



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 18 September 2019

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	2891
Fitzgerald Report, 30th Anniversary	2891
School Group Tours.....	2891
PETITIONS	2891
TABLED PAPERS	2891
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2892
Bushfires	2892
Regional Communities Program	2893
Whitsunday Coast Airport	2893
Alliance Airlines, Hawker Pacific	2894
Gold Coast, Tourism	2895
Byerwen Coalmine; Miners Memorial Day.....	2895
Stone Benchtop Industry, Code of Practice	2895
Bushfires, Police Service Task Force	2896
Bushfires, Local Government.....	2896
Bushfires, Recovery.....	2897
Bushfires, Roads.....	2898
Bushfires, Small Business	2898
Bushfires, Queensland Fire and Emergency Services	2899
Bushfires, Hospital and Health Services	2899
NOTICE OF MOTION	2900
Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, No Confidence	2900
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2900
Barbagallo, Mr D.....	2900
Barbagallo, Mr D.....	2900
Drought.....	2901


Table of Contents – Wednesday, 18 September 2019

Sarra, Dr C	2902
Regional Sitzings of Parliament, Townsville.....	2902
Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd.....	2903
Electricity Assets	2903
Sarra, Dr C	2904
Regional Queensland, Manufacturing Industry.....	2904
Sarra, Dr C	2905
Regional Queensland, Tourism Industry	2905
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Photograph of candidate for Gold Coast City Council division 1	2906
Sarra, Dr C; Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd	2906
Secondary School Students, Health and Wellbeing.....	2907
Global Climate Strike	2907
Regional Queensland, Electricity Prices.....	2908
Sarra, Dr C	2908
Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, Fire Safety.....	2909
Public Service, Conflicts of Interest.....	2910
Electoral System, Integrity.....	2910
Commercial Fishing, Vessel Monitoring System.....	2911
Howard Police Station, Road Policing Command	2911
Barbagallo, Mr D.....	2912
Ipswich Turf Club	2912
CHILD DEATH REVIEW LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2912
Introduction	2912
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Death Review Legislation Amendment Bill 2019.....	2912
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Child Death Review Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	2912
First Reading	2915
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	2915
POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2915
Introduction	2915
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019.	2915
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.	2915
First Reading	2918
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	2918
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL.....	2918
Second Reading	2918
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 2 July 2019, from the Director, Jaragun Natural Resource Management, Ms Liz Owen, to the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Leeanne Enoch, regarding the Russell River Catchment Sustainability Plan 2019-2035.	2920
ELECTORAL (VOTER'S CHOICE) AMENDMENT BILL	2926
Introduction	2926
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral (Voter's Choice) Amendment Bill 2019.	2926
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Electoral (Voter's Choice) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes.....	2926
First Reading	2928
Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.....	2928
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2928
Second Reading	2928
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents regarding the Great Barrier Reef.	2929
NOTICE OF MOTION	2932
Electricity Assets	2932
MOTION	2933
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders.....	2933
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	2933
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2933
MOTION	2933
Electricity Assets	2933
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Gladstone Observer</i> online, undated, titled 'LNP candidate says he knows sense of leasing port'.	2937
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'The truth about who sold Queensland's Assets'.	2939
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Australian Financial Review</i> online, dated 14 October 2014, titled 'Despite assurances, Queensland on asset selloff binge'.	2942
Division: Question put—That the member for Miller be not further heard.....	2944
Resolved in the negative.....	2944
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	2945
Resolved in the affirmative.....	2946
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2946
Shark Control Program, Federal Court Decision.....	2946
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 3 April 2019, from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, to the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Melissa Price, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area.	2946

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 18 September 2019

<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 5 April 2019, from the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Melissa Price, to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area.	2946
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 18 September 2019, from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, to the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Sussan Ley, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area.	2946
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Federal Court of Australia judgement, dated 18 September 2019, <i>Humane Society International (Australia) Inc and Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Qld)</i> [2019] AATA 617.	2946
Sarra, Dr C	2947
PRIVILEGE	2947
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House	2947
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2947
Second Reading	2947
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Email, dated 17 September 2019, from the office of the federal member for Kennedy, Hon. Bob Katter, titled 'KAP motion for Wednesday 17th Sept'.	2948
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 August 2019, from Emeritus Professor Ian Chubb, for the Independent Expert Panel, to various federal and Queensland ministers relating to the science regarding damage to the Great Barrier Reef.	2956
MOTION	2962
Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, No Confidence	2962
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba.	2972
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 19 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba.	2973
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 20 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba.	2973
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Crime and Corruption Commission media release, dated 6 September 2019, titled 'CCC determines not to investigate the Deputy Premier but calls for improvements to Cabinet processes and legislative reform—6 September 2019'.	2974
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Australian Electoral Commission, Political Party Disclosure return for financial year 2008-09, by the Australian Labor Party, Queensland.	2974
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Australian Electoral Commission, Political Party Disclosure return for financial year 2010-11, by the Australian Labor Party, Queensland.	2974
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	2975
Resolved in the negative.	2975
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	2976
Second Reading	2976
ADJOURNMENT	2986
Kawana Electorate, Schools	2986
Calamvale Special School, Spring Fair	2986
Bribie Island Bridge	2987
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of photographs depicting Bribie Island Bridge with dead fish, sand and rubbish on road.	2987
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 10 September 2019, from the member for Pumicestone, Mrs Simone Wilson MP, to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding the condition of the Bribie Island Bridge.....	2987
Mount Ommaney Electorate, Small Business	2987
Organ Donation, Jersey Day	2988
Jordan Electorate, Welcoming the Babies	2989
Bushfires	2989
Cairns Electorate, Jobs and TAFE	2990
Caloundra RSL, Bob McInnes Memorial Garden	2990
Oceania Cup, Hockey	2991
ATTENDANCE	2992

WEDNESDAY, 18 SEPTEMBER 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.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Fitzgerald Report, 30th Anniversary

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to remind members that there will be a launch at 1 pm today on level 3 of the Parliamentary Annexe of a display acknowledging the 30th anniversary of the tabling of the Fitzgerald report. The display will include the Queensland State Archives' signed copy of the Fitzgerald report, which was donated by former premier Mike Ahern to State Archives. I am pleased to announce that Hon. Mike Ahern, Mr Tony Fitzgerald QC and Ms Roisin Goss, the wife of former premier Wayne Goss, will be present at the ceremony today. I would like to thank the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport for facilitating the loan of the report from State Archives and cohosting the event with me as Speaker.

School Group Tours

 **Mr SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I wish to advise that we will be visited in the gallery this morning by students and teachers from Montessori International College at Buderim in the electorate of Ninderry and Emmaus College, Rockhampton in the electorate of Rockhampton.

PETITIONS

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

Mount Garnet, General Practitioner

Mr Knuth, from 18 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a regular and quality health service by a General Practitioner to Mount Garnet [[1495](#)].

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, lodged and sponsored by the honourable member indicated—

1080 Poison Baits

Mr Andrew, from 987 petitioners, requesting the House to review exclusions zones and distance requirements for commercially available baits containing 1080 poison [[1496](#), [1497](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

MINISTERIAL PAPER

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Hon. D'Ath)—

[1498](#) Legal Services Commission—Annual Report 2018-2019

MEMBERS' PAPERS

The following members' papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Hervey Bay (Mr Sorensen)—


[1499](#) Nonconforming petition regarding proposed changes to crab, trawl and inshore fishing quotas

Member for Hill (Mr Knuth)—

[1500](#) Nonconforming petition regarding medical services at Mount Garnet

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Bushfires

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.33 am): Vast areas of Queensland have been gripped by devastating fires over the past fortnight in what has become a sadly familiar phenomenon for our state. Several communities have been left physically scarred by these frightening and destructive fires. While they will rebuild, the emotional scars will surely take longer to heal. Today I want to announce the steps my government will take towards helping those communities get back on their feet and how the dedicated recovery effort will help those who were directly affected.

The fire emergency has affected 55,000 hectares of land with more than 600 community warnings issued in the past two weeks. Seventeen homes in the Gold Coast hinterland, the Southern Downs and the Sunshine Coast regions have been lost. In response today I announce that Mr Ian Stewart will be appointed the State Recovery Coordinator to ensure communities and Queenslanders who have been affected receive the help toward recovery that they require.

My government is acting as quickly as possible to ensure that the recovery begins immediately, and Mr Stewart will play a critical role. Mr Stewart will be on the ground to ensure all recovery efforts flow to the regions where they are most needed. Mr Stewart is well placed to perform this role after serving in the Queensland Police Service for 46 years including as Police Commissioner. During his long and distinguished career he acted as State Disaster Coordinator during Cyclone Yasi and the devastating Toowoomba, Grantham and Brisbane floods in 2011. In his role as commissioner, Mr Stewart also experienced Cyclone Marcia, Cyclone Debbie and the 2018 bushfire event across Central Queensland. Acting Senior Sergeant Darren Ward will assist Mr Stewart with recovery coordination. Sergeant Ward from Jimboomba has been on the ground throughout this emergency and was instrumental in evacuating residents from Timbarra Drive in Beechmont as the fire that would claim 11 homes approached the region.

Today I can also announce immediate support for Gold Coast hinterland and Scenic Rim tourism operators to help them get back on their feet. My government will provide a \$1.2 million partnership with the O'Reilly family to deliver a major redevelopment of the Green Mountain Campground at Lamington National Park and \$1.5 million to partner with Binna Burra Lodge to build Australia's first permanent climbing course. These two initiatives are in addition to tourism campaigns my government will launch in coming weeks to ensure visitors understand that despite the fires, the affected regions remain open for business.

Further, we are providing emergency hardship assistance grants to cover the cost of essential items such as food and clothing for people directly impacted by this disaster. Disaster recovery funding arrangements have been activated in four local government areas including the Scenic Rim, Southern Downs, Noosa and the Sunshine Coast. To date more than \$351,000 in personal hardship assistance has been paid, benefitting more than 1,900 people. As honourable members can see, the money is getting out the door quickly.

With the support of the federal government, my government has extended disaster assistance to primary producers, small business and not-for-profit—

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I had to warn the House yesterday about general conversation. Can you please keep that to a minimum or take your conversations outside. It is time for ministerial statements.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are talking about bushfire recovery.

Mr Bleijie: So are we.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It did not sound like it.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. Thank you, member for Kawana. Cease your crossfire.

Ms PALASZCZUK: With the support of the federal government, my government has extended disaster assistance to primary producers, small business and not-for-profit organisations impacted in the Southern Downs and the Scenic Rim regions. This includes concessional loans of up to \$250,000,


essential working capital loans of up to \$100,000 and freight subsidies of up to \$5,000 for movement of stock, feed, machinery, fuel, water and building materials. At the local level, community recovery hubs remain open at Stanthorpe, Canungra, Peregian Beach and Beechmont.

I encourage residents to attend a hub or call the Community Recovery Hotline on 1800173349 where staff can assist with accessing grants and a range of additional support services. In relation to that I spoke to some people on Sunday and they were unsure where they could go to get this help, so I will repeat that Community Recovery Hotline number: 1800173349. Further, my government will task the statutorily independent Inspector-General Emergency Management to review the recommendations made in 2018 in light of the recent bushfire event to ensure that we have the best advice about our capability to effectively respond to the bushfire threat.

This is the first time this bushfire season that we have experienced conditions like this. While we are focusing on community recovery, the bushfire season will be with us for several months. It was good to see a little bit of rain last night. We even saw some of the fireys out there celebrating that rain, especially around that Gold Coast hinterland region.

Today QFES is monitoring a bushfire on North Stradbroke Island about four kilometres north of East Coast Road, west of the Peat Mine Track. This is a large, slow-moving fire in an inaccessible swamp area approximately two kilometres from a traditional owners area. Police are evacuating residents from this camp. I urge all Queenslanders to remain vigilant in the days, weeks and months ahead and heed the advice of authorities.


Regional Communities Program

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.39 am): During the Townsville sittings of parliament I announced our regional communities program, including community forums starting next month. The forums will be in seven regions: Far North Queensland, North Queensland, Mackay-Whitsunday, Central Queensland, Western Queensland, Wide Bay and Darling Downs/South-West. The first of these regional community forums will begin on Monday, 28 October. We have hit the ground running and already started preparations over the past week. Ministers and local MPs spread the word about the regional program during activities around the state.

In Cairns the health minister joined the members for Cairns and Cook at the hospital along with you, Mr Speaker, to turn the first sod at the new Cairns South Health Facility. The Minister for State Development and the Minister for Communities opened the Townsville Manufacturing Hub. The Minister for Natural Resources, the Minister for Employment and the member for Mackay were at the sod turning for a new resources centre of excellence. In Charters Towers, the agriculture minister and the Minister for Child Safety met with the Country Women's Association and a local community services provider. The education minister and the Minister for Environment went to Maryborough and Hervey Bay for meetings with the Fraser Coast Regional Council along with the member for Maryborough. The Minister for Public Works and the members for Rockhampton and Keppel inspected the local QBuild depot which is being recommissioned. I know that everyone was delighted at that. In Toowoomba, the transport minister met with the mayor and with Surat Basin Enterprise as well as local businesses and producers to discuss inland rail. The Minister for Local Government also spoke about the forums when he visited the Southern Downs.

That is a taste of the community engagement the regional forums will stimulate. We are advertising for community members to join the forums. The applications were due to close on Friday but have been extended until Monday to encourage people to put together their applications over the weekend. This will further boost our regional presence and will give Queenslanders even better connection with the government, because this government is a listening government, and we deliver for the people of Queensland.

Whitsunday Coast Airport

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.41 am): The Palaszczuk government is focused on backing Queensland jobs and backing our regions. On Friday night, I had the honour of officially opening the Whitsunday Coast Airport expansion in Proserpine, another example of our significant investment in regional Queensland.

Along with 'Mr Whitsundays', Mayor Andrew Willcox, and local councillors, the Palaszczuk government's \$15 million investment in the airport was unveiled. To say that people were impressed is an understatement. With a beautiful coral aquarium greeting visitors and locals on entry, the revamped airport is now equipped to welcome one million passengers to the Whitsundays every year, double the capacity of the former airport. That means more jobs for the region.

Southern and South-East Queensland were the latest regions to endure disasters, but it was not long ago that the Whitsundays were ripped apart by Tropical Cyclone Debbie. The new airport terminal is another sign of the recovery and rebuild of this beautiful part of our state and a monument to the resilience and determination of Queenslanders who live in our regions. It is proof that when our communities get knocked down by natural disasters the Palaszczuk government invests to help them come back bigger and better.


The airport is a vital piece of infrastructure that has created local jobs in the construction phase and ongoing jobs in the operation phase. It has helped the local community get back on its feet. In the Whitsundays, we know that tourism is a \$1.6 billion industry that supports 6,000 jobs.

Mr SPEAKER: General conversation, members, is too high. I will not issue another warning. I will start issuing actual warnings under the standing orders. Please keep the conversation down.

Ms TRAD: Now with the increased capacity at the airport through our investment, this vital industry can continue to grow and create even more jobs in the Whitsundays for decades to come. On Saturday morning, Mayor Willcox and I also visited the Airlie Beach foreshore, which little more than two years ago was flattened by Tropical Cyclone Debbie. The foreshore today is unrecognisable from its profile in March 2017. Thanks to the Palaszczuk Labor government's funding, the foreshore I saw on Saturday morning was humming with activity. Local families enjoyed the enormous new playgrounds. Locals pounded the footpaths and sweated on the outdoor gym equipment. Tourists and locals alike enjoyed the sun's first rays on the waterfront.

The eagerness of Mayor Willcox to point out which new facilities were funded by which Palaszczuk government initiatives was only matched by the enthusiasm with which Whitsunday residents were taking full advantage of them. All of this is proof that the Palaszczuk government plans, builds and prepares—and, when disaster strikes, we plan, rebuild and repair. The rejuvenation of the Whitsundays is a testament to that.

Alliance Airlines, Hawker Pacific


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.45 am): Yesterday we heard about Queensland's great success in the contract process for Australia's next generation infantry fighting vehicle. It is not just on land where the Palaszczuk Labor government is creating more jobs for Queenslanders. I am pleased to inform the House that Australian aviation and aerospace leader Hawker Pacific has announced that it will be performing heavy maintenance on Alliance Airline's permanent line of Fokker aircraft in Hawker Pacific's newly extended Cairns facility.

With the support of the Palaszczuk Labor government's \$175 million Jobs and Regional Growth Fund, Hawker Pacific expanded its Cairns hangar by 50 per cent, allowing it to carry out this type of valuable maintenance work in Far North Queensland. In doing so, we have helped create 38 new jobs so far. This increased work from Alliance Airlines comes after the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland Industry Attraction Fund helped Alliance expand its Queensland operations and establish a new base in Rockhampton.

Alliance Airlines now operates the world's largest fleet of Fokker aircrafts, featuring more than 40 planes ranging from the twin turbojet F50 to the 100-seat Fokker F100. This is a great partnership, supported by our government, meaning more jobs in regional Queensland will take flight. The project in Rockhampton alone is expected to generate \$12.5 million in capital expenditure and support up to 30 new full-time jobs in its first year of operation—growing to 58 jobs over the next five years.


It is worth adding that the Alliance Airlines aircraft that Hawker Pacific will be servicing were previously maintained in Europe, making this another big reshoring result for Queensland. It also highlights the success of the Palaszczuk Labor government's 10-year road map and action plan for aerospace, which prioritises growing Queensland's aerospace industry and creating more highly skilled jobs for our state. With support from the Palaszczuk Labor government, we now see two world-class companies working together to create more aviation maintenance work for Queensland. This means more highly skilled jobs for Queenslanders, particularly in our regions, which is great news for our state.

Gold Coast, Tourism

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games) (9.47 am): As the Premier announced this morning, our government will partner with Gold Coast tourism icons the O'Reilly family and Binna Burra Lodge to deliver \$2.5 million in new ecotourism experiences on the Gold Coast. As a government we will invest \$1.2 million for a major redevelopment of the Green Mountain campground at Lamington National Park delivering new eco tents and improved kitchen and amenities for tourists. At Binna Burra, we will build an Australian-first climbing course which will attract an extra 41,000 international visitors a year and generate more than \$5 million for the coast.

Today is a major milestone for Gold Coast tourism. Many governments on both sides of politics have talked a lot about ecotourism for the Gold Coast but very little has ever been done—until now. It has been sitting in the too-hard basket. I am proud that it is a Palaszczuk government that is finally delivering a brand-new world-class ecotourism experience for the Gold Coast region, showcasing its rainforests and its natural beauty. We know that the Gold Coast hinterland and Scenic Rim communities are going through a very tough time at the moment. Today's announcement provides these communities with optimism for the future as we work hard with local tourism operators, businesses and locals to rebuild and provide even better infrastructure for the future.


Byerwen Coalmine; Miners Memorial Day

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (9.48 am): I can advise the House that the resources sector is thriving under the Palaszczuk Labor government. I joined the member for Burdekin yesterday at the official opening of the \$2 billion Byerwen coalmine near Glenden, west of Mackay. As I said yesterday, under this government more than 7,000 jobs have been created in the resources sector and more than 200,000 jobs have been created across the Queensland economy. This project alone will create 350 construction jobs and 500 operational jobs across North and Central Queensland when it is in full swing. I was particularly pleased to meet representatives from the traditional owners, the Jangga people, and see the difference this project and its jobs have made for them. It is worth pointing out that that mine will have 14 per cent Indigenous employment.

I also spoke at yesterday's opening about tomorrow's Queensland Miners Memorial Day. Tomorrow I will join miners, unions, employers, community members and families and friends of workers tragically taken in mines at a service in Moura. We will pay our respects to almost 1,500 workers who have died in our mines since 1877. On the eve of Miners Memorial Day I can advise the House that Queensland will support a reduction in the workplace exposure standards for coal dust, which are expected to be released by Safe Work Australia before the end of this year. The simplest way to prevent occupational lung diseases like black lung and silicosis is to protect our miners from mine dust. Safe Work Australia is proposing that the occupational exposure limit for respirable coal dust be reduced by 40 per cent, to 1.5 milligrams per cubic metre. I am advised that the Minister for Industrial Relations is confirming Queensland's support for these proposals to Safe Work Australia.

This commitment is yet another reform to mineworker health and safety by this government. We have made sweeping changes to better prevent and detect black lung disease amongst coal workers and provide a safety net for affected workers. We have given the mine safety regulator the power to issue fines without going to court and increased maximum court penalties to \$4 million and we have seen work site safety reset sessions at mines and quarries all over this state. Most importantly, we have a commitment from companies, unions and peak bodies to consider further reforms including industrial manslaughter, because this government, like all Labor governments, has a deep concern for the safety and health of workers. It is embedded in our DNA.

Stone Benchtop Industry, Code of Practice


 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.51 am): One year ago today, after receiving advice on the troubling spike in cases of silicosis in the engineered stone benchtop fabrication industry, the Palaszczuk government issued a public warning about the risks of working with engineered stone and banned uncontrolled dry cutting. Since then, we have led the nation in responding to the threat of silicosis and today I am pleased to announce we are launching Australia's first code of practice for the stone benchtop industry in the government's next step to combat this insidious disease.

The code, which comes into effect on 31 October 2019, applies to all fabrication, processing, maintenance and removal of engineered and natural stone benchtops. It sets minimum and enforceable standards to ensure silica dust is managed safely and workers are protected. The new code does not impose any new regulatory requirements but simply reinforces the already stringent requirements of the Workplace Health and Safety Act and regulations. The code focuses on dust control measures to eliminate silica, including water suppression and on-tool dust extraction; the use of appropriate respirable protective equipment; air and health monitoring to check dust controls are effective and there are no changes to workers' health; safe onsite installation methods, including in homes; and worker consultations as well as training, education, instruction and supervision of workers.

The code was developed in conjunction with unions, industry associations, medical and technical experts and stone fabrication businesses and has wideranging stakeholder support, and I want to thank the 23 organisations that made up the industry working group which developed the code. Next month, which is also Safe Work Month, the Palaszczuk government will partner with the Australian Institute of Occupational Hygienists to hold a series of statewide information sessions promoting the code and further raising awareness of the safety and health risks of silica.

We have seen a shift in industry culture. However, we want to see long-term behavioural and cultural change in the industry and we remain focused on doing everything possible to ensure workers exposed to silica are safe in their jobs. As such, this week I have written to the chair of Safe Work Australia to confirm Queensland's support for reducing the workplace exposure standards for silica dust. While higher order engineering controls are what keep our workers safe, exposure standards tell industry what those controls must achieve. We will continue to audit engineered stone fabrication workplaces to ensure the requirements of the code are being met and we will start work on a silica dust code of practice for the construction industry. This government, the Palaszczuk government, will continue to work with all stakeholders in the battle against silicosis. This Queensland code is the first in Australia and we are leading the nation in our efforts to eradicate silicosis to ensure every worker returns home safely after work.

Bushfires, Police Service Task Force

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.55 am): The Queensland Police Service has played a vital role in the response to the devastating bushfires that have recently affected so much of our state. Disturbingly, evidence has emerged that a number of fires have been deliberately lit. I can tell members that those who commit these reckless, dangerous, potentially deadly and, frankly, mind-numbingly stupid acts will feel the full force of the law.

Taskforce Overcross has been established by the Queensland Police Service with detectives from the State Crime Command. The task force's mission is to coordinate all investigations into suspicious fires around the state. Sadly, the statistics are confronting. There is current oversight of 60 fire investigations statewide. Some 34 of these investigations have been finalised. Of those, 23 are now subject to police action. As of eight o'clock this morning, 30 people have been dealt with for offences relating to deliberately setting these fires. We may not understand the motivations of these individuals who willingly put property and lives at risk, but we do know this: they will pay a price. The Queensland Police Service will make sure of that. Arson is a crime and a person who commits this crime could be liable to up to life imprisonment.

Eight senior officers are coordinating the task force, which comprises an additional 35 investigators. Investigations are still continuing into the fires which impacted the Sarabah, Canungra and Binna Burra areas. We must not forget to acknowledge that there has also been a much broader police response to these recent bushfires. Police have literally been on the front line, going to places at most risk from the fires and ensuring people in those danger zones get timely information, especially if there is a need to evacuate. There was one occasion last week where more than a dozen police officers almost spent the night with residents in the Gold Coast hinterland at O'Reilly's guesthouse. Residents, staff and police were forced to stay there because the fire had cut access to the road, and that is what our police do. This is another example of their hard work. In times of emergency, they stick with those who are vulnerable. Queenslanders can be assured that the police are ready to help and will ensure that anyone who breaks the law feels the full force of the law.

Bushfires, Local Government

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.57 am): Last week I had the opportunity to speak at the Local Government Managers Australia Queensland conference in Townsville. In that room there were due to

be representatives from a large number of Queensland's councils. Unfortunately, some could not attend. They had to stay closer to home—home to fight the bushfires that led to a devastating loss of property but fortunately, as we all know, not a loss of life.


Across the state in the past week or so dozens of fires of varying severity have affected our communities and councils, and our local government authorities from the Gold Coast to the tip of Cape York are an integral part of our firefighting arsenal. The mayors, the councillors, their families and friends are in many cases the firefighters and the people supporting those men and women fighting the fires. Most, if not all, of our local government authorities are employers of auxiliary or volunteer firefighters and I thank them for allowing those people to defend those communities.

Of course, our councils play an integral role in the disaster management of their communities through the convening of their local disaster management groups. I want to acknowledge the great work that has happened right throughout the state in recent times in those particular roles. Last week I saw just how important these groups are when I visited Stanthorpe and Applethorpe and met with the Mayor of the Southern Downs Regional Council, Tracy Dobie. Mayor Dobie and her CEO, David Keenan, were—and still are—dealing with the aftermath of the unprecedented fires that swept through that region a couple of weekends ago. It was sobering to see just how close the fire came to the town and see the remnants of the four homes that had been destroyed.

On the ground, one thing that quickly became obvious was that Stanthorpe was saved because of the strong partnership between the council, Queensland Fire and Emergency Services and the Southern Downs community. Firefighters—volunteers and staff—worked side by side as the fire swept down the hill and engulfed the homes of their neighbours. They held their ground as properties burned in a bid to stop more damage.

We did not see that just on the Granite Belt. Our local government authorities will be integral to the recovery efforts of their communities and, as we have seen already—which the Premier made reference to yesterday—the Palaszczuk government will be there with them every step of the way.

Bushfires, Recovery

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (10.00 am): As my colleagues have already described, these bushfires are another natural challenge that comes with living in this beautiful state but, as in other recent natural disasters, it shows yet again how resilient Queenslanders are. We do not allow affected communities to recover alone. The Palaszczuk government is here to support individuals, families and communities to get back on their feet and recover.


Just like we were after the North Queensland floods and many disasters before that, my agency's community recovery program was on the ground immediately. Today, we have 68 Ready Reservists working in the Scenic Rim, Southern Downs, Noosa and Sunshine Coast areas. They are working in the community recovery hubs and providing targeted outreach services in affected communities, such as at community meetings and in making visits to affected residents. We have three community recovery hubs operating across the affected areas: one at Moriarty Park Community Sports Centre in Canungra; the Stanthorpe Civic Centre, Stanthorpe; and Peregian Beach Community House. In areas where communities are mobilising their own recovery, such as Beechmont, the department will be there to support them.

Staff from other Queensland government agencies, such as the Department of Housing and Public Works, and partner agencies including Red Cross and UnitingCare Queensland, are also working at the hubs to provide practical assistance and emotional support. Additionally, our Community Recovery Hotline has taken 582 calls from people seeking information, support or wanting to apply for grants.

Under the joint Commonwealth-state Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements, financial assistance and support services are available to eligible people in affected areas, including Emergency Hardship Assistance grants to help cover the costs of essential items such as food and clothing for people directly impacted by this disaster. These grants provide \$180 per person to a maximum of \$900 for a family of five or more. As at 8 am, 1,462 grant applications had been received, including 1,328 Emergency Hardship Assistance grants across all activated areas, with a total of more than \$453,000 being paid out in grants in activated areas, benefiting 2,520 people.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the wonderful Ready Reservists, who have again answered the call to leave their own homes and families to help Queenslanders during their time of need. I would also like to thank all of those involved in their communities for supporting this community recovery operation.

Bushfires, Roads

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (10.03 am): Queenslanders in recent weeks have been through one of the worst starts to a bushfire season on record. Across the state, bushfires have impacted communities, properties and businesses. As is the true Queensland way, our first responders, our government agencies, our councils and our communities have rallied around those who have been impacted. Among those responding to the bushfires are our hardworking Transport and Main Roads staff, who I am proud to say have been out on the ground working hard to make sure that our communities are safe. They have been doing all they can.


RoadTek crews have been at the coalface, predeployed to risk areas and have done an amazing job in responding to impacts along the New England Highway on the Darling Downs; Lamington National Park, Beechmont and Binna Burra roads on the Gold Coast; and on the Sunshine Motorway near the Peregian area. I am pleased to advise that Binna Burra Road has since reopened to local traffic. However, a number of roads remain closed and crews are working around the clock to assess the impacts, carry out geotechnical investigations and get these roads opened as soon as possible. With the bushfires, a lot of the usual things that we see on a road have been destroyed and they are being progressively replaced as quickly as they can.

Our crews have also supplied generators to the Southern Downs Regional Council and water trucks to assist with fire control, going above and beyond for their fellow Queenslanders. I would like to express my huge thanks and appreciation to our incredible RoadTek crews, our fireys, our police and all those involved for their inspiring efforts to help communities impacted by the devastating bushfires.

What we have seen is that even just a small fire can have a significant impact on a person's visibility and ability to drive. Yesterday, a grassfire at Darra caused a significant smoke hazard on the Centenary Highway, impacting driver visibility. Additionally, while visiting the cape last week I saw how untouched areas along the roadsides can become quickly engulfed in just a matter of hours, impacting vehicle access.

With bushfire season only just beginning, it is very important that Queenslanders avoid driving near areas of controlled burns and bushfires, they drive to the conditions, they tune into local radio stations for updates, they make sure they have plenty of water and fuel on those longer journeys and always follow the instructions of our police, our road crews and our firefighters, who are all doing a magnificent job on behalf of Queenslanders.

Bushfires, Small Business


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.06 am): As fires continue to burn and smoulder in parts of Queensland, we want to assure impacted small business owners that they are not alone. Small businesses impacted by the unprecedented bushfires in the Southern Downs Regional Council and Scenic Rim council areas will be provided with disaster assistance under the Commonwealth-state Disaster Recovery Funding Arrangements. This assistance includes concessional loans of up to \$250,000 for those who suffered direct damage and concessional loans of up to \$100,000 for those who did not suffer direct damage but suffered loss of income as a direct result of the bushfires. Small businesses are the lifeblood of our communities and, with this assistance, along with support offered by my department, we hope that impacted businesses will be able to get back on their feet as soon as possible.

I encourage everyone to do their bit in helping their local small business. Especially after a prolonged drought, I urge all Queenslanders to support regional small businesses by buying and going local. In their generosity, Queenslanders can support local small businesses by giving donations online to Givit. Cash donations to Givit allow produce and products to be sourced locally through local small businesses, ensuring that the money gets spent where it is needed the most.

Of course, recovery can be quite difficult, especially if people are dealing with the emotional impact of the disaster as well. We have 153 Mentoring for Growth mentors who have experience in disaster recovery already putting up their hands to help affected local business owners. We are working with local chambers of commerce and councils to make sure that this assistance gets to everyone who needs it, such as businesses like Binna Burra Lodge. Already, our Regional Skills Investment Strategy coordinator is engaged with Binna Burra Lodge to assist staff to find ongoing employment while they rebuild. My department is also working with the Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning regarding the Binna Burra Lodge task force and is involved in supporting the workers impacted by these fires.

Queenslanders look out for one another when times are tough and our small business community is no different. We will continue to work with the Queensland business community to provide support to get them back on their feet as soon as possible.

Bushfires, Queensland Fire and Emergency Services


 **Hon. CD CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (Minister for Fire and Emergency Services) (10.08 am): I am pleased to update the House on the work of our QFES fireys, our volunteers and our staff and the support that this government provides to our frontline officers. Firstly, overnight I was advised that a volunteer firefighter from Western Australia, who came to help fight fires in the Bundaberg region, was viciously attacked by a member of the public. Although his injuries are minor and he is going home today with the rest of his team, it was a despicable act. The attacker has been charged and, obviously, will face the full force of the law. I will be contacting the Western Australian minister today to offer our support.

As of this morning, there are 35 active fires, which means that, since the commencement of this bushfire event on 4 September 2019, there have been 1,545 active bushfires across the state. We still have 80 interstate personnel working alongside our own crews across the state. We should be very proud of our women and men on the front line. The QFES response continues, with 25 appliances on scene today and three aircraft tasked if needed. I was also advised this morning that Canungra had 10 millimetres of rain land on the fire ground yesterday afternoon. QFES is assessing that this morning. Early indications are that it has not put the Sarabah fire out but it has brought QFES some much needed time. Yesterday the south-east corner endured 25,000 lightning strikes, with 2½ thousand of those striking the ground. Whilst we now have a reprieve from Mother Nature, we must still be prepared for a change in the fire weather. We have seen acts of bravery that have at times been hard to put into words: people putting their own lives at risk to save others. It is true that in the hands of our emergency staff Queenslanders should feel assured that they are looked out for.

QFES recognises that climate change is real and Labor recognises that we need new equipment to fight natural disasters with more planes, more boots on the ground, more trucks, more stations and more investment. The Palaszczuk government remains committed to supporting the work of our emergency services right now and into the future. We have put continued record investments into fire stations, equipment and staff. Since 2015, this government has brought on board more than 330 new firefighters. When the LNP was in office there was no fleet management plan: no plan on how to maintain the fleet, no plan to replace the fleet.

Since 2015, the Palaszczuk government has boosted the fleet to 365 new appliances: 222 trucks for the Rural Fire Service, 143 trucks for Fire and Rescue. This year alone we will deliver \$50 million for 34 Fire and Rescue appliances, 25 Rural Fire Service appliances, three replacement aerial ladder platforms and seven combined aerial pumping appliances. Our capital works program is also on track to further support the work of our fireys. Since the Palaszczuk government came into office we have spent—are you ready for it—\$156.8 million on stations and complexes across this state. The Palaszczuk government has supported our wonderful emergency services people since 2015. We will continue to back our emergency services volunteers and staff into the future.

Bushfires, Hospital and Health Services


 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (10.12 am): Yesterday I told the House about just one of our hero paramedics who came to the rescue of a mum and her young daughter during the bushfire that destroyed their home. There are many more. But even heroes need help sometimes. Fires do not just have physical impacts, they can cause mental distress. I am pleased to say Queensland Health has been assisting with the psychosocial and emotional wellbeing response to the bushfires. Along with the excellent teams at QFES who provide support to first responders, teams from the Darling Downs, Metro South, Gold Coast and Sunshine Coast hospital and health services have been responding to community needs in the Scenic Rim, Stanthorpe and the Peregian areas. Two clinicians from each area have been deployed into the community recovery hubs and this includes specialist mental health clinicians and social workers.

The Sunshine Coast Hospital and Health Service also had four social workers at several of the evacuation centres established by the Noosa and Sunshine Coast councils where they provided psychosocial support and stabilisation to approximately 110 evacuees over two days. The teams have provided support to a combined approximately 100 community members in community recovery hubs across the southern Queensland region.

This support was also extended to firefighters and members of the rural fire brigades who have often come into the centres not in uniform, but also as members of the community. These heroes were also affected by property loss and seeing the damage on the front line. We know they are stressed and anxious over the trauma of the bushfire and the evacuations, while also experiencing grief and loss over houses, infrastructure, small business and employment. We know many are feeling overwhelmed and struggling with the thought that the fires may have been purposely lit. Support will continue to be provided to the communities impacted. Our people on the ground will work with the communities directly to continue this support as they move into recovery.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, No Confidence

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.14 am): I give notice that I will move—


That this House—

- (a) notes the Deputy Premier failed to disclose on the Members' Register of Interests the purchase of an investment property pursuant to section 69B of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 and the standing orders of this House;
- (b) notes the Crime and Corruption Commission's finding that the Deputy Premier did not declare any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest when participating in the Cabinet Budget Review Committee decisions concerning Cross River Rail and the Inner City South State Secondary College;
- (c) notes the Crime and Corruption Commission finding 'The statement of interest issue and conflicts of interest issue are matters for the parliament';
- (d) notes the Fitzgerald inquiry reported, 'The financial interests of any Parliamentarian or person in authority are of public significance. Such interests can result in conflicts between public duty and private interest ... The significance, power and influence of high public office requires that accountability mechanisms be effective';
- (e) resolves that the Deputy Premier's conduct has fallen short of the ethical standard expected by Queenslanders of any person holding high public office;
- (f) expresses no confidence in the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships; and
- (g) calls on the Premier to immediately sack the member for South Brisbane from cabinet.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude at 11.16 am.

Barbagallo, Mr D

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.16 am): My first question is to the Premier. The ministerial staff code of conduct requires staff to dispose of any company shares that might cause a conflict with their ministerial staff duties. Will the Premier tell the House whether she authorised David Barbagallo to breach the ministerial staff code of conduct by keeping his shares in the cruise tracker app?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. That matter is currently before the CCC.

Barbagallo, Mr D

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is to the Premier. New right-to-information documents now show that David Barbagallo advised the Premier on Advance Queensland, its funding programs and the expert panel, despite the conflict of interest with his cruise tracker app receiving taxpayers' money from Advance Queensland. Why did the Premier fail to make sure her most senior adviser kept basic integrity standards to manage his conflict of interest?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As the Leader of the Opposition knows, Ernst & Young has conducted a report into this. The matters are currently with the CCC and I will await the outcome of that investigation.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left! Member for Toowoomba South, I ask you to withdraw the unparliamentary language.

Mr JANETZKI: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier is being responsive to the question asked as I hear it. I wish to hear the answer. I hope the House does as well.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The opposition is well aware that there is an Ernst & Young report that has been concluded. It has gone to the CCC and we will await the final outcome. We know that those opposite are very good at making statements and accusing people before bodies make their decisions.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will do the right thing and not comment until the CCC—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: You might not like due process.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Resume your seat, please, Premier. Members, I have given clear guidance to the House that when a minister is being responsive to the question asked, as the Premier is, I expect there to be minimal interjection. That will be my final warning for today.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We know those opposite do not like process. We will await the outcome of that investigation, because there is a process that is underway.

Drought

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier and the Minister for Trade. Will the Premier detail what is being done—

Mr Boyce interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt you, member. Who was that member? Member for Callide, you are warned under standing order 253A. I find that to be a juvenile interjection. I have asked for silence when questions are being asked. I expect that to be adhered to. Member for Mackay, please restart your question.

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier and the Minister for Trade. Will the Premier detail what is being done to help individuals deal with the emotional pressures of the drought?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mackay for the question. We know that the drought is having a big impact on families and communities. As the leader of this government and as Premier of this state, I want to ensure that people get the help that they need. I do not want to see hardship and I do not want to see people going through massive financial loss and the impact that can have. We also know that drought can have a devastating impact on people individually.

My government is determined to do everything we can to help people and that is why today we are announcing a record \$1 million in grants for projects to support mental health services for Queenslanders affected by drought. It is a very important issue and one that my government is absolutely proud to be involved in. I have sat around kitchen tables and spoken to people at length.

The member for Everton is laughing, but this is not a laughing matter. They are laughing when we talk about mental health issues. I find that quite deplorable. They are laughing when I am talking about mental health.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please continue your response.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Today I am announcing \$1 million in grants for projects to support mental health services for Queenslanders affected by drought. The Tackling Regional Adversity Through Integrated Care Grants Program is now in its fourth year, with \$600,000 provided per year. This year, we are adding \$400,000 as part of that project. The successful organisations have ideas to raise awareness of mental health issues, bring people together, break down stigma and encourage people to seek help if needed, which is a really important issue. It is really important to encourage people to seek help if they need it.

The member for Mackay will be very pleased to know that in the Mackay Hospital and Health Service district there will be a project that includes workshops on mental health first aid for farmers and local businesses. The Western Downs Regional Council will run a Words for Wellbeing project, which will equip nine libraries with self-help materials for mental and physical help. The Oakey Community Care Committee's Project 4401 will encourage people to share their stories about dealing with

adversity. With the Central West Suicide Prevention Network, Preston Campbell will be talking to people, encouraging them to share their stories and to get help where needed. I thank Preston Campbell for coming on board to help with that initiative. Those are just a few projects.

I close by saying that the federal government has a \$5 billion drought fund. They have set up a consultative committee. I do not think we need consultation. That money should go to the states and we will get it out to the communities in need. No more consultation—

(Time expired)

Sarra, Dr C

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. I refer to Director-General Chris Sarra, who is the sole director, secretary and sole shareholder of Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd. Did the Deputy Premier give permission to Chris Sarra under the Public Service Act 2008 to continue to own and operate that company after his appointment as director-general?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for the question. Of course, this is the intellectual property of Professor Chris Sarra. It is his intellectual property. I requested that he get advice in relation to the matter. He did so. He advised me appropriately. It is declared, as are all directors-general's pecuniary interests or interests declared appropriately.

Regional Sitzings of Parliament, Townsville

Mr HARPER: My question is to the Premier and Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on the success of holding regional parliament in Townsville in the last sitting week?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Thuringowa for the question. I think we can all conclude that the Townsville regional parliament was a great success. The people of Townsville loved it and I am quite sure the members of parliament enjoyed it, although maybe the member for Broadwater did not enjoy it as much as everyone else. I am quite sure that every single member of parliament enjoyed the experience of being in Townsville, listening to people and having the opportunity to showcase what my government is delivering.

Mr Costigan: What happened to the reef bill?

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is currently being debated. I am sorry, member for Whitsunday: wake up!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Whitsunday, the first interjection had some comedic value. The second was not directed through the chair. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: For the benefit of the member for Whitsunday, the bill is currently being debated, just in case he missed it. I honestly believe that having a regional parliament during a term of government is a great idea and it is something that I commit to if we are re-elected at the next election. I thank all the members who were involved, particularly the local members. Of course, we had the opportunity to talk about the \$35 million Riverway Drive project, which I know the member for Thuringowa is very much committed to. Just after we left Townsville Heatley Park opened, following a commitment of \$3.1 million under our Works for Queensland program. The Minister for Local Government would have been very pleased to have seen that.

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Broadwater, you will cease your interjections.

Mr Stevens: What about youth crime?

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are adding more police. If you want to talk about crime, we are adding—

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier will put her comments through the chair.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I had the great opportunity of meeting—

Mr Watts: Well short of population growth.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They do not like it.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Broadwater, I have already given you some guidance. You are warned under the standing orders. Member for Toowoomba North, you are warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I was happy to join the Deputy Premier and the Minister for Police to meet the new cadets. People commented on how those opposite were entertaining the idea of actually closing the Townsville academy and selling it off. We also had the great opportunity of seeing the pipes that are to be put together for the \$225 million pipeline. We visited the great stadium and, with Jonathan Thurston, were there when they installed the first seat. The Townsville stadium is rising out of the ground. It could be used in a future Olympics. It is often described as perhaps being one of the next greatest Rugby League ovals in Australia.

I thank the people of Townsville for welcoming the parliament. A big thank you goes to yourself, Mr Speaker, the Clerk, all of the attendants and everyone involved. It took a big effort to go there and everyone did a great job. Thank you to all the students and members of the public who came to the parliament.

(Time expired)

Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd

Dr ROWAN: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier guarantee that Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd, a company that Chris Sarra is the sole director, secretary and sole shareholder of, has not been the beneficiary of any government grants or taxpayer funds since Dr Chris Sarra was appointed to the role of director-general?

Ms TRAD: To be absolutely clear, the Stronger Smarter educational framework has international acclaim and it is the intellectual property of Dr Chris Sarra. Whether or not this program gets any government funding—and can I say the federal government has been very interested in this program and I cannot absolutely clarify whether or not the federal government has supported the institute through funding—I will have to take on notice. I will make this remark. There is no depth, there is no bottom to the lows that those opposite will go to. There is absolutely no bottom—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr Hunt interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Buderim, you are warned under the standing orders. Member for Nicklin, you are warned under the standing orders. Deputy Premier, do you have anything further to add pertaining to the question asked?

Ms TRAD: Their capacity to smear and create innuendo is absolutely mind-boggling. I will say, as I said before, that this is the intellectual property of Dr Chris Sarra. As I said, I requested he get advice from the Integrity Commissioner in relation to continuing on in this role which he does not do at taxpayer expense whatsoever. He acts in accordance with that. If there are any funding arrangements done they are done at arms-length. There is a tendering process. I will get the information for the honourable members opposite.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, can I confirm that under standing order 113 you are undertaking to provide a response back to the House?

Ms TRAD: Yes.

Electricity Assets

Ms LUI: My question is of the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on the benefits of keeping Queensland's electricity assets in public hands and is she aware of any alternative proposal?

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for Cook for the question. The member for Cook will know, I hope, that Queensland absolutely leads the way when it comes to generating electricity and feeding it into the national grid. The energy minister has been talking ad nauseam in this place about how much of an energy powerhouse Queensland is for the rest of the nation.

I am also really pleased to inform the House that for the June quarter ABS CPI data has shown that in Queensland electricity prices have decreased by more than five per cent in South-East Queensland. Of course, that follows almost a five per cent decrease in regional household power bills and a 5.8 per cent fall for regional businesses. This is part of the Palaszczuk Labor government's plan to make sure that we continue to transition to cleaner forms of energy like solar energy. The competition authority has indicated that this has had a direct benefit of reducing power prices for Queensland.

What we have seen from the federal government is an announcement to introduce big-stick legislation into the federal parliament—big-stick legislation to compel energy companies to divest. In Queensland we know what that means. We know that that means privatisation. I am calling on those opposite to detail to this House what they have said and when they have stood up to Canberra to ensure that this bill does not privatise Queensland's electricity and port assets.

We know that back in 2015 the member for Nanango talked about selling the Tarong Power Station and said that this would create enormous benefits for the region. The Leader of the Opposition should make clear in this place whether or not she still holds that view. If she still holds that view then that means that the Leader of the Opposition and those opposite support Scott Morrison and the LNP at a federal level when it comes to their ideological agenda of privatising state government owned assets.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms TRAD: In Queensland the Palaszczuk Labor government will stand up to Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg and the federal LNP and make sure that we keep our electricity assets and ports in public hands. We know that those opposite wanted to sell the Gladstone port, wanted to sell the Townsville port and wanted to sell the poles and wires. Not only did they want to do that, they spent \$70 million of taxpayer funds out there advocating for it.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, I caution you about using members correct titles. I heard some interjections of yours. I ask you to use correct titles. That is applicable to all members of the House.

Sarra, Dr C

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier guarantee that Chris Sarra has not personally benefited from the Palaszczuk government subsidy to Patria Consulting to teach a program which is owned by Chris Sarra's company?

Ms TRAD: I will take that question on notice.

Mr SPEAKER: Can I confirm that that is under standing order 113 that you will take that on notice?

Ms TRAD: Yes.

Regional Queensland, Manufacturing Industry

Mr STEWART: My question is of the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister please advise how the government is supporting industry and manufacturing in regional Queensland? Is the minister aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Townsville for his question and for his strong support for manufacturing, particularly in regional Queensland. As the member for Townsville and other members of the House know, manufacturing contributes so much to the Queensland economy. It employs 171,000 people and contributes about \$20 billion in value add to the Queensland economy each year.

We recognise the value and importance of manufacturing to regional Queensland which is why we are establishing manufacturing hubs in Cairns, Townsville and Rockhampton. I was delighted to join the Minister for Communities in Townsville recently when we kicked off the manufacturing hub in Townsville. I am pleased to say that hub staff have already engaged with over 200 stakeholders across industry, local government, peak industry groups, education and training organisations, schools, enterprise and chambers of commerce to identify opportunities to grow Townsville's manufacturing sector.

While we are supporting jobs, member for Townsville, we know what would be happening if the LNP got their hands on the levers of power again. When the Leader of the Opposition was Campbell Newman's assistant treasurer she was very proud to cut \$30 million from the industry support grants and support for regional business development. What have we seen in opposition? We have seen no support for the manufacturing hubs and no support for manufacturing grants. In fact, they want to cut \$26 million from the Made in Queensland program and turn it into a marketing campaign. That is their vision for manufacturing in Queensland. They will not even stand up for cheaper power for industry.

If the LNP want to stand up for regional Queensland they should say to Scott Morrison, 'Stop the legislation that will require the divestiture from public ownership of power facilities in Queensland.' Stand up to Scott Morrison and say no to this legislation that will force publicly owned power stations to be

divested from ownership of the state. We know they wanted to do that in opposition. In fact, they wanted to sell a power station to fund the refurbishment of Kingaroy Hospital. We have done that. The Labor government did that. We built a brand-new hospital in Kingaroy without selling public assets.

Mr Crandon interjected.

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

Mr DICK: No wonder there are drum beats about the Leader of the Opposition. Imagine one's position being challenged by Scott Emerson. What an embarrassment that the most forgettable shadow Treasurer—sorry, I see the member for Everton—the second most forgettable shadow Treasurer in Queensland marking her down as 'could do better'. That is what he says about the Leader of the Opposition. No wonder the drum beat has started. This is not leadership. It is not support for manufacturing.

Mr Lister interjected.

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

Mr DICK: It is not vision. It is not the future for Queensland.

Mr SPEAKER: Just to be clear, the member for Southern Downs is warned under the standing orders and the member for Coomera is warned under the standing orders in case you could not hear my rulings over the interjections.

Sarra, Dr C

Ms SIMPSON: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Is the Deputy Premier aware that her department awarded a \$16,500 contract for an executive training program in February this year to a company operated by an associate of Chris Sarra's Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd?

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There have been a number of questions put by the opposition specifically naming the director-general. Under standing order 115(b)(vi), it specifically states 'names of persons, unless they are strictly necessary to render the question intelligible and can be authenticated'. There is no doubt that these questions could be asked in relation to the title of the individual without naming the individual in these questions. They are seeking to impugn this individual, a senior public servant, in the questions they are asking. I ask that you rule—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members to my left! I will hear the point of order.

Mrs D'ATH: The use of this individual's name in these questions should be ruled out of order.

Mr SPEAKER: In response to the point of order, there is no point of order. In this circumstance the individual concerned is the head of a government agency. It does go to matters of accountability. The individual concerned has appeared before estimates committees and other parliamentary proceedings. It is not difficult to ascertain who the individual's identity is in the circumstances. I rule the question in order.

Ms TRAD: The question is a subset of the question asked by the member for Moggill. I already advised the House that I would take that question on notice as per the standing orders. The response to the member for Maroochydore is the same.

Mr SPEAKER: The question will be taken on notice under standing order 113.

Regional Queensland, Tourism Industry

Mr O'ROURKE: My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please update the House on the strong growth of the tourism industry in regional Queensland under the Palaszczuk government?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question and for his strong advocacy for the Rockhampton tourism industry. We know that Rockhampton is home to some of the most awarded hotels in Queensland in The Edge and the Empire. They have a great tourism offering there. As I spoke about yesterday, we saw the fantastic results of our most recent campaign where we saw not only the Rockhampton tourism organisation but seven tourism organisations along Queensland's coastline partnering together to deliver more tourists to Queensland than ever before when it comes to our Great Barrier Reef.

It is not just our marketing that is kicking goals; it is also our investment in infrastructure. We are very proud that as a government we have committed more funding for tourism infrastructure than any other government in the history of Queensland. This has seen the pipeline of tourism infrastructure planned or being delivered in Queensland right now at double the rate of when the LNP were in government—more than \$14 billion worth of tourism infrastructure projects being delivered across our state, whether it is investment in new resorts on the Great Barrier Reef or in new hotels and new experiences like we have already spoken about in ecotourism here on the Gold Coast.

It is not just us who is investing in the future of the Gold Coast and investing in the future of tourism. I see that the member for Broadwater is now investing in his protege's new political career. On page 3 of the *Gold Coast Bulletin* today it has been revealed that a young fellow—I am all for young people getting involved in politics—who was the member for Broadwater's former electorate officer is now having a tilt at council in division 1, I believe. He is a very interesting character. There were these lovely photos of him on his social media where he was holding a gun, toting a gun.

Mr SPEAKER: Stop parading it, Minister. You will table that.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms JONES: Very Gold Coast that one.

Mr Dick: As you do when you live on the Gold Coast.

Ms JONES: As you do on the Gold Coast.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Minister, if you have a series of those, I ask that you table them collectively instead of holding them up for display in the chamber.

Ms JONES: We have the member for Broadwater's protege who is trying to run for Gold Coast City Council division 1 running around holding a gun. Then there was a photo of him saying that he wants to fund the ABC. I am sure the journalists upstairs would be interested in that. Surprise, surprise—he is such a strong young character that he has deleted these photos from his Twitter feed. He must have got some advice that you can just change locations, change your values, change what you stand for. The latest photo that I will table for the benefit of the House is where he has put the gun down and he has picked up a little spade and now he is planting trees.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I have asked you not to hold those up.

Ms JONES: I will table that for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Photograph of candidate for Gold Coast City Council division 1 [\[1507\]](#).

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I have asked you not to hold those up.

Ms JONES: I tabled that, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: You can table it without holding it up. I warn you under the standing orders.

Ms JONES: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Sorry, old habits over 10 years die hard. That has been the practice in all my experience of being in parliament. What we have seen is the member for Broadwater's protege—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe the minister has reflected on your ruling. It might be 'old habits' but you are the Speaker of this House and I believe the member has just reflected on your ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. I am entirely capable of managing my own affairs in the chamber. The minister's time has expired.

Sarra, Dr C; Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd

Mr JANETZKI: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Will the Deputy Premier table the conflict of interest management plan to ensure all conflicts arising from Chris Sarra's simultaneous roles as director-general and sole director, secretary and shareholder of Strong Smart Solutions Pty Ltd are properly managed?

Ms TRAD: As I said, Dr Sarra has publicly declared all of his interests. They are publicly available on a website. I am advised that Dr Sarra does not receive any moneys from his role in a voluntary capacity within the institute.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members to my left, the Deputy Premier is being responsive to the question asked. You have asked the question. I expect that you will want to hear the answer.

Ms TRAD: I will reflect on the fact that it was former LNP prime ministers who invited Dr Chris Sarra to sit on their national Indigenous advisory body.

Mr Bleijie: Yes, but this is a state government and he is a director-general.

Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Kawana. It was a former state government led by Campbell Newman who also invited Dr Chris Sarra as chairman of the Stronger Smarter Institute to engage with the government. The point is that this is all information that is publicly declared. I have taken on notice the questions asked by those opposite in relation to whether or not there is any funding from a state jurisdiction that goes—

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Warrego, I have given a general warning about interjections when the minister is being responsive. This is clearly the case. You are warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: As I said, I advise the House that the director-general of my agency, DATSIP, has sought advice from the Integrity Commissioner. He has advised the Public Service Commissioner as well and he has advised me. All of this information is in the public domain. I have said to those opposite that I will take their detailed questions on notice and I will come back to them.

Secondary School Students, Health and Wellbeing

Mr BUTCHER: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister outline to the House the health and wellbeing support that is available to high school students in Queensland?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Gladstone for his question. I know that, as a grandad himself and as a passionate local MP, he cares very deeply about making sure that young Queenslanders get access to the health services they need. While for both of us and most of us high school seems a long time ago—in fact, the member for Cooper was just reminding me how we are not as young as we used to be—I am sure all members can remember that high school years can sometimes be challenging. In fact, most young people will experience some distress through their high school years, whether it is relationships, family issues, mental health or suicidal ideation, drugs and alcohol, sexual health and sexuality, acne, body image, healthy eating and living, as well as the full range of health concerns that any of us could experience. That is why the Labor government is very proud of our school based youth health nurses.

This program was introduced in 1998 by a Labor government and celebrates 20 years helping young Queenslanders. In that 20 years tens of thousands of young Queenslanders have been helped by our school nurses. It started off as a trial program with 100 nurses over two years; there are now 160 clinicians right throughout the state. They have made the lives of Queensland's young people better. On behalf of all of us I would like to acknowledge and thank them for the work they do every day. It is just one example of how Labor governments support nurses and expand services delivered by nurses while those opposite sacked nurses, including school based nurses.

Ms Jones: Shame!

Dr MILES: It is indeed a shame. They sacked 1,800 nurses, including school based nurses. Thankfully, that vital program survived their three short years in office and continues to deliver important services supporting the mental and physical wellbeing of Queensland's young people. In fact, today in schools in every one of our electorates young people will be getting help from a school based nurse, and those of us on this side of the House are very proud of that fact.

(Time expired)

Global Climate Strike

Mr BERKMAN: My question without notice is for the Premier. After devastating bushfires last week gave Queenslanders yet another taste of what climate change looks like, workers here and all over the globe are joining students striking for climate action. Will the Premier step up like Daniel Andrews did yesterday for Victorians and back Queensland public servants who want to attend the Global Climate Strike this Friday?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Maiwar for the question. Let me say a couple of things in relation to that. First of all, Queensland is seeing more and more natural disasters. Are they a result of climate change? Yes, I believe they are. We are seeing temperatures increase across the state

and across the globe. That is why my government has a very clear 50 per cent renewable energy target by 2030. That is why we have the most efficient coal-fired power stations in the nation. We have gas and we also have renewable energy. In fact, there is \$20 billion on the books and \$5 billion under construction, with most of the jobs happening in regional Queensland.

The Bureau of Meteorology also backs what I have said publicly. I have made public speeches about the change in our climate and the impact it is having on natural disasters. In fact, from memory a report was handed down at the end of last year which talked about changes in temperature and what that is doing for cyclones. For the first time ever Queensland has had a catastrophic level of bushfires such as we have not seen before. Unlike those opposite—especially federal LNP member David Littleproud, who came out and said he did not back the science and climate change is not man-made—we will do everything we can on this side of the House when it comes to climate change.

In relation to your question, I understand that children may be participating. As I have said previously, I believe that children should be attending school and people should be attending their workplaces. If these events are held after hours and if they held on the weekends, I am all for that. I believe in democracy. I believe in people being able to express their opinions on a whole range of things. We have a very vibrant democracy in this state which I support, but I do not support events that use dangerous devices. I know the Minister for Police will have more to say about that at a later stage. I do respect the fundamental right of people to protest in this state. They should do it peacefully. They should do it in spaces that are allowed. They should let the police know. I do believe that it should be done after hours or during lunch breaks.

Regional Queensland, Electricity Prices

Mr HEALY: My question is of the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. Will the minister advise the House of the government's policies to put downward pressure on regional electricity prices, and is he aware of any alternatives?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Cairns for the question. The Palaszczuk government's Affordable Energy Plan is delivering for Cairns families. It is delivering for Queensland families and Queensland businesses. The Affordable Energy Plan is delivering for all Queenslanders. It is delivering the lowest average power prices on the eastern seaboard. Regional Queenslanders are now in their second year of power price reductions. Power prices are falling in regional Queensland. All up, over two years a typical regional small business would have saved \$230 and a typical household \$82 thanks to the Affordable Energy Plan. That is what happens when you have sound, consistent policy. What does the LNP have?

The member for Everton was cogitating away in Townsville last week telling a pie shop owner that the LNP would cut his power bill by introducing competition. That pork pie just added \$400 to that pie shop owner's power bill, or it will add \$700 million to the LNP's tally of \$7 billion worth of unfunded promises. The member for Everton should have apologised to the pie shop owner for the 43 per cent increase, or he should have apologised for the \$400 increase in his power bill should they ever get elected. Federally we have 'chief ostrich' Angus Taylor burying his head in the sand over energy. As the Deputy Premier said, this morning he will pop his head out of the sand long enough to reintroduce the big-stick privatisation legislation. Everyone opposes this legislation except Angus. Businesses, communities—even the ACCC—hate the big-stick legislation. He should have consulted, but did he? There was not one drop of consultation with the state it would have had the most effect on.

This big-stick legislation is nothing more than privatisation in disguise. Privatisation will affect Queensland families and raise their power bills yet again, like those opposite. It is only the Palaszczuk Labor government that is doing the heavy lifting on power prices, making sure that all Queenslanders benefit from having power prices in regional Queensland come down. Over five years do you know how much power prices went up in Queensland? Zero per cent.

Sarra, Dr C

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier now order a full investigation into payments made by the Palaszczuk government to companies and individuals linked to Deputy Premier Trad's director-general, Chris Sarra?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Surfers Paradise for the question. Let me say from the outset that I think it is absolutely disgraceful to come in here and attack public servants.

Mrs Frecklington: Accountability!

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the Leader of the Opposition's interjection. Let us talk about accountability. Step one, the director-general's pecuniary interests register is now public information. That is how they found out about the company: it is there for everyone to see. Let us talk about when the LNP was in government. When I was the Leader of the Opposition we asked for Mr Grayson's—who was the director-general of the DPC—pecuniary interests register. It was refused because they were not public.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana.

Ms PALASZCZUK: When Campbell Newman's director-general, Jon Grayson's, name was being bandied around in the New South Wales ICAC, he was asked to table the pecuniary interests register. The former premier said, 'Mr Grayson has declared all of his interests to me, the Public Service Commissioner and the Integrity Commissioner.' There is no accountability from the LNP.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Not only that, but the Newman government made no change to the protection from RTI of the directors-general pecuniary interests register, and they continue to exempt the pecuniary interests register. Under my government, the directors-general pecuniary interests register is public.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: Not only that, the declaration of interests goes to the minister, the Integrity Commissioner and the chief executive of the Public Service Commission one month after being appointed and after a change in their interests, as well as after an annual review as of 30 June every single year, so do not come in here and lecture my government about accountability. I am angry because those opposite should hang their heads in shame. They have hidden the pecuniary interests register for all of their former chief executive officers. Not one was released publicly. Under my government, every single directors-general pecuniary register is in the public domain for the entire public to see. Shame on you.

Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, Fire Safety

Ms RICHARDS: My question is to the Minister for Fire and Emergency Services. Will the minister please update the House on the work QFES is doing to ensure young people are educated on the importance of fire safety?

Mr CRAWFORD: I thank the member for Redlands for the question. I want to thank her for her ongoing support of QFES volunteers and staff out in the Redlands area. The Palaszczuk government takes fire safety very seriously. We understand that not only must you have a whole-of-government response to stopping fires but you must have a whole-of-government response to preventing them. QFES runs a program called Fight Fire Fascination, or FFF. It supports educational fire safety sessions to educate youth from the age of three to 17 who may have previously been involved in a fire incident. The program teaches young people to understand the seriousness of fire and the dangerous consequences of fires. It includes education around handling things such as matches. It is a very important program that also works with childcare professionals and QFES officers to address the root issue of fire fascination amongst some young people.

It is a program that has had overwhelming success. One parent whose child was involved in arson situations said that her child has never touched matches again after being involved in the FFF program. Another parent said that the program taught their child the dangers of fire and that sometimes it is okay to say no to the peer pressure of playing with candles, fireworks or sparklers.

It is clear that this program has a fantastic success rate when it comes to teaching youth the dangers of fire, but during the LNP Newman years FFF was cut. It was axed. Those opposite axed the very program that prevents juvenile arson, and then it was reinstated by the Palaszczuk government in 2015. It is Labor that continues to support educational programs in this state because we know that they are a successful deterrent to criminal behaviour among young people. It does not stop there. Let us have a look at the record in other QFES education areas. Not only did they cut the FFF awareness campaign for schools; they cut the annual SES state championships where our SES volunteers go and actually learn, practise, train and hone their skills. It was cut by the LNP and reinstated by Labor.

Everyone in this House would be aware of the 'If it's flooded, forget it' campaign—that campaign that we run every single summer to stop drivers going into flooded water. Guess what? The funds for the 'If it's flooded, forget it' campaign were cut by those opposite and, again, reinstated by Labor. Only the Palaszczuk government prepares for the future. Only the Palaszczuk government prepares our people and our emergency services to deal with the future. The LNP is just cut, sack and sell.

Public Service, Conflicts of Interest

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier assure the House that no Palaszczuk government directors-general are in the position of both signing off on government expenditure and at the same time receiving payments from government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. If the member has any evidence of any wrongdoing, he should put that forward. The Deputy Premier has undertaken to take the questions that have been put to her on notice today. She will respond to those questions in due course. As I have said very clearly, under my government there is clear accountability with the directors-general pecuniary interests register being made public. That is in stark contrast to the LNP, where they were hidden from the public and from this parliament for three years. The pecuniary interests register was hidden.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection from the honourable minister. Their donors were also hidden. We had to drag that out. I will not be lectured by those opposite. As I said, the directors-general pecuniary interests register is publicly available for everybody to see.

Electoral System, Integrity

Mr MELLISH: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. Will the Attorney update the House on the work being undertaken by the Electoral Commission of Queensland to uphold integrity within our electoral system?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Aspley for his question. I know that he certainly supports the role of the Electoral Commission and integrity around electoral donations. I want to take this opportunity to thank the hardworking staff of the Electoral Commission of Queensland, in particular the ECQ staff who participated in the Townsville regional parliament education activities. In fact, the ECQ staff were on hand to explain to students how our electoral system works and the importance of having a say at the ballot box. The staff conducted a mock election for the school students, with over 1,245 votes being cast on a ballot on the question of the best thing to do on a weekend. A full official preferential count was then conducted, and I can inform the House that having a sleepover was declared the official winner for the 2019 North Queensland parliament student election.

On another important matter of electoral integrity, I would like to sincerely congratulate the member for Nanango and the LNP for accepting the Court of Appeal's decision to disclose all donations of \$1,000 or more. It has taken two years—actually, it has taken since 2015 when we passed the laws—for them to finally accept the law and the judgement of the courts, so well done to the member for Nanango for finally doing that. That should mean we are going to see disclosures on the real-time disclosure website go through the roof. I have no doubt we are going to see all those donations—maybe not the diamond membership or the paper bag membership, but certainly we will see some.

I would be interested to know what the member for Nanango's views are of the New South Wales Premier's announcement today to not allow cash donations over \$100. While they want all their donations to be under the table, the Premier of New South Wales wants to disclose them. We saw last week the decision come down in the Awabdy case in the Court of Appeal in which it was stated—

The versatile nature of money as a tool of corruption means that the scope of the provisions has to be wide and general to be effective ... it is easy to appreciate that a payment made ostensibly for one purpose may have another covert purpose. A significant donation to a State branch of a party in aid of a State political purpose might well serve to evoke a willingness to give improper assistance in the Federal political sphere.

We welcome that decision. That is why the LNP should apologise to the people of Queensland because around \$1 million of taxpayers' dollars had been spent here in Queensland fighting to protect our integrity and transparency around our electoral laws because the LNP just would not accept them because they want to hide their donations.

(Time expired)

Commercial Fishing, Vessel Monitoring System

Mr BENNETT: My question is to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries. With reference to the damning Coroner's finding of the joint inquest into the loss of life from the tragic sinking of FV *Cassandra* and FV *Dianne*, will the minister now apologise to the families of the eighteen commercial fishermen who have died in the waters off Queensland for failings in his department to implement the safety aspects of the vessel monitoring system?

Mr FURNER: Once again, we have heard here today in question time the depth and the low level of questions that have been asked by those opposite, and here is another example. They are lower than a snake's belly. In terms of the question from the member opposite, the government is still reviewing the inquest findings in detail, but actions have already been taken to address a number of those recommendations.

Fisheries Queensland has delivered a live feed of all vessel-tracking unit positions for Maritime Safety Queensland since the late 2000s as part of the Reef Vessel Traffic Service. DAF has already offered the Australian Maritime Safety Authority, which leads all search and rescue for commercial vessels, a direct feed of vessel-tracking data.

It remains the government's view that fishers should primarily be using the existing national search and rescue network, which is based on the emergency position indicating radio beacon satellite detection system. From 1 January 2021 float-free emergency position indicating radio beacons will be mandatory on certain types of commercial vessels. This change to safety equipment required is being led by the Australian Maritime Safety Authority and comes after a number of incidents in Australia and internationally in which commercial vessels have sunk quickly and masters and the crews were not able to deploy the EPIRB in time, resulting in a tragic loss of life.

My department will respond formally to the Coroner in due course. The member opposite and those who are perpetuating this particular issue and getting behind these grubby tactics regarding the families of those on the FV *Cassandra* and FV *Dianne* should hang their heads in shame. They should apologise to those families rather than come into this chamber to constantly ask their grubby questions attacking those families who are relying upon the Coroner's report and the goodwill of my department to bring about changes to this particular industry. Shame on you and shame on all those opposite!

Howard Police Station, Road Policing Command

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is to the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister please update the House on the work of the Road Policing Command operating out of the new Howard Police Station, which was delivered by this Palaszczuk government?

Mr RYAN: I thank the member for Maryborough not only for his advocacy for Howard and their new police station but also for the Road Policing Command, because it is a great success story at Howard. The Road Policing Command certainly has its motors running and has hit the ground running since it moved into the new Howard Police Station. During the months of June, July and August, which were very busy months for our Road Policing Command, they conducted active patrols to keep the roads safe, culminating in Operation Romeo Typhoon during Queensland Road Safety Week, and we have seen some outstanding achievements as a result. I am advised that in the Maryborough Patrol Group so far this year there have been zero fatalities on our roads, a wonderful achievement and commendable policing by the Road Policing Command right across Maryborough and right across Queensland, for that matter.

The member for Maryborough backs the Road Policing Command, our government backs the Road Policing Command, but there is a question mark over those opposite. We have heard all through question time this morning attacks on public servants. They do not just hate public servants; they attack public servants and they sack public servants as well.

A case in point is the member for Nanango, who one year ago to the day ridiculed the hardworking police of the Road Policing Command in this chamber. What did she say in this chamber? 'Not traffic police, not traffic cops,' she sniggered about our Road Policing Command. She did not want those police in her electorate, she said. She did not think they were good enough for her electorate. We think they are good enough. We value the work of the Road Policing Command; they keep Queenslanders safe every single day. I reignite my request for the member for Nanango to apologise to the 600-plus members of the Road Policing Command whom she put down and whose work she criticised one year ago to the day.

We are a government which backs our police. Not only do we back them with more resources but we also continue to grow the police family with a growth in numbers. We celebrated the good news about the growth in numbers coming to Townsville. We support our police with the additional resources that we are rolling out—additional resources like the new police station at Howard, like new vehicles for our police, like body worn cameras which those opposite refused to fund, like QLITEs which ensure that our police are out and about more often. We are a government which backs our police. All they do is attack and ridicule and sack.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southport, you have had a good go today. You are warned under the standing orders.

Barbagallo, Mr D

Mr PERRETT: My question without notice is to the Premier. The Premier has denied that David Barbagallo's resignation was related to the Crime and Corruption Commission looking into his receipt of a taxpayer funded grant. Will the Premier tell the House why David Barbagallo resigned as her chief of staff?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. Once again, it is another grubby attack. Last November Mr Barbagallo indicated to me that he was intending to resign. I asked him to stay. In June this year he had a conversation with me and discussed personal matters as to why he would be leaving. It had nothing at all to do with anything relating to the current investigation. I think it is absolutely disgusting that people opposite are coming in here and are once again trying to drag people's names through mud. It is absolutely appalling.

Ipswich Turf Club

Ms HOWARD: My question is of the Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Will the minister update the House on the Ipswich Turf Club?

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


Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Ipswich for the question as I know she recognises the importance of the Ipswich Turf Club to her region both as a sporting venue and as a community hub. Last Friday morning I had the opportunity to look through the Ipswich Turf Club redevelopment alongside the member for Ipswich and her nearby colleague the member for Bundamba and I have to say I was seriously impressed. That is all thanks to the Palaszczuk government's support and an allocation from the Racing Infrastructure Fund of some \$24.8 million to support the club. It has already had a transformative effect on the sport and it will have one on Ipswich itself. The club's redevelopment has seen a modern, state-of-the-art facility already in place providing state-of-the-art jockey facilities and new steward facilities. I look forward to seeing the full implementation of the redevelopment of Ipswich that will deliver not only for the turf club and thoroughbred racing but also for the whole of the Ipswich community.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired. Members, please leave the chamber quietly. I would like to remind members who are under warnings that those warnings will continue through until the lunch adjournment, those members being: the members for Callide, Whitsunday, Broadwater, Toowoomba North, Buderim, Nicklin, Coomera, Southern Downs, Cooper, Warrego, Kawana and Southport.

CHILD DEATH REVIEW LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (11.17 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection Act 1999, the Director of Child Protection Litigation Act 2016 and the Family and Child Commission Act 2014 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Child Death Review Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 [1501].

Tabled paper: Child Death Review Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [1502].

I am pleased to introduce the Child Death Review Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. In introducing this bill, I acknowledge the death of 21-month-old toddler Mason Jett Lee, who on 11 June 2016 died tragically at his Caboolture home. The death shocked the community. Following Mason's death, the Premier requested the Queensland Family and Child Commission, QFCC—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Kelly): Pause the clock. I ask those leaving the chamber to please exit the chamber quietly. The minister is addressing sensitive matters in her introductory speech.

Mrs D'ATH: Following Mason's death, the Premier requested the Queensland Family and Child Commission, QFCC, to oversee the reviews being undertaken by the Department of Child Safety, Youth and Women and Queensland Health about the services provided to Mason before he died. Child Safety and the Director of Child Protection Litigation, the litigation director, are currently the only agencies required to undertake a review of their involvement following the death or serious physical injury of a child who is known to Child Safety. Government accepted the single recommendation from the QFCC's report, *A systems review of individual agency findings following the death of a child*, to 'consider a revised external and independent model for reviewing the deaths of children known to the child protection system'. The Palaszczuk government also publicly committed to introducing legislation requiring expanded key government agencies—such as health, education and police—to conduct internal systems reviews in child death cases. This bill, if passed by the House, will fulfil that commitment.

Naturally, there is significant public interest in government's ability to safeguard our most vulnerable children, ensure cases are appropriately examined and identify opportunities for policy, practice and system improvements. While the QFCC found Child Safety's internal reviews are effective at an agency level, an important finding of the QFCC report was that Queensland's system of reviewing deaths of children known to Child Safety is not sufficiently independent and not delivering whole-of-system changes required to protect vulnerable children. The QFCC report also found that the current model does not apply to other government agencies that may have also been involved. The QFCC identified the need for key government agencies to better work together, with a particular concern being the lack of information sharing and collaboration, a key learning from the Mason Jett Lee case.

The QFCC report concluded that when it comes to child death reviews Queensland can do better. The proposed new model, established under the bill, will do this in two ways. Firstly, it will expand the current requirement to conduct an internal systems review when a child known to Child Safety dies or suffers serious physical injury to other relevant government agencies—Queensland Health, including hospital and health services, the Department of Education, the Queensland Police Service, and the Department of Youth Justice in addition to Child Safety and the litigation director. Secondly, it will establish a new, external and independent Child Death Review Board to carry out systems reviews following child deaths connected to the child protection system.

Importantly, the child death review model is focused on promoting continuous improvement of systems, legislation, policies and practice. It is not about individual blame or disciplinary action. Provisions in the bill ensure that the scope of internal agency reviews or reviews by the board must not include whether disciplinary action should be taken against any person.

The bill amends the Child Protection Act 1999 to expand the existing internal agency review process, which will continue to focus on children known to Child Safety who have died or suffered a serious physical injury in the past 12 months; require relevant government agencies to undertake a systems review of their involvement with the child if they have provided a service to the child; continue to focus on improvements to services and accountability, with an added purpose of promoting collaboration and joint learning; in exceptional circumstances, enable responsible ministers to request their agency to conduct a review outside of the usual scope; require agencies to decide the extent of, and terms of reference for, their review; introduce provisions to enable the sharing of information while protecting confidentiality so relevant agencies can carry out reviews and share outcomes; and require all agencies undertaking an internal review to prepare a review report and provide a copy of these reports relating to child deaths to the new board within six months. Requiring these key agencies to review and critically reflect on their involvement recognises that child protection is a shared responsibility.

The bill establishes the new Child Death Review Board under the Family and Child Commission Act 2014. Independence of the department of child safety is critical to the board and is central to the QFCC's recommendation and government's commitment. The independent board, and its ability to consistently make public systems recommendations, will increase transparency and improve public confidence. The bill provides that the board will sit within the QFCC, given its many synergies and opportunities for streamlining with QFCC's existing functions, including oversight of the child protection system and management of the Child Death Register in Queensland. Though the board will receive secretariat support from the QFCC, it is important to note that the board will be independent and operate as a separate entity from the QFCC with distinct functions and powers.

Likewise, while the board will be chaired by the principal commissioner or a commissioner of the QFCC, the bill makes it clear that they will not be subject to ministerial direction in their role as chair of the board. Under the bill, the board must also act independently and in the public interest. The independence of the board is further ensured because its primary focus is to review deaths of, or serious injury to, children known to the child protection system. The board sits outside the bodies that will have had the necessary contact with the child to trigger a review.

The new board is modelled on common elements from other death review models, particularly Queensland's Domestic and Family Violence Death Review and Advisory Board and other states and territories, in particular Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia. Other existing mechanisms in Queensland that review the deaths of children have different purposes and scope, can be limited in their ability to produce timely results and are not consistently undertaken. For example, reviews by the Queensland Ombudsman are largely complaints driven and limited to government agencies. While certain 'reportable deaths' are subject to coronial investigation, only a small number proceed to inquest—sometimes several years following the death. The QFCC currently conducts systems level reviews prompted by the death of a child, as in the case of Mason Jett Lee; however, in practice this only occurs by ministerial request.

Accordingly, the new board complements, not duplicates, these existing processes. The board will consistently consider all deaths of children known to Child Safety and will make whole-of-systems recommendations that are timely and public facing. The board's focus will not be investigating the death of a particular child. Whilst the board may examine the circumstances of a death and the contact various government agencies may have had with the child, the responsibility of investigating the specific circumstances and causes of the death will remain with the relevant expert agencies such as the Queensland Police Service and the Coroner.

The board will replace the current Child Death Case Review Panels and replace the QFCC's current function of conducting systemic reviews following the death of a child. The QFCC will continue to have a broader statutory systemic review function about the child protection system and will also retain responsibility to maintain the Child Death Register, which records information on all child deaths in Queensland. The purpose, scope, functions and powers of the new board are significantly broader than existing Child Death Case Review Panels. The board's focus will be to carry out systems reviews across a range of government and non-government entities, funded or private, following the deaths of children connected to the child protection system.

In exceptional circumstances, as the responsible minister for the board, I will be able to request the board to conduct reviews outside of its usual scope. This will ensure reviews can be conducted where there is a significant public interest—for example, a serious physical injury case that, while not within the board's usual scope, presents clear systems issues and requires a more in-depth review.

The board will have the ability to look at a child's involvement across a range of systems and services that may be provided by government, non-government or private entities and in turn make recommendations to these entities. A broad systems focus is necessary to allow opportunities for improvements to be identified across the spectrum of service delivery. The board will also have supporting functions relevant to its whole-of-systems reviews to analyse data and apply research to identify patterns, trends and risk factors, and to carry out or engage persons for research.

A key source for the board's systems reviews is the internal review reports that relate to child deaths that relevant agencies must provide to the board. Beyond this, the board will also have the power to request confidential information from any entity—government, non-government or private—that is required to support its whole-of-systems focus. For example, the board could request confidential information from a public entity, a non-government agency that provides a service to children or families, a private hospital, a medical practitioner, the principal of a school or an early childhood education and care provider. The bill makes it clear that entities may give confidential information to the board for the purpose of its functions, and this information can be provided to the board despite any other law that would otherwise prohibit or restrict the giving of the information. Provisions in the bill maintain existing protections to ensure privacy and the confidentiality of information obtained.

An important difference from the current system is that the board will be able to make public systems recommendations and publicly monitor implementation of these recommendations. The bill provides that the board produce an annual report on its operations, including whole-of-systems recommendations, which may highlight themes from a collection of cases or from individual cases, as well as progress made on implementation of previous recommendations of the board. The report will be tabled annually in parliament.

The board will, in addition, have the ability to prepare and publish other systemic reports relevant to its functions. These other systemic reports will not always, as a matter of course, be published. The bill makes it clear that the board must not publish a systemic report if it contains identifying information or information that may prejudice an investigation or recommendations, unless as the responsible minister I have decided to and in fact tabled the report. In making a decision about whether to table the report I am required to consider a number of factors, including whether the tabling of the report is in the public interest. Given the highly sensitive nature of these cases, these provisions balance independence and the need to ensure that privacy and confidentiality is maintained.

Under the bill, the board must have a multidisciplinary membership, balanced by government and non-government members, from a range of experience and disciplines relevant to the work of the board, including Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander representation. Specifically, the bill provides that the board's membership must not include a majority of persons who are Public Service employees. This will promote independent decision-making and also allow members to effectively understand patterns and trends, build a collective knowledge of key issues and develop expertise over time. To complement this mix of members, the bill provides that the board may invite guests or subject matter experts to attend a meeting to advise or inform the board about a particular matter, theme or issue.

The bill is a further commitment on the part of the Palaszczuk government to protect some of our most vulnerable, our children. We have taken great steps to meet government's obligation. This includes significant investment in the child and family support system; wideranging reforms to improve the blue card system; and implementing recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Finally, I would like to thank the QFCC for their extensive review and recommendation and the many stakeholders who have informed this important work. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (11.30 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 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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

POLICE POWERS AND RESPONSIBILITIES AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (11.30 am): I present a bill for an act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004, the Crime and Corruption Act 2001, the Criminal Code, the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act 2012, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, the Prostitution Act 1999, the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986, the Weapons Act 1990, the Weapons Categories Regulation 1997 and the Weapons Regulation 2016 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 [[1503](#)].

Tabled paper: Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [[1504](#)].

I am pleased to introduce the Police Powers and Responsibilities and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. This bill will amend legislation to improve community safety and the operational efficiency of both the Queensland Police Service and the Prostitution Licensing Authority. It will provide legislative clarity for police and Crime and Corruption Commission officers that they can lawfully obtain any information accessible on or via a digital device that may reveal evidence of a broad range of serious crimes.

Child sex offenders, drug dealers and perpetrators of other serious crimes often conceal evidence of their offences on digital devices such as computers or mobile phones. Police officers and officers of the Crime and Corruption Commission presently have powers to require a person to hand over the password or encryption code to their digital device under a suite of Queensland legislation including the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the Child Protection (Offender Reporting and Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2004, the Public Safety Preservation Act 1986 and the Crime and Corruption Act 2001. These existing powers are balanced by appropriate safeguards which balance the privacy of persons with the need to effectively detect and investigate crime.

Amendments in this bill to powers which permit access to password protected devices ensure that the suite of legislation I have referred to keeps pace with advancing technology. The bill ensures that terminology used in the provisions of the act is sufficiently broad to ensure that, no matter how incriminating evidence is contained on or through a device, it can be lawfully accessed. Whether evidence of crimes is stored physically on a device, in the cloud, in email accounts or in social media applications, police and commission officers will have access to the evidence upon meeting existing criteria.

The proposed amendments will ensure that state laws are enforced effectively and that evidence of crimes including homicide, sexual assault, drug trafficking, child abuse, cybercrime such as fraud and revenge pornography, and terrorism related offences cannot be concealed. These amendments will ensure access information provisions continue to operate as intended.

The bill proposes a number of other sensible amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the Weapons Act, the Prostitution Act and the Domestic Violence and Family Protection Act. These amendments enhance the efficiency and operability of the Queensland Police Service, the Prostitution Licensing Authority and the Weapons Licensing Branch of the Queensland Police Service.

The bill makes the following amendments to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act. The definition of 'controlled activities' is outdated as it refers to meetings, which implies the physical presence of the police officer and a person at the same location. The word 'meetings' will be replaced with the term 'communications between the officer and a person'. By replacing the word 'meetings' with this term, all methods of communication including email, mobile phone text messaging, social networking communications or meetings may be contemplated when considering the application of the controlled activity provisions.

Controlled operations are similar to controlled activities insofar as they authorise conduct which would otherwise be unlawful. However, whereas controlled activities may target an individual target—for example, an undercover police officer covertly purchasing drugs from an individual drug supplier—controlled operations target more complex matters or larger criminal enterprises such as organised crime syndicates. The approval process for controlled operations is justifiably rigorous, and applications must progress through a number of steps before reaching the Controlled Operations Committee, which consists of an independent person who is a retired judge, the detective superintendent of the Drug and Serious Crime Group, and the chairperson of the Crime and Corruption Commission. Upon this committee's recommendation, the application can progress for final approval to the assistant commissioner for crime operations or a deputy commissioner.

The bill proposes to broaden the delegated officers who can approve, vary or cancel an operation to any deputy commissioner, any assistant commissioner or the detective chief superintendent of statewide crime operations. The proposed amendment maintains the final approval at an appropriate high rank of delegated officers; however, the change will enhance the process to ensure the Queensland Police Service can act on timely intelligence. Furthermore, the amendments will better align the authorisation level with those in other Australian jurisdictions.

This government takes road safety seriously. As a result, Queensland has tough laws whereby the commission of certain traffic offences can result in the immobilisation, impoundment and ultimately forfeiture of an offender's vehicle. Impoundment costs are not cheap, and an audit by the Queensland Police Service's Road Policing Command revealed that a large percentage of impounded vehicles are worth less than \$500. When impoundment expenses exceed the value of a person's vehicle, this can result in unfairness to the person as well as to impoundment yard operators, who may be out of pocket. Present laws permit the voluntary transfer of a motorcycle to the state for impoundment related offences or the voluntary transfer of a vehicle to the state but only for an evasion offence. This bill sensibly proposes an amendment that would allow the transfer of an impounded vehicle to the state for any impoundment related offence under chapter 4 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act to alleviate any unfairness arising out of impoundment fees.

The Queensland Police Service comes into possession of a large volume of found property such as bicycles, backpacks, clothing, mobile phones and other digital devices. Current laws stipulate that the Queensland Police Service must hold the property for 60 days before disposal and must give a person 30 days notice before disposal of property. In cases where the owner of the property is unknown, notice and a description of the property is provided via the Queensland Police Service website. Due to advances in technology, the 60-day holding period stipulated in the law is outdated. Reports of lost property may be made online and over the phone, and online search capabilities allow quick comparison of lost property reports against found items. The Queensland Police Service capability to advertise lost property to the community is far reaching through the Queensland Police Service social media sites and blogs, traditional media channels and formal advertising on the Queensland Police Service website. In fact, the Queensland Police Service website has recently been upgraded, and this has markedly increased the usability level for the public when they are seeking to make inquiries about policing matters including lost property. For these reasons, it is proposed to reduce the requirement for the Queensland Police Service to hold the property for at least 60 days to at least 30 days.

Finally, with regard to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act, the bill repeals sober safe centre trial laws which were not continued after the 12-month trial concluded in 2015. There are also some minor but fair and practical changes proposed for the Weapons Act 1990. The current definition of 'magazine' in the Weapons Act and the Weapons Categories Regulation are inconsistent. The proposed amendment will address this inconsistency by changing the definition of 'magazine' in the Weapons Act to include receptacles for ammunition that are an integral part of the firearm.

The bill proposes to expand the period for which a weapons licence can be suspended from 30 days to 90 days. The Weapons Act currently allows an authorised officer to suspend a person's weapons licence where they suspect the licence holder is no longer a fit and proper person. The suspension period is designed to provide the licensee more time in which to demonstrate that they are in fact a fit and proper person. When a person's licence is suspended because they may no longer be a fit and proper person on the grounds of mental or physical health, the licensee may engage the services of a psychologist or a medical practitioner to demonstrate their fitness. However, delays can mean that a person is unable to provide the required evidence within the currently imposed 30 days. This statutory window of 30 days disadvantages licensees and is an administrative impost on the Queensland Police Service and QCAT. Consequently, it is proposed to amend the Weapons Act to mitigate this issue by extending the time for which a licensee can be suspended to 90 days.

Currently, armourers who modify a firearm in such a way that it changes the category of that firearm under the Weapons Categories Regulation are under no obligation to ensure the owner has the required licence to possess the modified firearm or to notify Weapons Licensing about the modification. The bill amends the Weapons Act to include an express obligation on armourers who are modifying firearms in a way that alters the category of the firearm to confirm that a person can possess the new category of firearm by sighting the person's weapons licence. The amendments will also require armourers to record such changes in their weapons register and report such modifications to the Weapons Licensing Branch to ensure that the firearms register can be accurately maintained.

A number of amendments are also proposed for the Prostitution Act 1999. These amendments will rectify the three-year ineligibility period for brothel licensees who have not paid annual fees; authorise the Prostitution Licensing Authority to enter, search, seize and require the production of documents at a licensed brothel; create the offence of obstruction of an authorised officer in the Prostitution Act; and make the offence of contravening a condition or restriction of a licensed brothel a simple offence which may make the offence suitable for the prescription of a penalty infringement notice in the future.

The bill will also amend the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act. This government considers the safety of our police officers and the broader community to be paramount. Police are required to transport persons in a variety of circumstances, for example because they are arrested, detained or otherwise in lawful custody. Prior to transport, police have a broad range of powers to search a person for items that may be used to harm police, themselves or others. The proposed amendments to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act will close a gap where police are currently unable to search a person whom they are transporting under section 134A of that act.

Under that act, a police officer may direct a person to move to another stated location—for example, a police station, police beat or courthouse—to enable the officer to carry out various functions, for instance serving a person with a domestic violence application or order. The direction to move to another location only applies if in the police officer's opinion it is necessary to separate people. Separating the parties can assist to de-escalate domestic violence situations, provide the opportunity

for a respondent to better understand the conditions of an order or a police protection notice, and reiterate the seriousness of the domestic violence that has occurred. It is important that police are able to give effect to that policy intent by transporting persons in a safe manner.

Recent amendments were made to the Domestic and Family Violence Protection Act to enhance information sharing between government agencies. The current provisions allow a police officer to share information with other agencies. However, this does not reflect the reality of the operational environment where many civilian staff are employed by the Queensland Police Service in back office style roles. The proposed amendment to the domestic violence legislation will permit authorised civilian staff to share information, enhancing the assessment and response to serious threats to life, health or safety of people because of domestic violence, and the referral of people who fear or experience domestic violence or who commit domestic violence to specialist service providers.

This government is committed to enhancing the safety of the people who work and live in or are lucky enough to visit Queensland. We remain committed to providing the Queensland Police Service and other agencies with the laws they need to prevent and detect crime in this fast-changing world. Of special importance are the clarification laws concerning their ability to access data on digital devices. Sex offenders, organised crime members, those who use social media for pornography and a range of other crimes are reminded that police will have the most up-to-date and effective laws to detect evidence of offences concealed on digital devices. The bill demonstrates our government's dedication to advancing the state of Queensland by keeping our community safe. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. MT RYAN (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (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 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee


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

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 17 September (see p. 2867), on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (11.46 am), continuing: As I was saying yesterday, the Great Barrier Reef is iconic and we need to ensure that it is protected, and that is exactly what this legislation will do. The reef contributes some \$6 billion to our economy, mainly through the tourism industry but through a variety of other industries, and 60,000 jobs rely on the reef's health. Sadly, we know that the Great Barrier Reef is facing two major threats—climate change and water quality. The Palaszczuk government is already taking steps to improve water quality through our proposed reef regulations. We know that some farmers are already doing the right thing through voluntary practices, and that is fantastic, but water quality improvements have not been happening fast enough.


The Environmental Protection Act 1994 objective is to protect Queensland's environment while allowing for development that improves the total quality of life both now and for future generations in a way that maintains and preserves ecological processes. Protecting the Great Barrier Reef is one of the Queensland government's six priorities under Our Future State: Advancing Queensland's Priorities. We know that the Barrier Reef is under threat. Besides climate change, poor quality water as a result of polluted land based run-off is the next biggest threat to the health of our reef. The Great Barrier Reef Water Science Taskforce recognised in 2016 that dual action on climate change and water quality improvement will be critical for the long-term health of the reef.

Poor reef water quality is a cumulative impact problem. Many small releases together across a vast area are causing the issue. The Burnett-Mary region is identified in the *Reef 2050 water quality improvement plan* as a lower priority for water quality improvement relative to other regions such as the Wet Tropics and the Burdekin. This is because of the comparatively lower impacts to marine ecosystems including seagrasses, estuaries and corals from land based run-off in this region. However, the science is clear that polluted run-off results in poor water quality and poor water quality impacts the health and resilience of aquatic ecosystems. This in turn affects the ability of aquatic organisms and marine life to thrive, and that is why the bill proposes to require the adoption of lower risk farming practices across all key reef catchments for all key commodities.

Practice adoption information suggests that many sugarcane growers in the Burnett-Mary region are not farming according to industry agreed best practice. The reef water quality report card 2017 and 2018 concluded that only 6.6 per cent of sugarcane growers have adopted those practices and the target is 90 per cent.

For the reasons that I have mentioned previously, the new regulatory requirements will be implemented in the Burnett-Mary over a longer time frame in recognition that this region is a lower priority for water improvement. Farmers in the Burnett-Mary region will have three years in which to transition to compliance with the regulated minimum practice standards established by the new legislation. These farmers then have another three years to show that they can meet the standards voluntarily. Burnett-Mary farmers will need to keep records of nutrient and pesticide application rates from commencement. This will ensure that the agricultural sector has data in the future that can show how their practices relate to water quality monitoring results and progress towards the reef water quality targets.

We all have a role to play in protecting the Great Barrier Reef. This bill strikes that thriving balance that Minister Enoch spoke of earlier by protecting jobs in the agricultural sector and also the jobs that rely on the reef, such as tourism. Like many Queenslanders, I am incredibly proud of my state. I have also been lucky enough to visit many beautiful spots along the coast, including Cairns, Palm Cove, the mighty Townsville, Airlie Beach and more. I want to make sure that these spots are just as beautiful for the Centenary State High School students, who visited me, when they go to visit them one day as well, and for my own kids, Heath and Allegra. This legislation is forward looking. It acknowledges the importance of the Great Barrier Reef, not just to Queensland but to the entire world. I commend it to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (11.50 am): I rise to speak to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. The primary objective of this bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen Great Barrier Reef protection measures to improve the quality of the water. The bill has an admirable title. However, it should be renamed 'The Destruction of our Agriculture and Grazing Industry in North Queensland (No Consultation) Amendment Bill 2019'.

We have all heard in this debate the speakers from the government side of the House talk about the terrible bushfires and their support for Queensland's farmers. Yet they have introduced this bill, which is destructive to our agriculture and grazing industry. This bill is a sneaky attempt by this government to hoodwink south-east corner voters into believing that it cares for the environment by imposing more regulation to prevent farming and grazing activity in North Queensland. The government, in introducing this bill, pretends to the people down here that it cares about the environment, but it smashes the farmers in the electorates in North Queensland.

Before any regulatory or legislative change is made, the function of government is to check and replicate the science so that any changes can be evidence based and not driven by emotion or politics. The key concerns about this bill highlighted by the industry include the undermining of the existing efforts by growers to improve water quality and imposing Big Brother style supervision over everyday farming decisions by an executive officer who knows nothing about farming.

The bill will also force growers to provide an environmental impact statement if they want to crop an existing part of their farm that they have cropped in the past. It also gives the government powers to demand information from any adviser or company working with the canefarmers. That is an absolute insult to farmers. It is like a person getting a permit and waiting six months for approval before they can mow their front lawn. This is KGB or Gestapo tactics. It is also similar to prosecution lawyers demanding that a defence lawyer provide all of the information that is discussed with their client. This bill is completely illegal and draconian legislation.

There is no doubt that this government treats farmers with complete contempt. Farmers are the backbone of this country. If this bill is passed, farmers will not be able to sneeze without filling out an application form and waiting six months for approval. It is disappointing that this state government will not stop targeting our agriculture and grazing industry over untested science that the reef is dead or dying. We all go out to the reef. It is in pristine condition. The government is using farmers as an excuse to give the perception that it is protecting the Great Barrier Reef but, when farmers request funding for riverbank reparation to reduce sediment run-off, the government is nowhere. It does not exist. There is no money. Farmers are trying to fix these riverbanks but, when it comes to the funding for that, the government is invisible.

Everyone in North Queensland loves the reef and wants to protect it, including farmers. Farmers love the reef. They also go out and fish in the reef. We know that the reef is worth an estimated \$55 billion to the economy, generates 60,000 jobs and needs protecting. The issue is that this government is introducing unnecessary legislation that demonises and destroys one industry instead of working in collaboration. The government's Department of Agriculture and Fisheries *Queensland agriculture snapshot 2018* says that the agriculture and food industry is worth \$20 billion annually to Queensland, which is 3.6 per cent of the state's economy. The agriculture and food industry also led us through the global economic crisis.

There are 24,000 farm businesses in this state. Fifty-seven thousand people are employed in the agricultural, forestry and fishing sector and an additional 46,700 people are employed in the timber and food processing industry. This legislation will destroy those agricultural jobs and the income they provide to the state, remove the incentive for the younger generation to take up farming and devastate entire communities. We hear that all the time. The younger generation are not taking over the farms from their parents because government imposed legislation makes it so difficult that they say, 'It's not worth it anymore.' If this legislation is passed, we will have to put up signs in Queensland that say, 'Queensland is closed for business' and 'Do not take up farming as we will be importing all of our produce in the near future'.

I am very disappointed with the trend of this government. Back in 1999, I was there when thousands of landowners protested and marched over the removal of their vegetation clearing rights. In 2004, under Peter Beattie, the then government removed freeholding rights. In 2006, the then government introduced wild rivers legislation, which took away the sustainable management of river systems in North Queensland. In 2010, the Bligh government imposed fines of \$75,000 along with ERMPs—environment risk management plans. That government said, 'If you don't fill out this form and declare where all the washouts are on your property'—and some properties cover 100,000 to 200,000 acres—'there will be jail sentences.' The landowners were so angry that they protested and stormed the Premier's building in Townsville. That year, the Bligh government was kicked out and Labor members were reduced to seven seats in the House.

Sadly, this bill imposes a \$78,000 fine for a regulation breach and a \$270,000 fine for noncompliance. This bill is just bad law. In 2018, we also had the introduction of the vegetation management laws. I will go back to 2016 when the government introduced laws that reversed the onus of proof and landowners were guilty before being proved innocent. In other words, murderers were dealt with more leniently than graziers. Now, we have this Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

Professor Ridd has constantly stated that the science that says that the reef is dying is not tested and that it is flawed. He was ostracised, sacked and ridiculed, but recently he had the last laugh in court. Now, those who live off government grants, perpetrating the nonsense that the reef is dead, are scurrying around working on the next bag of untruths to keep the money flowing to tell more untruths.

If this destructive legislation is passed, the KAP will move to have this legislation repealed within 100 days of a new government being formed after the next state election. The KAP was very proud to stop the vegetation laws in the last parliament.


I bring to the attention of the House the important issue of the Russell River Catchment Sustainability Plan 2009-2035, which I table.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 2 July 2019, from the Director, Jaragun Natural Resource Management, Ms Liz Owen, to the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Leeanne Enoch, regarding the Russell River Catchment Sustainability Plan 2019-2035 [1508].

This was developed in my electorate over a number of years and is a program involving Indigenous traditional landowners, canefarmers, environmental and local government groups in the Great Barrier Reef catchment. The program involves all local stakeholders working in consultation to

repair natural river flows, fix erosion on riverbanks, improve water quality, improve farming practices, implement an Indigenous feral pig program and reduce sediment run-off. This is a unique program that should be replicated with all stakeholders, including farmers and environmental groups working together. Despite this government bleating that it is dedicated to reducing sediment run-off, improving water quality and fixing natural flows and riverbank erosion, here is a perfect example of a program that is already in place and is working with local stakeholders in the Great Barrier Reef catchment.

We do not need to introduce draconian legislation. Good government is about allowing those catchments throughout Queensland to work together, in consultation with each other, to come up with a proposal and get an outcome.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (12.00 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. The LNP oppose the bill. Incredibly, the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee reported on 26 April 2019 recommending that the bill be passed with no other recommendations whatsoever. I draw to the attention of members the four-page statement of reservation that has been put into the document by the LNP members which outline many of the reasons why this bill is flawed. The member for Theodore and the member for Scenic Rim have made it quite clear that they were not supportive of simply recommending that the bill be passed. It simply cannot be done.

According to the explanatory notes, the primary policy objective of the bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen Great Barrier Reef protection measures to improve the quality of the water entering the Great Barrier Reef. I have spoken about this aspect of committee work in the past. Why is it that the ministers refuse to accept the evidence as provided by the committee? The committees go out into the community. They talk to the stakeholders in the community. They have conversations right across the state with community members, people who are going to be impacted by legislation, and yet it is all ignored. In this case the committee has completely ignored the recommendations and advice of the communities that will be impacted by this legislation and most certainly the minister has done the same thing.

The LNP will be proposing some amendments, the first of which is the removal of the head of power in the legislation that allows the government to set requirements for the collection of data. This amendment seeks to remove the overreaching provision that enables the government to mandate the collection of any data relating to the production, manufacture, distribution, supply or use of an agricultural ERA product, fertiliser product or agricultural chemical.

Another amendment will be the removal of the power to set ERA minimum regulated standards and BMP practice standards from the chief executive and replace it with a requirement that all standards are to be passed as non-exempt subordinate legislation under the bill. This amendment seeks to require all standards, minimum and best management practice programs, to be prescribed by regulation rather than set by an unelected department chief executive.

Thirdly, the LNP will move an amendment to introduce a requirement for a 10-year grace period to enable a staged implementation of minimum requirements in the Burnett-Mary catchment region. This amendment seeks to allow a phase-in period for the Burnett-Mary catchment region set at the same time frame as other regulated regions since regulation was introduced in 2009.

The Palaszczuk Labor government's anti-region, anti-farmer, anti-jobs agenda has driven many in the agricultural industry to revolt against these unfair reef laws. That has been very clearly enunciated by those witnesses to the committee through the very, very short process that was undertaken. Industry groups and farmers are sending a clear message to the Palaszczuk Labor government that the reef laws are unfair on farmers. These unfair reef laws will cost jobs in regional Queensland.

The LNP firmly supports the industry-led best management practice programs it funded whilst last in government. There is no reason why Labor cannot support local jobs and protect the reef. It does not have to be one or the other. That is something that is constantly referred to by the witnesses to the committee in their contribution: it does not have to be one or the other. It is common sense to work together to make things work properly. Alarm bells have been rung by all industries that these regressive anti-farming, anti-jobs, anti-region laws will be forced upon.

The Palaszczuk Labor government's unfair reef laws have been met with a huge backlash from industry groups, including Canegrowers, AgForce, the Australian Banana Growers' Council, Growcom and the Queensland Farmers' Federation. The state's cattle and grazing industry group, AgForce, has been holding rallies throughout the state to protest Labor's anti-farming reef laws. These are unprecedented types of activity. These organisations generally work on behalf of their industries and speak to government in common-sense approach, but they have been forced down the road of holding

rallies to try to raise more and more awareness, all falling on the deaf ears of those opposite. The Australian Banana Growers' Council has described the incoming laws as devastating, while Growcom has questioned farmers' ability to continue to absorb the costs of environmental regulation.

Farmers have been blindsided by these regulations and deserve to be listened to. They certainly have not been listened to at all in this process. It is completely unacceptable that Labor is going to ram these reef regulations through without listening to the very people these laws will impact. As we have seen so many times before, the Labor government continues to treat regional Queenslanders like second-class citizens. Canegrowers represents more than 4,000 farming businesses up and down the coast and it has taken the extraordinary step of running TV ads against the unfair reef laws as well. Once again these are unbelievable activities from these types of organisation which in the past have just quietly gone about their business and made their points and received common sense out of government, but clearly that is not working in this particular case.


Queensland's \$4 billion cane industry provides more than 22,600 direct and indirect jobs throughout the state. The majority of them are in regional towns. The sugar industry is already doing it tough with low international prices for sugar. That is putting pressure on the viability of existing cane farms and mills. In its submission to the reef bill, the Australian Sugar Milling Council highlighted specifically—

... the Queensland economy would be quite negatively impacted if the focus on improvement of reef water quality led to a significant reduction in the productivity and size of the State's sugar industry, and agriculture more broadly.

The ASMC further added that Labor's laws and regulatory approach could have a 'far-reaching and disastrous impact from an economic, social and environmental perspective'. In other words, what we are talking about here is a situation where the government is once again making it clear it does not care about farmers, it certainly does not care about regional Queensland and it certainly does not care about jobs in regional Queensland. Matt Leighton, from Bundaberg Canegrowers, stated—

It's hard to think that someone who may never have stepped onto a cane farm or a farm, or doesn't have an agronomic background, is telling people who live and breathe and work on their farms ... what they need to do on their farms.

In a nutshell, this bill is not only wrong for regional Queensland and for farming communities; but also wrong for all Queenslanders.

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (12.09 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this bill, which has rightly drawn widespread condemnation as a clumsy and punitive green inspired attack on regional Queensland. Like the member for Broadwater, and as many members know, I come from an agricultural farming business in the Central Highlands. I too remember as a young boy loading chemicals and fertilisers that would not be acceptable today. The technology we have today did not exist back then. We did not have high-value GPS technology such as GreenStar, which monitors output to the millimetre. Today's technology also allows us to apply to the millimetre fertiliser rates mapped out on a computer screen mounted in a tractor, where it is needed. We have regular shed meetings and field days to display the latest technology. Sustainability has long been a key focus of the Australian cotton industry. Today cotton growers grow more cotton on less land with more efficient water use and less impact on the environment than ever before. In Australia, 80 per cent of cotton growers are in a BMP voluntary program, which started back in 1997.

This bill is simply an overreach and a payback to the green environmentalists who helped many Labor members in South-East Queensland get votes. This government is prepared to throw our hardworking farmers and graziers in regional Queensland under the bus to prop up seats in South-East Queensland. It is telling that this bill was listed on the *Notice Paper*, but carefully not debated during parliament's recent sitting in Townsville. Why has it come up today? Could it be that Labor's only regional members of parliament fear what the bill will do to their electorates? The problem for those members—indeed, the problem for the Queensland Labor Party—is that eventually people will work you out by watching what you do. It is an old saying that actions speak louder than words and by its actions Labor has clearly shown regional Queenslanders that it does not govern for them. They know that this government has repeatedly sacrificed their interests in order to woo green votes in the south-east corner.

This bill is another example of the Labor Party putting its own political interests before the interests of Queenslanders. Every Queenslander loves the Great Barrier Reef. In agriculture, our role as stewards is taken very seriously. Therefore, the government should not be surprised that Queenslanders find it hard to believe that agriculture is the sole and major threat to reef and water quality. As AgForce General President Georgie Somerset has said, agriculture has done more than any

other industry or group to reduce its impacts on the reef. Even Mackay conservation advocate Pat Julien has criticised the bill, pointing out that it does not do anything to support the quick and reliable identification of water pollution sources or to address current pollution sources.

What are local governments being asked to do about upgrading to tertiary level sewage treatment in the reef catchments? What are they being asked to do with their stormwater run-off? Loaded with nitrogen from garden fertilisers, oil from road surfaces and other pollutants, are reef councils simply discharging it onto the reef for free? What are the property developers, airport owners, shipping and the tourism industry being asked to do in this regard? When viewed in this light, it is clear that the Labor government is once again using agriculture as a scapegoat and has no real interest in practical protections for the reef.

This is in contrast with the former LNP government. It was the LNP that brought in serious penalties for environmentally harming the reef. Labor chose to vote against those laws. It was Labor, under Anna Bligh, that planned to supersize the Port of Abbot Point. Labor planned to dump 38 cubic metres of dredge spoil on top of the reef. Fortunately, the LNP was elected in time to fix Labor's mess, reducing the amount of dredge spoil and insisting that the spoil must be disposed of on the land and not on the reef or in its waters. The LNP is proud of its solid record as a reef guardian. Highlights include embedding protections for the reef into Queensland's ports strategies, fighting one of the reef's biggest threats in the crown-of-thorns starfish and providing funding for agriculture to develop best management practices. I thank the member for Glass House, the former environment minister, who led the charge on that with BMP cane and also BMP cattle.

This minister justifies the bill by saying that agriculture has been too slow to adopt the BMPs, yet she provides no report on the results of the efforts of past decades. Even more basic research shows that legislation and government regulation do not achieve true practical change. A review of the past 10 years of voluntary efforts by agriculture have a lot to teach us. Instead, the minister has created such a punitive regime in the bill that AgForce actually deleted all of its BMP data. That was not done lightly. It was done in a direct response to fear about this bill mandating compulsory data reporting, not just by farmers and graziers but also by their suppliers.

Yesterday at 3.39 pm, my office received a ministerial media release stating that, while the minister is not amending the bill, the government will not make data collection compulsory and will, instead, seek to work voluntarily with the industry to collect the relevant data. I welcome this change. However, the last-minute announcement of that and other changes just highlights what a poor piece of legislation this is. It reinforces the fact that this legislation is for political purposes and not practical outcomes for the reef.

What has not changed is the fact that, if this legislation is passed, virtually every farmer and grazier across the 30 million hectares of reef catchment faces the prospect of committing an offence. The final insult to all thinking Queenslanders is that the very ambitious water quality targets set by the legislation are not supported by equally generous government funding. Farmers have publicly stated that they view the legislation as the last straw. One gentleman called on the Palaszczuk government to just buy him out, as it is clear that they want him out of business.

What is at stake here? The horticultural industry produces 120 different crops on farms that will be affected by the bill. This includes the bulk of Australia's tropical fruits, as well as macadamia nuts, avocados, citrus, tomatoes and winter vegetables. The effects of this bill will extend to graziers and cotton and grain growers in my electorate of Gregory, imposing administrative burdens that have brought members of the industry out to publicly protest at rallies. We have seen those rallies right up and down Queensland, involving Green Shirts, AgForce and Canegrowers. Economic modelling from the Australian Sugar Milling Council puts the value of the sugar industry at over \$4,000 million. As I am sure the member for Mackay appreciates, that industry is a major employer and a valuable export industry. It is also an industry that is struggling with prices that have been artificially depressed by the dumping of sugar on international markets. The Queensland government is loading the industry with penalties at a time when it should be offering every bit of support.

Given the importance of those industries to the people and the towns in the reef catchment, why wasn't there proper consultation? In Queensland, our committees are our house of review. Yesterday, the member for Stretton, in his role as committee chairman, pointed to regional hearings and public briefings on the bill as evidence of consultation. If that is the case, why did they vote to pass this bill without any amendments? I quote the Chairman of Canegrowers, Paul Schembri, on his view of the consultation. He mentioned that hundreds of growers attended the hearings and said—

That there is no recommendation—

by the committee—

for any amendments to the most dangerous elements of the Bill means the whole consultation process was a box-ticking exercise for a foregone political outcome—it was a sham.

He also said—

While the committee sat politely and listened, even asking questions of growers who took their time from their farms to detail the many practical ways they work for Great Barrier Reef water quality every day, the majority of MPs—


on the Labor side—

did not actually hear us and their report is an insult.

Again, actions and outcomes support Mr Schembri.

Following more than 230 submissions, the committee's sole recommendation was to pass the bill. It was the member for Scenic Rim and the member for Theodore who expressed the LNP's reservations, but could not change Labor's intentions. Therefore, here we stand again today. This is our last chance to deliver for regional Queensland the protection from flawed and punitive legislation that this parliament is supposed to provide. To that end, the LNP will be moving some amendments to try to remove some of the worst excesses of this bill.

Finally, I would expect all members, especially all members from regional Queensland, to consider and support the LNP's amendments. Believe me, on this vote the eyes of regional Queensland are on us. Regional Queenslanders have learned to tune in to our words and look at our actions. Attention is being paid to who votes for this attack on regional prosperity, regional families, regional jobs and regional farms. How can someone in my electorate who is grazing cattle at the headwaters of the Belyando, far away from the reef catchment, have much impact on the reef? We should be trying to help those people who are struggling through eight years of drought. They are trying to restock and put more pasture on their paddocks so that they can get back into action, and we are again going to penalise graziers and farmers right throughout Queensland. I can tell members now that if they support this bill, groups such as Green Shirts, AgForce and the agricultural industry will come out in force against them at the next election.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (12.19 pm): It gives me great pleasure to be here in Parliament House in Brisbane to debate this bill. There has been a lot said by those opposite about conspiracy theories and debating this bill in the people's house of Queensland. That is usually where we debate bills.

The Great Barrier Reef is an important world ecosystem. It is also an important economic driver for the Queensland economy so we need to make sure it is protected. As we have heard already, the reef contributes \$6 billion to our economy and over 60,000 jobs. A lot of those jobs are in the communities surrounding my electorate.

Sadly, the reef is facing two major threats: climate change and water quality. We need to address these threats. The science in these two reports shows that it is more important than ever that we take action to protect the reef. The Palaszczuk government is already taking steps to improve water quality through our proposed reef regulations. We know that there are some farmers who are doing the right thing through voluntary practices, and I thank them for their efforts. Not all producers are on board. Water quality improvements have not been fast enough. There are some farmers who are implementing some innovative practices and they must be commended.

The Environmental Protection Act 1994 already includes the Great Barrier Reef protection measures that aim to reduce the risk of sediment, nutrient and pesticide run-off from certain sugarcane growing and grazing activities. The proposed amendments are in response to the 2016 recommendations of the Great Barrier Reef Water Science Taskforce. The recommendations were made in recognition of the reef's World Heritage status and the contributions the reef makes to the Queensland and Australian economy. Protecting the reef protects the economy as well as our social, cultural and spiritual values. A thriving reef supports a thriving tourism industry, which is important for my region, fishing industry and a lifestyle that is the envy of many.

The 2016 Deloitte Access Economics report estimated that the reef, as I mentioned earlier, supports more than 60,000 jobs. The job numbers associated with the reef are larger than for most of Australia's major banks and many corporations. Tourism is the second largest dollar earner in the catchment of the Great Barrier Reef. The Deloitte report valued the reef at \$56 billion as an Australian economic, social and iconic asset. This means that it is considered more valuable than the Sydney Opera House—in fact, 12 times more so.

The Great Barrier Reef is also important from a global perspective. It is a global brand. It is superior to other Australian natural assets in terms of visitor preferences, reputation and experiences. Representatives of our tourism industry understand how important it is to have a healthy Great Barrier Reef, and so do our commercial, recreational and traditional owner fishers.


Fishing is another key industry supported by the Great Barrier Reef. Fishing continues to be a significant source of income and lifestyle for our coastal communities. Commercial fishing Queensland wide contributes approximately \$180 million to the Queensland economy annually and directly supports over 2,000 jobs and many small businesses. There are also thousands of recreational fishers. Their activities directly support jobs in our local communities up and down the Queensland coast.

Our fisheries resources are also a major tourism attraction and are another reason people visit the Great Barrier Reef. There are 300 licensed charter operators taking people fishing Queensland wide and a significant portion of these are accessing the reef. Fishing is heavily dependent on a functioning and resilient Great Barrier Reef ecosystem. The Great Barrier Reef also provides another significant economic and social benefit such as recreational uses, research, educational and scientific values. Having a healthy Great Barrier Reef ecosystem is critically important to everyone. We need these regulations to protect the reef and the thousands of jobs that rely on it.

When UNESCO last considered the Great Barrier Reef in July 2017 it acknowledged the Queensland government's progress in enforcing existing reef regulations and identified the need for accelerated effort to meet water quality targets. The next report will be submitted to the World Heritage Centre by 1 December and considered at UNESCO's meeting in mid-2020. We as a government must do something because farmers do not know what UNESCO will impose upon them. We must report that we have implemented the reef regulations to demonstrate that we are making every effort to meet our obligations to avoid the Great Barrier Reef being listed as in danger.

Our government supports the agricultural sector's need for certainty. In response to feedback from farmers in my community I asked the Minister for Environment to ensure that once this legislation and its underpinning regulations are ready later this year there would be no further changes to the minimum standards for at least five years. I am delighted that in her second reading speech the minister announced that the government has committed to doing that. Ensuring that there are no further changes to the minimum standards for five years once these changes are made will help provide certainty to industry to help increase profitability and productivity. These minimum standards were set by industry.

For the last decade, the Queensland government has supported agricultural industries to voluntarily improve their practices to help improve run-off. Unfortunately, the uptake of these voluntary practices has not been fast enough. Water quality has not improved fast enough. The standards that are in the legislation are already approved and accepted by industry. The regulations will ensure that these standards will be the minimum for everyone to follow. The legislation is vital to ensure that the reef and the jobs in the agricultural industry and the economic benefits that they support are protected now and into the future.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (12.27 pm): Some of the most far-reaching reforms to agricultural production and reef protection in Queensland history had already been decided before Labor left Brisbane. The sham that was the committee process had no effect. There was little recognition of the significant work that had been done on the ground in the Burnett-Mary region. It was embarrassing that certain members of the committee clearly looked uncomfortable and could not wait to leave the hearings and leave Bundaberg.

My contribution will deal mainly with the Burnett-Mary region as I do not claim to have knowledge of the northern area of our great state. That is why I will be supporting the amendments that I think are effective and sensible. We all accept that there is a need for effective reef protection, but not at the expense of rural and regional Queenslanders. We all agree to a plan that protects the Great Barrier Reef while protecting the rights of landowners. Despite knowing voluntary programs supported by industry get the best outcomes, Labor is choosing to put all that to one side and bring in a regulatory impost that we know is politically motivated and has a predetermined outcome. I hope those overzealous advisers appreciate the destructive course they are setting for rural Queensland.

Wide-reaching laws are proposed to be enforced from North Queensland to the Sunshine Coast by handing huge powers over farms and agribusinesses to Brisbane based bureaucrats without guaranteeing any significant benefits to the Great Barrier Reef. There is no reason to rush these changes, and I am calling on the government to acknowledge the botched communication and allow our community to have a meaningful say on the future of the Great Barrier Reef.

The proposed Labor government's regulations are high cost and support more regulatory burden with compliance and enforcement that supports minimum standards of compliance at the expense of true practice change. It does not encourage a culture of innovation and excellence, which for the reef's sake is what we need and we must get right.

We know that a lot has been said by those opposite on the claim of science being used to justify these heavy big-stick reef regulations. Further regulation of sugarcane growing, grazing and horticulture in the Burnett-Mary region is unjustifiable, and I am hoping to prove that. We have to acknowledge that this is a \$270 million industry in my electorate.

We know, because of the southerly movement of the East Australian Current, that run-off water from the Burnett-Mary catchments cannot reach the reef and islands. That is a direct reference from reef scientist Emma Kennedy from the University of Queensland who has clearly established science which proves that currents move in the opposite direction away from the reef. Again, that supports calls for delays in the implementation of this legislation in the Burnett and southern catchments until a thorough independent audit of the science has been conducted.

I will provide some facts about the Burnett-Mary catchment. Seventy per cent of the run-off in the Bundaberg district goes through a least one settling pond dam before entering any waterway. Eighty per cent of farmlands supplying Bundaberg sugar mills have nutrient management plans already taking into account previous cropping history and mill mud application. Hard coral cover in the southern Great Barrier Reef has increased by 50 per cent to 250 per cent from 2009 to 2015.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bennett, adjourned.

ELECTORAL (VOTER'S CHOICE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction



Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (12.30 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1992 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Electoral (Voter's Choice) Amendment Bill 2019 [[1505](#)].

Tabled paper: Electoral (Voter's Choice) Amendment Bill 2019, explanatory notes [[1506](#)].

Public confidence and consistency in our electoral system is fundamental to our democracy. This great state relies on electoral integrity to enhance public confidence in the governments that are formed and, by corollary, the decisions that a chosen government makes.

This bill that is being presented today has been quite deliberately named the Electoral (Voter's Choice) Amendment Bill 2019. A government is chosen by the people, and there is no process more fundamental to the solemn responsibility of good government than the way people choose who represents them and their interests. This bill recognises the importance of a democratic voting system—which is why the bill seeks to reintroduce optional preferential voting.

The bill is straightforward. It simply replicates provisions that were infamously and shamefully removed by the Palaszczuk Labor government with 18 minutes notice in April 2016. The policy objectives of the bill will be achieved by making changes to the requirements for the supply of ballot papers and electoral rolls, as well as how an elector may vote by writing on a ballot paper.

The amendments require only that voters register a first preference on their ballot papers for their votes to be counted. Voters who wish to register one or more additional preferences among the remaining candidates are able to do so in the normal way, using consecutive numbers.

Specifically, clause 5 amends section 122(2) of the Electoral Act which specifies how an elector must vote. Subsection (2), which currently requires the elector to vote by writing the number 1 for the elector's first preference and the numbers 2, 3 and so on to indicate the order of the elector's preference for them, is omitted and replaced with new instructions on how to vote.

Clause 6 is amended to provide that the ballot paper must contain writing that is in accordance with section 122 or other writing or marks that indicate the voter's intended preference or order of preferences. New subsection (2A) provides for the circumstances in which a ballot paper is to be disregarded.

This bill is not about introducing a new way of voting for Queenslanders, rather it is about the reintroduction of a longstanding voting system which has long been a part of Queensland's electoral system—specifically since 1992—but with a far more significant history. A form of optional preferential

voting was adopted for Queensland elections as early as 1892. By 1942, simple majority or first-past-the-post voting had been adopted. Compulsory preferential voting was then in force for elections between 1962 and 1989.

It seems appropriate that we are introducing these reforms on this the 30th anniversary since the report of a Commission of Inquiry into Possible Illegal Activities and Associated Police Misconduct, the Fitzgerald inquiry, was handed down. That report noted—

A Government in our political system which achieves office by means other than free and fair elections lacks legitimate political authority over that system.

The Fitzgerald report recommended, among other things, the establishment of a properly authorised and satisfactorily resourced Electoral and Administrative Review Commission, EARC, which reported directly to a parliamentary select committee. An electoral and administrative review was established by legislation to provide an independent and comprehensive review of administrative and electoral laws and processes. EARC was established in October 1989 and issued the relevant report, a *Report on Queensland Legislative Assembly electoral system*, in November 1990. It remains the most comprehensive review of Queensland's electoral system in our history.

Submitters during that review were clear: those in favour of optional preferential voting stressed its simplicity and the speed with which election results could be delivered. Most importantly, submitters argued that optional preferential voting would give choice to voters when indicating their preferences and lower the incidence of unintended informal voting.

Had the Attorney-General bothered to consider the seriousness and rigour with which Queensland's optional preferential voting electoral system was constructed post Fitzgerald during that shameful 18 minutes in April 2016, she would have surely known that submitters across the board had supported it. Consider some of the submissions made to the commission at the time. The University of Queensland stated—

Voters should not be compelled to vote for a candidate they do not want. As all preferences are weighted equally, many, under optional preferential voting, will be forced to favour candidates they do not support.

Professor Weller and Dr Wanna stated—

While we accept the value of preferential voting, we believe the casting of preferences should be optional. At present voters get the government or coalition that they least object to, not the government that they want the most. Optional preferential voting allows voters in a sense to weight their votes, to decide how much they want their preference and none other. Optional preferential voting allows the voter to make these choices and has the benefit of being a relatively simple system for voters to understand.

The Trades and Labor Council stated—

The TLC has considered material on the voting system and favours an optional preferential voting system. This system ensures that Parliamentarians are not elected on a minority of votes cast. On the other hand, optional preferential voting allows individual electors to prevent their vote going, after the distribution of preferences, to a candidate they do not support.

That is from the submitters, but look at the analysis of the commission itself. The commission stated their concern that electors were required to support views they may not have by ranking in order of preference all candidates offering themselves for election in their electoral district. The commission at the time said—

If they do not have a complete set of preferences they either have to invent preferences, or arbitrarily assign rankings to candidates about whom they know nothing and care less or accept that their ballot paper will be excluded from the scrutiny.

The commission went on to say—

The Commission believes it is not unreasonable or oppressive to require every adult citizen to play a meaningful part in the choice of their government. But having required that duty be discharged, it is inappropriate for the electoral system to corral votes on behalf of candidates or parties who electors do not wish to support but merely consider less objectionable than the others on the ballot paper.

The commission commented favourably on the operation of optional preferential voting in New South Wales—which still stands as our most populous state's electoral system today—before they went on to recommend that the same system be adopted in Queensland.

There was no doubt that optional preferential voting was increasingly utilised by voters across elections. We will never understand the full extent of the utilisation as we do not have access to the breakdown of the final two contenders on a ballot paper. Initially, optional preferential voting exerted little influence on voting behaviour. In 1992, the highest rate of voting for just one candidate was in the electorate of Warrego at 10.4 per cent. Generally speaking, for those elections held between 1992 and 1998, the major parties tended to ignore it and encouraged their voters to allocate a full set of preferences on their how-to-vote card.

By 2001 the Beattie government advocated a ‘just vote 1’ strategy, which saw nearly 60 per cent of voters across Queensland voting for just one candidate. Of course, only the votes of those voting for losing candidates who came, for example, third or fourth were technically exhausted. By 2009, 63 per cent of ballot papers were marked ‘1’ only.

Together with delivering choice to the Queensland voter, Queensland had very low informality rates under optional preferential voting. At the last optional preferential voting general election in 2015 the informality rate was only 2.11 per cent. By the next general election in 2017, the first under compulsory preferential voting, the informality rate had more than doubled to 4.34 per cent. All of this occurred after the Labor government argued vociferously in April 2016 that compulsory preferential voting would reduce informality rates—but, Madam Deputy Speaker, they knew that it would not. Only the optional preferential voting system will reduce the presence of invalid votes. This is due to the straightforward nature of the voting system that will least likely lead the voter to invalidate his or her vote through numbering error.

In April 2016 the then leader of the House, the member for Sandgate, the Attorney-General and the Premier thought they were very clever, but history will harshly judge their actions. In particular, it will forever stain the Attorney-General’s time as Queensland’s first legal officer: she was the one who jammed through compulsory preferential voting with no consultation, no cabinet consideration and no referral to a parliamentary committee. This was simply desperate politics from a desperate Palaszczuk Labor government. They needed to lock in Green preferences at the 2017 state election and beyond, and they did not blink at dumping Fitzgerald era reforms to ensure they would get them.

That is why the opposition today introduces the Electoral (Voter’s Choice) Amendment Bill 2019, because it will enshrine in law the voter’s choice. It brings back from the dead the spirit of the Fitzgerald era reforms and will pave the way to a fairer and more democratic electoral system which voters can have complete faith in. If you want more people to have their votes counted the way they really want, then you will support the bill. If you want to hear less talk about back room bargains and preference whispering, you will support the bill. If you want to return choice—real choice—to the people of Queensland by empowering them to express their true voting intention, you will support the bill. That is why I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (12.42 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a first time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Referral to Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

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


ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2926, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Burnett, I acknowledge student leaders and teachers from Aspley State High School and Craigslea State High School in the electorate of Aspley.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (12.44 pm), continuing: As I was saying, hard coral cover in the southern Great Barrier Reef increased from 50 to 250 per cent from 2009 to 2015. During this time the Burnett-Mary region experienced two large floods. This demonstrates that the Burnett-Mary catchments do not negatively impact the southern barrier reef. It is clear that when we discuss improved farm management practices it is important to have a sound scientific basis for the decisions we make.

Unfortunately, it has become apparent in recent years that much of the science on which decisions have been based is not as well quality checked as we would expect, and there are some doubts around these issues and the enforced legislation. We must talk about maximising benefits to the Great Barrier Reef and we must talk about remediation funds. It is possible that perverse legislation, which may significantly affect the viability of our farming and support businesses, may not have a significant effect on the Great Barrier Reef's health.

We need to worry about farmers, their families and the communities in which they live, which have been largely forgotten on a rising tide of support for the environment which often outstrips the rights of people. Farming is a tough game. Farmers are at the mercy of the weather and market forces, and the trend of environmental overregulation is only making things more difficult. Farmers are absolutely essential to feed and clothe our nation and others. In doing so, they contribute around \$60 billion to the national economy and provide hundreds of thousands of jobs. They share the nation's desire to conserve the landscape, preserve the reef and reduce carbon emissions. They have done much already to achieve those goals through voluntary industry-led programs, but there must be positive outcomes for producers who adopt global best practice in agriculture, not more punishment.

What producers need from government is not more regulation and red tape—which actually delivers worse environmental outcomes—but a clear long-term plan to drive better economic, social and environmental outcomes. Labor needs to stop talking down the reef. They have done much to stifle the tourism sector with their consistent claims that the reef is dead. It should not be a choice between agriculture versus the environment or damage to the tourism sector.

We know the environmental reasons why improvements in land use practice are required; that is, to improve water quality on the Great Barrier Reef, not at the end of catchments. For example, where are the predictions to show what the drop in concentrations of sediment on the corals of the Great Barrier Reef will be if the regulations are adopted? The reason this information is not given is because the effect would be negligible and below the level of detection. In any case, this information needs to be given to justify the regulations. If the southern Great Barrier Reef is not being affected, then the Burnett and other southern catchments should be treated like any other river in Australia. Current federal and state legislation already applies to those rivers, and no additional Great Barrier Reef related regulations are necessary.

The bringing in of regulations—as per the Great Barrier Reef Water Science Taskforce report of May 2016—was recommendation No. 5 out of 10 recommendations. While the government has said that changes are not happening quickly enough, it appears as though the state government has not allowed several of the other recommendations enough time to be implemented, as they were always designed to be recommendations with a lag time to demonstrate the benefits. Recommendation No. 2 was about communication, collaboration and stakeholder engagement. Recommendation No. 3 was about extension and education. These are always longer term programs that take more time than two years from the recommendation being made. Recommendation No. 4 was about incentives. There does not seem to be any significant incentive provided by the state government. For example, in Bundaberg, \$250,000 per 50 hectares will provide enough finance to improve irrigation infrastructure or purchase additional water and improve farm yield by 20 per cent to 30 per cent so that yields are close to or above district yield potential.

Recommendation No. 7 was about monitoring, modelling, evaluation and reporting. Yes, we do need more monitoring in the Burnett-Mary catchment, and that is where we should be putting our investment. The impact in the Burnett-Mary catchment, where agriculture is 13 per cent of the GDP compared to the state average of three per cent and unemployment is already at 10 per cent, means that regulation in the Burnett-Mary catchment will have a disproportionately high impact on the local economy. Emphasising the impact to employment in the sugarcane industry is really important. Given the attacks in my local paper by the minister about 'tin foil hat wearers', we again point out the reports from AIMS and other research which show water quality in the southern region is good and provide some reasons why we do not need more regulation. I table these documents.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents regarding the Great Barrier Reef [[1509](#)].

After Cyclone Hamish in 2009, the AIMS report showed that average coral cover was 9.32 per cent in 2011 and in 2017 it was 33.46 per cent. This rapid recovery is hardly proof of poor water quality. The condition summary also stated that any decrease in average coral cover occurred due to a large outbreak of crown-of-thorns starfish on Swains reef, and AIMS scientists stated that the outbreak at Swains reef is not based on terrestrial runoff. That was published in the *Journal of Marine Biology*. Professor Terry Hughes from James Cook University—director of the Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Coral Reef Studies—was lead author on a research paper published in the

journal *Nature*, which stated that corals in the far southern section of the Great Barrier Reef, the bottom third, had increased levels of spawning compared to the historical average. Another study about water currents I mentioned earlier was reported by Dr Emma Kennedy in *ABC Online*. It is important that we support the proposed amendments.

We want to talk about the removal of the head of power in the legislation that allows the government to set requirements for the collection of data. This amendment seeks to remove the overreaching provision that has been discussed in this House. We want to talk about the removal of the power to set ERA minimum regulated standards and BMP practice standards from the chief executive and replace it with a requirement that all standards are to be passed as non-exempt subordinate legislation under the bill. The amendment seeks to require all standards to be prescribed by regulation.

It is important that we talk about the requirement for a 10-year grace period to enable a staged implementation in the Burnett Mary catchment region. Yesterday, the minister quite rightly excluded the Cape York area, quoting that there had been some good work done and some good lobbying. I would ask what has not been done in the Burnett Mary catchment by all of the stakeholders that have been providing over the last years a lot of good science about the areas and why we should delay the Burnett Mary catchment rollout. I notice that Far North Queensland have had 10 years to participate in their practices. This legislation brings in that the Burnett Mary has to accelerate to do it within three years. That is hardly fair, hardly necessary and hardly something you would do in consultation with stakeholders. As I said, I would be very interested to hear the rationale for excluding Cape York and not excluding the Burnett Mary. I would love to see that evidence in a comparison.

In closing, although I know it will make no difference to the government's perverse agenda for the bush, I invite any member of the government or their key advisors who have obviously penned this legislation to participate in an on-ground tour in Bundaberg. The committee members were given this opportunity but did not really take it. We want to take you on a tour of the Bundaberg, Isis and Mary regions to showcase some of the voluntary programs that we have implemented to improve the environmental, social and economic sustainability of our sugarcane based agribusiness industry, grazing and horticulture. This will demonstrate why legislation is not required in my region, and it will show you the destructive results of Labor and its ideological agenda in killing off regional communities.

As someone who readily visits the southern Great Barrier Reef, Lady Elliot Island, Lady Musgrave Island and the inshore corals of Barolin Rocks and Nudey Beach areas around Bargara, I can say that there is no evidence that coral is suffering under perverse agricultural run-off. If anyone doubts that, if anyone wants to murmur—

Ms Enoch interjected.


Mr BENNETT: I will take the interjection from the minister. You are more than welcome to come back and spend some real time giving real thought to it. Don't make fun of my region.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): All directions—

Ms ENOCH: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence to the comments made by the member for Burnett and I ask him to withdraw.

Mr BENNETT: I withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hinchinbrook, I welcome to the gallery student leaders from Wellington Point State High School in the Oodgeroo electorate.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (12.52 pm): I rise to contribute to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I completely stand against this bill today because I think it is wrong what Labor is doing to Queensland farmers. This bill tries to stop the reef run-off from farms up and down the coast of North Queensland and Central Queensland. We are questioning right now the intent of this bill. Is this bill intended to stop the reef run-off or is it intended to stop farming and agriculture along the east coast? We are hearing that it is all about protecting the Great Barrier Reef. I would like to take the people here in the House to the Great Barrier Reef and show them the reef. It is fine. It is not dying.

I want to touch on the committee process as the committee came through the regions. Firstly, we needed to make a lot of noise in the media to even get committee hearings up in the regions. I was lucky enough to be invited along and granted leave to sit on the committee in Townsville. All I can say is that I did not waste my opportunity; I got to ask one question. I heard a comment that the member for Stretton made yesterday when he was speaking. He was the committee chair, and he said that while he was conducting some of the committee hearings no-one came up and talked to him against it. He said that no-one came and talked to him afterwards and spoke against—

Mr Pegg: I didn't say that. I said no-one didn't get a fair go.

Mr DAMETTO: I stand corrected. I take the interjection. If that is the case, we will go back and check *Hansard* from yesterday. I am quite happy to check that again. All I can say is that nobody from the agricultural sector went and talked to anybody from Labor after they conducted the committee hearings. Basically, they thought their comments during the committee hearing were falling on deaf ears.

Mr Pegg interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Member for Stretton, you have had your go. Let the member for Hinchinbrook have his.

Mr DAMETTO: Exactly. Madam Deputy Speaker, thank you for your protection. Farmers are already suffering out there in the regions. They are dealing with falling world sugar prices in my area and a falling banana price. We are trying to operate in a deregulated industry. Quite frankly, the cost of production is way too high at the moment because input costs from electricity to water to fertilisers and all those things are increasing. Those input costs are going up. This will not make it any more expensive for these input costs, but it will be dearer for farmers because they will have to go through different legislative requirements which will make it more expensive.

We will also see that the yields of these farms will come down. I will describe canefarming and agriculture in general to a lot of people on the other side of the House. If you are trying to grow a crop, you need a certain amount of fertiliser to actually grow it. Different country takes different fertiliser amounts. This is what the regulatory bit is about. There could be a cap on nitrogen phosphorus in certain areas. A farmer might need 160 kilograms per hectare to grow cane in one area, and for the same yields in another area another farmer might need 220 kilograms per hectare.

This legislation will also give too much power to the chief executive officer. They will be able to come in and say, 'We're going to change the regulations without consultation.' That pretty much happened anyway in this committee process.

Mr Knuth: Shame.

Mr DAMETTO: That is exactly right. I take that interjection from the member for Hill. They will be able to change the regulations at the stroke of a pen without consultation with farmers. Up to 22 per cent of farmers in the Hinchinbrook electorate have actually taken up BMP, which is great, but there are other farmers out there who are not recorded in this. Why? Because it takes up to two years to actually be accredited for BMP. Some of those farmers have just started going through that process and are continuing the hard work. At the same time, that is not being acknowledged from the other side of the House by the introduction of this bill. A lot is being done out there. There are best practice farmers out there who have not taken up the BMP accreditation simply because they do not believe they are killing the reef. They do not believe in what this legislation is trying to stop. The reef is not dying. As I said earlier, I invite anybody to come out to the reef. I live there. I live on the east coast right there in the middle of Hinchinbrook. I invite anyone to come out and talk to the spearfishermen and the recreational fishermen.

Mr Harper: Go and talk to AIMS.

Mr DAMETTO: I will talk about AIMS in a second.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Thuringowa, the member for Hinchinbrook has the call.

Mr DAMETTO: Exactly, thank you. If you have a chat to anybody out there, they will say—

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DAMETTO: AIMS are getting paid to make sure that they tell everyone that the reef is dying.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Put your comments through the chair.

Mr DAMETTO: Sorry, Madam Deputy Speaker, through the chair, of course. If we are going to talk about coral deaths and the inability to grow coral along the east coast because of reef run-offs from farmers, I would love to draw attention to the Palm Island group. Right in the middle of the Palm Island group is a little island called Orpheus Island where AIMS have their coral research centre. That is right. Just off the coast of Hinchinbrook, they are growing corals. Between there and Orpheus Island, they are growing corals where all of this run-off is killing the reef. Have a look between Pelorus Island and Orpheus Island. Have a look at the coral gardens at Curacoa. They are flourishing. That contradicts all the science. This is where the scientists are actually growing coral. If it were the inner reefs that were dying, why is there coral growing there and flourishing?

Mr Harper interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Thuringowa, your interjections are—

Mr DAMETTO: I will not take that interjection from the member because he is giving a useless contribution. I would actually ask him to leave the chamber—

Mr HARPER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr DAMETTO: While he is interjecting—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: We have a point of order—

Mr DAMETTO:—let us talk about how he—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook! What is your point of order, member for Thuringowa?

Mr HARPER: I take offence to the member's comments. I ask him to withdraw. I take personal offence.

Mr DAMETTO: I withdraw. While we are talking about the member for Thuringowa, let us talk about how he misled the cane farmers in the Townsville region in the *Townsville Bulletin* last Friday, on Friday the 13th, black Friday. We probably should have expected more from the Labor Party in the regions, but they misled the *Townsville Bulletin*. They printed stories saying they were going to push back on this legislation for five years. It has been said that it has been—

An honourable member: Fake news.

Mr DAMETTO: Fake news, that is right. It is untimely that three members would actually all come together and say that they are going to look after farmers' rights—not until they take the guts out of the industry right here today. That is what they are going to do here.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, that is unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr DAMETTO: I withdraw.

Mr HARPER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I believe he is misleading the House. I will be writing to you about his statements earlier.


Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is not a point of order. You can write to the Speaker about that. As the time is now 1 pm and the member for Hinchinbrook is not on his feet, we will adjourn the House for lunch.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

Debate, on motion of Mrs D'Ath, adjourned.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Electricity Assets

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (2.00 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House—

1. notes:
 - (a) the Palaszczuk government's commitment to maintain publicly owned power stations;
 - (b) public ownership of power stations has resulted in cheaper electricity prices for Queensland families and small businesses;
 - (c) the LNP's ideological obsession with privatisation and their attempt to sell Queensland's publicly owned energy assets in 2014, rejected by Queenslanders at the 2015 state election;
 - (d) the Morrison government's intention to bring back the big stick energy legislation to federal parliament which could force the break-up of Queensland's publicly owned energy assets;
 - (e) the Palaszczuk government's commitment to maintain public assets in public hands including the Gladstone port, the Port of Townsville, the Mount Isa rail line, SunWater industrial pipelines, Stanwell Corporation Ltd, CS Energy Ltd, Powerlink, Energex Ltd and Ergon Ltd that were all up for privatisation under the LNP's Strong Choices plan;
 - (f) reports that the Morrison government is considering reviving the Abbott government's asset recycling policy which promotes and encourages privatisation and cost Queensland \$1 billion in infrastructure funding; and
2. calls on the Morrison government to:
 - (a) listen to Queenslanders who have resoundingly rejected asset sales time and time again; and
 - (b) reject the failed asset recycling initiative that seeks to force Queensland to privatise its publicly owned assets.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.02 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships be permitted to immediately move a motion with the following time limits to apply:

- 5 minutes for all members
- total debate time before question put—60 minutes.

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

AYES, 51:

ALP, 46—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Palaszczyk, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 36:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MOTION

Electricity Assets



Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (2.08 pm): I move—

That this House—

1. notes:
 - (a) the Palaszczyk government's commitment to maintain publicly owned power stations;
 - (b) public ownership of power stations has resulted in cheaper electricity prices for Queensland families and small businesses;
 - (c) the LNP's ideological obsession with privatisation and their attempt to sell Queensland's publicly owned energy assets in 2014, rejected by Queenslanders at the 2015 state election;
 - (d) the Morrison government's intention to bring back the big stick energy legislation to federal parliament which could force the break-up of Queensland's publicly owned energy assets;
 - (e) the Palaszczyk government's commitment to maintain public assets in public hands including the Gladstone port, the Port of Townsville, the Mount Isa rail line, SunWater industrial pipelines, Stanwell Corporation Ltd, CS Energy Ltd, Powerlink, Energex Ltd and Ergon Ltd that were all up for privatisation under the LNP's Strong Choices plan;
 - (f) reports that the Morrison government is considering reviving the Abbott government's asset recycling policy which promotes and encourages privatisation and cost Queensland \$1 billion in infrastructure funding; and
2. calls on the Morrison government to:
 - (a) listen to Queenslanders who have resoundingly rejected asset sales time and time again; and
 - (b) reject the failed asset recycling initiative that seeks to force Queensland to privatise its publicly owned assets.

As we sit in this parliament, in Canberra the federal LNP will be introducing legislation this week to seek to forcibly divest energy companies, and that includes companies owned by Queenslanders in Queensland—publicly owned assets, energy-generating assets in Queensland. This comes from a party which says that it is the party of small business. They are only the party of small business when it suits them ideologically. When they have an ideological agenda around privatisation, asset divestment, putting money at the big end of town, then they are all for big government; they are all for a big, interventionist government.

Here in Queensland, regardless of what happens in Canberra, we know that we are doing a great job in terms of keeping assets in public hands and reducing the cost of electricity for Queensland families.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

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

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Chatsworth, you are warned under the standing orders. You will cease your interjections.

Ms TRAD: Let's see what some of the third parties have said about the LNP's big-stick legislation. The Grattan Institute, for example, says that it curbs practices that do not exist such as retailers not passing on cost reductions, generators not offering competitive contracts and wholesalers engaging in corrupt behaviour. The ACCC says that power prices might even go up under the LNP's plan. In the 2018 electricity report, the ACCC found that integrated retailers reduce overall costs. The Energy Users Association has said that the LNP's laws will smash investor confidence and force power prices up. The experts all agree that this is the heavy hand of government trying to do things that are unnecessary in our energy market right now.

Our chief concern is that this is a back door to privatisation. The legislation that was out in the public domain some time ago gave the minister discretion to direct divestiture of power companies. A federal LNP minister sitting in Canberra making a decision about Queensland's power assets is just not on. We will stand up to the federal LNP and we will fight against any moves by anyone in Canberra to tell us what to do with our assets. What I want to know is what those opposite are actually doing about the will of Queenslanders, which has been exercised time and time again in this state around public ownership of public assets continuing in this state, to keep faith with Queenslanders. Nothing!

We hear nothing from those opposite. They will not stand up to Canberra when it comes to a whole range of issues, be it GST, insurance in regional communities or fighting for natural disaster relief funding. Those opposite are as weak as weak can be when it comes to standing up to Canberra and making sure that Queensland gets a fair deal.

We also are incredibly concerned that the Morrison government is resurrecting the Abbott government's asset recycling plan. This is a plan that punishes Queensland for keeping assets in public hands. This is a plan that says that the only way that Canberra will treat you seriously is if you sell your ports, rail lines, poles and wires.


Mr Millar interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Gregory is warned under the standing orders.

Ms TRAD: This program has been implemented to the disadvantage of Queensland. Do not even take my word for it. An LNP member on the Gold Coast, Karen Andrews, said—

You look at roads in New South Wales. It was an entirely different funding commitment in New South Wales. A lot of that was because New South Wales sold assets.

The Palaszczuk Labor government will not sell assets. Those opposite are yet to stand up to Canberra and to detail to the people of Queensland how they will meet their fiscal imbalance of \$11 billion. Those opposite have a track record when it comes to selling assets: cutting, sacking and selling.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.13 pm): I rise to speak against this motion. What a desperate government that comes into this House today to look for a distraction.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr MANDER: I take those interjections: 'Let us look at this other shiny bauble over here which is not real shiny anyhow.' This is a government engulfed in an integrity crisis and looking for a distraction. The hypocrisy of those opposite to talk to this side of the House about a track record of asset sales! Let us talk about a track record with regard to asset sales. Let us talk about ministers in this government who were ministers and backbenchers in the Bligh government who agreed to the sale of assets. Let us talk about the members for Sandgate, Cooper and Woodridge. Who else was there? There were a couple of others there as well.

An honourable member: Inala.

Mr MANDER: The member for Inala—of course! If it were not so serious, it would be laughable. The only side of parliament that sold assets in this state—and the list is endless—is the Labor side. There were many reasons, but what was the one for which the Bligh government was voted out in record numbers? It was because they deceived the Queensland public. They made no mention whatsoever of asset sales in the 2009 election campaign. Just weeks later, then premier Bligh announced the asset sales. Did they rue that day? Not only did they lose the confidence of Queenslanders, they lost the confidence of the trade union movement, which felt betrayed, understandably, by the Bligh government. I will be the first of many who will talk about the track record of the Labor Party with regard to assets.


Ms Trad interjected.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the Treasurer: ‘Come on, Tim.’ I will come in and tell you about these asset sales.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Members will refer to each other by their correct titles. It is the last warning that will be issued during this debate.

Mr MANDER: The hypocrisy is beyond belief. We have a Treasurer who is looking for a distraction, a Treasurer who is engulfed in an integrity crisis—and it gets deeper and deeper—and a Treasurer who thinks it is all over because the CCC said there were no corruption charges to answer, but there are so many more questions. We will never forget it—and nor will the people of Queensland when reminded of the integrity crisis that engulfs this Treasurer. That is why the government is looking for a distraction.

I refer to Queensland Motorways, \$3 billion; Abbot Point port, \$1.8 billion; QR National, \$4 billion; Port of Brisbane, \$2.1 billion, Forestry Plantations, \$600 million; Cairns and Mackay airports, \$738 million; Brisbane Airport, \$289 million; wind energy assets, \$460 million; gas assets and Enertrade, \$268 million; Golden Casket, \$530 million; Power Direct, \$1.2 billion; Sun Gas, \$75 million; Sun Retail, \$1.2 billion; and Allgas, \$535 million. Today, what do Queenslanders have to show for it? We have a debt travelling towards \$90 billion, despite the sale of these assets by a government that deceived the Queensland public. They have absolutely washed all that sale money down the drain, because they cannot manage anything. They cannot manage the Queensland economy, and we are wearing the price of that now. Never have I seen such an own goal by a government that comes into this House and moves this motion. That shows the hypocrisy of the Labor government—the only government in Queensland that sold assets.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (2.18 pm): Queenslanders have been calling out for national leadership on energy policy. What do we see opposite? The new leader on energy policy? I cannot reflect on the absence of someone in the House, but this is like the situation in Townsville. Move over, here comes the member for Everton!

Finally, almost 12 months since the last COAG meeting and the energy policy vacuum that followed, the Morrison government has waded again into the shallow end of the policy conversation. What does it plan for those opposite? What was their energy plan? Was it a plan to lower greenhouse gas emissions, to increase reliability of the network or to increase investment and put downward pressure on prices for customers? No.

Their plan—the Morrison plan—is a policy time machine. Morrison fired up the DeLorean and whisked us back to 2015, when then premier Campbell Newman chose to have a plan—a strong plan, the Strong Choices plan. Who can forget that plan to sell Queensland assets? With this divestment legislation we are talking about plans to enact Newman’s plan again, only federally—to sell Queensland’s publicly owned power stations, to create havoc with investment and to provide Canberra the ability to interfere with strong decisions made by the Palaszczuk Labor government. We know what the people of Queensland thought of the previous plan.

Queensland has the lowest average power prices on the eastern seaboard. Regional Queenslanders are now in their second year of power price reductions. Why is that? It is because we own our assets. Owning our assets has allowed us to take action through our government owned generators and apply the brakes to wholesale power price increases. I remember my good colleague Minister Bailey directing Stanwell to modify its bidding strategies to move closer to reflect its underlying costs, recommissioning Swanbank E, turning the units back on at Tarong and establishing a third publicly owned generator, CleanCo. That is expected to translate to an estimated saving for the average Queensland household of \$70 per annum.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has a plan: the Affordable Energy Plan. We have well and truly delivered on our commitment to Queenslanders on price. We said that we would keep electricity price increases for a typical household and for small business customers below inflation for two years. That was well and truly delivered. We said that we would return dividends from our publicly owned assets to the shareholders, the people of Queensland. We have well and truly delivered. Right now, the second of two \$50 asset ownership dividends is appearing as a credit on the power bills of more than 1.9 million households. I encourage those opposite to check their bills. We could do this because we own our assets.

Those opposite have no energy policy. Their energy policy is just like a bag of cheap magic tricks. Every now and then they pull out a new magic trick, just like the Prime Minister with his conjuring act—with a top hat that is torn and worn, a fake moustache and a torn cape: 'Morrison The Unbelievable'. I will outline some of his tricks. First is the divestment legislation—just like the old bent plastic wand. Then there is the default market offer—three plastic cups with a pea, except that no-one wins because the pea is missing. Then there is the prospect of a nuclear power station delivered to every settlement along the coast of Queensland. Those opposite have no plan at all. Dr Parkinson, the head of the Commonwealth Public Service, said that there is only one outcome from Morrison's energy policies—that is, higher prices.

Those opposite use that same dodgy bag of cheap magic tricks for their power policy. They will give the north regional competition. We heard about that. That will add \$700 million to the budget bottom line—added to \$7 billion worth of unfunded promises—or just add \$400 to everyone's power bill. I will tell members where the magic lies: their energy policies are funded by a magic pudding. Under those opposite, power prices would grow and grow, just like the magic pudding. The 43 per cent increases under the LNP would now be 114 per cent over seven years, with the power bills of every Queensland household hundreds of dollars higher.

Only the Palaszczuk government has the Affordable Energy Plan. Only the Palaszczuk government will hold on to our publicly owned assets. Those opposite are with their federal cronies. They will just sack, sell and privatise.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: I acknowledge that we have had in the gallery students from St Joseph's school from Cloncurry in the electorate of Traeger.

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (2.23 pm): If there is anyone who ought not get up in this chamber today, it is the Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier should be in her office investigating her director-general's links to companies and so on. When ministers are besieged like the Deputy Premier is, they look for distractions.

Ms TRAD: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The motion is specifically around the big-stick legislation on asset privatisation. I ask that you rule on relevance.

Mr SPEAKER: I concur with the point of order. Member for Kawana, please come back to the motion as it has been presented to the House. Otherwise I will sit you down.

Mr BLEIJIE: Anna Bligh sold the assets in Queensland. Who worked for Anna Bligh when she sold the assets? The Deputy Premier worked for Anna Bligh. The Deputy Premier was the campaign manager for Anna Bligh when Queensland assets were sold. Who came up with the plan to sell Queensland assets? It was the Deputy Premier. She was elected the member for South Brisbane after Anna Bligh lost the election on the issue of asset sales. They are the facts that should be put on the table. The unions turned against the Labor Party. The unions turned against Anna Bligh. The unions are now turning against the Deputy Premier, with the anti-resources, anti-regions focus of this government.

The Minister for Mines and Energy just spoke about electricity costs, as he should. While in Townsville, just before we kicked off the parliamentary sitting day, I witnessed—as did the member for Burleigh—the member for Mount Ommanney complaining to the minister about the large power bill she had just received in the post. When the Minister for Mines turned around and saw me standing there, noting that I had obviously overheard the conversation, he said, 'Oh, no,' because he knew that I would bring it up eventually. This is a great opportunity to bring that up—an awesome opportunity!

Ms PUGH: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I am offended. I ask the member to withdraw, as I asked the member for Burleigh to do the last time this was raised.

Mr SPEAKER: You are personally offended?

Ms PUGH: Yes, I am personally offended.

Mr SPEAKER: Do you ask for the comments to be withdrawn?

Ms PUGH: I am asking the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has asked that the comments be withdrawn. Will you withdraw?


Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw. As the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has indicated, in this place we should talk about the truth of asset sales, the big-stick legislation coming in and the LNP's commitment. What we did differently was be open and honest when we put a plan to the people of Queensland. We went to an election saying, 'This is our plan.' The history shows that the people rejected the plan. That is why our leader, Deb Frecklington, has told the people of Queensland that we will not revisit that plan. She has been open and honest about it. That is the commitment. We have said it—unlike Labor.

I was in this chamber—the member for Mudgeeraba was also present—when Rachel Nolan stood up in this chamber, put her hand on her heart and said to the cameras, 'Queensland Rail is not for sale.' Unfortunately, the then treasurer, Andrew Fraser, did not give her the memo that a week later in the state budget Queensland Rail was to be sold. Those opposite did that.

It is an absolute own goal for the Labor Party to come in here and move a motion about asset sales, being the only party in Queensland that has sold assets. In fact, when he sold Energex retail Peter Beattie said, 'Power prices will not increase.' He said that at the time. Now we see power prices increasing over 70 per cent under the watch of the Treasurer and the Palaszczuk government. That is the fault of no-one but the current state Labor government.

The reality is that the big-stick legislation is to keep the big energy companies honest. I cannot believe that the Labor Party is sticking up for the battling big energy companies. They have been ripping off Queenslanders for years. The Palaszczuk Labor government has been ripping off Queenslanders for years. Let me make it abundantly clear: if the Federal Court were to order a divestment, publicly owned entities would need to remain publicly owned and cannot be forcibly privatised. There are mistruths contained in this motion. What more would we expect from the Deputy Premier?

This is nothing more than an attempt to hide the fact that there is a deep integrity crisis engulfing the Palaszczuk Labor government. The facts speak for themselves. The Labor government sold the assets. The LNP went to the election in an open and transparent manner. That plan was rejected. We have said that we are not revisiting the plan. Will Labor revisit their plan? Who knows, because they never tell the truth.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (2.29 pm): I rise to speak to the motion. Gladstone is a proud city and our region's economy is intrinsically linked to the port. The port of Gladstone is Queensland's largest multicommodity port, handling more than 30 different products. During the 2015 election I had the pleasure of having a candidate run against me who worked for the Gladstone Ports Corporation, and I table an article from the Gladstone *Observer*.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Gladstone Observer* online, undated, titled 'LNP candidate says he knows sense of leasing port' [[1510](#)].

The article, headlined 'LNP candidate says he knows sense of leasing port', states—

He said his experience as a sustainability specialist for Gladstone Port Corporation allowed him to understand what it would mean for Gladstone if the port was leased.

Not only did the LNP run a candidate against me who worked for the Gladstone Ports Corporation; it ran a candidate who wanted to sell it. It got to the point in the campaign where he said, 'We're not going to sell it anymore. We're going to lease it. It's going to be a 99-year lease.' However, over the months of the campaign the community of Gladstone saw right through him and they saw right through the LNP. What it had planned for the port of Gladstone was disgraceful and its planned asset sales were right on track to match the rest of its \$37 billion worth of commitments it had planned to sell during its next term in government, and it was just hoping like hell that it would get re-elected for the next three years so that it could continue selling the other assets that it had lined up ready to go, other than the \$10 billion worth of assets that it had already sold while in government.

I remind the House that Queensland Motorways was sold by QIC for \$7.1 billion, \$2.35 billion in Aurizon shares were sold and then there was the \$550 million for the ElectraNet business located in South Australia that was sold to a Chinese state corporation. Not only that, \$562 million from our wonderful assets that we had in buildings here was used by those opposite for their big elephant across the road that they all wanted to sit in, but they did not get the chance because they got booted out. They were booted out in that election. It was shameful that those opposite ran a candidate in Gladstone that they had planted at the Gladstone Ports Corporation to sell it in a private sale to a Chinese investor.

This government is spending millions and millions of dollars upgrading the Gladstone port. Wonderful cruise ships come into the Gladstone port now because of investment by government owned corporations, with the Queensland Treasurer supporting our Gladstone port, not setting it up for sale. None of these investments would be possible if the port was owned by a Chinese investor. I remember sitting on the foreshore in Gladstone when the Premier of Queensland came to visit. We looked over at the beautiful Spinnaker Park and I said to the Premier, 'Guess what, Premier? If they get their hands on this and sell it, those beautiful parklands where families are having their barbecues now will be big coal piles. They'll be gone.' It would have been gone because they would have used up every asset that they had under the Gladstone Ports Corporation to ensure that they could get their investment going and utilise our assets to do that.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Member for Southport!


Mr BUTCHER: The LNP was happy to put up a 'for sale' sign on the Gladstone port and the people of Gladstone definitely were not happy about that. If it was not for the 'for sale' sign, the LNP would have tried to pull the wool over the eyes of every Queenslander by putting up a 'for lease' sign with a 99-year lease. As the member for Clayfield has said, it was not an asset sale but a lease. Queenslanders are not—not then and not now—easily fooled.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: In 2015 we campaigned to keep that asset in public hands and we did it again in 2017 by our recommitment to the fact that we are not going to sell our assets again.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: We know. We went to an election and said, 'We know. We made a mistake. We're now on a journey to not sell those assets,' because we know the port is an economic powerhouse for the region and the state of Queensland. I am proud that as the member for Gladstone that port is continuing to give back to this state and provides schools, police stations, policemen, doctors and nurses. Do members know how we can do that? It is because the Port of Gladstone is in the hands of the Queensland public and we are giving back to those communities in Queensland through that port. We are not sacking people. We are not getting rid of nurses. We are not getting rid of doctors. We are employing people. We are getting more patients looked after in our hospitals and we are getting more police on the streets, as we heard in Townsville, protecting our communities. We will continue to do that because only the Palaszczuk government in Queensland will look after Queenslanders and our assets.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (2.34 pm): How do you spell hypocrisy? A-L-P! We have just heard from the member for Gladstone, who obviously does not have a very good handle on the history of the ALP's hypocrisy. Perhaps I should remind him. Who sold off Abbot Point port for \$1.8 billion? It was Labor in 2011. Who sold off the Port of Brisbane for \$2.1 billion in 2010? It was Labor, and there is a long list of assets that were flogged off by Labor. Let us look at who was in the cabinet—

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock. Sorry, member for Maroochydore. Member for Southport, you are constantly interjecting. Now you are quarrelling across the chamber. You are now warned under the standing orders.

Ms SIMPSON: Labor sold the assets. Who was in the cabinet? What a surprise—some of the Deputy Premier's right-hand men and women. In fact, the Premier herself was in the cabinet. The member for Inala was a minister in the Bligh government when these assets were being sold. The then member for Ashgrove, the now member for Cooper and a minister in this government, was a minister in the Bligh government when assets were being sold. The now Deputy Premier was working for Anna Bligh, the then premier, when the asset sale plan was cooked up and executed. The then member for Greenslopes, the now member for Woodridge—Minister Cameron Dick—was in the ministry when asset sales occurred under Labor.

We have talked about the port, but I well remember the situation with Queensland Rail when I asked the question of Rachel Nolan, who was the then transport minister, because I had heard that those opposite were scoping it out for a sale and looking at how many people's jobs would be impacted. I asked her a question in this parliament and she rose to her feet and said, 'Queensland Rail is not for sale.' What a load of baloney! Within days it was in the *Sunday Mail* and then they went ahead and sold Queensland Rail's assets. They sold it. They sold out the people to whom they told an absolute whopper in respect of asset sales.

I think it is a bit of an own goal for the Deputy Premier to move this motion. She has been under the heat of an integrity crisis of this government through her absolute foolishness with respect to buying a house in an area where she had a clear conflict of interest. She is trying to create a diversion in this parliament, but she has picked asset sales when the only people who have been selling and flogging off asset sales are still in Labor's cabinet in Queensland.

Forestry Plantations was sold for \$600 million under Labor. The Cairns and Mackay airports were sold under Labor, as was the Brisbane Airport. The asset sales of this Labor government are on the public record. The LNP did have a plan at the 2015 election, but it was rejected by the public. We were honest with the public about the intention. It was rejected and we also rejected that policy as a result. In contrast, Labor stood up in this parliament and promised not to do it but then it did it. It is incredible that this Deputy Premier—who is under so much scandal and so much disgrace with such an absolutely abysmal integrity crisis consuming this government—thinks that she can create a diversion with asset sales when her own ministerial colleagues who sit in the Palaszczuk Labor government—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Maroochydore, you are using that as a prop. Are you going to table that?

Ms SIMPSON: I will table it.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Table it, thank you, and do not use it as a prop.

Tabled paper. Document, undated, titled 'The truth about who sold Queensland's Assets' [\[1511\]](#).

Ms SIMPSON: I will still keep quoting from it though, Mr Deputy Speaker.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, you may.

Ms SIMPSON: I think it is a bit of an own goal that this Deputy Premier, who has been the reason for the integrity crisis from the disgraceful mess that she has made—

Mr de BRENNI: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask you to rule on relevance. The motion is specifically around the big-stick legislation. The other matters that the member for Maroochydore is talking about have nothing to do with that motion.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Members, when I am listening to someone on a point of order it is not an opportunity for you to start arguing across the chamber.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Gladstone just spoke about many things not relevant to the motion—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: One moment, member for Kawana. I hope you are not going to debate, because I have not even made a decision yet.

Mr BLEIJIE: No. Mr Deputy Speaker, under the standing orders, when a point of order is being accepted a member is able to offer another point of order subject to that point of order, which I am doing under the standing orders.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. I ask you to resume your seat. Member for Maroochydore, I ask you to speak to the motion at hand.


Ms SIMPSON: Thank you. Speaking to the motion, this Deputy Premier has raised the issue of asset sales and has the hypocrisy to stand up here and say, 'No', they are not in favour of asset sales when her own Labor colleagues in the ministerial cabinet room decided to flog them off.

We also have statements that were made by the now Speaker, Curtis Pitt, in respect of asset sales trying to defend the flogging off of Queensland Rail. I refer to a statement that he released about asset sales trying to defend the sales, particularly that of Queensland Rail. It is all on the record. This Labor Deputy Premier is at the forefront of an absolute integrity crisis and to try to have this motion as a diversion—

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Maroochydore is well aware of the motion that is before the House for debate later this evening. Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask you to rule on whether the member is anticipating that debate.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Maroochydore, I ask you to come back to the motion.

Ms SIMPSON: This is a diversion from the crisis of this government. Let us not forget the asset sales that Labor presided over. I have tabled the document that refers to a range of asset sales. I have referred to the fact that they happened when Labor said it would not happen. We listened to the people. We have proposed a plan that does not involve asset sales but involves lowering the cost of energy throughout this state, which is too high. It is a disgrace. People are being ripped off and this government is presiding over that. We will fight for people and their cost of living any day.

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Communities and Minister for Disability Services and Seniors) (2.41 pm): I rise to speak in support of this motion. As a proud North Queensland local, I know firsthand the difference that having our power assets in public hands has made for driving down the cost of electricity for regional Queenslanders. Unlike those opposite and their agenda of cutting, sacking and selling, we have our power assets in public hands. As a government, that has allowed us to allocate \$150 million through the Powering North Queensland Plan to support the development of strategic transmission infrastructure in North and North-West Queensland to support a clean energy hub. North Queensland is rich in renewable resources and project proponents are actively exploring the solar, wind and hydro potential in the region.


We have announced that the publicly owned Powerlink will build a transmission line from Genex's Kidston site to Mount Fox near Ingham, linking the hinterland to the National Electricity Market. This government has committed up to \$132 million to support this work, which will support 500 construction jobs. In addition, recently, the CopperString 2.0 project has been declared a coordinated project by the Coordinator-General. As announced by the Minister for State Development, this project will receive \$1.8 million from the Queensland government to advance through the assessment process. This transmission project potentially provides significant strategic linkages with the clean energy hub and needs to be factored into the investment considerations of the government.

Our goal is to achieve 50 per cent of Queensland's generation from renewable sources by 2030. We are making good progress to achieve this target and, importantly, we are doing all of this without selling our assets. Over the past two years, 17 projects generating over 1,200 megawatts have commenced operations and there are a further three projects currently committed that will deliver an additional 110 megawatts to North Queensland when completed. We have also established a new publicly owned clean energy company, CleanCo Queensland. This will be a game changer for electricity generation and shows that, unlike the LNP, the Palaszczuk government is serious about real energy market reform. As Queensland's third publicly owned generator, CleanCo will improve competition in the wholesale electricity market and put downward pressure on electricity prices all while staying in public hands.

Our government is also investing \$498 million in 2019-20 to provide the community service obligations subsidy payment to Ergon Energy to offset the additional electricity supply costs incurred in regional Queensland. Although many customers may not be aware of the community service obligation subsidy, it is critical to ensuring energy affordability for regional Queenslanders. To deliver this policy, the government pays a subsidy to Ergon to offset the higher costs of supplying electricity in regional Queensland. It is estimated that, in 2018-19, this subsidy reduced the average bill in North Queensland by 19 per cent. Best of all, we have been able to do all of that without following the LNP's plan to cut, sack and sell or signing ourselves up to the Abbott-Turnbull-Morrison government's failed asset recycling policy.

We know how desperately those opposite want to see their federal LNP colleagues' big-stick energy legislation become a reality, because they are obsessed with trying to force the break-up and sell-off of Queensland's publicly owned energy assets. We only have to look at the past to know how that worked out. We saw how Queenslanders really felt about asset sales. At the 2015 election, Queenslanders overwhelmingly rejected the LNP's \$70 million Strong Choices plan to sell assets, such as the Port of Townsville, Ergon, the Mount Isa rail line and Powerlink. As I said, we saw how that worked out for the LNP.

That is why the Morrison government should be condemned for even considering the idea of forcing us to break up our own publicly owned assets. It is not a solution for bringing down power prices for North Queenslanders and it will simply cost jobs. For that reason, I support the motion.

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (2.46 pm): This motion is a D-grade distraction from Anna's A-grade apprentice. This is a disgraceful attempt to try to divert the agenda of this parliament from what it should be this week and that is about integrity. This parliament should be talking about integrity and it should be talking about laws to improve people's lives. We have begged the government for more

time to debate the reef legislation. Instead, later on this evening, or tomorrow, one of the most important pieces of legislation that will be put before this House will be guillotined without every member being able to speak to it.

Mr de BRENNI: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Clearly, the member for Broadwater is straying into a debate on a private member's motion and also a debate on a bill. Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask you to remind him of relevance

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): I concur. Member for Broadwater, can you come back to the motion being debated.

Mr CRISAFULLI: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you. I certainly will not talk about the content of that bill. I will talk about the need for this parliament to debate things that matter to people. This motion seeks to get a grain, a link, from something happening in parliament in Canberra to use it to further an agenda. I will play the game of the Deputy Premier. I will paint a little bit of a history about asset sales. I am not going to go through the long list that has been referred to in this place—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I say to the Deputy Premier that I will get on to that. I want to talk about one sale in particular from 2007 that sticks in my craw, because everywhere I go people still raise it, and that is the sale of the Golden Casket in 2007. When I go to parts of regional Queensland, older Queenslanders tell me that that was an asset that used to fund health services in this state. When they saw it flogged off for all but \$530 million they thought, 'This is a government that doesn't have my interests at heart.' So it is with this government. Those opposite will stand up and somehow seek to debate asset sales against a party that has never sold an asset in this state. They will stand up and attempt to talk about Strong Choices—

Mr Bailey: You lost your seat!

Mr CRISAFULLI: I will take the interjection from the member for Miller. I did lose my seat. I learnt the lesson, but clearly those opposite have not learnt the lesson because in the same way we saw the Bligh government in its death throes in 2011, so too is this one in the middle of a term: a government so disconnected with the state, so out of touch, so unable to sell a vision, with a Treasurer who is more interested in her property value than your property value, more interested in lining her pockets than lining your pockets.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Those comments are personally offensive and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw. With a jaw made so much of glass that Windex could not clean it—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Broadwater, you are asked to withdraw unreservedly. It does not need further comment.


Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw.

Ms TRAD: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask for his second comment to be formally withdrawn as well.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Broadwater, the Deputy Premier has found your second comment offensive. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I withdraw. Since 2015, both sides of politics in this place have ruled out the notion of asset sales. Only one side has ever done that and then after an election sold an asset, but both sides have ruled it out. There has been one body that has spoken about asset sales and about privatisation and that is the ETU. The ETU has accused those opposite of privatisation via stealth with the rollout of the solar scheme. Let me rule it out today, as those opposite are calling on us to do. We have learnt our lesson. We took a package to the people of Queensland and, as the member for Kawana said and as I experienced firsthand, the message was received loud and clear.

The public would forgive those opposite for the deceit and the sale of an asset after promising not to if they had used the money wisely and delivered something for Queensland, but they did not. At the same time they failed to build key infrastructure, debt went up in this state. At the same time they were flogging things off, services were in freefall, and so it is today. Those opposite come into this place and seek to use a piece of federal legislation—which, by the way, states if a court orders the divestment of a publicly owned entity it would need to remain publicly owned and not forcibly privatised—as a diversion because it is a government void of an agenda.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (2.52 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the Deputy Premier. Before I get into the crux of my contribution today I want to table a 2014 newspaper article in the *Australian Financial Review* where it says very clearly that 'the Queensland government', the LNP government at the time, 'has sold more than \$10 billion of assets since elected in 2012 despite claiming that it would wait for a privatisation mandate at next year's election'.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Australian Financial Review* online, dated 14 October 2014, titled 'Despite assurances, Queensland on asset selloff binge' [\[1512\]](#).

Opposition members interjected.

Mrs LAUGA: You can take the word of the *Australian Financial Review*. The people of Queensland sent a resounding message to members in this place in 2015 because they absolutely, categorically rejected the LNP's plan to sell our electricity assets. The Palaszczuk government has committed to maintaining our publicly owned energy generators. I am the daughter of a government owned electricity generator worker. My dad has worked in our government owned electricity generators since before I was born and up until he retired a few years ago. I know how important our electricity assets are to jobs, to local communities and to electricity prices.

The Morrison government has plans to bring back the big-stick energy legislation to federal parliament which could force the break-up and privatisation of Queensland's publicly owned energy assets, not to mention the Morrison LNP government's intention to revive the Abbott government's asset recycling policy which promotes and encourages privatisation. New South Wales, Victoria, the Northern Territory and the ACT were all offered very generous rewards for selling public assets. In total, about \$3.3 billion in rewards were offered.

Despite allocating \$3.3 billion to New South Wales, Victoria, the Northern Territory and the ACT—Queensland was not eligible for the rewards because we opted not to sell our electricity assets—the federal LNP pocketed more than \$850 million allocated to the asset recycling scheme as budget savings. Those governments that sold their electricity assets and were told that they would be given rewards were not even given the rewards because the federal LNP pocketed the rewards. The budget papers revealed that the federal government quickly moved to pocket the remaining \$854 million. Because the Queensland people have categorically rejected the idea of selling our electricity assets, the federal LNP government is punishing all of Queensland.


We know that the privatisation of income-generating assets by governments reduces public sector net worth and fails to deliver improvements in economic performance. Privatisation has been rejected by the Australian public on almost every occasion when the issue has been put to them and yet those opposite, the Queensland LNP, are refusing to reject it too. We know that the real reason Queensland is not getting its fair share from the federal coalition is because the Palaszczuk government put a stop to the LNP's asset sales. As a result, we are missing out on billions of dollars of funding which was being used as a sweetener by the federal LNP to sell public electricity assets. The federal LNP is essentially blackmailing Queenslanders by saying that unless you sell your electricity generators, the very generators which we know have put downward pressure on electricity prices, Queensland will not get its fair share from the federal coalition.

I reject the notion of selling our electricity assets, Queenslanders have rejected the same notion and yet the federal LNP and those opposite are still trumpeting this botched policy. The LNP wants Queensland to sell its electricity assets which are actively working to put downward pressure on electricity prices. Does the LNP actually want higher electricity prices? Is that what they want? Why do they want to increase electricity prices for the people in Queensland?

A government member: They put it up 43 per cent!

Mrs LAUGA: They did! I take that interjection. They did put electricity prices up 43 per cent, in fact. In other states where they have opted to sell their government owned electricity generators not only have there been impacts on electricity prices but there have been other service delivery impacts such as job losses, increased brownouts, poor delivery of electricity services and poor maintenance on infrastructure. Rewarding the sale of assets through asset recycling like the Morrison government is doing is not smart public policy. Why on earth would you sell your house to buy an expensive car? Disposing of an income-generating asset for short-term gain is shortsighted at its best and at its worst foolish. It is a failed model.

The LNP and those opposite are looking at the short-term opportunity but are refusing to look at the long-term opportunity cost. Queenslanders will lose the annual income generated by our electricity assets. I support the motion.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (2.57 pm): We heard about magic tricks from the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. This motion and its purpose is one long virtuoso example of a magic trick. It is trying to distract attention from the appalling situation that the government finds itself in thanks to the antics of the Deputy Premier. When we talk about asset sales, I think the one asset sale that Queenslanders are interested in right now is the sale of the Deputy Premier's husband's house. We have heard over and over again that it is going to be sold but we do not know the circumstances under which it is sold and we do not even know if or when. We only have the Premier's word on that and so far that doesn't seem to be very valuable.

Mr KELLY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance.

Government members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Members, I do not need people barking from the benches debating whether it is or it is not. I will make my ruling. My ruling will be simple and clear. Member for Southern Downs, you need to come back to the motion.

Mr LISTER: I have heard speakers before me talk about what a mistake it was for the government to move this motion to discuss asset sales, when they are the ones who have sold assets and this side has not. I can see the sullen countenances to my left. I can see their faces. I have seen happier faces on a pirate flag. They are looking at this and they are saying, 'What are we doing this for again? Why did we come in here for this? We have the story down pat. We don't need speaking notes for this one.'

I have a list of the assets that this government or its predecessors have sold. Around the cabinet table that sold \$16 billion worth of assets were ministers who sit right now with that odious rump on the benches opposite. I am talking about Queensland Motorways, the Abbot Point port, QRNational which is the one that was never going to be sold, the Port of Brisbane, Forestry Plantations, the Cairns and Mackay airports, the Brisbane airport, wind energy assets, gas assets and Enertrade, Golden Casket, Powerdirect, Sungas, Sun Retail and Allgas. In this state under Labor, \$16 billion or more worth of assets were sold. It is the Labor Party that sells assets and it is completely disingenuous for them to try divert attention away from their problems by talking about asset sales. The LNP does not sell assets in this state.

Just a moment ago, I was talking to my good friend the member for Pumicestone. They are still at it. As we speak, they are selling land on Bribie Island. The tender closes tomorrow.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr LISTER: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I can hear myself quite well. I am not worried about the interjections, in case you were worrying about my welfare.

This Labor government is in no position whatsoever to lecture the House, the LNP or the people of Queensland about asset sales. We have no faith whatsoever in the Labor government, although there are not many assets left to sell. What happened to the \$16 billion from the sale of assets under Labor? The money was blown! It was frittered away on thought bubbles and projects, such as the \$100,000 program for weight loss for dogs. That is the sort of stuff that the Labor Party does with the money that it derives from asset sales.

I am also completely riled by the idea that electricity prices are being controlled by this Labor Party for the benefit of Queenslanders. That is not case in my electorate of Southern Downs. From the copious correspondence that I have sent him, the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy very well knows that in my electorate people are doing it tough. Along the border between New South Wales and Queensland, which is a large portion of my electorate, people are paying way over the odds for electricity, no thanks to this Labor Party government. I am talking about people who grow things from nothing, who employ people and who generate wealth, prosperity and taxes to pay for us and all of the services that we scrutinise in this House. Where is the deal for them? Nothing that comes from the Labor side of the House can teach us how to run the economy or how to provide cheaper electricity prices. Only the conservative side knows how to deliver for the economic growth and the welfare of the state of Queensland.

When I see the Deputy Premier pointing to us and talking about asset sales and economic management, it is like the pot calling the kettle black. It is like the Deputy Premier pointing to Gordon Nuttall and saying, 'Dodgy!' It is completely disingenuous. Everyone in this House understands the purpose of this motion. It is a distraction. The people of Queensland are not impressed. Look at what happened at the federal election. Look at what happened to seats in North Queensland. Look at the standing of the Labor Party with people. It is this kind of nonsense and subterfuge that is annoying them

and turning them away. They want action; they do not want talk. They want a government that listens to them and delivers the things that they are after such as proper electricity reforms, not ideology and not an agenda dominated by the social proclivities of the member for South Brisbane and others.

This state needs an LNP government to run electricity properly so that we can ensure that the farmers, the families, the small businesses and everyone in my electorate of Southern Downs and throughout Queensland get a better deal on their electricity. We will not be selling assets. If you want to look at asset sales, look at the Labor Party, because they are the ones who have done them all.

Hon. MC BAILEY (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (3.03 pm): It is no wonder that the opposition voted against having a debate on this motion. I will read from *Hansard* of 14 June 2018. During the budget debate, the member for Nanango and opposition leader said, 'I am proud—very proud—of the LNP's record in government.' That quote will come back to haunt her, because we know the record of those opposite. I come to one of the central points that has been repeated ad nauseam by those opposite. There are two words that we can be guaranteed never to hear in an LNP speech in the Queensland parliament. Those two words are 'strong choices'. It is like 'Don't mention the war' in *Fawlty Towers*. We will never hear those words from the lips of an LNP member, because they do not want to go back there.

Why do the opposition claim never to have sold assets? It is because the Labor Party stopped them! We defeated them. They had the biggest majority in Australian political history and they went with the biggest asset sale program under Strong Choices. It was a \$70 billion program. The first wave was for \$37 billion. That is an extraordinary amount.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I move—

That the member for Miller be not further heard.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order!

Mr Pegg interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, I was on my feet. You are now warned under the standing orders. Members, thank you for your patience.

Division: Question put—That the member for Miller be not further heard.

AYES, 35:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

NOES, 52:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr SPEAKER: Given that there was still some time allocated for the debate remaining on the clock when the member was interrupted by the moving of the motion, I will allow the member to continue for the time remaining before putting the question.

Mr BAILEY: When it comes to badges of honour, it is a line ball between Des Houghton's irritant of the week or that motion moved by the member for Kawana. I might put it on my letterhead and business card. What an honour.

I come back to the motion. We all know that Strong Choices is a case of do not mention the war with the LNP. They dare not speak its name. We know it was a \$70 billion privatisation program only stopped by the Labor Party. They already spent \$100 million during their term in office despite saying that they would not.

This motion is a great opportunity for the Leader of the Opposition to stand up to Canberra and stand up against asset sales. What we know is that her strategy and the strategy of the LNP is exactly the same as Campbell Newman's. They want to promise everything to everybody. They have no way of paying for it. When or if they get into government then they will do exactly what they want—whatever

they promised. They did it before. They will do it again. That is what will happen. They have \$11 billion in unfunded promises and yet they move ridiculous motions like the one they moved yesterday where they are trying to blow—

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs.

Mr BAILEY: They were trying to blow a \$300 million hole in the accounts yesterday and yet they have \$11 billion worth of promises. It does not add up without asset sales. We know that if they get into power that is the first thing they will do. That is exactly what they did before. They promised they would not do it, but that is exactly what they did when they got into government.

We had the contribution earlier from the member for Broadwater, the former member for Mundingburra. Why did he lose his seat? It was because he supported the privatisation of Ergon, Townsville port, the Mount Isa rail line and Powerlink. He lost his seat and he left. That is what he did. He did not stand and the fight in North Queensland.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs, you are warned under the standing orders. You have made that interjection before and it did not land well.

Mr BAILEY: The member for Broadwater did not stand and fight in his home town. He got the back room to support him to knock off Verity Barton and get a safe seat. He did not stand and fight and face the music in North Queensland because he voted for asset sales. That is the truth. If he gets a chance he will do exactly the same thing to his leader in this place.

We do not just keep our assets in public hands; Labor invests in our assets. Whether it is the Gladstone port, Townsville port, Cairns port, Stanwell, CS Energy, Powerlink, Sunwater, Energy Queensland, we invest in our assets to create jobs to get better outcomes for Queenslanders. We do not have 43 per cent power price rises. They were 43 per cent under you guys. We know what your record is. We know what you will do if you get another chance.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's comments will be directed through the chair.

Mr BAILEY: Only Labor can be trusted to keep our assets in public hands, to run them properly and to create jobs. Power prices are coming down under this government because of our commitment to assets and to managing them well. It is in their DNA—the LNP did it before and they will do again. They will play the same Newman card—I promise, trust me—and if they get elected you know in your heart they will sell assets.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for the debate of the motion had expired some time ago, as explained by my previous ruling.

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

In division—

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. I have been advised by the honourable opposition whip that a few government members on the backbench voted 'no' when the question was put for that motion. I would like clarification from the members on the backbench how they will be voting in this division.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The standing orders still apply during divisions. Before seeking to hear from members reporting votes, I will respond to the point of order raised by the member for Kawana. The member for Kawana has raised a point of order which asks me as Speaker to find out if any members of the government voted contrary to the other members of the government—voting 'no' instead of 'aye' when the question was put. There was certainly some audible evidence of that, but I would like to hear from those members if they are going to be voting contrary to their party. Now is the time to provide that advice. I will certainly be reviewing the audio. I have asked for members to stand and provide that response. That has not been forthcoming. I will be checking the audio. If it is discernible, the result of division may change. That is something that will have to be reviewed. That is your point of order dealt with, member for Kawana.

AYES, 52:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.


NOES, 35:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

Resolved in the affirmative.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Shark Control Program, Federal Court Decision

 **Hon. ML FURNER** (Ferry Grove—ALP) (Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries) (3.23 pm): This afternoon the Federal Court dismissed the Queensland government's appeal against an Administrative Appeals Tribunal decision affecting the operation of Queensland's Shark Control Program within the boundaries of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. The Queensland government has done everything to vigorously appeal the AAT decision and is disappointed by the Federal Court outcome. Our advice is that we do not have grounds to appeal this decision.

The Queensland government cannot immediately or safely comply with the conditions of the Administrative Appeals Tribunal and we will be working with the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority to discuss implementation of the decision. As a result of this decision we will remove Shark Control Program equipment from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. I wrote to the previous federal minister for the environment about this on 3 April this year. I table that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 3 April 2019, from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, to the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Melissa Price, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area [\[1513\]](#).

Then minister Melissa Price responded on 5 April and in that response expressed concerns about the implications of the AAT decision and agreed 'that the safety of humans is a priority'. I table that response.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 5 April 2019, from the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Melissa Price, to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area [\[1514\]](#).

Subsequently I met with the current federal Minister for the Environment, Sussan Ley, in Canberra on 31 July, along with the federal member for Leichhardt and Great Barrier Reef envoy, Warren Entsch, in relation to this matter. Today I am calling on the federal government to step in and protect human safety and our tourism industry by making changes to the federal legislation to allow Queensland's Shark Control Program to continue in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. I table that correspondence.


Tabled paper: Letter, dated 18 September 2019, from the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development and Fisheries, Hon. Mark Furner, to the federal Minister for Environment, Hon. Sussan Ley, regarding the operation of the Queensland Shark Control Program within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park area [\[1515\]](#).

The AAT decision was about the permit issued to the Shark Control Program by the federal government's Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority which happened under current federal legislation. Outside of the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, the Shark Control Program, with its combination of shark nets and drumlines, will continue at Queensland's most popular beaches. Our Shark Control Program has an exceptional record dating back to 1962 and our government stands by that record.

The government will also continue our swimmer safety SharkSmart education and awareness campaign. The Queensland government has always put the safety of human life first, and we will continue to do so. Additionally, I table the Federal Court's decision on this matter.

Tabled paper: Federal Court of Australia judgement, dated 18 September 2019, *Humane Society International (Australia) Inc and Department of Agriculture and Fisheries (Qld)* [2019] AATA 617 [\[1516\]](#).

Sarra, Dr C

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (3.26 pm): I rise to make a ministerial statement. In question time this morning, a number of members of the opposition rose to ask questions in relation to the director-general of the Department of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. I will respond to those questions in this statement as I undertook to do this morning.


Dr Chris Sarra founded the Stronger Smarter Institute, SSI, in 2005 as a partnership between Education Queensland and QUT. SSI derived from an initiative called High Expectation Relationships, which Dr Sarra had run in the late 1990s while he was the first Indigenous principal of Cherbourg State School. To date, the Stronger Smarter Institute has delivered more than 185 leadership programs to more than 3,500 educators in more than 965 schools. This represents a reach of more than 51,000 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students right across Australia. The Stronger Smarter Institute is a not-for-profit company.

In 2008, I am advised that Dr Sarra registered a company called Strong Smart Solutions. Through Strong Smart Solutions Dr Sarra has provided consultancy services to entities including the New South Wales government and the National Australia Bank. Upon learning of his impending appointment as director-general, I am advised that Dr Sarra sought advice from the Integrity Commissioner in relation to his existing roles with a number of entities. As Dr Sarra was not at the time a designated person, I am advised that the Integrity Commissioner's advice was provided verbally.

Dr Sarra complied fully with the advice given by removing himself from a number of organisations and changing his interaction with others. I am further advised that since Dr Sarra was appointed director-general of DATSIP, Strong Smart Solutions has not undertaken or sought to undertake any consultancy activities with any entity including the Queensland government. Strong Smart Solutions is occasionally paid royalties by ConNetica, a company which administers and delivers the Stronger Smarter Yarns for Life program developed in 2016 by Dr Sarra with Dr Sarra's intellectual property. Stronger Smarter Yarns for Life, I am advised, is an early suicide prevention training program that has been developed with and for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders and non-Indigenous peoples. Dr Sarra is unaware of any connection that he, SSS or SSI has with Patria.

Finally, Sharon Grose was an associate of Dr Sarra through the Stronger Smarter Institute. Subsequently, Ms Grose has formed an organisation called Leading with Strength, which delivers programs for school leaders in Indigenous education and corporate entities to develop high expectation relationships cultures. I am advised that from 2008 to 2015 these programs were delivered in conjunction with Dr Sarra and the Stronger Smarter Institute. I am further advised that in October 2018 Leading with Strength was contracted to work with DATSIP on leadership programs for departmental staff. Dr Sarra was not involved in authorising their engagement.

PRIVILEGE**Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House**


 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (3.30 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. During the debate in relation to asset sales, the members for Kawana and Maroochydore made assertions in relation to my employment and what I was doing during the 2009 to 2012 period. They misrepresented my employment history. As we know, those opposite are loose with the facts and are very happy to smear people's reputations. I will be writing to Mr Speaker in relation to these matters.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms McMillan): Deputy Premier, I do ask that you write to Mr Speaker. I remind the House of those members who are on warnings: Chatsworth, Gregory, Southport, Stretton and Southern Downs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL**Second Reading**

Resumed from p. 2932, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (3.31 pm), continuing: When the committee was in Townsville we heard an interesting submission from the JCU, who talked about their view on the condition of the reef. One of the panellists said that over the last 10 years we have seen zero change in the health of the Great Barrier Reef. He later contradicted himself and said that it would take 40 years for us to reverse the damage we have done to the reef. This government is trying to rush this legislation through, but over the last 10 years farmers have worked very closely with the Department of Environment and Science, industry and growers to make changes. On their own admission you would not be able to tell if there has been any improvement to the reef because they said it would take 40 years. We are talking to people like Peter Ridd right now, and he said that after the last coral bleaching event we have seen coral growing back. That is difficult to comprehend, because they said we would not see any improvement for 40 years. It sounds like they are trying to buy themselves some time.


We have always advocated for reef science. We want to see it checked and we want to see it replicated or audited. Earlier today we heard the minister say it is peer reviewed. The biggest problem with peer review is that it is like two kids in a classroom checking each other's paper after an exam. The idea is that your peer has a look at your research and what you have done and says, 'Yeah, that's okay. You can put that in your report,' and they will take that as gospel. Any science should be replicated and tested, which is how people in the engineering sciences work. You do not just say, 'We're going to build a brand-new jet.' 'Yeah, it looks all right. It's been peer reviewed,' and you put it in sky. People would die.

We do support what the Hon. Bob Katter tried to do in the federal parliament this morning. He tried to introduce a motion, but unfortunately for Mr Katter not one person was sitting in the House. I table this picture.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 17 September 2019, from the office of the federal member for Kennedy, Hon. Bob Katter, titled 'KAP motion for Wednesday 17th Sept' [\[1517\]](#).

Not one person from the LNP or the ALP was there to second the motion. The first part of the motion called for the allocation of resources for the Auditor-General to audit the reef science. The second part of the motion asked where the \$120 million has gone for the crown-of-thorns starfish. There is a lot of federal money being spent here and no-one seems to care where it is going. The KAP opposes this bill.

(Time expired)

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (3.34 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. The primary policy objective of the bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen Great Barrier Reef protection measures to improve the quality of water entering the Great Barrier Reef.

Protecting the Great Barrier Reef is one of the Queensland government's six priorities under Our Future State: Advancing Queensland's Priorities. Progress towards this priority will be measured against two targets of water quality in the Great Barrier Reef catchment: firstly, by 2025 contribute to a 60 per cent reduction in the anthropogenic—that is, environmental pollution and pollutants originating from human activity—end-of-catchment dissolved inorganic nitrogen loads; and secondly, a 25 per cent reduction in the anthropogenic end-of-catchment settlement loads.

These reef-wide targets reflect the Queensland government's commitment under the *Reef 2050 water quality improvement plan 2017-2022*. This plan also includes end-of-catchment load reductions for each of the 35 river basins ranging from zero to 70 per cent of the existing anthropogenic loads, depending on the location, for what is required to achieve ecological health for the reef. Despite significant government and industry investment, particularly in agriculture, voluntary approaches have failed to facilitate sufficient uptake of improved practices, and at the present trajectory the reef water quality targets will not be met.

The Great Barrier Reef is the largest coral reef in the world. The quality of the water flowing from land into the reef lagoon has deteriorated over the last 150 years. In 2016 the Great Barrier Reef Water Science Taskforce recommended the implementation of staged regulation throughout the reef regions to reduce nutrient and sediment pollution and contribute to meeting water quality targets for a healthy reef. The task force recommended a reinvigorated regulatory approach as part of a mix of tools to accelerate progress towards meeting targets to help preserve the high values held for the reef and increase the resilience of the reef to other pressures such as the impacts of climate change.

The Great Barrier Reef Protection Amendment Bill 2009 introduced the first round of reef protection regulations. This bill—the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019—will broaden and enhance existing reef

protection regulations as part of the Palaszczuk government's multipronged approach to radically improve water quality for Great Barrier Reef catchments. A key objective is to set nutrient and sediment load limits for all reef catchments. The load limits are derived from river basin targets in the *Reef 2050 water quality improvement plan 2017-2022*. They will be used to guide regulatory decision-making about environmentally relevant activities that generate nutrient and sediment loads. As recommended by the task force, this bill puts in place measures to ensure there is no net decline in water quality from new development.


The new standards will require growers to replace outdated high-risk practices with practices that are known to limit nutrient and sediment run-off and enhance sufficiency, including the cost of production of our crops. These changes will be staged to commence between 2019 and 2022 according to water quality risk. The minimum practice standards align with recognised benchmarks for agricultural practices but limit run-off while sustaining farm productivity and profitability.

This bill makes good sense. It addresses two serious issues for our farmers: loss of soil and loss of nutrients from our valuable farmlands. As I learned when I studied agriculture and horticulture at the University of Queensland Gatton Campus—which was then known as the Queensland Agricultural College—Queensland farmers have been cultivating land since the 1850s; however, early farmers were not aware that some of their farming practices were causing erosion.

In Queensland 45 per cent of all soils have what is called sodic properties. These are soils specifically vulnerable to most forms of soil erosion. Soil erosion removes valuable topsoil which is the most productive part of the soil profile of agricultural lands. The loss of this topsoil results in lower yields and higher production costs. When the topsoil is gone, erosion can cause rills and gullies that make the cultivation of paddocks impossible. Eroded soil, which contain nutrients, fertilisers and herbicides or pesticides, can be deposited where there is a reduction in the slope of the land. This can be in sediment traps, along contour banks, in grassed waterways, dams and wetlands. Downstream effects of soil erosion include siltation of watercourses and water storages, as well as a reduction in the water quality of creeks, rivers, coastal areas and our Great Barrier Reef. Major floods deliver high levels of pollutants, including eroded soils, from river catchments into the Great Barrier Reef catchment. This is why we need this bill.

This will have little impact on those producers who have already voluntarily moved to improved practice standards. Provision has been made to directly recognise those producers are credited against registered industry best management practice programs, or like programs, as meeting the minimum practice standards, but there is work to do for those producers who have not already embraced the change that is needed.

In closing, I would like to thank the members of the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee, including the chair, the member for Stretton, the committee secretariat, the submitters and Hansard. On 12 April 2019 I was pleased to assist the committee as a substitute at its public hearing in Bundaberg where I gained an insight into both the need for this legislation and also the concerns of the submitters who gave evidence at the hearing, including Canegrowers. I noted that all the submitters at the Bundaberg public hearing were given adequate time to have their say, notwithstanding the outrageous comments today by the member for Hinchinbrook. Having considered the various submissions in its report tabled in April 2019, the committee made only one recommendation and that was that the bill be passed. I support this recommendation and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (3.42 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. This bill was introduced in the House in February 2019 by the Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, and the Innovation, Tourism Development and Environment Committee reported in April 2019 with one recommendation that the bill be passed.

In accordance with the explanatory notes, the key policy objective of the bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen Great Barrier Reef protection measures to improve the quality of the water entering the Great Barrier Reef. The bill aims to achieve its objective via a regulatory framework targeting some of the following areas: the reef water quality targets for nutrients and sediments; producers moving to standards that align with recognised benchmarks for agricultural industries; existing industry-led best management practice programs or the development of new programs; and new development can occur without compromising the water quality gains made to date, while also minimising the regulatory burden on existing activities.

The LNP has concerns with this and has proposed three amendments to the bill: one, removal of the head of power in the legislation that allows the government to set requirements for the collection of data; two, removal of the power to set ERA minimum regulated standards and BMP practice standards from the chief executive and replaced with a requirement that all standards are to be passed as non-exempt subordinate legislation under the bill; and, three, introduction of a requirement for a 10-year grace period to enable a staged implementation of minimum requirements in the Burnett Mary catchment region.

This is just another example of the Palaszczuk government trying to blame our state's agricultural industries for everything from terminal cancer to ingrown toenails, from coral bleaching to whales beaching themselves, and from drought to flooding rains, in order to shore up inner-city green votes. The Palaszczuk Labor government is anti regions, anti farmers and anti jobs. It always has been and always will be. This government's continued attack on agriculture has driven many in the industry to protest loudly and clearly against these unfair reef laws. Agricultural industry groups and farmers are conveying a strong message to the Palaszczuk Labor government—that the reef laws are unfair on farmers and will cost more jobs in regional Queensland, jobs that these everyday Queenslanders cannot afford to lose.

The LNP is a strong supporter of industry-led best management practice programs. That is why when the LNP were in government they funded these programs. Only the LNP will ensure farmers continue to get a fair reef regulations deal with a proper consultation process in place—a process that involves listening and considering the impact on farmers and their communities.

The cotton industry is a perfect example of an agricultural industry that made the decision to self-regulate by creating a farm and environmental management system for cotton growers ensuring that Australian cotton is produced according to world's best practice. The original myBMP program began in 1997 so there has been over 22 years of best management practice. It was then updated in 2006 and 2007 and subsequently relaunched in 2010 with an online version—all funded by the industry and growers. The model used in the cotton industry has seen changes to other sectors of Australian agriculture.


The benefits of an industry self-regulating rather than being forced by government are immense, including safer farm workplaces, healthier natural environments, reduced input costs, better run farm businesses and improved community health. After all, the industry and farmers are the ones who designed this system with a stringent but practical auditing procedure to make sure their industry was sustainable, environmentally friendly and benefited the communities that are reliant upon cotton growers.

There was no resistance to the implementation of myBMP—no rallies and no protests. Farmers could identify the benefits and knew their input into the design was listened to. Perhaps the government should have looked at this model. There is absolutely no reason why Labor cannot support local jobs and protect the reef. They seem to think it has to be one or the other. I thought governments were supposed to be the problem solvers, not problem makers, ensuring the best outcome for all individuals and industries potentially impacted by changes to legislation.

The sugar industry in Queensland has an economic value of approximately \$4 billion and supports over 22,500 jobs. Why should it be treated like this? The Premier did not even have the good grace to debate the reef laws in North Queensland when she had the opportunity to do so at the recent Townsville sittings and face the thousands of graziers and canegrowers who will be directly impacted by this bill. There is not an agricultural industry group that has not expressed their dismay at these reef laws—Canegrowers, AgForce, the Australian Banana Growers' Council, Growcom and the Queensland Farmers' Federation to name a few. These industry bodies have large memberships, with the Canegrowers group representing over 4,000 farming businesses. This Labor government continues to think it has the right to treat regional Queensland like second-class citizens.

The LNP has a long history of protecting one of Queensland's greatest assets, the Great Barrier Reef. When in government, the LNP introduced tough laws to protect the Great Barrier Reef by increasing the fines for serious environmental harm to the reef to over \$3.5 million or five years in jail. This was an opportunity for Labor to support these laws. However, they chose to vote against them. They still stand firmly behind their environmental credentials though. The Bligh Labor government had planned to dump 38 million tonnes of dredge spoil into the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Thankfully, they did not get the opportunity to do this. When Campbell Newman became Premier of the LNP government, they acted immediately to develop a plan to dispose of dredge material on land and reduce the dumping on the reef by 90 per cent, and the spoil was not dumped in the marine park zone.

The Newman LNP government invested \$35 million each year to improve water quality including support for graziers and canegrowers to develop best farm management programs and adopt reef-friendly practices. The LNP can stand proudly behind their environmental credentials, unlike those opposite. The LNP maintains a strong history of protecting the Great Barrier Reef, unlike the many Labor governments who have approved extensive port developments, for example, without a single thought for protecting the World Heritage values of the reef. When in government, the LNP delivered upon their election promise and found real solutions to protect this iconic World Heritage site. The LNP accepts the science and works with industries. It has done more to address the issues facing the reef than any other previous Labor government.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (3.49 pm): I, too, rise to speak against this bill, the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I might start by giving credit to Michael Guerin, who is the CEO of AgForce. In an article which he penned that appeared in the Rockhampton *Morning Bulletin*, among other places, on 12 September, he said—

Despite the clear signal from farmers and the wider Queensland community that the current reef regulations are not welcome and will not work (unless the intention of the legislation is to send more Queensland graziers and grain growers to the wall), it appears that the government is set to proceed on its present course.

...

AgForce has felt the growing tide of frustration and even anger from members, industry and community, at the seeming indifference portrayed by the state government to an industry that contributes so much to the economic, social, biodiversity and environmental outcomes, and rightly so.

In my view—and I am sure my view is shared by others—Mr Guerin is expressing the irritation of tens of thousands of stakeholders in the primary producing industries along the Queensland coast. It is not just AgForce; it is Canegrowers, the Australian Banana Growers' Council, Growcom and the Queensland Farmers' Federation among others.

This bill is typical of Labor's approach to environmental issues. It is heavy-handed and whilst there is a pretence of consultation, there is actually no evidence of listening. Consultation where a government asks what people think and then goes ahead and does exactly as it pleases is not consultation in the minds of fair-minded Queenslanders. That is having a tin ear and that is exactly what we have seen from this Labor government, certainly in the time that I have been in parliament.

It is not the first time we have seen attacks on the bush. We have seen the vegetation management laws, which are a real sticking point to growth and prosperity in the regional parts of Queensland including in my own electorate. We have seen the debacle of the 'blue dots' where constituents of mine and many others around the state have been told by the department that they believe there is a protected plant species on their property. They then have to go to great lengths and great expense to investigate the matter.

In the case of one of my constituents he paid for a consultant biologist—many, many thousands of dollars—to identify the presence of a protected cycad. The scientist he engaged made it quite clear that the presence of that particular protected species was a result of his clearing of the land, his grazing of the land and his cultivation of the land and that it did not appear at all in the remnant vegetation. It was 'scientific opinion' that what my constituent was doing actually preserved the protected species and ought to have been allowed.

However, it seems that the government does not want to listen to science when it does not suit them, and I am looking at the environment minister. I have corresponded with the minister about this. It is quite obvious not just to a scientist but to any man on the Clapham omnibus that the individual farmer was being disadvantaged, but we complain to the government to no avail. That is the concern I have: we talk about science and accepting science, but it seems that the government only accepts science when it is electorally advantageous to them. Perhaps they are not concerned about the vote of my constituent but more about the vote of the people of South Brisbane.

We heard the shadow minister, my honourable friend the member for Broadwater, say in response to the minister's second reading speech that he actually has worked on a cane farm; he owns a cane farm, a small part of his parents' property, and his mum and dad still operate that cane farm. He speaks with the authentic voice of someone who has skin in the game, someone who understands the industry, not of a bureaucrat from William Street or George Street. He talked about how technology has advanced enormously in the sugarcane industry since he was a boy, which was not all that long ago. We are talking about a 90 per cent reduction in the use of fertilisers and a 50 per cent reduction in the amount of water run-off. Those are worthwhile advances. They contribute to the efficiency of the production and also to the good of the environment.

He made the point that this bill is not the solution. This bill hands enormous power to an unelected bureaucrat who will have the ability to determine what the farming practices are of people like Mr and Mrs Crisafulli up in North Queensland, people who know their properties, who have a concern for the environment and who use the very best practice possible. I could not help but notice his rather pithy observation that a line of affected Labor Party members got together and expressed indignation at what was happening and managed to secure an amendment to the bill. I am looking at the member for Mackay. She surely has iron in her soul; she put her foot down and she made sure that her electorate was represented. However, I do not think that anyone is going to believe that.

I think that those who have skin in the game in those electorates that Labor is concerned about like Cook, Cairns, Townsville, Thuringowa, Mundingburra, Mackay, Maryborough—even McConnel, the education minister's seat has an economic stake in the sugar industry—will see that for what it was: a shabby deception, a ruse—and a very bad one—to attempt to make it look like those members were acting with the best interests of their constituents at heart. I think they are going to be greeted with a lot of cynicism because of that, and why would they not?


In talking about how this bill is going to impact people in North Queensland, honourable members should think about how people in North Queensland responded to Labor at the federal election. I think that they vicariously expressed their unhappiness with the treatment of this state Labor government through the federal election. We all know that there was a conga line of concerned Labor backbenchers who traipsed off to see the bosses on the Thursday afternoon just before the election—we were all here in the House at the time—and they were told, 'No, no, no. You're right. You don't understand; Uncle Bill will be the Prime Minister. We'll all be good. Manna will rain from heaven afterwards and we will be able to continue doing what we are doing.' Of course, that is not what happened.

I say to this Labor government and particularly to those members like the members for Cook, Cairns, Townsville, Thuringowa, Mundingburra, Mackay and Maryborough that they are kidding themselves if they think that this bill is compatible with the economic and social needs of their electorate. I do not believe that there has been adequate consultation or acceptance of the responses of farmers all along the Queensland coast who are going to be impacted by these draconian laws.

We are talking about a situation in which regarding supplies of chemicals, farm workers and everyone in the agriculture supply chain will be compelled to participate in an East German style 'dob in your mate' regime. That is not good for communities. There is no assurance of confidentiality about the data that is collected nor is there about how it will be interpreted and employed. It could be employed to the disadvantage of the industry, against the industry's wishes and advice. That is not just what I say; that is what canegrowers said.

I had the pleasure of attending the demonstration by canegrowers and others outside the parliament which sat in Townsville with my honourable friend the member for Burdekin who spoke to them. It was quite clear to me that they were great people who understand the reef, understand their responsibility as producers and who also pay taxes and provide jobs and wealth to pay for the services that we need in this state, to pay for politicians and to pay the welfare bill in this country.

Where is the government's focus on that? I say to this government: this bill is a mistake. This bill is heavy-handed. It attacks those who might once, in years gone by, have voted for the Labor Party, but what has happened to that Labor Party? It does not exist anymore. It has turned its back on farmers, farm workers and the bush. This bill is one virtuoso demonstration of that failing. I will not support the bill. I urge everyone in the House to join me in that respect.


 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (4.00 pm): Queenslanders have plenty to be proud of: our World Heritage listed rainforests, our world famous beaches and our beautiful sand islands. In fact, from the Torres Strait and the Wet Tropics to Springbrook National Park in the Gondwana rainforests, Queenslanders are custodians of some of the world's most amazing lands and waters. The biggest treasure of all is undoubtedly our Great Barrier Reef, both big in size and big in the place that it holds in our hearts. Queenslanders have the great honour of being the guardians of this natural wonder—an honour they take very seriously. I certainly do. Protecting the reef motivated me to run for office in 2015. Even now in my new portfolio, people from all different backgrounds raise the reef with me. They want to know that we are doing all we can to protect it.

The Palaszczuk government has made that commitment to protect the reef to Queenslanders and to the global community. It was my great honour to lead that work last term. I commend the member for Algeester on her work, including bringing this bill for the parliament's consideration. Our job to protect the reef is made all the more difficult in a warming climate that sees rising sea temperatures,

acidification of the oceans and more cyclones, heatwaves and extreme weather events. In this new environment, we must do everything we can to give the reef a fighting chance. Legislating minimum standards for the pollution that ends up suffocating and poisoning the coral and sea life is one of those measures.

Most of our farmers are doing the right thing. I have met and worked with many of them. These producers take very seriously their stewardship of the land. They work hard to reduce pollution. They are innovating ways to cut their fertiliser use and run-off using different products, practices and new technologies. They are proud of this work. Their hard work, though, is undermined by the few who refuse to change. These laws are about creating minimum standards, about rewarding and recognising those who are doing the right thing for the reef and about lifting standards across industry. Right now, the actions of producers who refuse to change, continue to pollute and undermine the efforts of most farmers are not even illegal. Their run-off is flowing into the Great Barrier Reef, causing huge plumes of pesticides, nutrients and sediment pollution and suffocating the coral, killing the sea life. Right now, they are not even breaking the law.

These protection measures are just one part of our efforts to protect this great natural wonder and the 60,000 jobs it supports. They are for the Queenslanders who want a Great Barrier Reef to show their children and their children's children and visitors from every corner of the world. Those opposite will pay a heavy price for opposing these reef protection measures, because most Queenslanders say, 'How could you oppose protecting the Great Barrier Reef?' I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (4.04 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the bill before the House. I congratulate the shadow minister on his contribution yesterday. It is only to the amendments proposed by the shadow minister to clause 8 that I address my comments. Clause 8 deals with what are termed agricultural ERAs, agricultural environmentally relevant activities. Proposed section 79(1) defines what those activities are, and they are fairly encompassing: cattle grazing, horticulture and cultivation of another crop. They are significant in their embrace and cover many industries, towns, families and livelihoods and also many ancillary industries that flow from them.

If you are one of those activities, you are subject to a standard called 'agricultural ERA standard'. That is defined in proposed section 81(2) in part as 'preventing contaminants entering, or minimising the amount of contaminants that enter, the water of the Great Barrier Reef'. If we look at section 81(3) we have an idea of what a standard condition can cover. It is fairly extensive. The standard that governs the activity can include conditions about the use of water, nutrients or agricultural chemical products and requires compliance with a prescribed methodology for working out the amount of a nutrient to be applied to a crop, conducting tests relating to carrying out the agricultural ERA, and a catch-all subclause for 'another matter related to carrying out the agricultural ERA' or 'about the way land, the features of land and farming infrastructure are designed and used'.

The conditions imposed under a standard can be very wide and very broad. The clause does not give this parliament the right to vet and assess the intent and outcome of such a standard. In essence, it is left to the chief executive to issue the standard. There is no oversight. The wording that I read out, plus other terms, allows no restraint on the actions of a chief executive as to the number of standards that can be issued and the number of times they can be amended. There is no provision for consultation in relation to those amendments. It is given to a bureaucrat. They may well intend to propose standards that have long-reaching and serious impact in relation not just to the industry, per se, but also to all associated with it.

There is also no capacity in relation to the standard to assess the financial impact on the farming community, the economic impact to Queensland generally and, by the standard being implemented, the impact the standard will have on the reef or the local economy of the many towns that rely on the activity covered by the standard and referred to in proposed section 79(1). As I said, there is no consultation. This gives very powerful authority to whoever has the authority to set the terms of the standard. The problem is that there is no vet on that standard; it is simply imposed upon those impacted by their activity. There is no power that allows scrutiny by this House. There is no power that allows the 93 members of this House to assess the impact of that standard and to either pass or reject it.

The shadow minister made the point that, given the breadth of these standards and the authority that rests in the chief executive, these standards must be set by a regulation—a regulation that, as I said, empowers the parliament of this state to ensure it is in the best interests of all concerned. For example, the sugarcane industry in this state is worth over \$4 billion and employs over 22,000 people. I do not know whether that figure incorporates family members or just direct employers and employees, but a standard that impacts upon just that number of people and that industry base deserves better scrutiny than simply having a regulation issued, though well intended, by a bureaucrat.


I support the shadow minister's foreshadowed amendment as it is common sense. It gives oversight of a very powerful authority to a body that should have that oversight. The amendment proposed by the shadow minister achieves the right balance—that is, the right of a standard to be prepared and the right of this parliament to assess it and determine whether it should be implemented. I believe that is the right balance to be struck by way of the amendment.

The second amendment proposed by the shadow minister is to remove proposed section 89, which is headed 'Regulation-making power for particular records and returns'. I will not refer to the terms of the proposed section. Needless to say, it requires significant records to be kept in relation to the activity undertaken by somebody under the terms of the bill and subject to a standard.

The minister has said that it will not be used; rather, the minister will rely upon collaboration to ensure a better outcome can be achieved. If the minister believes that consultation and working as one are the way forward, why not remove the clause? If the minister wants to reinsert it, an amendment can be prepared and the history, from the removal to the insertion of the clause and the reason it is being put back in, can then be properly looked at, consulted on and debated.

The fact that it has not been removed raises a suspicion that this is a sop and at the minister's whim it can again be triggered. The real issue with this matter, as outlined by the shadow minister, is that its mere existence in the terms of the bill continues to raise suspicions. If the minister does believe that we can resolve the matter by consultation and working together, the clause should be removed from the bill.

The amendments proposed by the shadow minister make sense. They deal with two of the fundamental matters raised by him in his contribution yesterday. I support him in doing so. As a consequence, I cannot support the bill.

 **Mr BOYCE** (Callide—LNP) (4.12 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. I declare that I am a landholder who will be affected by possible ramifications of this bill. The details of my landholdings are available on my register of interests.

This bill is nothing more than an unprecedented attack on agriculture and rural and regional communities situated on the eastern fall of the Great Dividing Range, from Gympie to the tip of Cape York. It is based on flawed, manipulated science that is driven by a socialist political agenda that is more interested in ideology than environmental outcomes. The science is untested and cannot be replicated. The peer review process is a farce and has been corrupted. Of the four peer reviewers of the Great Barrier Reef status report, two are from James Cook University's coral reef centre, which is responsible for much of the work in the report. They are therefore not independent in any way and are reviewing their own institution's work. The other two reviewers are not even scientists. One trained as a political scientist and economist and undertakes research in the field of public policy and governance, with particular interest in public policy relating to sustainable development. The other has a background in law, particularly relating to Indigenous issues. One can only guess why such friendly or seemingly unknowledgeable reviewers were selected to scrutinise the report. This is a complete bastardisation of and total disregard for the proper scientific method—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Member for Callide, that is unparliamentary language. I ask that you withdraw that.

Mr BOYCE: I withdraw—and therefore, in my view, corrupt. It seems that corruption sits easily in the ranks of the current government and should not be of surprise.

Mr Richard Horton, editor-in-chief of the *Lancet*, among the world's oldest and most respected medical journals, said of peer review—

... we know that the system of peer review is biased, unjust, unaccountable, incomplete, easily fixed, often insulting, usually ignorant, occasionally foolish, and frequently wrong.

This statement sums up the report of the peer review of the Great Barrier Reef. There has been massive exaggeration of the threats to the Great Barrier Reef. The reef is in good health, contrary to the report. There is almost no land derived sediment on the Great Barrier Reef where 99 per cent of the coral lives. It is all sparkling white coral sand. Sediment plumes caused by major flooding events in rivers like the Burdekin only ever touch just a few of the over 3,000 reefs that make up the Great Barrier Reef. Even on these few reefs, the sediment plumes last for only a few days and often do not reoccur for many years. The Pacific Ocean currents flowing into the reef continually flush the reef, purifying and cleaning the water. These tides and currents carry as much water in eight hours as all of the rivers in Queensland do in a year. That is why the water on the Great Barrier Reef is sparkling blue, clear and clean.

The amount of coral on the southern part of the Great Barrier Reef increased by 250 per cent between 2010 and 2016, even after major cyclones destroyed huge amounts of coral. It has also recovered very strongly from bleaching events. Since reliable records began, the amount of coral on the reef and its growth rate have not declined. Lots of coral occasionally dies from bleaching, cyclones and native crown-of-thorns starfish plagues. It looks terrible—just like a bushfire on the land—but it always grows back strongly.

The science being used to damage our farming and tourism industries has not been properly checked, tested or replicated for certainty. Land based sediment settles close to river mouths and does not impact 99 per cent of our Great Barrier Reef. On-farm sediment traps, farm dams, public dams and weirs trap large proportions of land based sediment that flowed to the river mouths for thousands of years.

This legislation makes cattle grazing, horticulture and cropping an environmentally regulated activity, ERA. Every farmer and grazier without an accredited environmentally regulated management plan, ERMP, will have committed an offence and be liable to a fine of up to \$78,330 under the Environmental Protection Act 1994 the day this legislation comes into force. Section 440ZG outlines prescribed contaminants entering waterways, including leaves, bark and animal excreta. I refer to schedule 9 of the Environmental Protection Regulation 2008.

The legislation makes no allowance for natural disasters and weather events such as drought, flood, fire and cyclone. This legislation directly conflicts with the Vegetation Management Act 1999 and the 2018 changes that locked up 1.7 million hectares of land, with 465,000 hectares being in the six reef catchments. This will result in a long-term increase in woodland thickening, erosion and weed infestations; however, the legislation categorises the results as a failed score on the A, B, C, D framework. Some 33.7 million hectares of land in six Great Barrier Reef catchments are blanketed by one-size-fits-all legislation. The bill alleges that agriculture is wrecking the reef and places a disproportionate blame for water quality and sediment run-off on Queensland farmers and graziers, despite the abundance of evidence that the Great Barrier Reef is actually in good health.

The committee process has blatantly ignored generational experience and evidence from farmers and graziers in submissions and public hearings. The fact that you are a farmer or grazier now means that you will be engaging in an environmentally regulated activity and, in simple terms, the government is proposing that buildings full of bureaucrats will now oversee what you do. This is yet another example of the Orwellian socialism taking control, implemented by a Labor government that is anti farmers, anti coal, anti fishing, anti tourism and anti regions.

I note that the member for Mackay is publicly calling for a halt to these reef laws. The time draws near to vote on this bill, so will she run her colours up the mast and cross the floor? I doubt it, for I believe the honourable member to be nothing but a charlatan. She is only paying lip-service to her regional electorate in the vain hope that she may keep her job. Many speakers have raised the issue of climate change.

Mrs GILBERT: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is misleading parliament. I take personal offence and ask him to withdraw.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): The member takes personal offence. Will you withdraw those remarks?

Mr BOYCE: I withdraw. Many speakers have raised the issue of climate change in their address, including the minister. I believe in climate change. It is a normal, cyclic event that has been happening for millions of years and will continue to happen. Climate alarmists make outrageous claims that we will all die from sea level rise, temperature rise and climate events and are being called out. Their doomsday predictions, including the demise of the Great Barrier Reef, have not eventuated.

Recently Dr Michael Mann, lead author of many IPCC articles on climate change, has been exposed as a fraud in the courts for refusing to show in open court his R2 regression numbers behind the world famous hockey stick temperature graph. The graph first appeared in the IPCC 2001 third assessment report and has been an iconic image used ever since by environmentalists clamouring for urgent action on man-made global warming, including the effects on the Great Barrier Reef.

Yesterday in the federal Senate a motion was passed that will create a Senate inquiry into the identification of leading practices in ensuring evidence based regulation of farm practices that will impact the water quality outcomes in the Great Barrier Reef, and it includes six points in the terms of reference. I believe this inquiry will expose the manipulated, flawed and incomplete science that is being used to underpin this bill. The process of this bill should be halted until this Senate inquiry has run its

course. I will not stand idly by and see our farming and grazing communities vilified as environmental vandals by socialist fake Greens-Labor climate dogma. The Great Barrier Reef is an iconic national treasure and should be managed and protected properly, so let us get the facts right first. Legislation that will have severe and detrimental effects on regional Queensland should not be tolerated. I do not support the bill.

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (4.22 pm): I rise in support of the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. All of us have people in the community come up and say, 'I don't know how you can be a politician. It must be so hard.' If ever there was an example of why it is really hard to be a politician, it is the experience of having to sit in this parliament and listen to that absolute drivel that we have just heard. I am not even going to go there about Reds under the beds being responsible for climate change and all of those really terrible things.

What I want to talk about is the fact that the Great Barrier Reef needs saving. It is iconic and we have to look after it. We have to make sure it is protected. We have all talked about how it contributes \$6 billion to the economy and that 60,000 jobs rely on the reef's health. It is the heart and soul of who we are in Queensland and it is the heart and soul of who we are in Australia, even in the world. Our kids grow up feeling like the Great Barrier Reef is part of who they are, and the science about this is really clear. I want to table a document—that is, a letter from Professor Ian Chubb—regarding the science that shows that improving water quality is absolutely essential if we are to protect the Great Barrier Reef.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 August 2019, from Emeritus Professor Ian Chubb, for the Independent Expert Panel, to various federal and Queensland ministers relating to the science regarding damage to the Great Barrier Reef [\[1518\]](#).

For those who do not know, Ian Chubb is the former Australian Chief Scientist and Chair of the Reef Water Quality Independent Science Panel. This letter was addressed to the federal environment minister, Sussan Ley, and the federal science minister, Karen Andrews, as well as to our Premier and to our environment minister. I want to thank the environment minister for bringing this legislation forward and taking the action to do what we must do. In the letter Professor Chubb says that science—

... clearly demonstrates that the northern two thirds of the GBR—

the Great Barrier Reef—

was severely bleached in 2016 and 2017. There are signs of recovery in some areas.

He continues—

There is evidence that water quality is important in that surviving coral or newly growing coral have a better chance at continued survival in cleaner water.

He also said—

The 2017 Scientific Consensus Statement for the GBR—

the Great Barrier Reef—

identified that poor water quality, including nutrients, sediments and pesticides flowing to the sea, is a major threat.

That 2017 Scientific Consensus Statement was prepared by 48 scientists and experts who reviewed over 1,600 published technical reports and scientific journal papers on the latest peer reviewed science to reach a consensus about reef water quality and ecosystem condition. You do not get much more settled on the science than that consensus statement. Unfortunately, we know that the LNP has a spotty track record when it comes to accepting and acting on scientific evidence.

We know that if it gets into government it is seriously considering opening up what the environment minister called the 'department of alternative facts' but which it calls the Office of Science Quality Assurance, the purpose of which is to decide—those pesky scientists; you never know when they are around the corner trying to trick us all into doing something—which bits of science it likes and which bits it finds a little bit inconvenient. Members can just imagine who would be in charge of that. I hope those Reds under the beds are not anywhere near that. This refusal to engage with the facts stretches right up to the federal level. We know, as we just heard from our friend from Callide, that the coalition has approved an inquiry into whether farming and poor water quality harm the Great Barrier Reef when we know how clearly they do. I just talked about that eminent scientist who produced that consensus statement and we know the member for Callide is really into that inquiry.

Just last week in the midst of the national bushfire disaster the federal Minister for Natural Disaster was asked if he accepts that climate change is caused by humans. His response was, 'I've got no idea.' Where do we find these people? We have a federal environment minister who questions whether excessive land clearing is to blame for biodiversity and species loss, but apparently the issue of Australia's record deforestation is not high on her agenda.

The federal member for Leichhardt, who represents thousands of people whose livelihoods depend on the protection of this national treasure, also has a very casual relationship with science. He was on record in May this year saying, 'The reef doesn't need saving. It's still going.' Great! Wouldn't it be great if life was so simple? For bonus points, he has backed a plan to bulldoze 2,000 hectares of pristine forest right near the Great Barrier Reef even though we know the sediment and run-off caused by land clearing is a massive cause of serious water quality problems on the Great Barrier Reef.

In May, when asked if there was enough scientific evidence about climate change and impacts on the Great Barrier Reef, the federal science minister, Karen Andrews, said, 'Well, science is not always a black and white response to everything.' I can assure members that the science is quality on the future of the Great Barrier Reef. The science is black and white. I just referred to the consensus report. Two recent reports—the reef outlook report and the reef water quality report card 2017-18—show it is more important than ever that we take action to protect the reef.


The water quality report card showed overall marine condition is poor and that farmers are doing good work to reduce run-off, but we need this to continue. It also showed that the uptake of these good practices has not been fast enough. The outlook report says that the outlook for the reef is very poor and that high-risk threats to the reef relate to climate change or water quality from land based run-off.

The report also states that initiatives that tackle climate change at all levels and addressing water quality at a regional level are the most urgent. That is referred to by Professor Chubb. It is a scientifically robust assessment of 1,400 references which have undergone peer review. The reef's outlook is going from poor to very poor, even though the federal environment minister has seen that report, and it is pretty scary. You cannot read those reports and not feel really scared about the future of the Great Barrier Reef. The federal environment minister says, 'We have the best managed reef ecosystem in the world.' She says that she accepts the science, but she defends taking no meaningful action.

Of course, in Queensland the LNP members are always totally confusing. As the minister for youth justice, I have spoken at great length about how one minute the LNP members are saying one thing and then another and then they disagree with each other. The member for Broadwater raised the two major imperatives that we have to deal with, said that the minister outlined both of them and that she is right and that one is the need to act on climate change and the second is to improve water quality. That sounded good, but then the member for Broadwater is going to move an amendment that would see the legislation watered down so that it would be ineffective. It was in regard to scientific evidence about fertilisers and other chemicals being used by farmers in the catchment. The member for Broadwater's amendment would exclude a significant catchment, the Burnett-Mary catchment, from regulation. Then we have these other LNP members who do not seem to agree with him. They have not sorted themselves out. They must not have got that little list that they get from their people about what they all have to say and then they make the same points all over again. Obviously, there was not one for this bill.

Yesterday, the member for Bundaberg said, 'Our farmers are calling for a delay in the implementation of the laws until the science they are based on is confirmed to be right.' How much science do we need? If 99 engineers tell you that a bridge is about to collapse and one says, 'No, go ahead. It is fine,' do you drive your car on to that bridge believing that one person? No, you do not. You listen to the majority. The facts are irrefutable. We have to do something about this issue.

We know that, as farmers have become more aware of the issues, they have improved their fertiliser application practices and record keeping and have become compliant with legislation. I acknowledge the great work that many farmers have done. I also acknowledge the hard work and advocacy of the member for Mackay. When that member was speaking in this debate she acknowledged that she lobbied the environment minister and the minister has agreed that there will be no further changes to the minimum standards for five years. Those standards were set and agreed to by the industry. The member for Mackay listens to people and talks to people. She knows that we have a responsibility to look at the big picture and that sometimes we have to make really difficult decisions. This issue is absolutely critical. If we do not go ahead with this legislation, we are selling the Barrier Reef down the river and we are not upholding our responsibility to the people of Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (4.32 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I have read through some of the technical points in relation to this bill. Not surprisingly, a lot of alarm bells went off. I see that this bill regulates nutrient management plans and other incentive programs that were funded by the federal government. Those programs will no longer be supported by the federal government, as they will be regulated practices. That is cost shifting compliance onto the farmers, who mostly cannot afford it.

This legislation makes no allowances for the impact of natural disasters and weather events. Anyone who knows anything about land would realise how big a problem natural disasters and weather events are. I also see in the bill that 33.7 million hectares in Great Barrier Reef catchments are all blanketed with one-size-fits-all legislation. I heard the member for Gregory say that, in regard to his electorate, a farmer up to 900 kilometres inland from the Great Barrier Reef could be affected just as much as a farmer who is farming inland from the mouth. This is exactly what happened with the tree-clearing legislation. Queensland is far too big for one set of laws. The government cannot apply this blunt instrument of legislation. It is clumsy and irresponsible.

The Australian and Queensland governments are jointly investing roughly \$200 million a year into the reef's health. The Australian government has announced another \$500 million boost for reef protection. That works out to \$1.28 billion that has been committed over five years to the 2050 reef action plan. Unquestionably, the reef is a big concern for everyone. I do not think that any member in this House has a mortgage on feeling for the reef and wanting the reef to be there in the future. It reeks of hypocrisy that we have environmental challenges throughout the state—prickly acacia, feral pigs, feral cats, noxious woody weeds—that get a measly little bit of money spent on them, yet that sort of money goes on the reef. It is hard to see how that approach is commensurate with a holistic focus on environment. It just reeks of politics being applied to an issue.

There are reports that demonstrate that over 90 per cent of the sediment that is supposed to be causing all of the problems for the reef is falling well short of the reef. Regardless of the source of that sediment, the farmers are going to be the ones who will pay. I am also aware of some interesting facts about the level of sediment coming out of national parks.

This issue is about science. People are hiding behind the science and saying that it should not be questioned because 90 per cent of the scientists are saying it. We really cannot go past the fact that Peter Ridd, who has dedicated his life to science, would walk away from a career into oblivion. He has nothing to gain from this. He is not saying that there is no problem, he is just saying, 'You need to question this stuff. This stuff has to be looked at.' What a remarkable thing for someone to do. We have to take notice of that person and ask, 'Why would someone who is so qualified step outside his career into oblivion just to challenge that?' We should be objective and challenge the science. It is not sufficient to say that the science says it. Let us unpack the science and look at it. We need to ground truth it.

One thing I like to pride myself on is talking to people on the ground. I do not live near the reef. I have probably been to the reef as many times as other members in this chamber have. I have been there many times snorkelling and fishing, but I talk to a lot of people who go out to the reef. I find that they are trying to be objective when they say, 'Rob, there are parts of the reef that we have seen go down and sometimes it is from cyclones—who knows—but there are a lot of places that are blossoming and where the reef is expanding.' I get a lot of mixed views from the people I talk to about the reef. When I talk to people who are on the ground, the issue is not as cut and dried as we are led to believe. This legislation is being rammed through and it will have such a big impact on Queensland industry, yet we are not supposed to question it. Anyone who questions the science is ostracised. That is the whole point of having an argument. If the members opposite bring up these facts, they need to have some answers.

In relation to the vegetation management legislation, there was so much rubbish being dished up in this House about the SLATS reports. One of the reports that was damning of the clearing that was taking place remarked that Boulia shire was a place of concern. Anyone who knows the Boulia shire would see the humour in that remark. You could burn a tank of diesel going between two trees in Boulia, but that shire was identified by the science as being a reason for the vegetation management laws. We saw in those SLATS reports that there was no regard given to the encroachment of vegetation.

The other week I was up in the cape where carbon credits are being sold. Ironically, the cold burns are resulting in thickening scrub, meaning more erosion and less groundcover. Anyone with the slightest bit of common sense or scientific knowledge would know that that is going to create more

run-off into the reef. We are also not building any dams, which would seem to be the best sediment traps out there. We cannot build those. They seem to be an affront to these environmental people. This issue is embroiled in politics and needs to be debated properly in this House.


I spent a number of years living in Townsville. I spent time with a lot of people who worked in the industry and who also expressed a lot of concerns. There is an industry building around this science. I am not casting aspersions on all reef scientists. I am sure that most of them have a lot of integrity but, in this day and age, it is not much of a stretch of your imagination to think that, if a scientist is getting funding from reporting, 'There are problems and we need to have a better look at this,' there would be some influence and they would create alarmism. That alarmism has not been very good for our tourism industry. Living out in Mount Isa, all I hear about the reef is that it is bad and that it is dying. That is all I hear on the TV.

If there is a problem, let us have a look at it. It does not help tourism numbers on the reef, which are down. It would be a very sad reflection on this parliament if we did have some scrutiny on this science and it said it is not as bad as we think it is. There has been so much talk about this, it has been highly politicised, which must be damaging to the tourism industry. Living in Mount Isa all I hear is that the reef is dying. Presumably those overseas would be thinking it is dying and therefore why would they visit it. That correlates with the decline in numbers of tourists in the north. That needs to be a consideration.

Southern Gulf NRM, a natural resource management group in my electorate, does a terrific job. They cover a vast area with a variety of bioregions within it. There are seven people on the staff. About 40 people work in NQ Dry Tropics. I have asked why the disparity, as they have a much smaller footprint and it would presumably be a lot less technical area to deal with. They have told me, 'It is at the reef. Mate, you get funding if you mention the reef.' I hear that time and time again up north. We do need to study the reef. There needs to be reef science. That needs to be questioned as well, without name calling, being called a Neanderthal and told you do not know anything about it. I do. I spend time up there. I spend time with people on the ground. We are entitled to a view and I think there is a lot of validity in it.

Farmers have their hands tied behind their back. They are up against subsidised world markets. What better example than the sugar industry with the heavily subsidised Indian sugar killing them at the moment. In the Burdekin the majority of farmers are operating below the cost of production. They are struggling as it is. It is a \$4 billion industry. We are only talking about sugar cane. Many more industries will be hurt by this legislation. It is assumed these producers will keep providing. These industries will not keep providing to the people of this state. This is not just an issue for the north, it is an issue for the state. You cannot keep doing this to farmers and industry. They will not keep delivering. We will wake up in 10 years with no way to pay these bills. We need these industries. Maybe some of them do have to curb their practices. I am not saying they are all good producers; but this is not the way to go about it.

In the next parliament the KAP will be demanding a repeal of these laws in 100 days. They are no good and they do not belong here. We also call for an audit in the federal parliament of the reef science. I think it is important for people to have some clarity around this and see where all this money is going. I think there is a very genuine need. I think that it is a legitimate call that needs support in the federal parliament. We want to see validity around this science. This is bad legislation to try to fix this supposed problem.

 **Mr HUNT** (Nicklin—LNP) (4.42 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Here we are in the Palaszczuk Labor government's safe space called Brisbane, their safe space here in the inner city where they can pretend to care about regional Queensland, lip-service that regional Queenslanders see right through and they know it. They know it because they did not have the courage to debate this bill where it mattered most: in the regions. It was a perfect opportunity in Townsville last sitting week to not only take parliament to the regions, but also debate issues that the people in these regions care about. Those opposite are farmer phobic. We had to wait until we got back to their safe space, away from the farmers, away from the miners and away from regional Queenslanders, to be among their inner-city Greens voting pals who nod in furious agreement with them about destroying farming industries while supergluing themselves to the nearest inner-city bridge.

Labor do not want to listen to hardworking farmers who provide food for our tables. They would rather listen to activists who break into farms and terrorise families. The LNP is proud to fight for fairness, to fight for agricultural industries and workers and to fight for regional Queensland. This is

about fairness. I think the minister described this legislation as a thriving balance. This legislation is not balanced. When you have farmers protesting and angry you do not have the balance right. The amendments proposed by the member for Broadwater and shadow environment minister help strike that balance, as he outlined in his contribution. We all love the Great Barrier Reef and, yes, it needs protection and, yes, we can all do better, but once again Labor jumps the shark to please their inner-city Greens friends for their preferences at the expense of our agricultural industries.

Let us put to bed a few myths. The LNP has a proud history of protection of the Great Barrier Reef. The LNP government introduced the toughest laws ever to protect the Great Barrier Reef—

Government members interjected.

Mr HUNT: They do not want to hear about it—increasing fines for serious environmental harm to the reef to over \$3.5 million or five years in jail.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Weir): Member for Nicklin, hold on. There is too much noise in the House. I will particularly single out the member for Logan. You can stop the cross chamber chatter.

Mr HUNT: Labor voted against those laws. We recall also that the LNP when in government immediately acted to cut Labor's plan to dump 38 million tonnes of dredge spoil in the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park by 90 per cent and developed a better plan to dispose of dredge material on land. Also let us remind the House that the LNP, when in government, invested \$35 million each year to improve water quality, including support for graziers and canegrowers to develop best farm management programs and adopt reef-friendly practices.

We also know the LNP undertook a strategic assessment of the Great Barrier Reef coastal zone, the largest ever strategic assessment undertaken for a natural system. It was the LNP that developed the *Reef 2050 long-term sustainability plan* for the protection and management of the reef for the next 35 years. The LNP also established the Gladstone Healthy Harbour Partnership and invested \$4 million towards the partnership. Under the Queensland Ports Strategy we restricted port development to major long established points of Abbot Point, Gladstone, Hay Point, Mackay and Townsville as recommended by UNESCO.

We also know the LNP invested \$9 million to implement a buyout of the east coast net fishery that will provide conservation benefits and improve the profitability of the fishery. We also invested \$1 million to help control excessive numbers of the crown-of-thorns starfish. It is a proud history indeed of environmental and reef protection. The LNP firmly supports the industry-led best management practice programs it funded when last in government.

There is no reason this Labor government, so keen to shore up its inner-city Greens preferences, cannot protect the reef and support regional agriculture and jobs. It does not have to be one or the other. A competent government would listen to all stakeholders and come up with a plan that protects both. Those opposite have the green blindfold on again, as they did with the vegetation management laws. They could listen to people like Mr Dale Holliss, the manager of Canegrowers Bundaberg. In his evidence to the committees he stated—

We are outside the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. The southernmost point of the reef is 100 kilometres north of us and is north of the Kolan, Burnett and Elliott catchments where we grow cane. Given the southerly direction of the east Australian current, it is physically impossible for any of our run-off to affect the reef. Including this region makes about as much sense as including the Brisbane, Noosa and Nerang catchments and would provide as much benefit to the reef. The Burnett and other southern catchments should be treated like any other river in Australia. There exists a plethora of current federal and state legislation that applies to those rivers. Additional Great Barrier Reef related regulations are not necessary nor justifiable.

Labor could also maybe listen to the concerns of Mr Mark Mammino, chair of Canegrowers Isis, who spoke of his concerns about going from no regulation to full-blown regulation overnight, commenting that it was akin to—


sitting in the starting blocks at a racetrack behind the gates for 10 years and not been part of regulations but now we have been told we have to cross the finish line at the same time as every other canefarmer or agriculture further up the coast that has been subject to regulations.

Once again this government ignores fairness to farmers. It demonstrates those opposite do not care about any jobs other than their own.

Despite these pleas, once again this government has not given an inch to the stakeholders' concerns. Also of note is this government's unwillingness to adequately deal with their green mates who superglue themselves to roads and invade farms by introducing decent penalties, but they are quick in wanting to send offending farmers to the wall with massive increases in fines.

I note that the bill consolidates a number of previous offences for contravening the requirements for undertaking an agricultural ERA in chapter 4A of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 into a single offence for failing to comply with an agricultural ERA standard. These offences were for the previous section 78 offence for over fertilisation, the section 84 offence for failure to keep certain records, the section 86 offence for failure to provide primary documentation and the section 85 offence for contravening a prescribed operating requirement. The maximum penalty for those offences was 100 penalty units. I note that the bill increases the penalties for an offence against the requirements for carrying out an agricultural ERA. The maximum penalty for an offence for contravening an agricultural ERA standard will be over \$200,000 for wilful noncompliance or otherwise around \$78,000. If only this government would show the same enthusiasm for penalties against people who terrorise our farmers by invading their businesses and family homes.

The Australian Banana Growers' Council has described the incoming laws as devastating, while Growcom has questioned farmers' ability to continue to absorb the costs of environmental regulation. Our farmers have been blindsided by these regulations and they deserve to be listened to. Unfortunately, we have become used to a Labor government that rams through laws without listening to the very people upon whom those laws will impact. The Labor government continues to treat regional Queenslanders like second-class citizens. The people in the regions and our hardworking farmers deserve better. However, we all know why. Over the past few weeks it has become clear who is actually in charge of this government. It is the Deputy Premier who is driving this green bus off a cliff and taking Queensland's agricultural industry with it.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (4.52 pm): I rise to support the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. My constituents care very much about the protection of the Great Barrier Reef and the protection of our environment, so, as the member for Miller, it is a great pleasure to support the bill of the Minister for Environment and Minister for Science. The Great Barrier Reef is iconic and it needs to be protected. While the reef contributes \$6 billion to our economy and 60,000 jobs rely on its health, the most important thing is its environmental integrity and the fact that it is one of the seven wonders of the modern world. We have a responsibility to do everything we can to protect it and to preserve it for future generations and for all the creatures that live within it.

Sadly, the reef is facing two major threats: climate change and water quality. The Palaszczuk Labor government is already taking steps to improve water quality through our proposed reef regulations. We know that some farmers are already doing the right thing through voluntary practices and we sincerely thank them for their efforts, but water quality improvements have not been made fast enough. Protecting the Great Barrier Reef is one of the Palaszczuk Labor government's main priorities.

I am proud to be part of a progressive and achieving government that is acting to save the Great Barrier Reef. The Great Barrier Reef is certainly under threat, despite the words of LNP members opposite, particularly the member for Callide, who ignore the facts so readily. The devastating impacts of climate change aside, we know that poor water quality as a result of polluted land based run-off is the next biggest threat to the health of the reef and it is one that any responsible government needs to tackle.

In 2016 the Great Barrier Reef Water Science Task Force recognised that dual action on climate change and water quality improvement will be critical for the long-term health of the reef. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority's outlook report for 2019 makes that clear. Climate change is escalating and it is the most significant threat to the outlook of the reef. It is certainly impacting the reef now. In 2016 and 2017, two consecutive years of extreme sea surface temperatures, mostly due to climate change, caused mass coral bleaching. The extent and severity of the coral bleaching was unprecedented, impacting two-thirds of the Great Barrier Reef and causing large numbers of coral deaths. Research published in April this year in the journal *Nature* found that coral reproduction has fallen 89 per cent as a result of the bleaching—I repeat, 89 per cent.

While coral cover fluctuates, the overall trend is that it has been declining across the reef since monitoring started in the mid-1980s. Some corals in northern and central regions of the reef survived the bleaching event and that provides some hope for the future. However, extreme weather events have also contributed to the current situation where coral cover is now in decline for all reef regions—northern, central and southern. This was confirmed recently by the Australian Institute of Marine Science in its *Annual summary report on coral reef condition for 2017/18*.

Recently, the International Panel on Climate Change released a special report warning that even under a 1.5 degrees warming scenario reefs around the world will continue to decline. The report states that countries' current commitments under the Paris agreement are not sufficient for limiting warming to 1.5 degrees Celsius relative to average annual temperatures between 1850 and 1900 and cannot be sufficient if action is not ramped up until after 2030.

I strongly encourage the Queensland LNP to listen to the science. Science is fundamental to good policy. This science supports the work of both the Palaszczuk Labor state government and the current federal government. If the Queensland LNP are against this science, they are also against the science that even their federal colleagues acknowledge and that underpins the joint *Reef 2050 water quality improvement plan*.

In contrast, the Palaszczuk Labor government understands the fundamental importance of science and is taking a lead in addressing climate change. We have bold targets to achieve that across many policy areas. I note our Powering Queensland Plan, which has a 50 per cent renewable energy target by 2030 and 335 large-scale renewable energy projects that have been funded with billions of dollars worth of investments in solar, wind and hydro projects, many of which have already been built. Currently between Kingaroy and Dalby, one of the largest wind farms in Australia is under construction at Coopers Gap. We are achieving our net zero emissions by 2050 target. We are achieving emissions reductions of at least 30 per cent below 2005 levels by 2030. Also, we should transition not just in terms of clean energy generation but also in our transport sector. We have shown leadership on the electric vehicle superhighway. It is the largest electric vehicle superhighway in one state in the world. We have been nation leading in that regard and we will continue to do so.

The LNP may want to play farmers off against other industries that rely on a healthy reef, but we are pursuing a solution that will work for both industries. We need action on both a global and a local scale to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and ensure the future of the Great Barrier Reef. In the meantime, it is more important than ever that other threats to the reef are reduced, particularly in the short term, including by improving reef water quality. Other research that substantiates the relationship between water quality and the ability to recover from coral bleaching was recently published in the journal *Nature: Ecology and Evolution*. Science shows that water quality is essential to boosting the resilience of the reef to be able to better withstand the impacts of climate change.

We ignore science at our peril. In modern life, most things that we rely on are dependent upon science. If we think of changes over the past 100 years in terms of vehicles, phones, trains, television, medicine, planes, the radios we listen to, the worldwide web, how we manufacture goods and move things across our oceans, and energy generation, they are all based on science. However, so many people are willing to ignore the science on one particular sectional area. I say to the people who pose those questions around and oppose science that if you have this one wrong you have a pretty big one wrong. In the science community, the overwhelming belief is very clear and it is that we need action. The clear thing is—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I can hear the deniers of climate action yelling across the chamber. I can hear their interjections. The longer the partisan divide on climate change continues the more inaction and damage will result. I say to those people that they should think about that.

Hopefully everyone in this chamber will live long lives and see a lot of change and future generations come along. We have to be very clear on what our role is on this fundamentally important issue. We have to end this partisan divide. Future generations depend on it. I say that from the heart and sincerely to everybody in this chamber.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bailey, adjourned.

MOTION

Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, No Confidence



Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (5.00 pm): I move—

That this House—

- (a) notes the Deputy Premier failed to disclose on the Members' Register of Interests the purchase of an investment property pursuant to section 69B of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 and the standing orders of this House;

- (b) notes the Crime and Corruption Commission's finding that the Deputy Premier did not declare any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest when participating in the Cabinet Budget Review Committee decisions concerning Cross River Rail and the Inner City South State Secondary College;
- (c) notes the Crime and Corruption Commission finding 'The statement of interest issue and conflicts of interest issue are matters for the parliament';
- (d) notes the Fitzgerald inquiry reported, 'The financial interests of any Parliamentarian or person in authority are of public significance. Such interests can result in conflicts between public duty and private interest ... The significance, power and influence of high public office requires that accountability mechanisms be effective';
- (e) resolves that the Deputy Premier's conduct has fallen short of the ethical standard expected by Queenslanders of any person holding high public office;
- (f) expresses no confidence in the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships; and
- (g) calls on the Premier to immediately sack the member for South Brisbane from cabinet.

This motion sets out the litany of errors, misjudgements and questionable behaviour by the Deputy Premier and Treasurer. The motion outlines issues that have been discussed quite widely over the last two months, starting at the estimates hearing and going through to today. Every day something else has been revealed about the Deputy Premier's behaviour and her integrity issues.

The Deputy Premier came in yesterday and offered an excuse for this type of behaviour occurring. Her excuse was that she is very, very busy with all the different roles she has, and particularly her political role. I am not too sure whether the Deputy Premier has realised that she is Deputy Premier and Treasurer and that she does get paid \$350,000 or thereabouts a year to carry out these duties in the way the Queensland public would expect.

It is interesting to look at what her busyness has led to. The Deputy Premier has been so busy that she forgot to declare the purchase of the property at Woolloongabba. I think it was at least five months after the purchase that she declared it. Her busyness caused that. Her busyness also caused her to change her story a number of times in terms of whether she knew about the purchase or she did not know about the purchase. 'I did not know about the purchase initially,' she said. Then she said, 'Hang on. My husband bought it, but it had nothing to do with me.' Then she said, 'Hang on. I am a co-director of the company that bought the property.' Then it was, 'Hang on. I was advised by text message a couple of days after it happened.'

Her busyness also caused her not to declare any real or perceived conflict of interest during the cabinet discussions and CBRC discussions about both Cross River Rail and the Inner City South State Secondary College. The Deputy Premier obviously has an issue with busyness. I suppose she would be very happy that some of that busyness has been relieved by the Premier taking responsibility for Cross River Rail away from her. I am not too sure what time that took up in the past, whether it was 10 per cent of her time or 20 per cent of her time. She will have a lot more time now to deal with issues around her memory and failing to fulfil her obligations.

She was not too busy on a Sunday afternoon to ring the CCC chair on her personal mobile phone, which she would have looked him up very quickly—I have his personal mobile number and I will ring the CCC chair on a Sunday afternoon to talk about the fact that I will cooperate fully with the CCC investigation.' It is funny that this busyness is selective with regard with her ability to do her job. It is selective busyness.


Mr Powell: See-through busyness.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the member for Glass House. We cannot discuss the issues around her omissions and failure to fulfil her obligations without discussing the role of the Premier in all of this. As has been discussed previously, the only reason legislation will be brought into this House to ensure that ministers fulfil their legal obligations and their moral obligations to this parliament is due to the weakness and inability of this Premier. This Premier lacks any authority whatsoever to bring her ministers into line. We have seen it time and time again. We saw it with the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. We are now seeing it clearer than ever with the Treasurer and Deputy Premier.

There is no reason this parliament should deal with this type of legislation. It is unnecessary when we look at the regulations, the protocols, the principles of standing orders—

Mr Nicholls: Conventions.

Mr MANDER: The conventions. I take the interjection from the member for Clayfield. The only reason legislation is coming in to moderate and regulate the behaviour of ministers of this government is the weakness of Annastacia Palaszczuk as Premier.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (5.05 pm): I rise to oppose this motion. Of all the lamentable and incomprehensible motions that those opposite have moved in this House this surely is the most bizarre. Of all the issues the LNP might like to prosecute—of all the parties and all the issues—what do they land on? They land on ethical standards and integrity. Really and truly, being lectured on ethical standards by the LNP is like being lectured on parliamentary convention by Boris Johnson.

This is the mob that took the brown paper bag out of the tuckshop and into the executive building. This is the mob whose earliest actions in government included lifting the threshold at which political donations had to be declared from \$1,000 to \$12,500 and who fought every step of the way, including to the High Court, to keep secret \$100,000 in undisclosed contributions.

Who can forget the Al Capone years of the Newman LNP government when the PCCC was sacked in the middle of the night and Campbell Newman's handpicked head of the Ethics Committee was dumped and promptly joined the Palmer United Party. There was the absolute scandal surrounding the appointment of Campbell Newman's mate as the director-general of the Department of Transport and Main Roads without process at all. I remember Campbell Newman on the radio saying, 'We've been processed to death.' The cost to the taxpayer was hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The member for Mudgeeraba was forced to relinquish her ministerial position because of accusations of nepotism. We had the absolute debacle surrounding Dr Chris Davis—precisely because he had his own ethical standards. The man was hounded out of this parliament by the LNP and rejected by Campbell Newman's government for a position for which he was the only suitable candidate. That was overturned by the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal. The cost to the taxpayer was \$1.5 million. This is the ethical and moral universe of the LNP. The LNP are to ethical standards what Barnaby Joyce is to the sanctity of marriage—far better at talking about it than sticking to its principles.

We will be hearing from the member for Kawana shortly. That will be a good one. Of all people, the member for Kawana will be lecturing others on ethical standards. I will say this for the member for Kawana, at least he has no shame. There was one person in Queensland who was happy when he became the attorney-general of Queensland. How could we forget Denver Beanland. How could you forget him. He was a proud member of the LNP who defied a no confidence vote of this House before breaking constitutional convention and refusing to resign. He was extremely happy when the member for Kawana became attorney-general because he was no longer the worst attorney-general in the history of Queensland. Even Denver Beanland had higher ethical standards than the member for Kawana because Denver Beanland never broke the confidence of the president of the Court of Appeal so those issues could be published in the newspaper. Parliamentary democracy is utterly dependent upon its processes. The democratic ideal—

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Sorry to interrupt, Minister. Member for Southern Downs, you are already under a warning. I have made myself clear: no interjections. You can leave the chamber for one hour. That goes for the members for Chatsworth, Gregory, Southport and Stretton.

Whereupon the honourable member for Southern Downs withdrew from the chamber at 5.09 pm.

Mr DICK: The democratic ideal rests upon the concepts of natural justice and procedural fairness to ensure that matters pertaining to personal misconduct, including allegations of impropriety, are considered carefully and deliberately by disinterested and independent arbiters—and in the case of Queensland that is the Crime and Corruption Commission.

Those members opposite yet again have shown their disdain for the capacity and the professionalism of the CCC, a body which owes its existence to the endemic corruption of earlier LNP administrations in this state. As was made crystal clear in question time today, it is impossible for the LNP to occupy the moral high ground while they continue to drag the standard of their own conduct further and further into the fetid swamp of unsubstantiated innuendo, which is exactly what we heard in the parliament this morning.

It is extraordinary, considering how low they have set the bar of expectations, the way the LNP continue to come up with new ways to disappoint. This motion was moved by the member for Everton—say no more. That is further evidence of the hypocrisy and intellectual decay at the heart of the Queensland LNP. It is a waste of the parliament's time, an absolute waste of the parliament's time. I support the Premier and the Deputy Premier and all members of this state parliamentary Labor Party in opposing this motion.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: All members are reminded that they must put their comments through the chair and not directly address other members in the chamber.

Mr JANETZKI (Toowoomba South—LNP) (5.11 pm): This is a serious motion, and the opposition does not move it lightly. Extraordinary times call for extraordinary measures. It is an appropriate motion to move which should end this evening with the Premier sacking the Deputy Premier.

In looking through the motion here tonight, there is one phrase that keeps coming to me. Whether it be all the different issues listed in this motion or whether it be the last 10 weeks or whether it be the Deputy Premier's career, there is one phrase that keeps coming to me: lack of judgement. Lack of judgement has plagued the Deputy Premier for the last couple of months and through her earlier career.

Mr Mander: That's being complimentary.

Mr JANETZKI: I take the interjection from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. It is complimentary. Whether it be the motion that was moved this afternoon which gave the opposition an hour's free kick to belt the Labor Party about their asset sales over the last 20 years—\$20 billion worth of asset sales; whether it be the Deputy Premier personally receipting a \$5,000 donation from that upstanding citizen from New South Wales Eddie Obeid—

Ms TRAD: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Those comments are offensive. They are untrue and I ask that the member withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier has asked you to withdraw those comments. Will you withdraw them, member?

Mr JANETZKI: I withdraw, Mr Speaker—or whether it be the Deputy Premier as a minister misusing her call-in powers. We often forget that when the Deputy Premier moved to Treasury she took the Cross River Rail project with her. She did not trust the member for Woodridge with the project. She did not want the member for Woodridge taking the praise, taking the plaudits for the project. She took the project with her to Treasury. I wonder whether that little lapse of judgement would be the cause of some regret for the Deputy Premier today.

We also know the lack of judgement around the Queensland economy—higher debt, credit outlook deteriorating, near the bottom when it comes to the State of the States—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, your comments will come through the chair.

Mr JANETZKI:—no plan for the debt—

Mr Mander: Higher unemployment.


Mr JANETZKI: Higher unemployment. There is lack of judgement time and time again from the Deputy Premier in her role as the chief economist for this state.

I want to turn briefly to the CCC findings. There are two themes to these findings. The first one relates to good governance. The findings from the CCC said there should be a standing agenda item for cabinet meetings for the consideration of conflicts. The second issue was, if there is a conflict, there should be a conflict management plan.

It is shocking that the biggest employer in this state, the biggest spender of other people's money, would not consider conflicts in every single meeting. This is the executive arm of government. If they were an ASX company—forget that. If they were a small business or a small to medium enterprise all the way through to the big end of town, which is much loathed by that side of the House, they would consider conflicts as par for the course. Then it dawned on me. There are probably not many members on that side of the House who have worked in a small business, in a small to medium enterprise let alone in the big end of town. I wonder how many of them have even done the AICD course. That is the first thing you learn. If they have done the AICD course and forgotten anything they learnt, that is even worse.

In terms of the criminal offences that the CCC has recommended, have we really got to the stage where it must be a criminal offence to complete your register of interests? Is it really that bad in this state that the Treasurer cannot comply? It reminds me of the first thing I recall in the ASX corporate governance guidelines—and it would do the cabinet well to read them: personal integrity cannot be regulated. That is what corporate governance, good governance, in this country is about: personal integrity cannot be regulated.

It was timely that Mr Fitzgerald was at Parliament House today. I was pleased to attend the event with the Leader of the Opposition because it is right that we remember 30 years ago. I think the Premier, as is often the way, does not understand the irony of her words sometimes. The Premier spoke and she finished by saying, 'The price of liberty is eternal vigilance,' and 'The spirit of Fitzgerald watches over us.' If the spirit of Fitzgerald were in the House tonight, he would demand transparency and accountability. If the spirit of Fitzgerald were in the House tonight, he would demand action. If the spirit of Fitzgerald were well and truly in this House tonight, he would demand that the Premier sack the Deputy Premier immediately.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (5.16 pm): I rise to oppose this motion. I oppose this motion for a number of very good reasons. If the member who just spoke, the shadow Attorney-General, who has a law degree I expect—

Ms Trad: Apparently.

Ms GRACE: Apparently—cannot not decipher and understand the CCC's determinations, then I suggest he goes back to university. He talks about lack of judgement as if with lack of judgement you have to be jailed or ostracised or whatever. If we applied that to those opposite, there would not be one member over there. The member for Warrego had a remarkable lack of judgement when she was appointed to this House. Having been admonished by the Speaker at the time, she still sits there behind the opposition leader as a shadow minister. If you want to apply integrity and ethics to parliament then I suggest you look in your own backyard.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, you will put your comments through the chair.

Ms GRACE: I suggest that those opposite look in their own backyard. I suggest that the Leader of the Opposition turn around and have a look in her own backyard.

I will not support a motion that asks for no confidence in the Deputy Premier or for the Deputy Premier to be sacked because of the lynch mob mentality of those opposite. When it comes to delivering for Queensland in education alone, this Deputy Premier, this Treasurer, has delivered record funding for education for every child in this state. She is putting on an extra 1,000 teachers. We have a record \$13.8 billion budget. We have a record \$1.58 billion infrastructure spend. In addition to that, we have \$100 million for the non-government sector. We have an infrastructure spend that has never been seen before in this state. They expect this side of the House to support a no confidence motion. It is utter rubbish. We will not be supporting the lynch mob mentality of those opposite.

If we go to the findings of the CCC, which are always selectively quoted by those opposite—I will quote what it says verbatim.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms GRACE: You can say it one way; I will say it another way. The CCC's determination stated—

... no evidence or information was identified that supported a reasonable suspicion of corrupt conduct ... The CCC's assessment did not identify evidence or information suggesting a criminal offence had been committed.

It goes even further.

Mr Mander: So why the recommendations?

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, you have had a go.

Ms GRACE: I will take that interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for one reason only: because the recommendations go to intent. If the shadow Attorney-General or the Leader of the Opposition do not understand, the recommendations clearly deal with intent. The Deputy Premier has accepted that she made a mistake, but there was no intent and there have been no findings after a thorough assessment. To come in here and move a no-confidence motion demanding that somebody be sacked is absolutely disgraceful and does nothing for the processes in this state or the respect for the CCC.

We know they have no respect, because when they were in government I never witnessed in all my years of being involved in politics a more arrogant, drunk-on-power government. It only lasted for three years and the people of Queensland threw them out. The interesting thing is that they are displaying exactly the same body language as they did back then. They will come back in—

Mr Stevens interjected.


Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mermaid Beach!

Ms GRACE:—and they will be exactly as they were. The CCC also found that no evidence was identified during its assessment—and they looked at every document available to it—to raise a reasonable suspicion—the shadow Attorney-General should understand that terminology—that the non-disclosure of the conflict of interest was for any dishonest or corrupt reason; furthermore, no evidence of corruption or dishonesty was found. It is cut and dried. To sack somebody and move a no-confidence motion based on that finding is nothing but arrogant and out of touch.

Mr Krause interjected.

Ms GRACE: This is nothing but a lynch mob mentality from an opposition that is not fit to govern, not fit to respect the institutions of this state and not fit to ever occupy this side of the House.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Scenic Rim, you will use members' correct titles. You are warned under the standing orders.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (5.21 pm): Well, tonight we are hearing Labor ministers defend the indefensible. It is incredible! This Labor government clearly is not sorry. They are not sorry for the foolish, abhorrent behaviour of the Deputy Premier. In fact, they are almost applauding the Deputy Premier. Is it any wonder there is a conga line of Labor ministers and backbenchers lining up to support the Deputy Premier, whose outrageous behaviour has been condemned by everybody outside of this place. Is it any wonder they are lining up to support this Deputy Premier when she is the most powerful politician on those benches. She controls the purse strings of government. She controls their favourite projects. She controls what projects they will see. They know that if they go against her they will lose funding for their favourite projects, so is it any wonder we have seen a defence of the indefensible from Labor ministers who have learned nothing.

This is a disgrace! What we have seen is foolishness at best. It is an outrageous abuse of the Ministerial Code of Conduct and the conventions of parliament. It is an outrageous abuse of the trust of Queenslanders when the Deputy Premier, who presided over the biggest infrastructure project in Queensland, did not declare that she and her husband bought a property that stood to benefit from the uplift in that region. There was an educational project, so what a surprise that the education minister has been on her feet defending the Deputy Premier, who has just spent money in her portfolio and in the Deputy Premier's electorate. We see a project that is at the heart of another conflict of interest issue with the Deputy Premier, who is laughing. She thinks it is funny. The integrity crisis has mired this Labor government, and they think it is funny.

Queenslanders do not think it is funny. I have had people from across the political spectrum come up to me, as I am sure other members of the parliament have. I would hazard a guess that Labor members who are going to back up behind the Deputy Premier tonight have also heard how absolutely appalled people are. Even the CFMMEU marched on parliament to call for the Deputy Premier to be sacked. When the CFMMEU 'gets' that there is rot at the top of this government and they march on this parliament to call for the Deputy Premier to be sacked—

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for McConnel!

Ms SIMPSON:—I think that speaks for itself. This is an integrity crisis. It is not going to be washed away by all the ministers who want to get their favourite projects funded.

Ms Grace interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will cease her interjections.


Ms SIMPSON: Clearly, this government does not understand that they do have the ability to act, but the Premier is too weak. The real power in this government sits with the Deputy Premier, and she certainly has the backbench and Labor ministers all lined up to back her. There has been no appropriate penalty brought to bear. What a disgrace to think that this government is still defending her. It is going to stand up here tonight, get in behind her and vote to support her when she should go. She should be sacked! That is the only reasonable standard that Queenslanders expect. She should have resigned, but there is no shame. She has not learned, and neither have the ministers who have backed up behind her to give her their support.

I note that the Deputy Premier took umbrage when I linked her to the time Labor premier Anna Bligh sold state assets such as Queensland Rail. I said she was a staffer. I understand she said she did not work for Anna Bligh at the time of the Labor government's asset sales. If that is the case, I apologise. What I will say is that it is time this government and this Labor Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk grew a backbone and really looked after Queenslanders. Sack the Deputy Premier! Show

them who is in charge! The Premier should be in charge of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, but clearly while this Deputy Premier is in charge of the treasury benches, the money and the purse strings, they are all going to be weak little pets behind the scenes and they are not going to push her. They are going to put their heads down and blindly go ahead.

The integrity crisis will not go away. We have never seen such a situation as the arrogance of this Deputy Premier, who would buy a house in an area standing to benefit from the biggest infrastructure project this state has seen, yet there has been no apology from this government. It is a shame this government has no shame. Queenslanders deserve better!

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Theodore, I have asked members to use correct titles. You did not. You are warned under the standing orders. I was not going to interrupt the member for Maroochydore.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (5.26 pm): I rise to speak against this motion and in support of the Deputy Premier, because without the Deputy Premier and Treasurer Queensland would not have a record \$19.2 billion investment in our hospitals this financial year. As you know, Labor governments believe in delivering jobs for Queenslanders, education for Queensland kids and free universal health care for everyone, no matter where they live—

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Everton, this is the last time I will give you any guidance.

Dr MILES:—and nobody personifies those priorities and values more than the Deputy Premier. As Deputy Premier and Treasurer, she is delivering those things for Queensland. Our record Health budget means our hospitals are treating more people than ever before. As more and more people put their faith in our fantastic public hospital system, that demand means we need more doctors, nurses, specialists, allied health workers and support staff.

The Palaszczuk government, with the leadership of this Deputy Premier and Treasurer, has rebuilt the public health system and its workforce after it was decimated by the LNP. Thanks to the Deputy Premier's leadership we are improving health services with an extra 400 nurse navigators and 100 additional midwives. We are adding 200 more paramedics. The Treasurer's budget is slashing specialist outpatient wait times via the Specialist Outpatient Strategy and she is giving a \$17.5 million boost to aeromedical services, providing vital emergency transport for sick and injured people in Queensland, especially those in rural and remote areas.

The Deputy Premier understands that in many of our regional towns the local health service is a cornerstone. It employs local people in permanent roles to take care of their community, and when we upgrade those services it creates more local jobs in construction. Across Queensland we have 58 projects under construction, creating more than 770 full-time jobs each year. These projects are providing major health infrastructure in metropolitan, regional, rural and remote communities across the state.

These projects are at Ipswich, Logan, Caboolture, Caloundra, Roma, Blackall, Kingaroy, Maryborough, Sarina, Hervey Bay, Bundaberg, Gladstone, Rockhampton, Townsville, Mareeba, Cairns, Atherton and on the islands of the Torres Strait. The budget delivered by this Deputy Premier is creating almost 3,000 jobs across these growth areas. She is a Deputy Premier who is delivering for the health of Queenslanders, for the wellbeing of Queenslanders and for the livelihood of Queenslanders. I and everyone in this House should have absolute confidence in her.

Those we cannot have confidence in are those opposite—those opposite who, when they had their chance, sacked 4,400 health staff including 1,800 nurses and midwives, those opposite who have not made a single significant proposal for health care in this state, those opposite who have made no commitments to new hospitals or more staff or services. They have the hide to criticise the Deputy Premier who has consistently delivered those things for Queensland. It is those opposite who Queenslanders expressed no confidence in at the last election and the one before that and they will express no confidence in them again next year.

Queenslanders cannot have confidence in an LNP that still refuses to declare \$100,000 of secret donations. They cannot have confidence in a party which cannot remember who their donors are. They cannot have confidence in a party which will not tell Queenslanders who is funding their election campaigns. They will stop at nothing to get their dodgy donations in.

Mr Millar interjected.

Dr MILES: Queenslanders know who the dodgy ones are and it is not the Deputy Premier. It is every single one of those opposite—every single one who has spoken in favour of this motion, every single one who will vote for this motion.


Mr Millar interjected.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Gregory, it is you again. You are already under a warning. You have been constantly interjecting. You can leave the chamber for one hour.

Whereupon the honourable member for Gregory withdrew from the chamber at 5.31 pm.

Mr SPEAKER: I have made it very clear that members under warnings will not interject at all. That should be enough of a warning for members to not interject in the first place.

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (5.32 pm): Yes, member for McConnel, the CCC allegedly did peruse all supplied pages and recommended a new criminal charge be created. From one real estate principal to another—the queen of value capture—I am available whenever you want to talk real estate. Whenever you want to talk, come and call me.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Chatsworth will direct his comments through the chair.

Mr MINNIKIN: Parliament is about honourable members' integrity but just as importantly the perception of integrity. The member for South Brisbane would be wise to heed the advice of another British prime minister, Winston Churchill, when he stated, 'With integrity, nothing else counts. Without integrity, nothing else counts.' The bottom line is that this goes to the very heart and core of not what we think about the member for South Brisbane personally; what it comes down to is her integrity. This is indeed a question of value. It is indeed a motion about character or the perception of a lack thereof.

The Deputy Premier is indeed the little leftie gift that keeps on giving. We saw the pathetic stunt pulled earlier this afternoon by the democratic socialists opposite to try to divert attention away from this government's integrity crisis, but try as hard as she might the little red socialist engine from Peel Street just cannot seem to get a break lately.

Mr SPEAKER: They are characterisations. Correct titles will be used. I will limit that, member for Chatsworth. You will withdraw those comments.

Mr MINNIKIN: I withdraw. When we were on the other side of the chamber, we thought the most valuable player award for those on this side of the chamber used to go to the member for Bundamba. I am sorry to say that, member for Bundamba, because she is not in the chamber. The member for Bundamba was our MVP for a long, long time because of her outstanding contributions, but I am delighted to announce to the House—

Ms GRACE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is a code in here that we do not say when someone is not present in the chamber and he did indicate that.

Mr SPEAKER: I think you are misunderstanding that. He indicated that the member is not in the chamber, but he has not made a point of their absence as being the point of the comment being made. There is no point of order.

Mr MINNIKIN: I am delighted to announce to the House that this mantle is now well and truly worn by the Deputy Premier. Although Whistler is attractive, please do not go anywhere. We know the accommodation in Whistler is not all that luxurious, but please we would love you to stay for—

Mr SPEAKER: Member, that is the second time I have had to warn you. Given that you are warned under the standing orders, I ask you to tread very carefully.

Mr MINNIKIN: At the end of the day, we know that the poll that has been run by one of the major commercial TV stations was not pretty. There is another way to engage in statistics and that is actually to come and visit real people, so I invite the member for South Brisbane to come down for a drink with me to the Carina Leagues Club and engage in the real pub test about the perceived lack of integrity. The comments that she would hear would be very interesting.


The member for South Brisbane claims her integrity scandal is just simply a grubby LNP smear campaign, but we absolutely disagree. The member for South Brisbane has never fully told the House if she signed off on donations from Mr Eddie Obeid—a bit of a void still there. The member for South Brisbane claims to have lived in South Brisbane all of her life but was enrolled to vote in Narangba for

six months in 1999. That was around the time of the Shepherdson inquiry and just before she moved to New South Wales—a bit of a void still there. She called on the CCC to investigate donations to the LNP but refused to include the union donations to the investigation because there is no way a Labor government does favours for union donations—more than a void there.

We all know she has an investment property—and still has it actually—that she did not declare that has increased probably in value because of decisions she made as Treasurer as part of cabinet with Cross River Rail and the Inner City South State Secondary College. That is a big, big void there—a huge void waiting to be fully and fulsomely answered. She has also failed on many other counts. We have got the lack of declaration of her husband's law firm on the panel for CS Energy and the free accommodation in Whistler with the Queensland government account lead for PwC.

We have an absolute litany of past behaviour by the Deputy Premier in relation to the way she treated the former premier, Campbell Newman. There were many, many tweets which also go to the heart of her particular integrity in relation to the very web of deceit and lack of integrity that she has actually been showing to this august House for many, many months. She needs to go.

(Time expired)

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (5.37 pm): The next beer that the member for Chatsworth has in the Carina club will be his first beer because I know his family members and the blokes—

Mr MINNIKIN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. As a regular drinker, I take umbrage at that and I ask that it be withdrawn. I take personal offence.

Mr SPEAKER: The member has taken personal offence. Will you withdraw?

Mr BROWN: I withdraw. I rise to speak against this motion. This is a desperate motion by a desperate opposition to flog a dead horse of an issue. They have come in here playing gutter politics with their question time and their motion, trying to squeeze the last bit of milk out of this issue. We on this side are focused on the real issues that are affecting Queenslanders—which are jobs, health and education. We are making sure that we get on with job security and delivering for the people of Queensland while the opposition come in here and play gutter politics. If it were not for the opposition, we would not have a Fitzgerald report. If it were not for the opposition, we would not have a CCC. If it were not for the opposition, we would not have 26 years of a Labor government.

They have some hide to come in here and quote Fitzgerald 30 years later because they were the cause of Fitzgerald. I repeat: 30 years. Members of the public in Queensland have not forgotten that. They have not forgotten the corruption and the unethical behaviour of those opposite.

Ms Trad: Now they have the 'diamond club' membership.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier; they have the 'diamond club'. I will turn to donations now, because we do not have to go back 30 years; we only have to go back to the last term of parliament. Let us turn to Scott Driscoll. I am not going to talk about him specifically but I am going to talk about the LNP. They had the chance in 2017—\$50,000, the proceeds of crime from a fraudster—when they had the opportunity to give back those donations from a fake association, but what did they do? They kept the money; they kept the money from small businesses, mum-and-dad businesses, retail businesses that they had the chance to give back. They say they are the party for small business, but when it came time for an election they said, 'We have to keep that \$50,000.' That is their principles.

Let us have a look at some of the ministers who served during that time in that level of government. Let us look at the member for Mudgeeraba. There was the nepotism and the undeclared lobbyist meetings. Then when the member for Mudgeeraba was sacked you went into hiding. You cancelled your mobile phone. They could not ring you.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Capalaba, you will direct your comments through the chair.

Mr BROWN: That brings me to Michael Caltabiano. He was suspended—\$130,000 of taxpayers' money while he was suspended only to have the axe fall down on him. There was Bruce Flegg; who could forget him? Then we had Gibbo, the police minister, driving his car while suspended. He was gone. Nothing typifies the opposition more than the former member for Stafford Chris Davis. He was so disgusted with the level of integrity of those opposite he had to leave. He could not stand those opposite. He left parliament. Now we have the current member for Stafford, an honourable member, a man of integrity. That just typifies it. Who could forget the former member for Callide Jeff Seeney and Karreman, a big LNP donor? They said, 'We just have to come back in here and change the legislation

to make sure they are not prosecuted.' Who could forget the member for Kawana overruling his department and bringing in Beyond Billabong? Then one week later, surprise, surprise, there is \$5,500 in the coffers of the LNP. We will not forget that one.


This is a ridiculous motion moved by a desperate opposition in order to continue to play politics.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana.

Mr BROWN: We know that the media are not taking any interest in this. They are trying to wring the last little issue out of this.

On this side we hold our heads high with regard to integrity. We are the government of Goss; we are the government that reformed this state for the better. I fully support the Deputy Premier, I fully support the Premier and I fully support every government member on this side because we are the party of integrity. We are the ones who cleaned up their mess 30 years ago and we are the ones who cleaned up their mess from the Newman years as well.

 **Mr LANGBROEK** (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (5.42 pm): Has it not been interesting to look at the speaking list this evening and see the member for Woodridge? He used to do this in the dying days of the Bligh government. He would come in with his Bill Shorten zingers—that is all he is known for—and he would just bluff and bluster his way through defending the Deputy Premier even though we know in his heart he does not really want to because he wants her job. He did not even campaign in his then seat of Greenslopes. Off he went to Woodridge and he came back in the last term of parliament. Then there was the member for McConnel. Then of course, the second most senior member of the left faction had to read a speech which was all about how the only good reason he is supporting her is because of the extra money that has come into Health, in his own portfolio. What a joke!

Let us have a look at what those opposite said when we were in government just a few short years ago. I quote, 'It's time the Premier stood up, took control and showed some leadership,' by sacking the minister. Another article stated—

The minister has been an embarrassment for the Government ... This minister has become a household name for all the wrong reasons.

Another one stated—

Time and time again we have seen bumbles from this Minister. This Minister has lost all credibility.

These are not my words. These are the words of the now Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, from 2012 and 2013 when she was calling for LNP ministers to be sacked. Here is another one—

It is now up to the Premier to declare if he accepts such sloppy standards and explain why the minister is still in Cabinet with such a string of disasters behind her ...

These are the words of the member for South Brisbane in 2013 when she was calling for an LNP minister to be sacked, and those ministers resigned. Even the member for Bundamba resigned as minister, but not this Deputy Premier, who is not being held to account. It seems that whilst Labor was more than willing to sit on their high horse when in opposition, they cannot meet the same standard the LNP set whilst in government. In the words of Steven Wardill—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members in the gallery, I ask you to please sit down or please leave the public gallery.

Mr LANGBROEK: In the words of Steven Wardill, the CCC found that Trad's failure was not a crime but it should be. He also said that less work and the same wage is not much of a penalty to pay. The more the Deputy Premier has spoken or written about matters, the more questions have been raised. Today she accused opposition members of smearing her reputation. I advise the House that the Deputy Premier is completely responsible personally for her own reputation being smeared, for not having filled out the pecuniary interest register, which we all know has to be done, for not abiding by the ministerial code of conduct, for not explaining at a cabinet meeting about a conflict of interest.

Let us have a look at the Integrity Commissioner's advice, which I will table at the end of my contribution. The Integrity Commissioner's responses and advice to the Deputy Premier dated 19 and 20 July only respond to what the Deputy Premier has advised her. Subsequently, in response, the Deputy Premier sent more information to the Integrity Commissioner. I refer to the first response on 19 July 2019 in which the Integrity Commissioner states—

I am of the view that a conflict of interest will arise in relation to the Woolloongabba property and the development of Boggo Road Station ... as the development could directly and materially affect the value of the property in a way that is not widely shared.

She confirms a conflict of interest. I table that advice from the Integrity Commissioner.

Tabled paper. Letter, dated 19 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba [1519].

Having had that advice from the Integrity Commissioner, on the same day the Deputy Premier wrote again. On 20 July the Integrity Commissioner wrote in response to the Deputy Premier and she quoted what the Deputy Premier had said to her. The letter states—

After reading your advice and reviewing the chronology of events, I have become aware of a matter which I consider prudent to advise you of.

That is only after she received the first response from the Integrity Commissioner. That is where the Deputy Premier has consistently not given all the information to the Integrity Commissioner and it had to be dragged out of her kicking and screaming. The Integrity Commissioner says in this second letter of 20 July—

... I am unclear if you declared the purchase of the new property during the CBRC deliberations of 3 April 2019.


She subsequently found out that she did not declare the purchase of the new property.

Finally, the other thing that could have been said—and I want to refer to this in terms of the member for Mermaid Beach, who was constantly asked by those opposite to release his Integrity Commissioner advice. The final line from the Integrity Commissioner states—

... it is at your discretion as to whether you disclose this letter, noting the precautions I have suggested above.

Yet the Deputy Premier has said that Queenslanders deserve to know more. Who can forget her classic ABC 612 interview with Craig Zonca and Loretta Ryan? She was all over the shop when it came to specific details like the details she forgot to give the Integrity Commissioner. Queenslanders expect more from their government. The LNP will deliver for Queenslanders. The Premier will wear this like a crown of thorns.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (5.48 pm): I am still getting over the member for Chatsworth asking the DP out on a date to Carina Leagues. I want to make it clear that I am rising to speak against this motion. It is absolutely disgraceful that those opposite are trying to keep on prosecuting this issue when the CCC has made a very, very clear ruling on this matter. The CCC is the independent umpire for Queensland and it holds us to account. They said—

... no evidence of corruption or dishonesty was found.

Those words that they used are very important. They did not say there was ‘insufficient evidence’. They did not say there was ‘some evidence’. They said ‘no evidence’. That means none—zero, no evidence of corruption, no evidence of dishonesty. There are two issues here. One of them is that those opposite just do not like the decision. The Deputy Premier made it very clear all the way along during those seven weeks that, if the CCC said that there was a need for investigation, she would step down.

I am sure she would not have liked that decision, but she said that she would step down. The LNP’s problem is that they just do not like that decision, but the biggest problem is that they have no respect for the CCC in the first place. There is so much evidence of that.

I know that the member for Toowoomba South today referred to the Fitzgerald inquiry. We all had the great pleasure of meeting Tony Fitzgerald and Mike Ahern—dignified, well-respected men who did a great service for Queensland. What did Tony Fitzgerald say about the LNP in 2015? He said that the LNP refuses to accept that there are limits to the proper exercise of democratic power, that they treated the community with contempt and weakened the CCC. We know what they did when in power. They axed 26 staff from the CMC, impacting on the capacity of the CMC to go after proceeds of crime.


They appointed, then reappointed and reappointed again an acting chair of the CMC without consultation with the PCMC. The acting chair of the CMC was investigated by the Ethics Committee for misleading the PCCC in relation to any contact with government before he wrote an article about outlaw motorcycle gangs. They sacked the PCMC in the middle of the night after committee members questioned the level of the Newman government’s interference in the CMC, including conversations between the head of the CMC and the LNP’s chief media adviser about coordinating an opinion editorial

piece in the newspaper. Then Campbell Newman's chief of staff called the Integrity Commissioner to undertake what was described by the Integrity Commissioner as an ill-informed, abusive rant. If those opposite get back into government, the CCC should be very worried because, clearly, the LNP will be after them.

When I go out in Bulimba and across this state to talk to some of the most vulnerable people in Queensland—the kids whose parents are harming them, the women who are fleeing from the men who say that they love them because they are in fear for their lives and the lives of their families, the people who suffered sexual abuse as children and never had a voice, the young people who have suffered years of trauma, abuse, neglect, poverty and homelessness—and when I say to those people, 'Tell me what is worrying you,' do members know what they say? They say, 'Will you people stop talking about each other and start talking about us? Start talking about the things that matter to us and what you will do for us.' They are sick of those opposite never showing an interest in them.

It has been months since I was asked a question about child safety, youth justice, domestic violence or anything that the people care about. Who did I go to when I needed money to get more staff to help those kids? Who did I go to when we needed funding for women's shelters? Who did I go to when we needed to get redress for victims of sexual violence? Who did I go to? I went to the woman sitting here. She listened because she knows that those Queenslanders really need people to speak up for them. They do not need a party that sacks people in order that services are not delivered. They do not need a party that gets rid of staff so that they cannot deliver services properly. They need someone who will stick up for them, who is talking about them every single day. This woman, the Deputy Premier, is talking about the people of Queensland. Do I support the Deputy Premier? Absolutely. Do I support the Premier of Queensland? Absolutely. I am very proud to do so.

(Time expired)

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.53 pm): We only need to look at the list of speakers today to see the company with which the Deputy Premier surrounds herself. The member for Woodridge kicked it off. Of course, who could forget that the member for Woodridge was under investigation because he split SPER debt payments into two to try to cover up one of the payments to ensure the debt did not look as big as it actually was? The same guy, because he was scared, put a digital lock on his door so that his department officials could not get into his office! What about the member for Murrumba's biggest, dodgiest poll to change the name of the Lady Cilento hospital? He got up and defended the Deputy Premier. Of course, then the member for McConnel said last year in this place that she had nothing to do with the Queensland Council of Unions' program involving union indoctrination in Queensland schools. It turns out a senior policy adviser helped draft the program for the QCU! The company the Deputy Premier has around her is testament to why that mob, the backbench, does not want her in that position anymore.

The minister who just spoke said that she has not been asked a question. The reason is that the opposition believe in integrity and accountability. The longer the Deputy Premier is in that position and in that chair, the more distraction she will be for the government. The government will not be able to get its agenda on the go, because the Deputy Premier is a distraction. Every member opposite knows that she should go, she should resign.

The member for McConnel said that we were selectively quoting from the Crime and Corruption Commission findings. The CCC's recommendation 3 states—

Parliament create a criminal offence for occasions when a member of Cabinet does not declare a conflict that does, or may conflict, with their ability to discharge their responsibilities.

This is a criminal offence. Recommendation 4 states—

That Parliament create a criminal offence to apply when a member of Cabinet fails to comply with the requirements of the Register of Members' Interests ...

That is what the CCC said. I table a copy of that. I table a copy of both Integrity Commissioner advices received by the Deputy Premier.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 19 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba [1520].

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 20 July 2019, from the Queensland Integrity Commissioner, Dr Nikola Stepanov, to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships, Hon. Jackie Trad, regarding the recent purchase of a property in Woolloongabba [1521].

The question remains: where are the letters, emails and telephone notes from the Deputy Premier to the Integrity Commissioner? That is what is missing in this equation. If we go to the advice the Integrity Commissioner clearly said—

I am of the view that a conflict of interest will arise in relation to the Woolloongabba property.

Did the Deputy Premier disclose that conflict or perceived conflict to cabinet? No. Did the Deputy Premier disclose the conflict to the CBRC? No, she did not. In the Integrity Commissioner advice under the code of conduct, the Deputy Premier had an obligation to advise the Premier of any conflict of interest. The Premier said that the first she knew about the purchase of the Woolloongabba property was when she saw a press release in the *Courier-Mail*.

Tabled paper: Crime and Corruption Commission media release, dated 6 September 2019, titled 'CCC determines not to investigate the Deputy Premier but calls for improvements to Cabinet processes and legislative reform—6 September 2019' [1522].

That means that the Deputy Premier sat next to the Premier in cabinet and at CBRC and spoke positively about Cross River Rail and the inner-city school but did not disclose the conflict to her boss sitting next to her.

The Crime and Corruption Commission findings also say that the Deputy Premier did not dispute the fact that she did not make the declaration as required. What was her punishment? Nothing. She lost Cross River Rail, which she voluntarily gave up two weeks earlier—same pay, less work. That is the punishment.

Mr Mander: And promoted.

Mr BLEIJIE: And promoted to Acting Premier the next day! The Deputy Premier's colleagues want to talk about donations. I will never forget the day the Deputy Premier signed off on a \$1,200 donation from corrupt Eddie Obeid. Some \$1,200 signed by Jackie Trad, Australian Labor Party, State of Queensland. I table a copy of that.


Tabled paper: Australian Electoral Commission, Political Party Disclosure return for financial year 2008-09, by the Australian Labor Party, Queensland [1523].

Who could ever forget a \$5,000 donation by Obeid Corporate, signed by Jackie Trad on behalf of the Labor Party?

Tabled paper: Australian Electoral Commission, Political Party Disclosure return for financial year 2010-11, by the Australian Labor Party, Queensland [1524].

Did they ever pay back the money from that corrupt individual? I doubt it. There is only one answer to this integrity crisis: for the Premier to sack the Treasurer and Deputy Premier and restore accountability to government.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (5.58 pm): I rise to speak against the motion. Here we are again this parliament week—another sitting, another waste of time from this opposition. This has to be the most wasteful opposition in this state's history. They carry on about democracy and then waste this parliament's time with frivolous repetition. It was only a few weeks ago in Townsville that they asked the same questions as they asked today. We know from the member for Currumbin's words that they were dragged up to Townsville. They had nothing to say about the state then and have had nothing else to talk about this week either.

They could have asked the Deputy Premier or the Premier about the long-term impact of the LNP's decision to sack 1,654 QBuild employees. They could have asked about the \$288 million they slashed from the employment programs in Queensland. They could have asked about the benefits flowing from our decision to deliver free TAFE and free apprenticeships so people can learn a trade and get a job. We will give people a job—not cut their jobs. We will deliver jobs with \$49.5 billion of capital works projects over the next four years.

They are wasting the parliament's time because the LNP still has no plan for Queensland. This matter has been considered over eight question times—in this place and at the Townsville sittings of parliament. This matter has been considered by the CCC. It has handed down its findings. Matters of integrity have been resolved. As I said, this is the most wasteful opposition in this state's history.

The Queensland Labor Party backs its Premier and backs its Deputy Premier—and so do Queenslanders. For the information of the members for Surfers Paradise and Kawana, so does every member of this caucus. Queenslanders know that it is only Labor that will deliver them the education

and health care they deserve. It is only Labor that will make sure Queenslanders get paid on time, every time. It is only Labor that will make sure every Queenslander has a safe, secure and sustainable place to call home.

For the member for Everton, the author of this motion, to come into this House and try to lecture this government on integrity is nothing short of a joke. He should not come into this chamber and lecture this government about ethical standards when he has still failed to explain his role in the collapse of Walton Construction—a failed building company building Queensland government projects while the same time making massive donations to the Liberal National Party in this state. He has continually failed to front up to the people of Queensland and explain his role in the Walton collapse.

When that company collapsed it had debts of \$70 million. Around \$30 million was lost by Queensland mums and dads. All the while the Liberal National Party—the member for Everton—took \$1.4 million in rent from Walton Construction while they were in trouble. In fact, in the death throes of that company \$430,000 was collected in rent, in donations. That is the subbies' money lining the pockets of the LNP fundraising arm. It was not rent; it was a donation from a company that was paying to the LNP rather than paying construction workers in Queensland. Before the member for Everton thinks about lecturing anyone about integrity, he needs to do a very simple thing: apologise to those subcontractors.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr de BRENNI: You are listening.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The minister will put his comments through the chair.

Mr de BRENNI: The member for Everton is listening. He should meet the standard that he supposedly wants to set. Those opposite want to come in here and talk about ethics. They do not have the moral fibre let alone the ethics to own up to their scam of Queensland subcontractors to line their own pockets.

This is part of a clear pattern of behaviour from the LNP and the member for Everton. Was it ethical when they tried to give away Queensland's public housing stock to the highest bidder? Was it ethical when they changed the law and left the QBCC blind to the financial health of licensees? How many tradies lost everything because of those unethical decisions of the member for Everton? Was it ethical when they misled Queensland plumbers to believe they would only have to pay for one licence, leaving them at risk of losing their licence? Was it ethical when the LNP voted against minimum housing standards for Queensland renters, to stop the slum records and prevent the situation faced by people like Carolyn in the electorate of Nanango? Was it ethical that the LNP slashed QBuild and sacked tradies after they had been told they had nothing to fear?

The member for Everton has no standing to come into this chamber and speak about integrity and ethical behaviour. His track record says it all. This motion is nothing but an attempt by a desperate opposition to distract from the Prime Minister's plan to sell off Queensland's electricity assets, to distract from their secret plans to cut, sack and sell.

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

AYES, 40:

LNP, 35—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Connor, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stuckey, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

NOES, 49:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.


Resolved in the negative.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (GREAT BARRIER REEF PROTECTION MEASURES) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading


Resumed from p. 2962, on motion of Ms Enoch—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (6.08 pm), continuing: When it comes to action on climate change and science, we have to be very clear that human evolution is based on knowledge and science. We put our heads in the sand and ignore it at our own peril. It is sad to see this still being a partisan issue when there is so much scientific consensus around it.

This bill is another step forward when it comes to protecting the Great Barrier Reef. It should be seen in partnership with the Palaszczuk Labor government's reforms in a whole lot of other areas, particularly our renewable energy target of 50 per cent by 2030, which has seen billions in investment in clean energy in this state, and our electric vehicle superhighway leading the way in this nation in transforming the transport sector to cleaner energy forms.

I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Science on her leadership on this. She is very clear. She is very reformist. She is a trustworthy minister who believes in science, who is a steady hand—getting the reforms done as part of a government that is progressive and that understands that issue very well and is acting on it, as any responsible government should.

 **Mr MICKELBERG** (Buderim—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise to speak in opposition to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. This is legislation that will push more Queensland farming families out of the industry they have been in for generations. At the outset I note that, like many Queenslanders, I own a farm—this is disclosed on my register of interests—and may be affected by this legislation.

Despite the hyperbole of those opposite, no-one wants to see the Great Barrier Reef put at risk. It is clear that the reef is under pressure as the impacts of frequent tropical cyclones, climate change and poor water quality make it more difficult for reef ecosystems to recover after periods of decline.

What is really at question here today are the actions that government, industry and the community generally should take in response to those threats. How does government improve the water quality of the reef while balancing the impact on communities?

At its core this bill seeks to improve water quality on the Great Barrier Reef and the main issues, as I understand them, are caused by excessive sediment, pesticide run-off and dissolved nutrients like nitrogen and phosphorous. It is clear that this bill seeks to deal with the effect of agricultural production in relation to these issues. However, the bill is silent on the impact of urban areas and indeed the impact of state owned land on these very same problems. As I understand it, the state is not required to apply the same standard to crown land, road reserves, national parks and state forest as will apply to graziers and farmers. For some obscure reason, the government has chosen to exclude Cape York areas from this bill despite bank erosion and sediment loads being a significant part of the rationale for the introduction of Labor's wild rivers legislation in Cape York many years ago.

I note the submission from the Reef 2050 plan independent expert panel. I take from its submission that sediment loads are a significant issue for the reef and that any solution needs to be targeted. It states that landscape remediation may be required and that such remediation may take a number of years to be fully effective. I note the expert panel comments in relation to the contribution of gullies and stream bank erosion and its suggested course of action, including 'targeted land retirements'—targeted land retirements of country that is currently used for agricultural production. It begs the question: is Labor's next step to force landholders to cease using existing agricultural land if it contributes to reef water quality issues?

I note that the independent expert panel submission to the bill discusses the need to potentially intensify agricultural production on more productive and less vulnerable landscapes. Such a course of action could maintain profitability, achieve better water quality outcomes and provide improved biodiversity—they are its words, not mine—but such an approach would require the ability for farmers and graziers to develop country, something which Labor has already made more difficult with its draconian vegetation management changes. Labor is happy to sheet home responsibility for dealing

with the changes facing the reef to farmers and graziers, but at the same time it wants to tie their hands when it comes to making positive changes to their business in developing additional country and protecting the environment.

Along the same vein I note the committee contribution from a third generation grazier, Rebecca Vander Have. Rebecca details the manner in which many graziers renovate degraded pasture through tillage and reseeded with perennial pasture plants. It is a process that improves the environment, provides ground cover, improves soil health and improves water quality. Rebecca details the fact that at her grazing enterprise they improve 300 hectares each year. Such a process is only made more difficult under this legislation. Under this legislation, graziers who try to do the right thing are now going to have to navigate complex and costly administrative processes just so they can do the right thing by their business and by the environment.

Ms Grace: You're making it up!

Mr MICKELBERG: If I am making it up, Minister, I am more than happy for you to come in here and correct the record.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Through the chair.

Mr MICKELBERG: I am more than happy for the government to come in and correct the record.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Through the chair.


Mr MICKELBERG: Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your guidance. For Rebecca and many other graziers, they are going to have to do that each and every year. Perhaps the most concerning aspect of this legislation is the fact that this legislation will place the power to set the rules in relation to farming practices across the vast majority of the state in the hands of an unelected public servant. With this bill the government has abrogated its responsibility for that task and instead placed the responsibility in the hands of a bureaucrat. Surely we owe it to the people of Queensland to be accountable for decisions that affect primary producers to the extent which this bill does. Surely the 93 elected representatives who sit in the Queensland parliament and are accountable to our communities should properly consider and debate issues of significance like the regulations and the rules which will now be in the hands of an unelected bureaucrat.

Earlier we heard the inspiring contribution from the member for Mackay, who contends that it was her advocacy that resulted in a five-year stay of execution for canegrowers.

Mrs Gilbert: And others.

Mr MICKELBERG: And others; I take that interjection. What she has delivered for canegrowers in her electorate, and evidently others from the Labor benches, is a five-year blank cheque for a public servant to make decisions that will have a considerable community impact and will disproportionately place the burden for dealing with this issue on canegrowers. Mackay canegrowers are already struggling with low global commodity prices and escalating costs of production and they will wear the cost of the actions of a local member who will not fight for them.

This bill is just the latest Labor government attempt to appease its Greens masters, whom we all know it relies on as it clings desperately to power. I would welcome a considered approach that deals with all of the challenges facing the reef including those factors related to urban development, road maintenance and construction, and the management of state land. This bill is not a considered solution, however. I will be opposing this bill and I urge those few members opposite who care about regional communities to do the same.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (6.16 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. Coral reefs are said to be the rainforests of the ocean, teeming with life and vital to our underwater ecosystems. The Great Barrier Reef is the largest living structure on earth, home to six of the world's seven marine turtle species, 3,000 corals and 1,700 species of fish. It is a cultural icon. It encompasses lands treasured by more than 70 Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander language groups for tens of thousands of years and whose sovereignty over those waters has never been ceded. The reef itself is said to be more than 500,000 years old.

Essentially, every member's contribution in this debate has acknowledged that we all love the reef, but I am still not clear whether most politicians actually fathom the incredible cultural and environmental significance that is at risk here. I am staggered—genuinely staggered—at some of the opposition members' contributions that appear to dispute the clear message from all credible scientists—that if we continue on our current path the reef is completely cooked. The member for

Callide, for one, authoritatively stated that coral cover has not decreased. It is proper tinfoil hat stuff. Cherry-picked figures and references to increased coral cover at one point in the southern reef are provided to insinuate that everything is hunky-dory, but clearly it is not. Let us put the risks and costs of inaction in language that the LNP hardheads might understand. It is a source of jobs for more than 60,000 people and contributes more than \$6 billion to the economy annually.

The government says it wants to protect the reef, but we know that by far the most significant threat to the reef is inaction on climate change. Government members and the Premier constantly repeat that they accept the science of climate change, but I cannot help but notice the repeated refrain in this debate that climate change is just one of two major threats to the reef along with poor water quality. I do not think that repetition is a coincidence. I think it is a deliberate attempt to downplay the government's inaction on climate change and to mask the hypocrisy of accepting the science but continuing to expand our fossil fuel exports in a manner completely inconsistent with what the science says is necessary.

The most recently published Great Barrier Reef outlook report states unequivocally that climate change is the primary threat to the Great Barrier Reef and that, 'The current rate of global warming will not allow the maintenance of a healthy reef for future generations.' The government shamelessly promotes and supports new thermal coalmining in the Galilee Basin. The level of cognitive dissonance here is truly astounding. Our leading reef scientists predict that, if we do not make extraordinary efforts to tackle these leading threats—climate change foremost of these—we will lose the reef as we know it. That is not hyperbole. Those are the facts.

This legislation should go some way to help improve water quality. For that reason I absolutely support the bill but, without action on climate change, remaining coral will die and ocean acidification will continue to intensify. The reef will be lost anyway. Calling for new tenders on gas projects and opening the Galilee Basin to produce new thermal coal is tantamount to signing the death warrant for the Great Barrier Reef. Every single member of the government and the opposition supports that and it is utterly unconscionable.

As we have heard a number of times in this debate, last month's Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority outlook report downgraded the reef's future prospects from poor to very poor. Scientists at the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority say that leading reasons for these declining prospects are primarily climate change and water quality but there are a plethora of other threats, most caused by human activity. The need for reef water quality improvement could not be more clearly framed than it is by this most recent report.

The IPCC has also recently reported some hard truths that inform this assessment from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, which I have raised here previously. Even if we achieve the Paris Agreement's target of 1½ degrees of average global temperature increase, coral reefs are expected to decline by a further 70 per cent to 90 per cent. Achieving this goal requires us to move completely past thermal coal power generation by 2050. It is a tough task, but it is not impossible. The IPCC tells us that, if average global temperature rises by two degrees, the consequence is that more than 99 per cent of coral cover will be lost.

Against this backdrop and the government's commitment to new thermal coalmining in the Galilee Basin it is hard to not feel cynical about this bill. Nonetheless, the legislation is necessary to improve the reef's resilience and give it a fighting chance if we, in fact, see the necessary action on climate change. The bill is a good start but could be improved and it leaves some significant gaps unaddressed. It provides a good framework for tackling sediment nutrient loading. That much is clear. I suggest that it could go further, even in just addressing water quality issues, as I will detail in a moment. To be effective, this regime will need to be backed up by tight regulations that provide the necessary standards and implementation detail and the resources to ensure that the new regulations are effectively monitored and enforced.

I am also of the view that a purely punitive approach is not enough. Certainly, the proposed enforcement measures are necessary, but much more needs to be done to work with the agricultural sector and industry in improving these standards. The government should also be proactively employing more Landcare advisers to work collaboratively with the agricultural sector and peak bodies to improve practices.

Queensland Labor's recent approval and ongoing support for Adani's new thermal coal project is important to discussions about the reef not only because of the enormous contribution of this project to climate change. I think there is little doubt that the approval of Adani indicates this government's tacit willingness to sacrifice one of the natural wonders of the world to escape the heat from the Murdoch

press for a little while and to firm up some political donations from Labor's mates in big mining. Beyond the climate change impacts, a key part of Adani's mine is a massive expansion of the Abbot Point Coal Terminal, which is in the Great Barrier Reef riparian area.

Mr BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member for Maiwar should be well aware that he has a bill before parliament that directly addresses this issue. Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your guidance to bringing him back to the bill at hand and the focus of the sedimentation run-off.


Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Maiwar, before I get you to resume your speech, I give you some guidance that you have a bill with regard to this matter. I suggest that you do not stray into that territory. There will be plenty of time to address that. Could you come back to the long title of this bill.

Mr BERKMAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I appreciate your guidance and the assistance from the member for Capalaba—always, always a solid contributor to this House in debates. Beyond the climate change impacts, a key part of Adani's mine is the massive expansion of the Abbot Point Coal Terminal, which is itself in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. That means more industrialisation in the area, more water pollution, more coal barges floating through reef, more risk of disasters that would dump dirty black rocks on one of nature's crown jewels.

In recent years, research from the Australian Institute of Marine Science—or AIMS—demonstrates the impacts of coal dust on corals, seagrass and reef fish. Coal dust is a real concern for the health of the reef in the same way that sediment loading and nutrient loading are, which are addressed by this bill. Twice in recent years—not just once, but twice—Adani has breached its licence conditions and released coal-laden water into the waters of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. Adani at Abbot Point was issued a temporary emissions licence to account for the massive rainfall brought by Cyclone Debbie, but ended up breaching even the amended, expanded licence by 800 per cent.

As I understand this bill, it will go absolutely no way to addressing this kind of impact on reef water quality and the health of those ecosystems, nor will it do anything to address the ongoing lawful dumping of enormous amounts of maintenance dredge spoil offshore in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. Although the agriculture sector is doing the heavy lifting to reduce sediment loads from across reef catchments, port operators are allowed to sully the waters of this World Heritage area with impunity.

In conclusion, I want to again use this opportunity to plead with the government to take action on climate change seriously, starting with a moratorium on any new thermal coal and gas mining. Our reef depends on it, so do all of our children's futures and so do our Pacific neighbours, whose homes are already disappearing. The measures imposed by this bill are a positive step and, on that basis, I support both its intent and substance, but it will all be for nought without the most urgent possible action on climate change.

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (6.25 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. That should come as no surprise to anybody. The primary policy objective of this bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and, in doing so, strengthen the protections of the Great Barrier Reef.

The Great Barrier Reef, World Heritage listed for its ecological significance, outstanding universal value, exceptional biodiversity and national beauty, is the world's largest coral reef ecosystem. It is visible from space. It extends for over 2,300 kilometres along Queensland's coastline—from the Torres Strait in the north to Bundaberg in the south—covering an area pretty much the same size as Japan. With more than 2,900 individual coral reefs, which represent about 10 per cent of all the coral reef areas in the world, the Great Barrier Reef sustains extensive seagrass meadows, mangrove forests and soft-bottom habitats and is home to a diversity of species, including 1,625 types of fish, 600 types of coral, 100 species of jellyfish, 3,000 varieties of molluscs, 30 species of whales and dolphins and 133 varieties of sharks and rays.

The reef continues to be Australia's greatest natural attraction, recognised as an iconic experience locally, nationally and internationally. The importance of the Great Barrier Reef to our First Nations people is significant and heavily recognised. The Great Barrier Reef is also a significant economic asset. We have heard speakers talk about other industries and their importance. The worth of the Great Barrier Reef has been estimated at \$56 billion. It supports reef-dependent and reef associated communities and industries in a range of commercial activities and attracts millions of

visitors from around Australia and the world. The Great Barrier Reef provides up to 60,000-plus jobs and generates an annual revenue of approximately \$6 billion for the Australian and, more importantly, Queensland economy.

I have spent over 28 years of my professional life diving, working on, promoting and selling the Great Barrier Reef across Australia and, fortunately at somebody else's cost, around the world. For the people of my electorate of Cairns, the Great Barrier Reef is fundamental to their economy. Tourism operators have increased their stewardship through contributing to reef monitoring, adhering to responsible reef practices, trialling small scale reef restoration initiatives and supplying the delivery of quality reef interpretation and education via accredited master reef guides. We all recognise that everybody has to play a part—not just the canefarmers. Every industry has a part to play and the tourism industry is certainly doing that.

The reef continues to provide not just thousands of jobs and career opportunities, but is a magnet for investment not only in Cairns but also in other regions throughout our great state. When one looks at the local investment in Cairns we see amazing and unique infrastructure like Skyrail. If the Barrier Reef were not there Skyrail would not exist. There are over 300 tourism products in Cairns alone. They would not exist if we did not have the Great Barrier Reef.

When we look at international investment, one only has to recall the vast investment made by the Japanese company Daikyo back in the eighties and nineties that contributed to a number of hotels being built in Cairns. Daikyo built one of the most impressive golf courses in the world. Another example of investment is Cornes & Co, who for the last 30 years have owned and operated the Quicksilver Group, one of the largest employers in the region of the Great Barrier Reef. There are existing industries making huge impacts on people's lives. People are receiving wages, they are paying for their kids to go to school, they are paying their mortgages. This is a key and integral part of the economic cycle in North Queensland.

Recently, we have seen Mr Gussan Aboud make a personal investment of over \$600 million for three new hotels in Cairns. All of these investments have and continue to provide jobs and careers. Last year in Cairns alone we welcomed 2,900,000 domestic and international visitors and the Great Barrier Reef was the drawcard. When some of my colleagues in the chamber talk about the economic importance of the Great Barrier Reef, we are living it, we are looking at it.

The undisputed science and I reiterate that, the undisputed science, tells us that climate change and poor water quality are recognised as significant threats to the long-term health and resilience of the Great Barrier Reef. Climate change is already affecting the Great Barrier Reef's corals and the ecosystem they sustain through sea surface temperature increases, ocean acidification, altered weather patterns—as we have heard, more intense storms, more powerful cyclones—and rising sea levels. Tasked to assess and report on the Great Barrier Reef's health every five years, the 2014 Great Barrier Reef outlook report identified that, even with positive actions undertaken since 2009 to reduce threats and to improve resilience, the Great Barrier Reef remains at risk from a cumulative effect of impacts including climate change, poor water quality from land based run-off, impacts from coastal developments and some remaining impacts from fishing. The bill will achieve its objectives through a regulatory framework that ensures that reef water quality targets for nutrients and sediments are taken into account in regulatory decision-making; the broad application of minimum regulated standards to eliminate high-risk practices that contribute to excessive nutrient and sediment run-off; producers move to standards that align with recognised benchmarks for agricultural industries under the Paddock to Reef Water Quality Risk Framework while maintaining productivity and, most importantly, profitability; new development can occur without compromising the water quality gains made to date, while also minimising the regulatory burden on existing activities; good performers that utilise practices with low water quality risks are recognised and rewarded; and existing industry-led best management practice programs or the development of new programs can provide participants with an alternative pathway for meeting regulatory requirements.

On 4 March 2019 the committee invited stakeholders and subscribers to make written submissions on the bill. The committee received, I am told, 230 submissions. The committee received a public briefing about the bill from the Department of Environment and Science and the committee held public hearings in Brisbane, Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Bundaberg. I was very pleased to join the meeting in Cairns and see it well attended. A significant number of interested members of the public were in attendance at each one of these hearings, showing the interest and the importance of this particular issue. It is important to note that the government has undertaken significant consultation


with all relevant sectors as to how best to meet these policy recommendations. Any claims that the policies in this proposed framework are not based on evidence and thorough consultation is not based on fact and ignores the significant work done in this area.

The Department of Environment and Science is taking a multipronged approach to working with farmers to reduce pollutant run-off. This includes investment in a number of initiatives, such as industry best management practice programs, on-ground works, landholder extension and education activities, more monitoring to understand the issues and where to invest, regulatory proposals and innovation to trial new solutions.

The department also implemented a targeted compliance program in 2016 to increase the adoption of the existing fertiliser use and record-keeping provisions under chapter 4A of the Environmental Protection Act. There have been 629 sugarcane compliance activities undertaken since the completion of the program. Follow-up visits indicate that the compliance program is successfully prompting growers to amend their practices in relation to fertiliser application rates, soil testing and record keeping.

As a person who has spent the last 28 years making a living off the Great Barrier Reef, I had great pleasure talking to my brother-in-law and my father-in-law this morning—funnily enough, both of them canefarmers. I broached this topic with them and I was told there are a few changes but they will be right, it should not be a big issue, we have to look after the reef. They said it had been a good process and they were pretty happy. They said there are a couple who will whinge and carry on but fundamentally will get away with it. They indicated that they should be right and in principle they agreed with the protection of the reef.

Contrary to what some in this chamber are suggesting, we on this side know that farmers are part of the solution. We do not build a wall and create an issue; the dull and ignorant will pursue that. The science is clear and undisputed and this legislation backs the science. As a person who has made a living off the Great Barrier Reef, I am proud to commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (6.35 pm): I rise to speak to the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. From the outset I want to make clear my opposition to this legislation because it is yet another attack on regional Queensland. Yet again this government is hiding behind the shambles of a consultation process in an attempt to cast the hardworking men and women who put food on our table and clothes on our backs as environmental vandals. The minister would have Queenslanders believe that primary producers are not doing their bit to improve water quality at the reef. Nothing could be further from the truth. In just four short years, over 69,000 hectares of sugarcane growing land in the Burdekin has been registered for best management practices, or BMP, and statewide more than 70 per cent of sugarcane land is managed by growers who are registered for BMP according to Canegrowers Queensland.

In fact, even the Department of Environment and Science's most recent Service Delivery Statements confirm that the take-up of BMP for sugarcane growers within reef catchments was above the department's own target. My question to the minister is: if the department's own targets are being exceeded, why will he not defer this legislation here tonight? As QFF president Stuart Armitage said, regulation is a high-cost, simplistic instrument that supports minimum standards that does little to encourage innovation and excellence. The reality is that our primary producers are innovative. They are striving for excellence and they are delivering results.

This government's efforts to mislead Queenslanders does not stop there. The minister continuously states, '60,000 jobs now rely on the reef's health'. The reality, according to respected economist, Colin Dwyer, is that just under half of those jobs are outside Queensland. While the WWF says tens of millions of dollars are going towards improving practices, it is farmers who have done and continue to do the heavy lifting. For example, canegrower Russell Hall in the Burdekin has spent \$600,000 on one farm to increase recycling of water and to reduce run-off. His neighbour, Ricky Mio, has constructed a ring tank to capture all the water on his farm at a cost of \$3 million, which means no water leaves his farm. That is right: there is no run-off from his farming operation. Instead of demonising our farmers, why will this Labor government not work with our farmers to deliver works on the ground that will make a real difference.

Let us look at the consultation process. Contempt is a strong word, but it is the only word that can be used to describe this government's attitude towards primary producers. That contempt is illustrated perfectly by the fact that this government had to be dragged kicking and screaming to conduct hearings on this legislation in regional Queensland. In contrast to all the submissions made, all the witnesses who have appeared and all the rallies held around this state, the minister unashamedly

confirmed in her media release that the bill is not being amended. That contempt is further illustrated by the minister coming to the Burdekin to promote this very bill. Did she meet with farmers whose families have been caring for the land for generations? No. The minister met with a multinational company that, I might add, in 2017 and 2018, donated \$22,000 to the Queensland Labor Party. So much for consultation.

Those opposite stand here and say that they consulted by holding meetings in Brisbane, Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and Bundaberg, but I for one am yet to hear of any primary producer who believes they were consulted in an appropriate manner. There is clear evidence of members from that side of the House not just ignoring their constituents but also selling them out. At our last sitting, the three Townsville based members mentioned the need for jobs in North Queensland 20 times. Instead of standing up for more than 14,800 North Queenslanders employed in or as a result of the sugar industry, they were silent until they went back to their standard playbook of saying one thing in the north and another thing here in Brisbane. Along with the members for Mackay and Cook, their attempts in calling for no further changes to the minimum standards for at least five years is nothing but a smokescreen and will mean nothing for the farmers on the ground.

It is not only primary producers whom this government is holding in contempt. According to the government, the basis of modern science is wrong. Further, the scientific process is not a one-off; it is actually an ongoing cycle. However, will this government embrace retesting the science? The answer is, no! Entire industries are at risk and even asking for the science to be revisited is treated as blasphemy. My question to the minister is this: what economic and social modelling was undertaken by the government for this bill? The implementation of this bill will provide a \$40,000 impost on each and every farmer in the reef catchment area. That is money that they will need to fund out of their own pockets.

You cannot ignore the science. In 2009, it was lead scientists from the Australian Institute of Marine Science who concluded that localised agents such as water quality could not be the main factor causing the decline of the reef and that farm run-off did not extend to offshore reefs. That science directly contradicts the minister's statement yesterday that 'sediment and nutrients from farms and other land based activities can travel hundreds of kilometres'. Professor Walter Stark, who studied the Great Barrier Reef for more than 30 years, has questioned claims that drainage from land based activities is the main cause for damage to the reef. After an extensive study into the effects of nutrient levels, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority found that even at 20 times the normal nutrient level there was no increased algae growth. This is not covert science from untrusted sources. In fact, those studies were referred to in this place in 2009. Add to that the claims by Professor Peter Ridd, whose message has not changed in the 10 intervening years, and we can clearly see that science has an integral role in this debate.

Even when we look at the science that this government refers to, there are serious questions raised about the government's credibility. The reef 2050 plan was adopted in 2015 and benchmarks were set in 2016, with the goal of achieving catchment targets by 2025. The way the minister and other members of this government speak, one would think that no progress had been made, but nothing could be further from the truth. If we look at the Burdekin region, by 2018 there had been an 18.4 per cent reduction in sediment leaving catchments. With seven years remaining to reach the goal of a 30 per cent reduction, our primary producers deserve congratulations, not demonisation. According to the 2018 report, the reduction of particulate nitrogen leaving catchments in the Burdekin region sits at 16.4 per cent, which is well on the way to a 25 per cent reduction by 2025. Meanwhile, also according to the 2018 report, a 17 per cent reduction in particulate phosphorous has been achieved in the Burdekin region, which is also well on the way to a 25 per cent reduction by 2025. We all value our environment and, despite the attempts by those opposite to say otherwise, our primary producers love the reef.

My challenge to the minister is to stand in this House and acknowledge the progress that is being made. The *Great Barrier Reef outlook report 2019* states—

Coral juveniles were observed in densities likely to support future reef recovery.

However, there is no mention of that by those opposite. There is also no mention of the serious concerns raised by the Queensland Audit Office. Those concerns include a lack of monitoring sites, the use of model results rather than measured results and goals that are simply unachievable.


This legislation is based on political ideology, not science. Respected scientists and farmers have merely asked for the science to be reviewed. Where is the review for Queensland's primary producers? Where is the review for the 22,657 jobs that this legislation will put at risk? As one contributor to the

Townsville Bulletin said today, this is duplicitous political hypocrisy. I have seen firsthand how primary producers are playing their part in protecting the reef. They are recycling water, planting alternate crops to secure nitrogen in the soil and leaving paddocks fallow. It is work such as that that will help us achieve our goals while protecting a vital part of the Queensland economy, but this government refuses to work with our primary producers. As my colleague the member for Broadwater explained yesterday, practices have changed over the years and our primary producers have adapted. That fact was highlighted when he, unlike the minister, met with representatives of a sugar growing family in Clare, just west of Ayr. While the minister met with donors, the LNP met with farmers. Our primary producers are some of the best and most innovative in the world. They do not deserve the demonisation that they have endured from those opposite.

We are questioning why the science the government is choosing to use cannot be questioned and we are questioning when its attacks on primary industry will stop. As AgForce CEO Mike Guerin said, the so-called commitment to not make any further changes for five years will not even be enshrined in this bill. It is being reported that the commitment will not even be in the regulation. It is just another empty promise from a Labor government that is hell-bent on punishing regional Queensland. When not a single change to these anti-farmer laws is made, a hollow commitment to not make any further changes for five years is meaningless. The minister and her government should make no mistake: they will be held to account by hardworking people in regional Queensland who just want a fair go. Your actions far outweigh your words—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Through the chair, please.

Mr LAST:—and the primary producers will never forget the contempt this government has shown for them. I am proud to stand shoulder to shoulder with our farmers to oppose this bill and I will continue to support them in their efforts for a fair go.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (6.45 pm): I rise in support of the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. In a former life I was a scientist and, as such, I have to say that in this debate the attacks on science by those opposite have been extraordinary. It has descended into ridiculousness as they have called into question scientists and peer review. In his contribution, the member for Hinchinbrook tried to describe peer review as some sort of kindergarten classroom. That is completely and utterly ridiculous, especially coming from members from the other side who, for the most part, do not have a scientific background or experience in that regard. However, I commend the member for Callide, because at least he has the guts to be up-front—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock. Member for Capalaba, you have used unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Mr BROWN: He has the fortitude, the strength, has been up-front—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: You need to withdraw.

Ms Bates interjected.

Mr BROWN: I withdraw. The member for Mudgeeraba is a bit sensitive from the debate before. At least the member for Callide is up-front in his opposing belief about climate change and the science behind it, but wouldn't one think that the opposition spokesperson for the Great Barrier Reef would pull him up? No, he let him go. Opposition members say that they want to protect the reef, but they never do it. Only we on this side of the House are willing to bring in measures such as tree clearing laws and this bill which is before the House, as well as making sure that we reach our targets to reduce carbon emissions in our energy network.

That brings me to the member for Maiwar, who took offence when I upheld the standing orders of the House during his contribution. It reminded me of the great quote from Gough Whitlam about the impotent being pure. It is us. It is the Labor Party that implements measures to protect the environment. I was also reminded of the CPRS debate years later in 2013, when Christine Milne said that she could not be happier voting with Tony Abbott. That gives us an insight into the Greens. They do not actually want to do anything about the reef. They do not actually want to do anything about climate change. For them, it is purely politics.

As soon as the CPRS and the ETS went down they moved on to attacking coalmines. They do not actually want to do anything for the environment. It is the Labor Party that always comes into this House and into the federal parliament proposing legislation that will protect the Great Barrier Reef and reduce carbon emissions. I commend the Minister for Energy for his work in having us on track to reach our target of a 50 per cent reduction in carbon. I commend the member for Miller for his work as well

as he was the minister responsible in the first term of government. It is those of us on this side of the House who care about the reef. It is those of us on this side of the House who make sure we are implementing measures in a sustainable way.

I want to touch on farmers. We do support our farmers and recognise the important role they play in our economy and in feeding people. The hard work they do on their land is invaluable to Queensland. We are not here to alienate them. We have heard many on the other side say that farmers are doing exactly what will be required to do under the minimum requirements. Nearly every speaker has given an example of a farmer who is doing what is required. If they are doing it what is the issue with this legislation?

Mr Crisafulli: We don't know the standards. They haven't been outlined.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection from the member for Broadwater.

Mr Crisafulli: There are no standards out there. That's the point.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection from the member for Broadwater. If the standards are not out there then why has every single speaker given examples of farmers doing what is required, implementing new technology and tracking data?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BROWN: This shows their true colours. They want to do something for the reef but they do not have the guts to come in here and do it. They did not have the guts—I am sorry, fortitude—to do it while they were in government. They come into parliament and sit over there and say, 'We wish and hope that the reef gets magically better, but we do not want to bring in legislation that will do that.'

We know that having good quality sedimentation run-off and reducing it increases the resilience of the Great Barrier Reef. We can do that in our backyard. They are the measures we can implement. We cannot control all climate change, but I have given examples of where our government is addressing that. They are the two main factors for the long-term survival of our reef.

In conclusion, I want to congratulate the minister for having the fortitude—


Dr Miles: The guts.

Mr BROWN:—to bring this legislation into the House and for having the fortitude to go out and talk to the farmers—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Pause the clock. Member for Murrumba, you have used unparliamentary language. I ask you to withdraw.

Dr MILES: I withdraw.

Mr BROWN: It is contagious. The minister had the fortitude to consult with farmers and have tough conversations. This is listening. She has been respecting and listening to the scientists. It is important that we get the science right, bring farmers along with us and bring the community along with us. It is important to make sure that we put in place the measures we said we would when we went to UNESCO and said that we would take guardianship of the reef—this is our reef and we are here to protect it now and for future generations. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (6.53 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Protection (Great Barrier Reef Protection Measures) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019. As indicated earlier in the debate by the shadow minister for environment, the LNP opposition will not be supporting this legislation. Here we are debating this bill that the Palaszczuk Labor government did not have the ticker to debate at the last sitting in Townsville. According to the explanatory notes, the primary objective of the bill is to amend the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen the Great Barrier Reef protection measures to improve the water quality entering the Great Barrier Reef.

If the Labor government was genuine in their objective to improve the water quality on the reef, we would not have seen such a rushed committee process and the shutdown of debate and input from stakeholders. We would not have seen the collection of data from producers and agribusinesses without any idea of how this is to be used. We would not have seen the handing of powers to bureaucrats in Brisbane to decide how, when and where businesses will operate throughout this state without any requirement for the decisions to be based on science or industry input. What we are seeing in this legislation is more cheap political expediency rather than care for the Great Barrier Reef.

This government has a shocking record when it comes to supporting agriculture in this state, and this legislation is another example. We have the draconian vegetation management laws making it hard for farmers to feed their stock during the drought. We have the trigger mapping debacle that mapped

towns and major infrastructure and even Hills hoists in some backyards. We have electricity costs and water pricing gouging landowners. We have this Labor government phasing out drought assistance measures that aid animal welfare. There is no need to rush these changes and punish the regional communities with poorly designed laws.

We all know the Labor-Green alliance is pushing this agenda along and it is all about preferences in South Brisbane and other seats in the metropolitan area. I have no problem with changes that genuinely ensure the best environmental protection is established for the Great Barrier Reef. However, this needs to be done with respect for landowners, agricultural producers and the communities that depend on these industries. This legislation will reinforce that the Palaszczuk Labor government is a truly anti-regions, anti-agriculture and anti-jobs government. This legislation impacts on my electorate.

I hold great concerns for how it will impact the agricultural producers who live in the Injune district and in all reef catchments. Injune is just an hour's drive from my electorate office. It is in Fitzroy catchment and considered by this legislation as part of the Great Barrier Reef catchments. I have a number of landholders who are in this Fitzroy catchment. What a nightmare of restrictions and additional paperwork they will now face to produce food and run their family businesses. This is a monstrosity of regulation and procedure that they will now have to endure on the reef side of their properties and then just over the fence they will be dealing with the Murray-Darling Basin. There are properties with the same landowners who have property on both watersheds in my electorate, and those people are not happy.

There is a saying about carrots and sticks. The same can be said for legislation. Some legislation is a carrot and some legislation is a stick. There is no carrot in this legislation. It is all about stick and, in fact, it is a whopping great log used to belt up landholders and agriculture. I have not even started with the concerns of local governments yet.

I wish to quote the submission of a constituent of mine, Garrey Sellars. Garrey is a third generation primary producer with 39 years experience as a qualified diesel mechanic and the last 26 years as an earthmoving contractor, concentrating on erosion control for landholders with the main aim to minimise soil loss by repairing roads, contour banks and fence lines. He knows a bit about sediment. I would go so far as to say that he knows a lot more about the practical solutions for sediment than the bureaucrats who are being given the decision-making power by this legislation and who reside in Brisbane. This is what he said—

To hold landowners solely accountable for sediment run-off to the Barrier Reef is ludicrous, unfair and unaffordable.

Fining landowners would take away their already stressed financial capacity to correct situations which are out of their control, caused by severe flooding or drought.

A far more positive outcome would be to work with landowners to help them better manage difficult situations rather than a negative fining solution.

Mr Sellars has a question for the minister and he would like an answer. His question is: will national parks that have suffered catastrophic destruction by fire, which leaves the ground in a worse state than classification D, be assessed as accountable for their wilful destruction at the same level as rural landowners when it comes to fining? It should be noted that these fires which have burnt millions of hectares in the Great Barrier Reef catchment zone are not a climate change event but a man-made event, due to mismanagement and a lack of foresight. The minister needs to answer Mr Sellars. When her own department mismanages state owned land, like they have in Garrey's region, will the government pay the same level of fines as rural landowners? Garrey would like an answer.

I turn now to the concerns of local governments in the Great Barrier Reef catchment. The concerns of the Burdekin Shire Council mirror the concerns of many other stakeholders when they say—

Unfortunately, the proposals seem to focus wholly towards protection of the reef with no regard for the impact on the community and the flow on effects from greatly increased administrative, energy, monetary and opportunity costs in supporting human populations in north and far north Queensland.

Council believes that the science being used to support some of the measures proposed is flawed.


The Local Government Association of Queensland, while supportive of the intent to reduce the impacts of poor water quality on the Great Barrier Reef, remains opposed to the increased regulation of local governments' relevant activities, specifically sewage treatment plants. In summary, the basis for the LGAQ's position is that it is unreasonable to propose to further regulate local government STPs to achieve a 'no net decline' outcome while there is insufficient evidence that local government STP impacts overall are significant and warrant additional costs of increased regulation of all the STPs in the reef catchment and—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! Member for Warrego, can you adjourn the debate please?

Debate, on motion of Ms Leahy, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Kawana Electorate, Schools

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (7.00 pm): How good are Kawana schools! They are great. We have great students, great principals, great administration and great parents. I want to reflect tonight as the member for Kawana on a few of those schools and a few other issues.

The other week I attended the Meridan State College Twilight Festival. Well done to the P&C administration on a wonderful festival. It had an international theme. I can say that the Dutch were represented. I had the Jarrod Bleijie stand set up. I had Dutch clogs on. I dressed like a Dutchman. One thing about the Dutch is that we cannot make lollies. Every kid who took a lolly from the stand spat it out about two metres away, including the licorice. However, we can make Dutch oliebollens. I thank Dutchy's Bakehouse on the Sunshine Coast for making the Dutch oliebollens that we were selling, raising money for air conditioning for Meridan State College.

The Talara Primary College trivia night was a wonderful night. I was a sponsor, but I could not attend. By all accounts, and from the photos, they had a wonderful night, again raising money for vital air conditioning in the school. Well done to the Talara Primary College P&C Association.


I am really looking forward to 1 November and the Buddina State School Freaky Friday Fete. I already have my costume sorted out. We will again be raising money for air conditioning for the school.

I went to the Kawana Waters State College health and innovation expo recently. They are doing a tremendous job. I look forward to participating in that program. We have iPads for kids at Pacific Lutheran College and Currimundi State School for kids to get involved in democracy and to win an iPad.

I want to raise a serious issue for Talara Primary College. I wrote to Minister Bailey on 23 February 2016 about the need for a signalised pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Nicklin Way and Gannawarra Street. Minister Bailey replied on 3 May 2016 advising that his department 'has undertaken planning for future safety and capacity improvements along Nicklin Way. The planning includes installing a signalised pedestrian crossing ...' I then wrote to Minister Bailey on 20 June 2019 asking when the signalised crossing would be completed. Minister Bailey replied on 23 August 2019 advising that 'TMR has reviewed the intersection ... and determined that installing a signalised pedestrian crossing at this intersection is a low priority'. Someone will get killed at that intersection. A child going to school will get killed. I call on Minister Bailey to urgently install the safety improvements at the Gannawarra Street and Nicklin Way intersection.

Finally, I call on Minister de Brenni to meet with the Seachange Retirement Village. It is hybrid scheme. It has been severely impacted by the new government legislation whereby the unit owners are required to buy a property that they cannot sell. That is severely impacting the community at the Seachange Retirement Village, and I request that Minister de Brenni meet the community members to sort it out.

Calamvale Special School, Spring Fair

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Alger—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (7.03 pm): School fetes and fairs are a highlight of the year for many schools, and that is true for the many outstanding schools in my own electorate of Alger. Over the weekend I had the great pleasure of attending Calamvale Special School's Spring Fair. Calamvale Special School is a school led by an outstanding principal, Sue Howell, who brings abundant energy to her role and has an incredibly talented and committed teaching and support staff who I am in awe of.


It is a school supported by an incredibly generous and passionate P&C, led ably by new president Natalie Cupitt. It is a school that has absolutely beautiful students who every time I visit remind me of the true gift they are to our community. If the first ever Calamvale Special School Spring Fair on the weekend was anything to go by, it is also a school that has the full support of our Alger community. It was a huge hit. I know that the school community had worked hard over the last few months to make this event a success, and their hard work definitely paid off. There were performances from students. There were businesses and community organisations represented at numerous stalls. The school's op shop was open. There was a great P&C cake stall and there were activities for all to be involved in.

More than a thousand people—that is my estimate anyway—from across our community came out to support the school with its fundraising efforts. Funds raised from the day will go towards a much needed new playground which the P&C have been working towards for a while now. The playground equipment will be more suitable for all students including those in wheelchairs or with a vision impairment. This means that all students can have a better learning experience including students like Arianne, who I have known for some years now and was happy to see enjoying the fair with her grandmother.

I would like to congratulate the entire team at Calamvale Special School for a successful spring fair. I am incredibly proud to have one of Queensland's 45 special schools in my electorate. In this year's budget our government has committed \$350,000 for refurbishments at Calamvale Special School. These upgrades mean new classrooms, improved facilities to support students' unique learning needs and more breakout spaces. It is obvious that big things are happening at Calamvale Special School. I look forward to seeing what is next for the school community.

While I still have a little more time on the clock, I want to add that this weekend I will be holding a community forum for a number of my communities who live in what is known as peri-urban locations to prepare for any dangers that the continued fire season may have for our community. I encourage everyone to be involved in that.

Bribie Island Bridge

 **Mrs WILSON** (Pumicestone—LNP) (7.06 pm): Bribie Island is home to 33,000 residents and caters to thousands of visitors every month. It has one access point—the Bribie Island Bridge, and hasn't this been a hot topic for locals over the past eight weeks in my office! On 26 July my office was alerted to a significant amount of loose rock debris on the bridge. We immediately sent an urgent notification to the north coast region of Transport and Main Roads about the traffic hazard on the bridge and requested an urgent clean-up crew to attend. We received no acknowledgement of this request and, despite attempts to follow up with TMR over the following days, still no action was taken to address this traffic hazard.

We sent TMR photos to show the rock debris and the other litter scattered across the bridge and pedestrian walkway including dead fish and sand spills—and still no action. I table a copy of those images sent to TMR.

Tabled paper: Bundle of photographs depicting Bribie Island Bridge with dead fish, sand and rubbish on road [[1525](#)].


It is now 18 September—almost eight weeks since we first notified TMR about the traffic hazard on the bridge—and the loose rock is still there. In fact, it is worse. As the state representative for my community, I would expect that when a road safety hazard is reported to the authority action will be taken.

Accountability for state controlled roads starts and ends with the minister, who is in the House tonight. He needs to heed the message of his own campaign—road safety first! Early last week I wrote to the minister bringing this road safety hazard to his attention and asking him to urgently intervene and have the bridge cleaned up. I table a copy of that letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 10 September 2019, from the member for Pumicestone, Mrs Simone Wilson MP, to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding the condition of the Bribie Island Bridge [[1526](#)].

This morning residents are still calling my office about the loose rock debris that remains on the bridge. Nothing has been done by the minister to get this cleaned up. There has been no urgent intervention by him or his office whatsoever. I am not sure what it will take to get some action happening, but I would hope that, by my speaking about this on the floor of parliament tonight and the minister being in the House tonight, he finally does his job and gets the bridge cleaned up immediately. I have to ask: just what will it take for the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to do one good thing for Pumicestone?

Mount Ommaney Electorate, Small Business

 **Ms PUGH** (Mount Ommaney—ALP) (7.09 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, as a former small business manager and an avid foodie, can I say at the outset how much I really enjoyed being in your beautiful home of Townsville last sitting week. It was so great to experience firsthand the collection of eateries that Townsville has to offer. My father, David Pugh, would often attend the wonderful Chefs in the North event in his previous life as a chef and restaurant owner. It is so wonderful to see that the Townsville small business and hospitality scene continues to grow and thrive.

In that vein, I am excited to report that the Mount Ommaney Small Business Awards are once again on the horizon. In recent weeks I have met with the new president of the Centenary Chamber of Commerce, Ada from Silver Dove, a number of times. Can I say how exciting her enthusiasm for her new role is. With her team Adam, Lisa, Louise and Gaye, I can see that there are big plans to grow the chamber following on from the wonderful work of former president, Keith Hamilton. Keith has recently stepped down as president after many years of hard work to grow the chamber. He has done a wonderful job, and I want to thank him here in the people's house for his many years of service to the small business community.


Members of the House may recall that last year I hosted my first Mount Ommaney Small Business Awards, and what an exciting night it was. Minister Fentiman attended, and Milton Dick, my good friend the member for Oxley, was emcee. We launched this year's event last week with two events: one at White Lies Brewing and one at last year's overall winning venue, Just Poppy's. Lots of awesome local businesses showed up to collect their packs, including: Peta from Ageless Women's Fitness; Lissy from the Middle Park newsagent, who sold the winning lottery ticket last week, might I add; and Gav Shill from All Year Pest Solutions.

I am so proud of our government's record for small business. This year's budget was welcome news for small business, and payroll tax cuts from \$1.1 million to \$1.3 million per year is music to the ears of many small to medium enterprises in Mount Ommaney. Indeed, Bill Gaydon of Australian Fundraising in Spine Street contacted me to let me know that this cut meant he would be looking to hire more staff now so he can grow his business. But we are not stopping there. We are backing it up with free TAFE. Chefs, early childhood educators and many more qualifications are in high demand, and our government is helping young people get those jobs of the future.

I vividly remember at Restaurant II just how tricky it was to attract and retain skilled and qualified chefs. This will make it easier for venues like the one I used to work at to give our Queensland kids a job. I am so proud of our government's commitment to small business, and it is wonderful to have a Minister for Small Business who shares my passion. I certainly will not stop listening to, and advocating for, the businesses in my electorate and the wonderful locals they employ.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Thank you, member for Mount Ommaney. It was a pleasure hosting you and all of parliament in the beautiful city of Townsville.

Organ Donation, Jersey Day

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (7.12 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, 30 August was Jersey Day—a day where everybody is encouraged to wear their best jersey to help promote awareness of organ donation. Jersey Day was inspired by the story of Nathan Gremmo, who tragically lost his life in an accident in May 2015. To honour Nathan's generous personality his family chose to give the gift of life to others by donating his organs.

My community of Bundaberg is filled with generosity. We continually see it in our local media, we have seen it in times of natural disasters, and we see it again when we look at our local organ donation statistics. I am proud to know that 75 per cent of Bundaberg's residents are willing to donate their organs when the time comes. While that figure is fantastic, we need to work on the number of Bundy residents who are actually registered on the system. Even though our local registration rate is in line with Queensland's average of 28 per cent, I think it is important that we strive to improve that.


That is why on Jersey Day this year I launched a 12-month challenge for the Bundaberg community. It was a privilege to be joined by Martin Brennan, our local Donate Life representative and donation specialist nurse coordinator, as well as local residents Janelle, Geoff and Michelle, who are donor recipients, and Lynette, who is the mum of an organ donor. It was fantastic to have them there in support of my challenge and to hear their personal stories, their gratitude, and why they believe that registering as a donor is vital. Without his gift from an organ donor, Geoff told us he would not be here today. On Jersey Day 2020 I would love for Bundaberg registration statistics to have jumped by at least 500. While this may not seem a lot, I have learned that historically organ donation registry numbers are increasing very gradually, and 500 feels like an achievable place to start.

When I speak to people about registering as an organ donor, many are unaware that it is an incredibly simple process. They are often under the impression that it is complex to organise, with many thinking it is not something they need to think about until that time comes. I would love to shake these misconceptions and make people aware that registering takes just one minute. I would also love to

spark conversations amongst friends and family so that people are aware of how their loved ones feel about being an organ donor. I will be regularly working with local businesses and media, starting with our local radio station 4BU later this month, to help spread the word.

I would like to encourage everybody in this House—if they have not already done so—to go to donatelife.gov.au and register today. All you need to do is have internet access, a Medicare card and 60 seconds. It is that simple. If you are already a registered donor, do not worry: you can also help. Find a friend, a colleague or a family member and talk to them about why you chose to register, and hopefully they will do the same.

Jordan Electorate, Welcoming the Babies


 **Mrs MULLEN** (Jordan—ALP) (7.15 pm): On Sunday, 8 September, we welcomed all the babies. To be precise, we welcomed around 100 babies into the Jordan community at our annual Welcoming the Babies event. This event is fast becoming one of my favourite events to host alongside our federal member for Oxley, Milton Dick MP. Whilst the event could be dubbed one of the cutest citizenship ceremonies, there is much more to this event for our community.

In 2017 there were 953 babies born in the Jordan electorate, which statistically is a birth rate of more than 16 per 1,000 people. The state average sits at 12 per 1,000; we have a lot of babies. As a mum, I know that becoming a parent to our two daughters was the most amazing and precious thing I could ever experience. I also know that it was one of the most difficult, and I sometimes wish I had sought more support when I had my first child. As the local state member, I want to ensure that parents—particularly new parents—know they have support and services available to assist them through their parenting journey. I also want to ensure that we plan for the future for the health and social services our families will need.

Welcoming the Babies brings together an array of incredible local services in our community to offer information, advice, referrals and even a shoulder to cry on for those sleep deprived mums and dads. I always begin with our baby health services, and I am so grateful for the support of West Moreton Health. The child health nurses are just amazing. They were kept very busy on the day answering queries, offering support and reminding our parents that the child health nurses have a clinic each Monday at the YMCA Springfield Lakes Community Centre. I would like to thank Mater, who is always so supportive of our greater Springfield community, and particularly Nurse Claire, who gave a fantastic baby CPR presentation on the day. Emma and Jess, these amazing counsellors from the Australian Breastfeeding Association, are there every day and late into the night helping mums with feeding questions and support, and I am a big fan of what ABA does in our community.

I would like to thank Kidsafe Australia and the Office of Fair Trading, who were also there. They play such an important role in keeping our kids safe. The knowledge they espouse, particularly around baby product safety, is second to none. Ipswich City Council libraries brought their First Five Forever van for an interactive library experience. We can never underestimate the importance of reading from an early age. I would like to thank all of the council staff who were kept very busy at the event. To all of our terrific early childhood services who participated on the day, thank you for all the activities you organised to keep the toddlers and little ones entertained, and of course all of our local businesses who cater for families: Peter McMahon's Swim Factory, for those important swim lessons; Revive Yoga & Wellness Centre, who provided the best interactive sessions of baby-friendly yoga and kangatraining. Thank you for your support. I will continue to grow our Welcoming the Babies event not only to celebrate the beautiful babies born into our community but, just as importantly, to celebrate and support their amazing parents.

Bushfires

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (7.18 pm): I rise to speak about the recent conflagration of bushfires that passed through the Mount Archer area in Rockhampton. We have recently been told by the federal member from the Greens that it was all due to climate change. I spoke to the police minister today, and there have been over 30 charges laid for people lighting these fires. That is an absolute shame because we almost lost some people at Alton Downs. There were some 'Red, red, red' calls, and it was a very close call for our people.

I am very concerned but there were some good things that came out of it. I was there on Thursday night after the fire to go through it with Mr Steve Barber. We spoke about how we could make things better because the way the fires unfolded presented a new challenge. Some of the people were moved from urbans back to rurals and vice versa. I am hoping that going forward there is a cross-contamination


of training between the urbans and the rurals so they understand each other's equipment and they can work between the two. In that way, time would not be lost and fires could be adequately looked after and put out as quickly as possible. This would be especially so in a situation where people are lighting fires and we have our people out there trying to work. We do not know the cause yet, and it is a matter before the courts that I will not go into.

Situations can arise from these things that make it more dangerous for our frontline workers. I would like to thank all of the people from Alton Downs, including Owen Buckle and all of the people who work there. I would also like to thank the Queensland Police Service and the Ambulance Service because they were all there on the scene making the whole thing run very smoothly.

I would like to raise some issues that are ongoing with both Mount Morgan and Alton Downs. They are both really active within the rural firefighting community. A lot of fires have been lit by firebugs and they have been constantly pushing these people out into the districts for a long time. They have no toilets. There are no amenities for the women to go to the toilet. At night-time when they come home, they have to walk over 500 metres just to access any amenities, and I think that is wrong. We need to do something about that as soon as possible. These good people are putting their time and their lives on the line and the least the House can do is give them some way to go forward.

I would also like to raise the issue of the Finch Hatton airstrip. The federal government has put money in there but we have put nothing in. We need to put some water reserves in there for people and shore that place up. That took us to another area not long ago in the last lot of fires. I hope we can work together to make sure we deliver for these people.

Cairns Electorate, Jobs and TAFE

 **Mr HEALY** (Cairns—ALP) (7.22 pm): I am proud to be associated with a Palaszczuk Labor government which has made jobs a priority and continues to invest in the wonderful electorate of Cairns. Cairns is certainly seeing the benefits of our focus on people getting into work. It has the lowest unemployment rate in Queensland, and that is absolutely outstanding. The incredibly successful Back to Work program reached an exciting milestone earlier this month as the 20,000th Queenslanders was assisted into work under this successful program—the majority of them being in the state's regions. That is absolutely fantastic and is a milestone to be celebrated. Our investment in this program is an example of our dedication to jobs, particularly in our regional areas.


We know that some Queenslanders have struggled to find the right opportunity to get a job, and that is why this program is so important. That is also why the 2019-20 budget increased funding for the Back to Work program to \$14 million, bringing the total program funding to \$383 million. This is really, really good news.

In Cairns alone, 2,647 unemployed people have now found work through the program, and 1,164 businesses have benefited from those individuals. The jobs are as varied as Indigenous rangers working on boats for Experience Co, baristas working in coffee shops and a number of positions at the very popular Hemingway's Brewery on our beautiful waterfront. The Back to Work program has now injected almost \$26 million into the local economy. This just proves that Back to Work is living up to its name and that the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job of growing our economy. We want all Queenslanders to have access to world-class training that leads to good job opportunities.

When we were elected in 2015, TAFE campuses were left in a concerning state with a severe maintenance backlog and they were ready to be sold off. That is why we have a \$105 million investment to rebuild and revitalise TAFE campuses across the state, and in next year's budget we have \$15 million allocated to continue the upgrade of the Cairns facility. This investment in TAFE infrastructure will support another great initiative of the Palaszczuk government about jobs—that is, the \$32 million program for free apprenticeships and traineeships for those under 21 years of age. This is on top of our free TAFE for year 12 students.

We want more young Queenslanders to take up an apprenticeship or traineeship in industries where we know there will be jobs. That is why we are offering the free apprenticeships for those under the age of 21, particularly in regional areas. We understand the importance of this, particularly for our children. These are fantastic initiatives. It is good to see the government reinvesting in them and I am very proud to be delivering them.

Caloundra RSL, Bob McInnes Memorial Garden

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (7.25 pm): The Caloundra RSL Sub-Branch has launched a petition to stop 7.5 metres of its land being reclaimed for road widening. This will have a major impact on what is formally known as the Bob McInnes Memorial Garden. Bob was president of the Caloundra


RSL Services Club for many years, as well as being on the Caloundra RSL Sub-Branch Committee and a welfare officer. The garden is home to a fully restored RAAF Iroquois 'Huey' helicopter—one that flew in the Battle of Long Tan on 18 August 1966. The helicopter was recently used as a prop in the film *Danger Close: The Battle of Long Tan*. The garden and helicopter restoration were Bob's idea, with the first stage being unveiled on 11 November 2013 and the garden officially opening on 25 April 2015.

The garden consists of many items, including a tree propagated from an original pine cone brought back from Gallipoli by Sergeant Keith McDowell of the 24th Battalion AIF. It commemorates many conflicts this country has been involved in, including the Boer War, both world wars, Korea, Vietnam, East Timor, Sierra Leone and many others—in fact, 39 in total. The garden consists of four completed garden rooms, with one still under construction. It has a wooden arch, three Bofors, a stone brick wall with various memorials, a plinth dedicated to veterans who suicided and a plinth dedicated to the *Vyner Brooke* tragedy, plus many other important memorials. In fact, the items of this nature run to over 30 in number. The gardens were designed by a landscape architect and are professionally maintained. They are used for reflection by the community at large, by the families of those who fought and to hold memorial services.

If this resumption takes place, it will have a major impact on the garden, which is a labour of love and reflects the RSL's dedication to all service men and women. The resumption is for road-widening purposes and to ease congestion. I understand the need for that in Caloundra as I have been fighting for it for years, yet it is important to understand the role both actually and emotionally the garden plays in our community. A lot of people have worked hard and a lot of people use the garden to remember and wander with their thoughts.

The Sunshine Coast Regional Council wants to resume this land. It is up against a formidable opponent, ably led by Heather Christie, the secretary to the sub-branch. The RSL has a tradition of taking on tough challenges, and I can assure the council that it does not lie down. I intend to support the RSL to find an alternate solution. I assure the council that it is a matter that will garner public support on and on. We cannot let this garden and the men and women it honours stand for nothing. I say to the council that it should start looking at alternates because the RSL has fought tougher opponents than you and will not give up.

Oceania Cup, Hockey

 **Mr O'ROURKE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (7.28 pm): Sport, sport and more sport was the theme in Rockhampton over the week of 4 to 8 September when the Rockhampton Hockey Association played host to the Oceania Cup. Kalka Shades Hockey Fields saw about 1,500 spectators fill the stands to watch the fast paced, nailbiting competition between the Australian and New Zealand men's and women's teams, and what a challenge it was. Six test matches were played across three days, with Pacific Island nations including Papua New Guinea, Tonga and the Solomon Islands competing in an Intercontinental Hockey5s competition across all five days. The Australian men's and women's teams battled it out in the Oceania Cup, which doubled as a qualifier for the 2020 Tokyo Olympics. Ultimately, we got the Australian men to Tokyo but our women were not so lucky. They played extremely well and we are very proud of them.

There were so many firsts, with the event played on Rockhampton's brand-new international hockey field, which I am pleased to say was constructed with funding of \$3.4 million from the Palaszczuk government. It was also the first time that video reviews had been used in an Oceania Cup and it was the first time that the Intercontinental 5s have been live streamed.

I congratulate the vision of the Rockhampton Hockey Association and their incredibly hard work over 18 months to stage this enormously successful event. A special thanks goes to president Barbara Knowles, her husband, Ryan, and all the members of the committee. With their persistence, they drew three tiers of government together to deliver a field that is already a venue capable of supporting Olympic qualifying matches right here in Rocky.

Last week the Premier returned from meeting with the International Olympic Committee with Queensland as a frontrunner for the 2032 games, and I want to see CQ included in the push for the Queensland Olympics bid. The benefits of an event like this should be spread across the state, not just confined to the south-east. We can host any number of events locally from hockey to cycling, rowing and so much more. Whatever it is, our local community will be showing up in force to support it. Let's make sure that CQ is included in any future Olympics.

The House adjourned at 7.31 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, 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