg numbers and distribution in the state; promote the farming of crocodiles and the harvesting of crocodile eggs in the state; investigate the viability of the use of state land to farm crocodiles or as crocodile reserves; declare and manage crocodile reserves; and make recommendations to parliament about crocodile management in the state.

We travelled all around the north of the state and got all of this information from the Indigenous communities, from the Cape York Land Council and from crocodile farmers. Even the federal member for Leichhardt said, 'We need some sort of body people go to, because it is no good going to Brisbane. People need a local response to deal with crocodile problems on the ground.' That is what the bill provides.

We appreciate the fact that two elements of the bill have been accepted. One is egg harvesting and the other is the removal of crocodiles in populated areas within 72 hours. Our proposal was for removal within 48 hours. That is all well and good, but there are other issues to be dealt with. One is dealing with crocodiles in swimming holes in unpopulated areas. The areas might be unpopulated but the swimming holes are well used. Well, they are not used now because they are full of crocodiles. The issue of egg-harvesting permits is something that both sides of the House need to deal with. The financial return to Indigenous communities from crocodiles is another issue that needs to be dealt with. It is all right to say that we will remove crocodiles from populated areas within 72 hours, but we need to deal with all of the other factors.

The KAP—small party that we are—has put this bill together. We have made the effort because we are passionate about reclaiming our waterways. We want kids to enjoy the quality of life that we enjoyed when we were growing up. They do not have that opportunity currently.

Brisbane has Lang Park. It is a great facility. I have been there many times to watch football. I have also played there. I also acknowledge that South Bank is a great asset. The south-east has trains running frequently so that people can travel from the Gold Coast to the Sunshine Coast, out to Ferny Grove and so on. Brisbane also has big shopping centres. What do we have in North Queensland? We have freshwater waterways, and they have been taken off us. We are trying to claim them back. That is all we are asking. That is not really a lot to ask for, that we reclaim a wonderful recreation.

At a meeting of tourism operators in Port Douglas one operator said that her tourism facility could make money because people might come up there because they could see a croc. She said that 25 years ago if people asked if they could swim in the water she could say, 'Yes, no problem at all. It's possible. There's still a risk, but it's an acceptable risk.' What she was saying is that right now it is an unacceptable risk. That is the situation we are trying to bring back. It is always going to be a risk. People will always get a false sense of security and swim after crocodiles have been removed and still get taken by a croc. That is what it was like in the seventies, eighties and nineties. There was always that

little bit of risk, but we did not have to worry about seeing all of these croc signs and we did not have to worry about swimming in that nice little saltwater creek. It was never a concern. That is all we are trying to achieve—that is, to bring it back so it is an acceptable risk.

The department talks about its survey, and we saw that 18-year-old who jumped in the Johnstone River. Everyone said that he was a fool for jumping in the river because a croc bit him straightaway. He was showing off to the girls and it said that he was a fool for doing it, but the department told him that there is only one croc every kilometre. That one croc per kilometre must have been right there at the spot where he jumped in! There are many pictures in Innisfail—

Mr Millar: Don't use him.

Mr KNUTH: No, I am not using him. I am using—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Members, direct your comments through the chair.

Mr KNUTH: There are pictures around Innisfail when they used to be able to swim there. Going back 20 years ago they used to ski in the Johnstone River. They all swam in that water. Now they cannot. They skied in the Tully River and Banyan Creek. These are just some of the areas in my electorate. People used to spearfish and swim in Banyan Creek that runs through Tully, so they would just go down and out towards the sea and they would be able to spearfish there. Now they cannot or they will be dead. People used to picnic next to the Tully River and swim in the Tully River and Jarra Creek going through Tully. They used to have barbeques next to the water. They cannot now.

At Hull River farmers now have crocs all through their bore drains. What is the government doing with regard to the crocs in bore drains? It says that it has a policy to remove the crocs, but they are not being removed. The ones in the freshwater waterholes are not being removed. In terms of the Crocodile Management Plan, it only removes them in certain zones, and they are lucky to be removed even in those zones. If a crocodile is seen at a Cairns beach, very rarely is that crocodile removed or culled.

Mr Katter: How do you know it's aggressive?

Mr KNUTH: In most of those areas where those crocodiles are sighted, the department will come back and say that they have to show aggression. Meanwhile, an 18-foot crocodile is out there ready to kill somebody but it must show aggression. What is the farmer going to do every time he goes down to turn on his pump and there is an 18-foot crocodile? If members do not believe me, they should look at some of the recent pictures in the paper of dead crocodiles that were displayed. They end up dead, because farmers have a choice of whether it is them or the crocodile. Our bill will take away this problem while at the same time protecting crocodiles. It will stop people taking matters into their own hands because we will do something with them.

Surf Life Saving numbers are way down. Parents are pulling their kids out. Nipper numbers are down. Rowing club numbers are down. Ski club numbers are down. We are trying to look for another form of recreation, but we would hope that when we have a parliament and a government that is elected it will do something. That is what those people in the north are crying out for. They are just hoping that we have a government that will do something. I never thought I would say this, but I admire previous premier Peter Beattie for what he did because there were a lot of problems with regard to dingoes on Fraser Island. He was copping a lot of flak because he was not doing something about the wild dogs on Fraser Island. Then the boy was mauled and killed by a pack of dingoes, so Peter Beattie went and shot the crap out of those dingoes.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hill—

Mr KNUTH: I withdraw. Sorry for those comments.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr KNUTH: People admired him for the fact that he put people first. He put those children first. That is what we are about. We are here to claim back our waterways and we are hoping that the government and the opposition will support us in something that is so important for rural and regional Queenslanders—that is, protecting the lives of people whilst claiming back our waterways. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I put the question, member for Hill, one of the documents that you have sought to table has already been tabled. I refer to previous Speakers' rulings that documents already tabled should not be tabled again. The relevant document will be returned to you and will not be tabled.

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

AYES, 5:

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

NOES, 83:

ALP, 45—Bailey, 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, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

LNP, 36—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, 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.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

Pairs: Boyd, Leahy; Power, Hunt.

Resolved in the negative.

VEGETATION MANAGEMENT (CLEARING FOR RELEVANT PURPOSES) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 21 March 2018 (see p. 592).

Second Reading



Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (6.43 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

We introduced the amendments in this bill before the government made the most recent changes to the Vegetation Management Act, but they are no less relevant and still very much have a purpose in the industry. The vegetation management laws affect the broadacre beef, sheep and grains industry in Queensland, which in 2016-17 generated about \$8.2 billion in gross farm value production. The amendments in this bill are not just emotive arguments, they are not arguments about keeping industries alive; they are very much about preserving and, in some cases, allowing an industry to prosper, which is very much needed in this economic climate in Queensland.

Through the introduction of this bill we set out to, as always, not overreach, but try to find the middle ground and achieve a meaningful outcome by making what we regard as a massive compromise so that the government can deal with this issue relating to vegetation management. There is always an implied reference by the government that people in rural areas cannot be trusted and that it must legislate for the lowest common denominator and make things terribly restrictive and hard for everyone because someone might do the wrong thing. There will always be a small number of people who will do the wrong thing but, through vegetation management legislation, the government has hamstrung much economic activity in western areas that, although are far from this place, far from Alice Street in Brisbane, are still very relevant to our economy. I regard the two amendments contained in this bill as moderate. They should be regarded as a compromise in dealing with the very strong impact of the amendments to the vegetation management legislation that were brought into this parliament.

I have been informed—and I would love to be corrected on this—that so far there has been not one application for thinning under that legislation. Such applications were supposed to be easy, but not one application has been made. It is pretty easy to read into that that the application process is either prohibitive or there are machinations in the department that work against people who are trying to make these applications so much so that they throw their hands in the air. That is real evidence that the government has put a handbrake on prosperity in rural areas.

Clause 3 of the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill 2017 amends section 22A to create an obligation on the chief executive to issue an information notice if an application for clearing as assessed under section 22A of the act has been rejected. People are spending tens of thousands and, in some cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars on applications. They are spending all of this money and taking all this time and effort in the belief that the government will

act in good faith. I am dead certain that there is a culture in the department that started with the change of government of putting the handbrake on all of these applications. There is no obligation on anyone to report back on the validity, or the progress of these applications. If you have someone spending \$100,000 in good faith thinking, 'I'm doing everything right. I'm getting all of these approvals, soil tests, business cases, economic environmental impact studies and all of these things. Over the years the government has made regulations that makes it really hard to do any clearing, but I've done all of that in good faith. I've handed it in, but you won't even tell me if you're going to reject it or, if you are, why.' There is no obligation on the government to give feedback. I do not think that passes the fairness test.

There is a fair bit of history behind the second amendment that is proposed in this bill. This amendment removes grazing activities from the definition of high-value agricultural clearing to ensure that it is considered a relevant purpose in the chief executive's consideration of an application to clear under the act. Since the inception of the Vegetation Management Act 1999, I note that there have been 41 amendments. People are pleading for some certainty. As a result of those amendments to the act, the relevant purposes for clearing under that act ended up being thinning encroachment weeds and installing and maintaining necessary infrastructure. Grazing activities, with a focus on improved pastures and cropping, do not fit within that definition.

People who have approvals to clear will spend \$100,000 on trying to get to the point where they can make their land more productive. In many cases I am talking about land that has been cleared already and people are applying for development approvals, but they cannot carry out certain activities on that land. The government could talk to natural resource management groups—it could talk to anyone it wants. There is no material difference between including these activities for improved pastures or cropping to any other fodder crop that is already listed in the act.

These amendments are really just getting rid of these silly anomalies that are in the act. By doing that, the industry has a vast array of activities it can conduct. The good news for everyone in this House is that that is better land management practice. It is always forgotten in debates on vegetation management that these applications to clear are not about a licence for broadscale clearing. Often, these applications allow people to manage their farm. If they can put in improved pasture, they are not holding on to the cattle in other paddocks when it is dry because they have improved pastures.

It gives them options to manage their property. They can rest a paddock and get higher productivity on another paddock when times are tough. The majority of people who are good land managers have an option to carry out better land management practices. These give people the keys to perform better land management practices. The upshot is that there is more economic benefit to the state because there is higher productivity, more soil control and less erosion and it allows for a more diverse operation. Everyone is a winner out of fixing this anomaly that includes those activities.

Most of these practices relate to applications made under section 22A. Going back to the point about notices, there is no legislative or regulatory trigger requiring the Department of Natural Resources and Mines to provide a formal response to the applicant. One can imagine how enormously frustrating this is, particularly in this political environment when there is so much pressure from environmental and green groups to lock this land up. Surely at the very least they have the right to feedback. That is an easy one that we should be able to tick off. I cannot believe why anyone in this House would argue with that. Whether you believe in tree clearing or not, you should have the right to receive feedback.

Let us fix up an anomaly in the legislation to improve soil condition and improve erosion. If we care about the reef, the way to improve erosion is to get more ground cover so people like Blair Knuth at Burdekin Downs, where there is false sandalwood country where nothing much grows, can put in improved pasture. This will provide grass cover and mean less run-off which I believe is what is trying to be achieved. I sometimes find it hard to understand what the government is trying to achieve in this space, but surely a worthwhile objective would be to try to improve ground cover. These are sensible amendments, they are very moderate and I implore the House to support them.

 Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (6.53 pm): I rise to speak to the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill. The State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee in its report on this bill made two recommendations, the first being that the bill not be supported. I concur. This private member's bill should not be supported and I will outline the reasons for that, despite the very eloquent reasoning by the member for Traeger. I always respect the way the member for Traeger and the member for Hill eloquently put their case forward, even though the reasoning may be in error, and the way they support their local communities.

The committee's second recommendation was that the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy examine the merits of providing an information notice to applicants under section 22A of the Vegetation Management Act 1999. I thank the committee for the recommendation and now table the government's response to that recommendation.

The response concisely states that the government will monitor the rate of requests and refusals under section 22A of the Vegetation Management Act 1999 and will progress a proposal for a more appropriate review and appeal mechanism if a need emerges for an appeal process to be implemented. The important part is 'if a need emerges'.

The provisions contained in this bill were first proposed by the honourable Mr Robbie Katter in a bill introduced in 2017. At that time, the Newman government's unbalanced and destructive vegetation clearing laws were in place. Despite the very high rates of loss of remnant vegetation, landholders could apply for a permit for broadscale clearing to establish high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. That 2017 bill sought to widen these unbalanced laws even further. It sought to allow broadscale clearing even for the lower economic value purposes of grazing and growing fodder to be used on the property. Even the Newman government knew that would be irresponsible and would lead to excessive loss of our valuable remnant vegetation.

The 2017 bill also sought to provide landholders with an additional right of review and appeal avenues if the Department of Natural Resources and Mines refused a landholder permission to make an application for a clearing permit. Such refusals were rare, but if and when they occurred it was because the landholder could not establish that their land was suitable for the proposed agricultural activity or that they had access to water to undertake the proposed irrigation. Refusals very rarely occurred for requests for a determination that the clearing was for another relevant purpose, because the other purposes are easy to determine on clearly evident facts. It is clear whether the applicant's project is a coordinated project, for example, or whether they have the approvals they require to do an extractive industry. The only situation in which an appeal would arise was in relation to proposals for clearing for high-value agriculture or irrigated high-value agriculture. The bill we are considering today is exactly the same as that 2017 bill.

The world has moved on and we now have fair and balanced vegetation management laws in place. This government was elected with a firm mandate to end broadscale clearing of remnant vegetation and to reinstate a responsible vegetation management framework. We have done that. In May 2018, the Vegetation Management Act 1999 was amended to remove high-value agriculture and irrigated high-value agriculture as relevant purposes. Clause 4 of this private member's bill has been ruled out of order as it would seek to reinstate these relevant purposes. Clause 3 needs to be considered in light of established review and appeal mechanisms. Clause 3 seeks to provide a right to appeal to the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal where the Department of Natural Resources, Mines and Energy determines that proposed clearing is not for a relevant purpose and therefore an application for a permit cannot be made.

There is no doubt that this government supports transparency and accountability in decision-making. However, this review right already exists under the Judicial Review Act. There is a very low rate of refusals of requests for determinations. If we leave aside decisions about high-value agriculture, only 0.3 per cent of requests have been refused since 2013 at the time of the Newman government's laws. The existing appeal right provides an adequate safeguard against the risk of an error of process. It is for these reasons that the private member's bill should not be supported and I recommend that honourable members reject the bill.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (6.58 pm): I rise to speak to the Vegetation Management (Clearing for Relevant Purposes) Amendment Bill. This bill has been developed to address gaps within the existing legislative framework that constrain the ability of primary producers to clear land for legitimate purposes and enables access to a reasonable appeals process. Currently, grazing is not considered a relevant purpose for high-value agriculture clearing. However, it is considered a relevant purpose for irrigated high-value agriculture clearing.

This limits the ability of a grazier to establish a source of feed to improve the productivity of their operation. In order to develop a more profitable and competitive domestic international agriculture industry in Queensland, graziers must have a range of options for cultivating and sourcing feed. Although the bill broadens the scope of activities that are an acceptable reason to undertake clearing, the existing legislative regulatory framework provides inadequate mitigation of detrimental environment impacts.

Furthermore, the farm management practices of producers ensure a high standard of environmental management across the industry. Currently, there is no right of appeal or review for persons who have made an application under section 22A of the act where the application has been rejected.

Debate, on motion of Mr Knuth, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Toowoomba North Small Business Advisory Committee

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (7.00 pm): I rise today to speak briefly about the Toowoomba North Small Business Advisory Committee. I thank the members who are on that committee for their input: Adnun Khan and his brother Albab Khan, who will shortly reopen a chocolateria in Grand Central; Lynette and John Yeo from Northpoint Meats; Craig Stibbarb from Craig's Highfields Hardware; Danielle Temple from New Brew Cafe; Melissa Taylor from Taylor's Removal and Storage; Nathan Dwight from Donut King—I have to confess I have been to his store often; Bruce Louden from Big Tyre; Robert Schatz from Totally Baked Grand Central, who also is someone I regularly visit; Marie Streidl from Toowoomba Flower Markets—my wife will be pleased to know that I often call in there; Tressa Lindenberg from Sovereign Property Partners; Jim O'Dea, who is part of the Highfields and District Business Connections; Jo Sheppard from the chamber of commerce; and Joy Mingay, the president of the chamber of commerce. I thank them all for giving up their time.

It was a really important meeting to get a grip on and understanding of what is affecting small business owners, our largest employer, and to get information and some ideas. First and foremost, they brought forward the cost of electricity as crippling their businesses. Also, regulatory interference and the burden of government administration prevents small business from capitalising on opportunities to expand, employ more staff and improve the profitability of their business. After 25 years out of 30 of Labor in Queensland, as a small business owner I can say that regulatory interference is big.

They were also concerned about payroll tax, workers compensation, stamp duty, the cost of auditing and how the onus always fell on them to do all of this reporting for government to collect various forms of taxation. I agree with them, but it was really interesting to listen to some of their ideas about how to deal with that. I also tabled an article that just shows a little bit of the resilience of small business.

Tabled paper: Article from the Chronicle, dated 2 April 2019, titled 'Why my shelves are bare' [515].

Craig Stibbarb's hardware business in Highfields, which I have used regularly, has suffered greatly in recent times, but he is still fighting on and we hope that he will be successful. Another area that they raised with us was the difficulty of access to business finance and how it is becoming increasingly difficult in a tight market. There were many other issues raised. I hope to speak to them again soon.

(Time expired)

Nudgee Electorate, Rail Services

 **Ms LINARD** (Nudgee—ALP) (7.03 pm): Today's announcement by the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Mark Bailey, of additional peak time rail services is a welcome one for commuters across my electorate. From Monday, 13 May Queensland Rail will add 32 extra weekly services at peak times and 14,000 seats to South-East Queensland's network. Locally, key services added include a 7.39 am Shorncliffe-Central service operating Monday to Thursday—I know it directly impacts and benefits the member for Sandgate's electorate also—adding to the existing Friday service, in addition to a 7.10 am Kippa-Ring-Central service operating Monday to Friday. A new 6.58 am Central-Shorncliffe service will also operate Monday to Thursday, adding to the existing Friday service. These additional services come after 46,000 weekly seats were added to the region's rail network last December, with the upgrade of 193 three-carriage trains to six-carriage trains, which was also a significant and welcome improvement for commuters across my local community—particularly so at Nundah station, where capacity issues were being felt by commuters.

I appreciate that delivering a new or altered train timetable is a complex task involving managing train crew resources and rostering, planning, the stabling and maintenance of trains, and scheduling daily train movements. My community has been calling out for additional peak time services, particularly at the Nundah, Toombul, Banyo and Nudgee stations, making today's announcement exactly what my community has been calling for and I have been fighting for. This is just the start.

These additional services will be followed by further timetable improvements later this year, following the largest driver recruitment and training campaign in Queensland Rail's history. Some 76 drivers are in training, adding to the 136 drivers who have completed their qualifications and are working on the network, representing a net increase of 73 after attrition. NGR trains are continuing to roll out on the network too, with 51 now available for service, adding to the gradual improvement to services that commuters are seeing.

It is not lost on me or on the people living across my electorate, or the thousands moving into our community, that the Nudgee electorate, with 12 train stations, is well serviced by public transport. It also means that additional services and improvements to the rail network are keenly felt by and are of significant importance to my community. I take this opportunity to thank Minister Mark Bailey, as well as the former ministers for transport—Stirling Hinchliffe and the Deputy Premier and Treasurer, Jackie Trad—who have all taken the time to visit my electorate at my request at different times to meet with and hear firsthand from commuters.

That is what advocacy is all about and that is truly why I love in my role fighting for better services and outcomes for my community. Over the past two years, our government has delivered additional commuter car parking at the Nudgee, Banyo and Nundah stations. Planning is currently underway to extend commuter parking at the Virginia and Geebung stations. We have a new pedestrian footbridge at Banyo, a police outpost at Northgate train station, and a major upgrade of Boondall rail station is underway. There is more to be done, and I look forward to the minister sharing more positive rail and timetable news later this year.

Burrum Coast National Park, Fire

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (7.06 pm): On Sunday, 10 March a large fire was deliberately lit in the Kinkuna section of the Burrum Coast National Park in my electorate. I take this opportunity to highlight the serious impact on a farmer and grazier of an out-of-control fire. On Monday, 11 March the fire reached the farming property of Roger and Cynthia Draper when national park rangers attempted a major back-burn on their common boundary. The Drapers believe that the national parks team were under-resourced for this back-burn and, as a result, control of the fire was lost, the task was abandoned and all units left the site.

As a result, the Drapers lost 700 hectares of grazing pasture. They were forced to sell this year's calves two months early in a very flat market while they were still underweight, incurring a major financial loss. If they had been able to hold until the recent rains, they would not have had this problem. As it happened, the Drapers had to sell 143 calves at a loss of \$400 a head for the forced sale, a loss of \$70,000. If the pastures recover fast enough, the Drapers hope to maintain their breeding herd but they cannot graze cattle on burnt pastures for at least three months. With winter approaching, it may be longer. Roger and Cynthia have 22 kilometres of fencing affected by the fire. Some five kilometres of fence needs to be completely replaced, at a cost of around \$50,000. The other 17 kilometres of fences will need the wire replaced because the burnt wire will rust very quickly, and this will cost another \$30,000, including the cost of cleaning up the burnt-out and fallen trees. The Drapers also have a family business producing manuka honey from their wallum scrub. With all this burnt, the business will take two to three years to recover before the bees can return.

I highlight this disastrous situation for one family in the Burnett because I believe the fire and the damage it caused could have been far less or even prevented. This government's refusal to acknowledge the need for sensible, planned and regular cool burns in national parks has meant that the fire in Kinkuna became a raging inferno and swept across 6,000 hectares of national parks, decimating the environment for six long days. Worse, it destroyed the livelihood of a successful farmer whose property adjoins the Burrum Coast park. I doubt that the Minister for Environment will be willing to travel to Goodwood to meet the Drapers and to see the damage for herself, much less reconsider the need for planned back-burns in our protected area estate. For all who live near national parks, there is a powder keg on the doorstep of unmanaged vegetation just waiting to ignite. Unfortunately for Roger and Cynthia Draper, this government's payback to the Greens has destroyed their livelihood.

In conclusion, I again highlight the very important issues of cold burns and vegetation management reforms needed in our protected area estate. One thing we should look at in an urgent manner in this place is the involvement of Indigenous fire stick coal burning. Indigenous rangers around my part of the world are very keen to get involved. I would like to think that in future environment policies we give traditional owners the credit and use their well-known knowledge about what the protection of national parks should look like.

Mundingburra Electorate, Flood Recovery

 Hon. CJ O'ROURKE (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (7.09 pm): As we have seen over the years, North Queenslanders are gritty, determined and willing to lend a helping hand when times are tough. Unfortunately, the opportunities provided by disasters, both natural and manmade, highlight this strength and resilience far too often. The recent flooding event showed the Mundingburra and broader Townsville community coming together to support those affected. From spontaneous mud armies to the tireless work of SES volunteers and Defence personnel, to neighbours helping out those who were not as lucky as they were, it was a mobilisation of our community during its time of need.

I was privileged to recently attend the reopening of the Woolworths store at Fairfield Central that was completely destroyed by floodwaters. In an absolutely amazing effort, it took only 46 days to completely rebuild the store. It is a shot of confidence for the community, particularly for the 176 employees and their families who are now back at work. I also had the chance to talk to my agency's community recovery staff at the opening who were there to continue to provide support to the community, giving both financial and psychosocial support.

We also saw the North Queensland Cowboys' first game of the year. This first game allowed the team to use this as an opportunity to thank those people who had worked so selflessly and tirelessly during the floods with some free tickets. The first responders did a lap of honour before the game and there was not a dry eye in the house amongst the roar of applause. While the work continues, I could not be prouder of my community and our government's response during this difficult time.

Despite still being in recovery mode from the floods, my community has also shown strong support for our local Muslim community following the Christchurch terrorist attack. I attended a service at the Townsville Islamic Society's mosque. During the service, Imam Sheikh Abdul Salik encouraged the community to share messages of love and peace and to be open to having conversations of the shared values that run across religious lines.

After the service I was able to meet with the Imam and several members of the mosque, one of whom lost a cousin and three close friends in the Christchurch attack. They told me of their appreciation for the support they have received from the broader Townsville community after the attacks and how a lot of non-Muslim community members have attended the mosque to show their support and offer condolences. As the member for Mundingburra, I could not be prouder of how our wonderful community steps up and comes together during these challenging times.

Toowoomba South Electorate

 Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (7.12 pm): Tonight I would like to rise and reflect on some of the remarkable people in my remarkable city who are achieving great things and reaching for the stars. In that respect, quite literally the University of Southern Queensland did that with the relaunch of the Mount Kent Observatory, near Greenmount. This was a \$6 million investment. That puts the University of Southern Queensland at the heart of space exploration. They are working with NASA. They are working towards certain projects. I congratulate Vice-Chancellor Geraldine Mackenzie, Chancellor John Dornbusch and the director of the Centre for Astrophysics, Professor Brad Carter, on that wonderful accomplishment that puts the University of Southern Queensland at the heart of space exploration and investigation throughout the world.

I would also like to reflect on the drought breaker that is the Toowoomba Royal Show. The Toowoomba Royal Show was a wonderful event over last week. However, it brought some rain with it and water underfoot. I can tell members, though, that it brought plenty of smiles to the faces of the exhibitors and agricultural producers who came to Toowoomba. CEO Damon Phillips, president Shane Charles and vice-president Mark Freeman do a wonderful job putting on the Toowoomba Royal Show. Although it was a little damp, the exhibitors and exhibitions were as strong as ever—fruit and vegetables, cattle, poultry. Across-the-board it was another wonderful show. I congratulate the RASQ on that delivery.

I want to reflect briefly on the official launch of Emerge, which is a new social enterprise in Toowoomba. They run a food van and a co-working youth hub space. It is one of the new, exciting social enterprises that is establishing its reputation and making its mark in Toowoomba. Jen Shaw, what a remarkable woman! She is leading a wonderful social enterprise at Emerge. She is working with our underprivileged youth, giving them skills and giving them hope for a far brighter future. I commend Jen and congratulate her on the opening of Emerge last week.

I also want to reflect on a little chocolate factory in the corner of my electorate in Harristown. Trevor and Magdalena Smith are running a factory called Metiisto. It makes the highest quality chocolate. They want to take chocolate to the next level—along the lines of wine and coffee. It made a wonderful Christmas present for my wife last Christmas as I purchased a number of their beautiful, exquisite quality products. It is wonderful to see small business in Toowoomba South expanding, showing innovation and taking their product to the world. I wish them all the very best. I also congratulate Bill Smith and Charles Clarke, fine JPs whom I recognised recently.

Hall, Mr CJ

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (7.15 pm): I would like to take this opportunity tonight to congratulate my daughter and her husband on the birth of their first child and my first grandchild—a beautiful granddaughter named Payton.

On a more serious note, I rise tonight to pay tribute to a man named Clive Joseph Hall, who passed away in Gladstone on 13 March 2019. Clive was born in Townsville in 1936. He completed his schooling at South Townsville, sometimes being educated at home when his school was commandeered by soldiers during World War II. He gained an electrical fitter/mechanical apprenticeship, studying for an extra three months to make up for time he was conscripted to serve in the 11th Infantry Brigade Signal Division with the Australian Army.

Clive proposed to the love of his life, Leah, who is a very good friend of mine, on their first date in 1957, and they were married the next year. They celebrated 60 years of a wonderful relationship and marriage which produced four boys: Neil, Michael, Andrew and Adam. He had 11 grandchildren and last year his first great-grandchild was placed in his arms by his eldest granddaughter.

Clive's work took him interstate to the Regional Electricity Commission in Yass, New South Wales, and the Illawarra County Council in Wollongong. In 1966 he accepted a position at Queensland Alumina Ltd, and the family returned to Queensland. Clive retired from that workplace 30 years later. In retirement Clive and Leah often retreated to his favourite place in the world, the family holiday home he built on the south end of Curtis Island in the 1960s. Although they travelled extensively, times spent with his family, no matter the meeting place, were always his most treasured memories.

Clive enjoyed active membership and involvement in various community organisations, including National Seniors, a Gourmet Food Group and the Gladstone Gem Club, but his pride in the 'Nashos' held a special place in his heart. Last weekend I was privileged to look through an amazing collection of photographs, documents and clippings of Clive's military memories, lovingly preserved by Leah over the years.

Until his health failed, Clive was amongst the first to fall into line at local military commemorative services. On 25 April 2015, the first Anzac Day service I attended as the state member for Gladstone, I was honoured to have my photo taken with Clive and other Hall family members in attendance at the Gladstone cenotaph. That photograph takes pride of place on my office desk to this day.

Goodbye Sergeant Clive Joseph Hall, 1/714863, a gentle and a humble man who will be sadly missed by his family and all who knew him. Rest in peace Clive.

Hughenden Irrigation Project Corporation, Alstonvale Dam

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (7.18 pm): Population in decline is a demographic disease, one might say, in western areas that I represent. It is something we face in the future. The one thing that can offer prosperity in the future that everyone would agree on is water development and water storage. There are proposals for Cave Hill Dam at Cloncurry, another dam at Richmond and Green Hills Dam at Forsayth-Einasleigh. The one I want to talk about tonight is the HIPCo project and Alstonvale Dam at Hughenden, which has recently received \$180 million from the federal government to be built.

A lot of environmentalists will run for the hills saying that this water storage is a terrible thing, but I want to get to the facts. It will take three per cent of the Flinders River. People were allowed to take 50 per cent at some stage. I think they agreed on 35 per cent. The environmentalists will say that 30 per cent can be taken out without compromising the value of a river. The proposal is talking about taking out three per cent. There are hardly any farms on this system at all. Bear that in mind—hardly anything exists out there at all. The government has taken \$10 million from selling water out there. We are talking about taking three per cent out of the Flinders River. That is to build a 500,000 megalitre storage, plus another 200,000 megalitre pond, and it will have a hydro component added to it. It will deliver an 85,000 megalitres per annum yield with 90 per cent reliability. That would be the envy of any irrigation scheme.

It is the happy marriage of the last bit of high topography that opens out on to the midwest plains. That is good news again for the so-called environmentalists—there is no tree clearing. It opens out on to the midwest plains.

Another good news story is that one of the best ways we can provide flood mitigation is by building water storages out there. A lot of the damage that was recently experienced at Hughenden would have been mitigated if we had had this water storage in place. This can deliver water to 100 farms, and that is 100 families. It is quite distinct from a lot of other irrigation schemes that are proposed these days that are for large foreign corporations to take advantage of. This will benefit 100 small sized farms, from 100 to 200 hectares. It will allow railway workers, contract workers and people in town to have a go and get into the rural industry and support the state economy in that way.

Again, there is \$180 million from the federal government to build this dam. We can get money from the Clean Energy Finance Corporation for the hydro component. There is not a cent to be spent here from the state government. We can provide water storage and give prosperity to people in these areas. We can give them some hope that there is a future and that we can do something out there. All we are asking is to take some of that water, to build this dam so that the people of the midwest can have some prosperity and to start capturing some of the water that flows out to the sea every year.

St Catherine's Catholic Primary School

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (7.21 pm): I rise in the House tonight to celebrate a vital road safety achievement for the St Catherine's Catholic Primary School community in my electorate of Mansfield. Located on busy and undulating Newnham Road at Wishart, St Catherine's was founded by the Presentation Sisters in 1973 and the school has continued to grow in its mission to provide education in a spirit of outreach to the marginalised. The staff are a highly committed professional group of educators who continually strive for best practice, innovation and creativity.

For the years I was principal at Cavendish Road State High School I would drive past St Catherine's on my way to and from work, often perplexed as to why this school did not have a 40-kilometre zone like all other schools in the area. In fact, my own school was and is located on Cavendish Road, which is an extension of Newnham Road, and it had a 40-kilometre zone. Throughout my campaign leading up to the 2017 election, this was my opportunity to address this important safety issue for our young people of Wishart State School and St Catherine's. I worked closely with both schools, our parent community and local residents. In listening to the St Catherine's community I heard very disturbing stories of the large number of cars entering and exiting the school—in many cases turning in front of oncoming traffic travelling way too fast for a school zone—and the near misses caused by the inability of exiting traffic to see oncoming vehicles.

As a former high school principal, I took personal responsibility for my students' and families' safety. Now, as their local member, I will fight passionately and tenaciously for the safety of my community. I established a petition and coordinated and chaired community meetings that were attended by school staff and parents, local residents, ministerial Transport and Main Roads advisers and representatives, and the Brisbane City councillor and traffic management representatives. It took great perseverance and tenacity in pursuing the local LNP councillor to take action. However, I am delighted to announce that finally the Brisbane City Council has listened to my community and has indicated that a 40-kilometre-per-hour school zone will be constructed during these Easter school holidays, ready in time for the start of term 2.

This is a great example of my community standing together to support long-awaited and much needed change—change that will ultimately result in greater safety for the youngest and most vulnerable members of our community, our children. I thank the entire school community for their support and efforts to make the new school zone a reality. In particular, I acknowledge Principal Paul Leeson, P&F President Paul Hillberg and past parent Mel Cavell, who led and activated the school community throughout this campaign.

Australian Surf Life Saving Championships

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (7.24 pm): I have great news for the House. The Australian Surf Life Saving Championships have returned to the Gold Coast at multiple venues and have been an enormous success for the community, the economy of the Gold Coast and a boon for the competitors from all over Australia. Over 6,000 competitors, along with thousands more family and friends and 90,000 spectators, have seen the national championships return to its rightful home on the Gold Coast.

When I was mayor of the Gold Coast, I signed a deal for the Gold Coast to be home for the championships for 10 years and, consequently, the council spent hundreds of thousands of dollars putting in appropriate infrastructure to cater for viewing, media and the competitors in what Surf Life Saving Australia saw as a natural fit for everyone's enjoyment of the championships. The variety of locations for different categories of weather, the variety of accommodation for competitors, and the variety of entertainment and dining for the supporters were all compelling reasons to make the Gold Coast the home of the Australian Surf Life Saving Championships. The fact that we have only 65 days of non-sunny weather a year was also a determining factor in putting on this important national sporting spectacular, particularly in the otherwise quiet time for tourism on the Gold Coast in March.

A series of unfortunate bad accidents occurred, which led to the championships being entertained at other areas around Australia, but they are back in triumph in 2019 at venues spread from Broadbeach to Burleigh. I am proud that I have the wonderful surf lifesaving clubs of Mermaid Beach, Nobby Beach, Miami and North Burleigh in my electorate and am proud to support these clubs at every opportunity. As integral players in the Australian Surf Life Saving Championships, these clubs are a credit to their community with beach patrols, nippers and a family based ethos that sees just as many young girls as young boys coming through the junior ranks of surf lifesaving.

I would like to congratulate Australian Surf Life Saving and the Gold Coast City Council and all involved—from the volunteers to the business alliances who supported the event—on staging a truly magnificent carnival that I hope continues to call the Gold Coast home. Just as the US Masters calls Augusta home, the Melbourne Cup calls Melbourne home, the AFL calls the MCG home, I would love to see the day when Australian Surf Life Saving called the Gold Coast home, with a surf lifesaving legends museum and a national headquarters located on the Gold Coast, where an annual pilgrimage to the Gold Coast for the Australian Surf Life Saving Championships was the holy grail for every surf lifesaver in Australia. The minor disruptions that we have had to roads and minor inconveniences to residents in their movements is well worth the price of having this magnificent event in the sporting calendar for the Gold Coast and for Queensland.

World Autism Awareness Day

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (7.27 pm): Today is World Autism Awareness Day where everyone is encouraged to 'go blue for autism'. I note that significant landmarks in Brisbane are lit up blue tonight. I could use this speech to rattle off a whole heap of facts about autism spectrum disorder—the symptoms, the prevalence, the support systems available—but I thought I would share with members the impact of a diagnosis.

It has been almost a year since my son's ASD was confirmed. Like most parents, we had seen the signs, the symptoms, but they could easily be attributed to other things and I had heard them all—'Boys always take longer to develop,' or 'Some kids appreciate routine more than others.' I could and would as a parent make excuses for everything. He had had more surgeries, more invasive procedures and more blood transfusions in the first three months of his life than I have had in a lifetime. His first 12 months featured regular cranial scans to track his brain haemorrhages. Of course he was going to have delayed development. He generally caught up with his milestones, even if they were six months, 12 months or 18 months delayed. He got there, right? 'He'll be fine'—but his prep year was fast approaching and I had heard all the stories of parents who had missed the window of having their child diagnosed in order to access support at school. I had to face up to what I had likely been denying for some time.

As a family we had been bruised and battered, literally and figuratively, attending to a boy who was at once charming and affectionate but could resort to a physical outburst once his limit had been reached. Shopping expeditions are fraught, large public events are generally a no-go and routine is king, even if it is not particularly doable in a shift-working household like ours.

I honestly do not know what the future holds for him, but I tell members what I do know. We now have a team around us—a speech therapist, an occupational therapist, we have access to a psychologist specialising in children with autism and he has assistance in the classroom. These were things we did not have a year ago. A diagnosis—while unleashing a torrent of parental emotions—has already brought with it the interventions he so desperately needs.

He is in a mainstream classroom and he is having daily interactions with teachers and his peers. The first few weeks were a bit rough. I will not lie; there was a lot of bribery involved just to get him into the classroom. Some days are tougher than others in ways we can never predict, but his vocabulary

has grown, his sentences are longer, most times we understand what he is saying and he can mostly write his name in a manner that we can recognise. I table a self-portrait, age 5—something he could not do six months ago.

Tabled paper: Child's drawings [516].

I urge any parent to ask the question, particularly when their child's teacher or principal approaches them with concerns. They only have their child's best interests at heart. I often speak to the school principals in my area about how many verified children they have, but the hardest work is with the unverified ones. Conversations with parents are difficult, but I urge parents to ask the question. Do yourself a favour and get the help.

The House adjourned at 7.30 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, 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