



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au

Phone (07) 3553 6344

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-SIXTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 22 October 2019

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3409
School Group Tours.....	3409
PETITIONS	3409
TABLED PAPERS	3410
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3411
Retired Racehorses, Inquiry.....	3411
State Education Week.....	3411
Princess Alexandra Hospital, Spinal Injuries Unit	3412
Endometriosis	3412
Jobs	3412
Retired Racehorses, Forum.....	3413
Infrastructure.....	3413
Education Queensland; School Infrastructure.....	3414
International Education	3414
Police, Resources	3415
Ipswich Hospital, Redevelopment.....	3415
Public Transport, Investment	3416
Fuel Prices, Reporting	3416
CONVO2019; Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, National Apology	3417
Floods, Recovery Assistance.....	3417
PERSONAL EXPLANATION	3418
Comments by Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services; Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs	3418

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 22 October 2019

ETHICS COMMITTEE	3418
Reports	3418
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 189, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 October 2018 relating to an alleged contempt of parliament by the Premier and Minister for Trade.....	3418
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 190, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 28 February 2019 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by a member.	3419
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ethics Committee: Report No. 191, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Report on a Right of Reply No. 38.....	3419
HEALTH, COMMUNITIES, DISABILITY SERVICES AND DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE PREVENTION COMMITTEE	3419
Report	3419
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 28, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 June and 20 August 2019.....	3419
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3419
Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs	3419
Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs	3419
Council of Australian Governments	3420
Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs	3420
Whitsundays, Cyclone Recovery	3421
Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services	3421
Federal Government, Economy	3422
Townsville, Crime	3423
Jobs and Investment	3423
Gold Coast, Police Resources	3424
Tourism Industry, Projects	3425
Racing Integrity Commission	3426
Education	3426
Cyclones, Insurance	3427
Regional Queensland, Road Infrastructure	3427
Coalmining	3428
Gas Industry	3428
Agricultural Training Colleges	3429
Rockhampton, Ambulance Station	3430
Police-Citizens Youth Clubs	3430
Police, Resources	3430
MINISTERIAL STATEMENT	3431
Ethics Committee Report, Apology	3431
MOTION	3431
Business Program	3431
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Local Gov Bill'.	3432
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Police Discipline Bill'.	3432
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	3435
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3435
NOTICE OF MOTION	3435
Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt	3435
MOTION	3436
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders	3436
PRIVILEGE	3436
Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt	3436
MOTION	3436
Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt	3436
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	3445
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3445
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders	3445
Non-Government Members, Resources	3446
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3449
Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance; Liberal National Party, Policies	3449
Building Safety	3450
Racing Integrity Commission	3451
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 18 October 2019, from Racing NSW titled 'Racing NSW Response to ABC 7.30 Report'.	3452
Gladstone Electorate, Health Services	3452
Drought	3453
Drought	3454
Health System	3455
Ipswich Electorate, Jobs	3456
Law and Order	3457
Theodore, Mr EG	3458
MOTION	3459
Non-Government Members, Resources	3459

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 22 October 2019

WORKERS' COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3467
Consideration in Detail	3467
Clauses 29 to 33, as read, agreed to	3467
Clause 34, as read, agreed to.....	3467
Clauses 35 to 92, as read, agreed to	3467
Schedule, as read, agreed to	3467
Third Reading.....	3467
Long Title.....	3467
CIVIL LIABILITY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3467
Second Reading	3467
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Letter, dated 5 October 2019, from multiple authors to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Yvette D'Ath, regarding the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018.	3483
RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT (FEES) AMENDMENT REGULATION.....	3485
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	3485
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Photographs depicting Stradbroke Island.....	3497
PRIVILEGE	3501
Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>.....	3501
RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT (FEES) AMENDMENT REGULATION.....	3501
Disallowance of Statutory Instrument	3501
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	3501
Resolved in the negative.	3501
ADJOURNMENT.....	3502
Southern Downs Electorate, Drought	3502
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Letter, dated 9 September 2019, from the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, regarding drinking water to residents in the Stanthorpe area.	3502
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Document, undated, from the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission webpage titled 'Granite Belt Drought Appeal'.....	3502
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Letter, dated 25 September 2019, from the Premier and the Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, to the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, regarding drinking water to residents in the Stanthorpe area.	3502
Redlands Electorate.....	3502
Rite Journey; Polished Man	3503
Gold Coast, Infrastructure	3503
Gold Coast, Crime.....	3504
Townsville Electorate, Education Week.....	3505
Drought Assistance	3505
Yatala Enterprise Area, M1	3506
Coomera Railway Station	3507
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Email, dated 12 July 2019, from the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding the upgrade of the Coomera Railway Station.....	3507
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Letter, dated 15 August 2019, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, regarding the upgrade of the Coomera Railway Station.....	3507
<i>Tabled paper.</i> Photograph of a car parked under an overpass.....	3507
Education Week; World Teachers' Day.....	3507
ATTENDANCE.....	3508

TUESDAY, 22 OCTOBER 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 STATEMENT

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 Mount Archer State School in the electorate of Keppel, Greenbank State School in the electorate of Jordan, and Bribie Island State High School in the electorate of Pumicestone.

PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petitions, sponsored by the Clerk—

Palliative Care

From 67 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure equal access to world class palliative care for every Queenslander and to not consider legalising euthanasia [[1893](#)].

Carseldine Railway Station, Park-and-Ride

From 104 petitioners, requesting the House to expand the existing Park n Ride facility or provide an additional space for commuters to park and access the Carseldine Train Station [[1894](#)].

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

Assault, Sentencing Law Reform

Mr Saunders, from 3,967 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the law to effect consistent maximum sentencing is applied to perpetrators of unlawful assault against any member, officer or employee of a service established for a public purpose under an Act [[1895](#), [1896](#)].

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

Pimpama-Ormeau, Youth Centre

Mr Crandon, from 640 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure the construction of a Youth Centre in Pimpama-Ormeau [[1897](#)].

Rosella, Bruce Highway Upgrade

Mr Andrew, from 374 petitioners, requesting the House to save the Rosella Store and adjacent parklands from compulsory acquisition and to consider alternative routes for the proposed Bruce Highway upgrade at Rosella [[1898](#)].

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

Economic Management

From 546 petitioners, requesting the House to freeze the Queensland debt level; provide a financial plan that demonstrates how the State budget will be brought back to surplus within two years and how the debt to GDP ratio will be reduced to under 10 within three to five years [[1899](#)].

Southern Moreton Bay Islands, Infrastructure

From 433 petitioners, requesting the House to set up a Commission of Inquiry as to why Redland Shire Council/Redland City Council has failed to provide Russell, Karragarra, Lamb and Macleay Islands urban infrastructure to a standard normally provided in other urban areas; and to recommend a means to remedy this failure [[1900](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS (SO 31)

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

18 October 2019—

- [1869](#) Economics and Governance Committee: Report No. 34, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 3 May 2019 and 20 August 2019
- [1870](#) State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee: Report No. 40, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Resources Safety and Health Queensland Bill 2019
- [1871](#) Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 27, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Health Transparency Bill 2019
- [1872](#) Queensland Budget 2019-20: Service Delivery Statements—Department of Local Government, Racing and Multicultural Affairs: Erratum
- [1873](#) Queensland Budget 2019-20: Service Delivery Statements—Department of State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning: Erratum
- [1874](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services (Hon. Dr Miles), to a paper petition (3197-19) presented by the member for Hill, Mr Knuth, from 18 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a regular and quality health service by a general practitioner to Mount Garnet
- [1875](#) Response from the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services (Hon. Dr Miles), to a paper petition (3198-19), presented by the member for Mirani, Mr Andrew, and an ePetition (3125-19) sponsored by the member for Mirani, Mr Andrew, from 534 and 453 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to review exclusions zones and distance requirements for commercially available baits containing 1080 poison
- [1876](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Hon. Bailey), to a paper petition (3200-19) presented by the Clerk under provisions of Standing Order 119(3) from 1,837 petitioners, requesting the House to terminate the Yorkeys Knob Boat Ramp project

21 October 2019—

- [1877](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 52, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019
- [1878](#) Public Trustee Act 1978: Public Trustee (Fees and Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2019
- [1879](#) Public Trustee Act 1978: Public Trustee (Fees and Charges Notice) (No. 1) 2019, explanatory notes
- [1880](#) Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012: Rail Safety National Law National Regulations Variation Regulations 2019
- [1881](#) Rail Safety National Law National Regulations Variation Regulations 2019: Rail Safety National Law National Regulations Variation Regulations 2019, explanatory notes
- [1882](#) Rail Safety National Law (South Australia) Act 2012: Rail Safety National Law National Regulations (Fees) Variation Regulations 2019
- [1883](#) Rail Safety National Law National Regulations (Fees) Variation Regulations 2019: Rail Safety National Law National Regulations Variation Regulations 2019, explanatory notes

TABLING OF DOCUMENTS (SO 32)

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Transport Infrastructure Act 1994:

- [1888](#) Transport Infrastructure (Public Marine Facilities) (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 207
- [1889](#) Transport Infrastructure (Public Marine Facilities) (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 207, explanatory notes

Building Act 1975:

- [1890](#) Building (Approval of Amendment of QDC) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 208
- [1891](#) Building (Approval of Amendment of QDC) Amendment Regulation 2019, No. 208, explanatory notes

REPORT BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

- [1892](#) Report pursuant to Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by His Excellency the Governor, viz—

Police Service Administration (Discipline Reform) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019

Amendment made to the Bill*

Clause 29 (Insertion of new ch 8, pt 16)

Page 73, clause 29, inserted section 452A(2), 'part, 2,'—


Omit, insert—

part 2,

* The following page reference relates to the Bill, as amended.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Retired Racehorses, Inquiry

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.34 am): Anyone who viewed the 7.30 program last Thursday night and witnessed the vision of retired racehorses being mistreated at a Queensland abattoir would have been sickened and appalled. This was deeply disturbing, horrendous footage and I was just as appalled. I know that my minister for agriculture along with my Minister for Racing have spoken to many racing industry figures in the past few days and they have all been deeply concerned about the allegations of animal abuse that surfaced. My government stands with the many industry figures who love their racing animals and, like them, I want to make sure we leave no stone unturned to restore the faith people quite rightly have in our racing industry and ensure we do everything possible to stamp out animal cruelty.

That is why, today, I am announcing an urgent inquiry into the treatment of retired racehorses and animal welfare concerns in dealing with retired racehorses at Queensland abattoirs. This independent inquiry will be overseen by the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, which is the independent watchdog charged, in part, with safeguarding the welfare of racing animals during their racing career. It is a necessary inquiry to provide Queenslanders with confidence that the racing industry is doing everything possible to ensure the welfare of horses.


Animal welfare is everybody's responsibility and my government will not stand for cruelty to animals. That is why Queensland has the toughest animal cruelty laws in Australia, including penalties of up to seven years jail for the most serious offences. This inquiry will determine what more we can do to make sure that we have the best possible processes in place to end cruelty to animals in Queensland. Separate to this, Biosecurity Queensland investigators visited the abattoir last week immediately after this story aired and their investigation is ongoing.

The inquiry will be headed by retired District Court judge Terry Martin SC, with the support of equine veterinary surgeon and Australian Veterinary Association representative Dr Peter Reid. Both Mr Martin and Dr Reid have extensive experience in their respective fields and will bring a wealth of personal and professional knowledge to their roles in the inquiry.

I stand with the many industry figures who love their racing animals and, like them, I want to make sure that no stone is left unturned. The inquiry will examine the regulatory and oversight arrangements for the management of retired racehorses; the regulatory and oversight arrangements for the operation of facilities accepting horses for slaughter; the adequacy of arrangements for detecting, assessing, mitigating and prosecuting breaches of the welfare of retired racehorses, including those moved from interstate; comparative assessment of arrangements in other states; and any changes required in oversight of the tracking and welfare of retired horses.

The inquiry will also engage the expertise of the Queensland Department of Agriculture and Fisheries and is expected to report back to the ministers for agriculture and racing early next year. I reiterate that animal cruelty will not be tolerated in Queensland and that is why my government has implemented this inquiry with the urgency it requires.

State Education Week

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.37 am): We owe an enduring debt of gratitude to everyone who guides and protects our young people in life—parents, of course, as well as youth workers and police, child protection officers, sports coaches, and club volunteers—and we especially hold our teachers in the highest esteem. This week, schools all over Queensland—teachers, students, parents and friends—are celebrating State Education Week. This annual event honours our teaching staff, celebrates Queensland's world-class education system, and further strengthens relationships between schools and the community. State schools are holding performances, open classrooms, special assemblies and cultural activities. This year's theme is 'creating opportunities'.

All students, regardless of circumstance, should have access to the very best educational opportunities. Our budget this year includes funding to employ 1,000 more teachers and more than 200 extra teacher aides. That is part of our four-year commitment to employ 3,700 more teachers by 2021-22. More than 4,800 teachers and around 1,400 teacher aides have been hired by my government since 2015. We are immensely proud of that record. Five new schools have been built, with eight more to open next year: a new special school in Caboolture; the Fortitude Valley State Secondary College' new secondary schools at Calliope, Mango Hill, Coomera and Yarrabilba; and new primary and


secondary schools in Ripley Valley. There will be another five in 2021: new primary and special schools at Palmview; a secondary school at Caloundra South; a primary school at Pimpama; and the new Inner City South State Secondary College.

State Education Week will culminate on Friday night with the 2019 Showcase Awards for Excellence in Schools. It is fitting that these awards will be held on World Teachers' Day. The American William Arthur Ward said—

The good teacher explains. The superior teacher demonstrates. The great teacher inspires.


As a government and as a society, we thank Queensland's teachers for their explanations, their demonstrations and their inspiration.

Princess Alexandra Hospital, Spinal Injuries Unit


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.39 am): My government is committed to improving health infrastructure and services for Queenslanders right across the state each and every day. On the weekend I visited the PA Hospital and got to spend some time with Dr Atresh and staff and a couple of patients, including Cath and Shane, at the Spinal Injuries Unit. The Minister for Health joined me. We had a wonderful time. The 40-bed unit is the state's referral centre for acute and rehabilitation services and takes patients from right across Queensland and even northern New South Wales. We even help out New South Wales when we can. Many patients end up here for a variety of reasons, whether it is an accident or other trauma, medical illness or disease. As we know, disability can happen to anyone at any time. Dr Atresh told the health minister and myself that one piece of good news is that the number of people presenting to the spinal injuries unit as a result of road trauma has substantially decreased over the years. That is great news. Our road safety advertising is obviously working.

We want to make sure the families have the best facilities possible so they are as comfortable as possible. That is why I was very pleased to announce a \$1.85 million refurbishment to the unit, which includes refurbishment of 10 bathrooms, creation of a new garden feature and a communal dining room upgrade. Every dollar counts and this funding will help improve the lives of patients while they are getting the best possible care for their injuries.

Endometriosis

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (9.40 am): Last weekend whilst at the Princess Alexandra Hospital I had the pleasure of announcing \$420,000 in funding to the Endometriosis Association Queensland to help sufferers of endometriosis. One in 10 women are now affected by endometriosis, which occurs when tissue similar to the uterus lining grows outside the uterus and attaches itself to other organs. Having been through a couple of operations I know how bad this condition can be. As yet there is no cure for the disease. I have spoken openly about my experiences. When I was young I did not know what the symptoms were. I did not know why I was in so much pain. Sufferers will now have the opportunity with an app to monitor their condition but also to join a support group of women who can support one another during this very difficult time. Through the app, women will be able to track and report their symptoms, develop a care plan, and use many resources to assist in their treatment. The free app will be available in June 2020 and will remind sufferers that they are not alone.


Jobs

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (9.42 am): The Palaszczuk Labor government is focused on jobs for Queenslanders: rewarding jobs, skilled jobs, secure jobs, jobs in traditional industries and jobs in emerging industries, jobs in our regions and jobs in our cities. We want to see more secure employment and better wages for those who have a job. We want those Queenslanders looking for a job to have the best possible chance of finding one.

That is why I was so pleased to see the rise in the participation rate in the latest labour force data released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics. On trend, the Queensland participation rate has risen to 66.3 per cent. This is the second highest in Australia and the highest participation rate in Queensland since 2012. This strength in the participation rate shows more Queenslanders have confidence in the economy, a sentiment also reflected by the latest Deloitte Access Economics Business Outlook. That report stated 'the state government is ... providing a solid pipeline of public infrastructure' and forecasts that this financial year and next Queensland will have the second strongest economic growth in the nation.

The latest ABS labour force data also showed that, on average, more than 200 jobs were created every day in Queensland in September and that the number of jobs created since we came to power in 2015 is now more than 226,800. We know there is more to be done to help Queenslanders get jobs. That is why we have slashed payroll tax by \$885 million to help small and medium businesses and regional businesses employ more Queenslanders. It is why we brought back Skilling Queenslanders for Work after the LNP axed it. It is why we are investing in industry attraction through our Jobs and Regional Growth Fund and Advance Queensland Industry Attraction Fund. It is why we are providing free apprenticeships for school leavers, making it easier for workers to attain the skills for existing and emerging industries. It is why we have expanded free apprenticeships to all Queenslanders under 21 so that the next generation of Queenslanders are job-ready for our diversifying economy. The Palaszczuk Labor government will never stop backing Queensland workers and investing in the programs and infrastructure that support job creation.

Retired Racehorses, Forum

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (9.44 am): Last week, the ABC's program 7.30 broadcast a story about the treatment of horses after they had retired from their racing careers. Part of that story—a shocking part of that story—was the treatment of several retired racehorses at a Queensland abattoir. The images were horrific and sickening and I hope I never see anything like it again.


I welcome the Premier's announcement this morning of an independent inquiry into the treatment of retired racehorses. Some time ago I tasked my office with organising a forum to look at racehorses and their post-career lives. Invitations had been sent and accepted before the ABC story broke on Thursday night. First thing on Friday I asked that the forum be brought forward to this week. It has taken some organising but I am pleased to inform the House that the forum is being held this afternoon.

This is an issue that the whole of the racing industry needs to address and for which everyone must take responsibility. It is not about the trainers or the breeders; it is about the trainers, the breeders, the owners, the codes and all levels of government. Today major stakeholders from across the racing industry will be represented, from breeders and trainers to re-homers, vets and Racing Queensland. Also at the table will be the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, the independent organisation charged with safeguarding the integrity and welfare of racehorses and the industry.

The history of the commission actually speaks to the Palaszczuk government's commitment to animal welfare. It was established under the Racing Integrity Act 2016 and was borne of the 2015 commission of inquiry which was set up to look into the Queensland greyhound racing industry after the revelations of live baiting. We needed Racing Queensland to look after the business of racing, with the commission independent of that and focusing on integrity and welfare issues. It is this independence and the experience of QRIC that will continue to drive us towards excellence in the animal welfare arena.

Already we have the highly successful Greyhound Adoption Program, which brings ex-racing greyhounds and families together. Could we do something similar in the equine arena? It is certainly up for discussion, although we know it is a slightly different prospect finding a happy home for a greyhound than it is for a horse that stands 16 hands high. As the 7.30 story pointed out, this is not an issue that is confined to Queensland's borders. Next month all Australia's racing ministers will be meeting at the Australasian Racing Ministers Conference in Perth and I know this will be a key issue on the agenda. I look forward to updating the House on these issues.

Infrastructure


 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.47 am): This week we saw yet another example of how the Morrison federal LNP government is failing Queensland. As reported in the *Courier-Mail* yesterday, out of a \$4.5 billion Morrison government fund, a fund meant to build roads to connect regions with major business opportunities, less than one half of one per cent, or only \$14.5 million of the fund, will be allocated to Queensland this financial year. It is typical of a federal LNP government that sees Queensland as nothing but a source of revenue and a source of votes.

Queensland is the export powerhouse of Australia, exporting more than New South Wales and Victoria combined, bringing in \$85.8 billion worth of international sales that keeps our national economy going. While Queensland is bringing home the bacon for the national economy, Queensland does not get so much as a tin of Spam from the Morrison government. A single town in Victoria gets more than

we could ever hope for. Geelong gets \$2 billion for a fast rail, it gets a \$1 billion defence howitzer system, a new women's and children's hospital, new pools, a new mental health service and \$3.5 million for the Drysdale Sports Precinct. This is all for people who did not even elect the LNP. Meanwhile the logs in the federal Queensland LNP caucus, sitting on fat margins, cannot even get money for Gold Coast light rail. There is no money for Cross River Rail. When it comes to infrastructure, the Palaszczuk Labor government is doing the heavy lifting.

When we came to government, the Newman LNP government had an infrastructure budget of \$42.481 billion, with an arrow pointing down. The Palaszczuk Labor government has turned that around, lifting our four-year spend to almost \$50 billion—\$49.544 billion—supporting over 40,000 jobs in the next 12 months. That is why infrastructure underspend under our government is approaching zero per cent, which is the first time that has happened in Queensland for a decade. However, we cannot do it alone. It is time that Scott Morrison and the federal LNP government started giving Queensland its fair share and paid for the infrastructure that our growing state deserves.


Education Queensland; School Infrastructure

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (9.50 am): This week is State Education Week and there is no better time to reflect on Queensland's education sector, with the Palaszczuk government delivering on its iron-clad commitment to give every child a great start and a world-class education. That is why this week I was very proud to hear that the Queensland Department of Education had been honoured by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the United States of America. Education Queensland is one of only three recipients from around the world to receive this prestigious award, with Carnegie President Anthony Bryk saying, 'We are thrilled to honour the exemplary efforts of the Queensland Department of Education and share out into the education field practical lessons from their efforts.' In particular, they also praised our efforts in Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities. We will be honoured on 21 November at the Spotlight on Quality in Continuous Improvement Symposium, at the National Press Club in Washington DC, along with two American school improvement initiatives. Congratulations to my department! Of course, this comes on the back of the Grattan report that identified Queensland as a star performer in school improvement across the nation.

Providing a world-class education is not possible without world-class facilities for our hardworking teachers, staff and students. That is why the Palaszczuk government is investing record amounts in our school infrastructure. We have a record \$13.76 billion education budget, which is up by \$789 million compared to last year. We have a record \$1.5 billion school infrastructure spend, which will deliver eight new schools next year, another four new schools in 2021 and \$100 million for non-state school capital funding, and will help upgrade schools from Cape York to Coolangatta.

Our record investment in school infrastructure means we are catering for increased student numbers in our fastest growing regions. We are building new schools on the Gold Coast, Sunshine Coast, Logan, Ipswich and in the Moreton Bay region. Following a period of unprecedented inner city growth, two new high schools will be built here in the city, one in Fortitude Valley to open in 2020 and another at Dutton Park to open in 2021. They will be the first new high schools built in the inner city in over 50 years. All of that is just more proof that the Palaszczuk government's investment in schools and quality teachers and staff is paying off, and is giving every child a great start with a recognised world-class education.


International Education

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail) (9.53 am): It is not just in state education that we are kicking goals. Today I am proud to announce new data that shows Queensland's international education industry is growing rapidly thanks to the Palaszczuk government. A new Deloitte Access Economics report shows that the state international education sector is now worth \$5.2 billion in export revenue to Queensland, supporting 38,000 jobs across our great state. That is a 16 per cent growth year on year. It is Queensland's fastest growing service export. We have also seen a 9.6 per cent increase in student enrolments, with one in three international students in Queensland studying outside of Brisbane.

Even better, the new report has found that Queensland's international education sector is more diverse than that of any other state in our country. We have more students coming from more countries around the world than any other state in Australia. That means that our industry is less vulnerable to geopolitical tensions overseas and proves that our strategy to diversify our student population is working.

Forty-two per cent of our student enrolments come from China, India and Brazil. China is an important market, but we are not putting all of our eggs in one basket. We are seeing particularly strong growth from Latin America, including 10 per cent growth in the number of Brazilian students and 80 per cent growth in the number of Columbian students here in Queensland. This is no accident. We have a strategy to grow this industry to create more jobs for Queenslanders. We will continue to invest in this sector to grow Queensland's economy.

Police, Resources

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.54 am): A group of individuals behaved appallingly in Townsville yesterday. Those people acted with callous disregard for the safety of other people. Those people showed utter disrespect for the rights and property of other members of their community. The causes of that outrageous behaviour are complex, but the consequences are simple: those people will be arrested. A short time ago I was informed by Townsville police that they know exactly who they are looking for. The police have strategies in place and those people will have nowhere to run.


There are over 600 police already permanently based in Townsville and 53 extra police will be deployed there by the end of next year. Police in Townsville, as well as right across the state, are working hard every day to keep our communities safe. Our government is making significant resourcing investments in police right across the state.

There are over 1,000 police permanently based on the Gold Coast and another 20 officers will be deployed there by the end of this financial year. Our anti organised crime legislation is the strongest in the nation. It is the strongest, toughest and most comprehensive legislation in the nation. Last year our police made the highest number of arrests of members of organised crime groups since Taskforce Maxima was formed. Data shows that patched OMCG membership in Queensland continues to decline.

Following the deaths of two people on the Gold Coast recently, police have established a dedicated operation, Operation Romeo Masking, with an investigative centre being established at the Gold Coast CIB at Burleigh Heads. Just this morning I was advised by police that a team of more than 20 detectives is working around the clock on that investigation and they are being assisted by State Crime Command, including the homicide squad, the Organised Crime Gangs Group, forensic specialists and intelligence officers.

I know that our police will not rest until their investigations are complete. They will continue to work until justice is delivered and they will continue to keep working hard for the safety of our communities.

Ipswich Hospital, Redevelopment

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.57 am): I am pleased to provide an update on the Ipswich Hospital redevelopment. West Moreton is one of the fastest growing regions in Queensland, with the population forecast to more than double to 590,000 by 2036. The Palaszczuk government is investing a record amount into West Moreton's health services. At the last state budget we delivered annual funding of \$642.8 million for West Moreton HHS, which was an increase of \$35.7 million. The budget also included funding for 87 more staff to support Ipswich's booming population. That is on top of the 800 new nurses, doctors and other health professionals we have hired in West Moreton since 2015.


We went to the last election with a bold plan for Ipswich Hospital, with \$127.5 million of funding for stage 1 of the Ipswich Health Precinct. The opposition went to the same election trying to tell us that Ipswich did not need that expansion and promised not a single cent for Ipswich Hospital.

We are already delivering on our promises, with our MRI machine expected to be operational this year. Planning is underway for the new mental health facility. That new facility will provide a much needed boost to mental health services and create a space for further expansion of the hospital. While under construction, the project will employ around 500 construction workers, which includes local trade apprentices. Recently I was pleased to visit the staff of the mental health unit with the member for Ipswich. They do an important and sometimes challenging job and I am pleased that the Palaszczuk government is supporting them with this new facility.

The MRI machine we are delivering for Ipswich Hospital is a first of its kind in the Southern Hemisphere. Designed to be patient friendly alongside cutting-edge imaging technology, the machine produces its images via a blanket wrapped around the patient. This means that the chamber in which the patient lies is much larger, more comfortable and less likely to cause anxiety. The MRI machine will

mean that every week, around 50 people will no longer have to leave Ipswich Hospital to get their images. The Palaszczuk government and the members for Ipswich, Ipswich West and Jordan will continue delivering for the people of West Moreton.

Public Transport, Investment

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.59 am): Public transport investment is in the fast lane under the Palaszczuk Labor government. This morning, the first trials of express ticketing gates started at Central Station as part of the Palaszczuk government's \$371 million statewide Smart Ticketing rollout. Next month, people catching buses in Innisfail, Bowen, Hervey Bay, Maryborough and Minjerribah will be able to track the real-time journey of their bus for the first time. These trials will give Queensland commuters a first look at how our public transport investment is making their journeys better.


Smart Ticketing means people will be able to pay with their credit or debit card, smartphone or smartwatch to speed up boarding and exiting. Queenslanders will access the latest technology used by millions of commuters in London, Chicago and Vancouver. For the first time in Queensland history this will be a ticketing system for all Queenslanders and not just those in South-East Queensland.

We are also investing in Cross River Rail which will unlock the bottleneck at the core of the South-East Queensland rail network. One hundred per cent funded by the Palaszczuk Labor government, the \$5.4 billion Cross River Rail project will give us the capacity to run more services, more often.

On the Gold Coast we have \$351 million committed for the next stage of light rail to Burleigh—not an infliction, but an investment in Gold Coast jobs. We are building thousands more car parks at train and bus stations across South-East Queensland with a \$116 million park-and-ride program. Our \$357 million station upgrade program is modernising train stations across the region to make them more accessible and commuter friendly. Two years in a row of record public transport patronage shows more people want to catch trains, buses, ferries and trams. That is why public transport investment is a major feature of the Palaszczuk government's record \$23 billion roads and transport investment over the next four years.

Like any rail network around the world, occasionally technical faults can occur, and this morning's train delays have seen our hardworking staff respond as quickly as possible to fully restore services. On-time running on our rail network remains much better than Sydney or Melbourne's, but, unfortunately, not today. A signalling fault at Eagle Junction this morning resulted in some cancellations and delays to services, so I thank our passengers for their patience and sincerely apologise to those who were affected.

Fuel Prices, Reporting


 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (10.02 am): The Palaszczuk government cares about the cost-of-living pressures that many Queenslanders are facing, and we continue to do everything we can to help, including finding the cheapest fuel in town. Since December last year, when the Queensland government's fuel price reporting trial started, Queensland motorists have been able to save at the bowser by finding the service station with the cheapest fuel.

I can report to the House that the Palaszczuk government's fuel price reporting scheme is delivering for motorists. As of this morning, more than 98 per cent of fuel retailers across Queensland are providing up-to-date fuel prices in real time. This demonstrates the high level of continuing cooperation shown by fuel retailers to make their fuel prices available to motorists. I appreciate the goodwill shown by the industry groups and their members, including the Australasian Convenience and Petroleum Marketers Association, the Australian Institute of Petroleum and the RACQ. Currently, petrol prices in South-East Queensland are heading towards the top of the price cycle; however, there are still opportunities to save. Across Brisbane motorists can save 40 cents per litre or about \$20 on the average per tank just by shopping around. In regional centres such as Cairns and Townsville around 10 cents per litre can be saved.

I am pleased to advise there are already 11 smartphone applications and websites that have come on board, many of which are newcomers to this state. These apps and websites are: Ezy Street, Fuelify, Fuel Map, Fuel Price Australia, MotorMouth, PetrolSpy, RACQ's Fair Fuel, Pumped Fuel, ServoTrack, Simple Fuel and Vroom Fuel Price Compare. These apps are making fuel prices easily available to motorists to shop around and save.

I can also report to the House that hundreds of thousands of motorists are taking advantage of these freely available apps and data. The latest data shows more than 600,000 fuel price checks last month alone. That is hundreds of thousands of dollars back in the pocket of Queensland motorists. Motorists can find all of their fuel price apps available to them by visiting my department's website. I encourage motorists to start saving at the bowser by jumping on a fuel price app and shopping around.

CONVO2019; Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, National Apology

 **Hon. DE FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (Minister for Child Safety, Youth and Women and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence) (10.04 am): There is not one thing that will end cyberbullying—we have to do everything, and we have to do it together. That is why I am delighted to advise members that yesterday we hosted an Australian first at the Queensland State Netball Centre—Convo2019. Almost 100 young Queenslanders got together with some of the world's biggest social media companies and several social media influencers to create an anti-cyberbullying campaign developed by young people for young people.


This campaign will deliver on one of the 29 recommendations made by the Premier's Anti-Cyberbullying Taskforce. Young people aged 12 to 25 came from far and wide to create an anti-cyberbullying campaign which we will roll out statewide next year. They came from all over Queensland—Emerald, Dalby, Cairns, Alligator Creek, Mount Isa and Kowanyama. One young man drove 750 kilometres to Cairns before hopping on a plane to come to Brisbane to be part of this. I am looking forward to unveiling this new campaign next year.

On another matter, today is an important day. It is the first anniversary of the national apology to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. On 22 October 2018 I had the very great privilege of hosting the Brisbane screening of the federal government's apology on behalf of all Australians to the individuals and families whose lives were forever changed by institutional child sexual abuse.

Now, one year later, the Palaszczuk government reaffirms our continued commitment to truth, healing and reconciliation for those who have experienced institutional child sexual abuse and our commitment to continue doing everything we can to protect our children and young people so that history is not repeated. Today I had the privilege of making a very important announcement with the Attorney-General about supporting victims and survivors of institutional child physical abuse.

As the Minister for Child Safety, I have listened to stories from many people who have experienced institutional child abuse. Today, on the anniversary of the national apology, I want to pay tribute to the courage of everyone who came forward to tell their story, and everyone who has not been able to tell their story. To all of you, we say: we see you; we believe you; we support you.

Floods, Recovery Assistance

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (10.07 am): The Palaszczuk government is committed to supporting all small businesses that were impacted by the devastating floods. More than six months on we are still there on the ground assisting businesses that need a helping hand. We know that supporting local businesses will help create more local jobs. Despite the floods in February, Townsville's unemployment rate is more than two per cent lower than it was a year ago. That would not be possible without the continued support on the ground following these devastating floods.


I am proud that already we have approved over 650 Special Disaster Assistance Recovery Grants to small businesses, providing over \$9 million in funding. During Small Business Week I announced an additional \$10 million support package to help small businesses with longer term recovery and building business resilience.

The Small Business Recovery Centre in Townsville continues to provide support. However, I am excited to announce a new initiative that takes the recovery centre on the road. Our Back on Track bus has hit the road this week to provide assistance to businesses that need it most in Western Queensland with our mobile outreach teams. Between late October and early December the Back on Track bus will deliver support and information direct to recovering small businesses across 16 locations hit hardest by these floods. We know how busy these business owners are so we are coming to them. We are connecting them with experts to help them with their recovery so that they are ready to face any future disasters. This includes information on loans and grants, disaster preparation and, importantly, mental health support.

We have also announced our new Small Business Recovery and Resilience Champion, Ben Verring, who will be on the ground working with locals to hear their stories and develop strategies on how we can continue to support local small businesses. Ben has spent most of his career working for small business, particularly in the regions, and he recently served as the CEO of the Townsville Business Development Centre. Providing the right support and assistance not only during times of disaster but also for the long recovery is vital to continuing job growth in our regions. Small businesses are the lifeblood of our regional communities, and we are committed to supporting their recovery because we know that when businesses get back up and running so does the community.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Comments by Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services; Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (10.10 am): I rise to make a personal explanation about media reports last Thursday night following comments made by the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services in this House. I travelled to New Zealand only to investigate how Queensland can learn from the New Zealand corrective services system. The facts are that I was on the ground in New Zealand for 43 hours and 36 minutes—less than two days, not the four days the minister alleged. I travelled economy on all flights.

During the short period I was there I had multiple meetings and inspected three correctional facilities. The purpose of the travel was to learn about how the New Zealand corrections are rehabilitating Maori inmates using traditional culture and carving, restoring self-esteem and developing skills and qualifications that are transferable into the workplace upon release. I travelled alone. I did not spend a night in Kerikeri as stated by the minister. It was simply the closest airport I could fly into. I believe that the minister has deliberately misled the House, and I call on him to apologise and correct the record.

I also understand that the Premier's office had backgrounded the media that my wife was in New Zealand at the same time as part of an elaborate conspiracy. The Premier's office was wrong. We were not in New Zealand at the same time. The fact of the matter is that my wife is a postgraduate qualified teacher with 30 years experience. My wife accompanied 45 children from her school, which is a girls school in my electorate where she has worked for 10 years, on a sports tour to New Zealand. They departed after I returned to Australia. I understand that the Premier's office distributed multiple photographs of my wife and the 45 schoolgirls to support their baseless claims.

There is no indication that the Premier's office obtained permission from these children or their families before distributing these photos. It is a gross violation of the privacy of these schoolgirls, their families, the school and my wife. This attack is a new low in Queensland politics. The Premier should apologise for this invasion of privacy to the schoolgirls and for the baseless political hatchet job. Premier, I love my wife and I love my family—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North.

Mr WATTS:—and the baseless claims made here—


Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North.

Mr WATTS:—are unjustified and you need to apologise.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, I appreciate the emotion, but you will put your comments through the chair and you will listen to the chair when instructed.

ETHICS COMMITTEE

Reports

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (10.13 am): I table Ethics Committee Report No. 189 titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 October 2018 relating to an alleged contempt of parliament by the Premier and Minister for Trade*.

Tabled paper: Ethics Committee: Report No. 189, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 12 October 2018 relating to an alleged contempt of parliament by the Premier and Minister for Trade [[1884](#)].

I also table Ethics Committee report No. 190 titled *Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 28 February 2019 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by a member*. I advise the House that the Ethics Committee has attached to these reports the submissions received in respect of, and an extract of minutes relevant to, report No. 189 and report No. 190, as appropriate, to comply with standing order 211B.

Tabled paper. Ethics Committee: Report No. 190, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Matter of privilege referred by the Speaker on 28 February 2019 relating to an alleged deliberate misleading of the House by a member [1885].


I also table Ethics Committee report No. 191 titled *Report on a right of reply No. 38*.

Tabled paper. Ethics Committee: Report No. 191, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Report on a Right of Reply No. 38 [1886].

I commend the reports and the committee's recommendations to the House.

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

Report


 **Mr HARPER** (Thuringowa—ALP) (10.14 am): I lay upon the table of the House report No. 28 of the Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee titled *Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 June and 20 August 2019*. I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper. Health, Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee: Report No. 28, 56th Parliament, October 2019—Subordinate legislation tabled between 15 June and 20 August 2019 [1887].

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will conclude today at 11.14 am.

Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (10.14 am): My first question is to the Premier. As a mum with a daughter in high school, I was horrified to learn that the Premier's office, as part of Labor's smear campaign, had given the media multiple photos of schoolgirls from the school where the member for Toowoomba North's wife works. How on earth could the Premier have approved these actions?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I am unaware that my office was doing that. If they did do that, I apologise to the member concerned. Let me make it very clear: on that side of the House when those opposite were in government I clearly recall a journalist working for that side of the House—

Mr Mickelberg interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Buderim, you are warned under the standing orders. I have indicated before that I will not tolerate such outbursts in the chamber.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My understanding was, and I stand to be corrected—I remember that it had something to do with the previous member for Cook's child support payments which I know that at the time the journalist found it absolutely despicable to circulate personal financial details, confidential details.

Mr Bleijie: You sacked him for it.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No. Member for Kawana, that was the record of what they did when they were in office. Also, for the public record, my understanding is that the photos that the member for Toowoomba North talks about were photos that were on the school website.

An opposition member: Private photos.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No. It was not private; it was on a public website.

Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My second question is also to the Premier. Will the Premier extend her apology to the member's wife, to the school and to the schoolgirls for involving—

Mr Saunders interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Maryborough, you are warned under the standing orders. There are no interjections to be made during questions being asked. Please continue your question, Leader of the Opposition.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will start again. Will the Premier extend her apology to the member's wife, to the school and to the schoolgirls who have all been involved in the Premier's office's baseless smear campaign against the member for Toowoomba North's family?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I said I apologised to the member for Toowoomba North. Now will the opposition apologise for attacking the Deputy Premier's husband, for attacking people on this side, for attacking Chris Sarra, a director-general of the parliament—

Ms Trad: The member for Keppel.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is right—the member for Keppel and the member for Toohey. The list from those opposite goes on and on. Let me make it very clear: I have never once in this House heard any apology from those opposite for sacking 14,000 workers. There has been no apology—zero.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118B on relevance to the question that was asked with respect to the particular matter raised by the member for Toowoomba North and an apology being extended to the school and the schoolgirls, not what the Premier is speaking about.

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, do you have anything further to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: No.

Council of Australian Governments

Mr HEALY: My question is to the Premier and the Minister for Trade. Will the Premier update the House on opportunities to raise matters of national importance directly when meeting with the Prime Minister?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Cairns for the question. I note that the member for Cairns was very excited when the Prime Minister, at my invitation, for the first time ever took COAG to a place outside of a capital city: Cairns. We met in August and spoke about a number of issues which are important to the Australian public. It was great to see all of those premiers and first ministers leave their states and come up to see what Cairns has to offer.

We talked about issues such as the impacts of climate change in the member for Cook's electorate, where rising sea levels are causing the collapse of sea walls. We have our money on the table but we have yet to hear the Prime Minister comment on that. In fact, the Prime Minister said that his focus was on the Pacific, not the Torres Strait islands, because they would be my responsibility and not the Commonwealth's. You can imagine my dismay just the other week when the Prime Minister announced he had cancelled COAG in December. At the last COAG meeting in Cairns the premiers expressed a very clear desire to talk about health. Everybody in this House knows how important health is to families and to make sure we have the hospitals, doctors, nurses, healthcare professionals, including midwives, providing the best possible care to people in our community. Why did the Prime Minister cancel COAG? We still have no answer. Health was a key issue that we—

Ms Bates interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I know the member for Mudgeeraba is interjecting. As a former nurse, I would have thought she would have been excited about that and picked up the phone to advocate for COAG in relation to that matter. No, we hear nothing.

We know that the member for Nanango was down in Canberra last week. The Prime Minister had time to meet with Liberal leaders to celebrate the 75th anniversary of the Liberal Party. Maybe they were talking about secret donations. The Prime Minister had the opportunity to speak with Liberal leaders but he will not meet with COAG leaders because drought is No. 1 on our agenda along with health and education, the funding that we need for our young people. Why would the Prime Minister cancel such an important meeting?

Office of the Premier and Minister for Trade, Photographs

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. With regard to the smear against the member for Toowoomba North, did the Premier or her office seek permission from the school or the schoolgirls before sending their images to the media?

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I said in this House earlier, it was on a public website and I apologised to the member for Toowoomba North. Whilst I am on my feet, the LNP may have broken laws over Billy Gordon's child support payments by circulating the ex-Labor MP's child support documents. So do not come in here and try to throw stones—

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—when you are up to your eyeballs in it.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, you will put your comments through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, 118B, relevance. Particularly to the question asked about permission from the schoolgirls.

Mr SPEAKER: The Premier has completed her contribution. There is no point of order.

Whitsundays, Cyclone Recovery

Mrs GILBERT: My question is of the Premier and the Minister for Trade. Will the Premier please update the House on ongoing efforts to have the Whitsunday region rebuild and recover and become more resilient in the aftermath of Tropical Cyclone Debbie?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mackay for the question. We know the huge impact that Tropical Cyclone Debbie had on the region and right across Queensland. We have been able to achieve a lot in the Whitsunday region through the jointly funded National Disaster Relief and Recovery Arrangements. I know that the member for Mackay is a frequent visitor to that region, as is the Minister for Tourism. We have restored seawalls at Conway Beach and the Bowen front beach and we have revitalised the Airlie Beach foreshore for both tourists and locals. I know that the mayor was very excited to talk to me about that when the minister, the member for Whitsunday and I recently opened the new Hayman Island resort. Fifty-seven local contracts have been awarded—it is great to see local work being utilised—and through that program hundreds of local jobs have been created.

I can report that the Commonwealth and the state have reached an agreement to provide an additional \$5 million each—an extra \$10 million—for Shute Harbour. Those works were a bit more complicated than was originally budgeted for. We want to continue to show our support to the Whitsunday region and especially the mayor, who has been a very strong advocate to ensure we get Shute Harbour back to pristine condition. In relation to the Shute Harbour restoration work, I can advise the House that this will include: demolition of the damaged infrastructure; reconstruction and raising of the height of the seawall; raising the level of the car park; construction of a new floating pontoon; and reconstruction of the terminal fuel facility and other land based facilities. In addition, we have been speaking to the Whitsunday council about making sure we have a new community centre for them. We know how extensively damaged that was.

The other thing I want to mention to the House is that after a cyclone we know there are long-term impacts. We want to make sure that our children and the families who live in these regions receive all of the support and help they need to recover through this time. I want to give a big shout-out and thank you to the mayor for working in a cooperative fashion with members of the Reconstruction Authority, which is overseen by the Minister for State Development. Everyone is working well together. It just goes to show that, even though the cyclone happened a couple of years ago, there are still ongoing works progressing. We will rebuild those communities and make them even more resilient in the future.

Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services

Mr WATTS: My question is to the Minister for Police. Last week the police minister told the parliament I stayed in Kerikeri when in fact I stayed 242 kilometres away in Auckland. How can Queenslanders trust the police minister when he cannot even get basic facts right?

Mr RYAN: By the member for Toowoomba North's own words today he has created further contradictions and conflicts with the public record.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Was that the member for Coomera? The member for Coomera is warned under the standing orders.

Mr RYAN: The official annual report of expenditure against the general travel allocation which bears the member's signature—which also requires a declaration that the member confirms all of the details are true and correct—states that the member travelled to Auckland and Kerikeri, departing on 26 June and arriving back on 29 June. In his statement and the itinerary released to the media, the member that said he returned to Australia on the 28th.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, you may not agree with the statements being made by the minister, but the minister is being responsive to the question asked. I want to hear the answer.

Mr RYAN: There is a contradiction in what the member has produced in his itinerary that he gave to the media, in what he has said today—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

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

Mr RYAN:—and in the official declaration, which bears his signature, which said he returned on 29 June. These contradictions raise further serious questions for the member for Toowoomba North.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members to my left, I will not issue another warning. I will start naming members and I will start removing members from the chamber. The minister is being responsive to the question asked. That is the function of question time.

Mr RYAN: These inconsistencies raise further serious questions. They build on the serious questions that relate to why the member went on a wine tour to Western Australia with his colleagues and spent \$45,000.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118 on relevance. The minister is straying from the question asked directly about the alleged misrepresentation to the House in the minister's statement last week.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Premier will cease her interjections. Member for Kawana, the minister has I believe given one sentence straying from the question. I will allow him to come back to the question asked, otherwise he will resume his seat.

Mr RYAN: There are serious questions about the member's travel. The member, by his very words, said that he returned on the 28th. His signed declaration to the parliament says the 29th. Why is that serious? It relates to the spending of taxpayers' money. The member claimed travel allowance. These are the serious questions that the member needs to answer. Why did the member sign a parliamentary declaration for a four-day visit to New Zealand when the itinerary he produced to the media and mentioned today in parliament was for only three days? Why did the member claim—

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glass House, member for Mudgeeraba and member for Maroochydore, you are all warned under the standing orders. I remind members who have been warned under the standing orders that if there are any further interjections you will be removed from the chamber.

Federal Government, Economy

Mr KING: My question is to the Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. Will the Deputy Premier update the House on how the federal government's plan to respond to global and national economic conditions will impact Queensland?

Ms TRAD: I know the member for Kurwongbah is deeply interested in making sure that people in his community have jobs. That is why he was incredibly supportive of our payroll tax package that will affect some 1,000 businesses in his community. On top of that, through our public spending, we are creating more than 4,700 jobs in the member for Kurwongbah's region because this government understands it is governments that have the power, that have the levers, to make sure that people have jobs in the community. That is why we have progressed significant infrastructure spend, significant payroll tax changes and support for skills and job creation.

I have to say that, when it comes to doing the heavy lifting, the federal government is nowhere to be seen. That is really clear from the comments made by the federal Treasurer on the weekend, where he referred to what was happening as a 'synchronised slowdown'. That was in response to calls from the RBA, the IMF, the Business Council of Australia and the Australian Industry Group, who all say that the federal government needs to step up and do more to stimulate the economy. This is following on from Mathias Cormann, the Commonwealth finance minister, who talked about slow wage growth as 'a deliberate design feature of our economic architecture'. These are people who are rejoicing in the economic slowdown and refusing to take their foot off the pedal when it comes to doing more for jobs, wage growth and economic growth.

What else could you expect from the Liberal National Party? We know that when it comes to actually standing up for Queenslanders those opposite are missing in action. We know what they do in terms of securing jobs. What do they do? They sack 14,000 workers—workers in health, workers in education, workers in transport and rail, workers in the community sector. That is the form of those opposite. I was really interested to see last week that the member for Nanango, rather than being in this place, ran off to Canberra so that she could take some flashy photos with her friends in Canberra. This put beyond any doubt that the member for Nanango's most ardent desire is to be Canberra's representative in Queensland and not a Queensland champion in Canberra. This put beyond doubt that those opposite have no spine when it comes to standing up for Queensland.

Townsville, Crime

Mr LAST: My question without notice is to the Premier. Yesterday in Townsville anarchy reigned as criminals rampaged across the city in stolen cars, with locals afraid to go about their daily business and flights being diverted. How much more proof does the Premier need that Labor's soft-on-crime policies are not working and that people are not safe in their own streets?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for that very important question. As the Minister for Police outlined in his ministerial statement this morning, my understanding is that the police know who the people are and hopefully they will be arrested soon.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am acknowledging that it is a really important question. It is an important question to the people in Townsville—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The member for Thuringowa has raised it with me personally and with the Minister for Police. That is why we are putting more police into Townsville.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take the Leader of the Opposition's interjection. How many were they putting in? In fact, when the Leader of the Opposition was Campbell Newman's protege, they actually cut police. They cut police across the state.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left, I am having difficulty hearing the Premier's answer.

Ms PALASZCZUK: When the police minister, the Deputy Premier and I went to the Townsville police academy, the police union reminded us that it was the LNP who wanted to sell off the police academy. There would have been no police academy in Townsville, full stop.

I love these questions where I can put the facts and the record on the table. The facts are that the Palaszczuk Labor government equals more police in Townsville, and the LNP equals fewer police across the state, wanting to close the academy and not backing our frontline services.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Ninderry and member for Nicklin, you are both warned under the standing orders.

Ms PALASZCZUK: That is why we back our police 100 per cent. That is why we give the police the resources they need. In fact, I remember Ian Leavers saying that this Labor government backs the police by giving them the resources—such as the body worn cameras and the new police vehicles they need—to make sure they can do their very important work across the state.

In relation to that incident, I hope that the people involved will be found. As the police minister said, the police know who they are and hopefully there will be a swift response.

Jobs and Investment

Mr STEWART: My question is to the Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning. Will the minister advise how the government is working to get Queensland's fair share of jobs and investment and is the minister aware of any other approaches?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Townsville for his question. I am pleased to report to the House that on 10 October this year I travelled to Sydney for the Pacific International Maritime Exposition to help showcase the work of 16 Queensland companies working in the defence and maritime industry

space and of course to seek more defence jobs for Queensland. While I was there, I met with former senator David Johnston, the federal government's defence export advocate, to impress on him that Queensland was seeking its fair share of defence contracts for our state.

Of course I was not the only member travelling to Sydney. We have seen the Leader of the Opposition, her deputy and all those other members travelling to Sydney at taxpayers' expense for an LNP love-in. They commenced their very heavy and busy schedule with 'an optional sign-on day'. I can assure the honourable members that even the under-6s at the mighty Logan Brothers have a compulsory sign-on day.

Then we saw the Leader of the Opposition in Canberra to meet with the Prime Minister and other state leaders—I mean other state LNP leaders. We saw the photo. The Leader of the Opposition had a grin bigger than the clown at Luna Park. What was the Leader of the Opposition doing there? I was asked about other approaches. Was the Leader of the Opposition talking to the Liberal Premier of New South Wales about her plan to conspire with Scott Morrison—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. The member for Surfers Paradise will resume his seat or leave the chamber.

Mr DICK: Was the Leader of the Opposition there talking to Gladys Berejiklian about her conspiracy with the Prime Minister to increase the GST? The member for Surfers Paradise does not want to hear it, but was the Leader of the Opposition talking to the Prime Minister about increasing funding for light rail on the Gold Coast, which would help his constituents? What did the Leader of the Opposition ask from the Prime Minister for Queensland? Did she say, 'We need more than one-half of one per cent of an infrastructure fund'? Did the Leader of the Opposition ask whether he would rule out—or will she rule out—a nuclear power plant in Kingaroy, in Bundaberg and in Gladstone? She did not. The Leader of the Opposition did none of this because the Leader of the Opposition is a wholly owned subsidiary of Scott Morrison. She will never stand up for Queensland, so we have a choice. We know the Leader of the Opposition was too weak to stand up to Campbell Newman. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Please take back that unparliamentary language directed at the member.

Mr DICK: The 'weak' part?

Mr SPEAKER: Yes.

Mr DICK: I apologise, Mr Speaker. We know the Leader of the Opposition would not stand up to Campbell Newman. In fact, she was proud of the decisions made when she sat around the CBRC table as Campbell Newman's protegee. The choice is clear for Queensland: a Leader of the Opposition who wants higher GST, less funding for infrastructure for Queensland, more nuclear reactors and more privatisation; or a leader, our Premier, who will always stand up for Queensland and to Canberra.

(Time expired)

Gold Coast, Police Resources

Mr HART: My question without notice is to the Premier. After another fatal shooting on the Gold Coast, reportedly connected to criminal gang members, when will the Premier stop her head-in-the-sand approach to people's safety and give the police the resources and the tough laws they need to keep the community safe?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Burleigh. If the member for Burleigh was listening he would know that the Minister for Police actually made a ministerial statement in the parliament talking about this very issue. He talked about how there are over 1,000 police on the Gold Coast. We have the strongest serious organised crime legislation in the country. He also talked about how the police have had the highest number of arrests since task force—

Opposition members interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: As we know, the extra police on the Gold Coast will go a long way to addressing the issues down there—

Mr Ryan: Twenty this year.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—an extra 20. What did the LNP do? They shut down the Coomera police district. That worked out well, didn't it, because Pimpama-Coomera is one of the fastest growing areas in the south-east?

Going back to my earlier point about how they sacked senior police, 110 senior police were sacked across the state. Honourable members opposite should just step back for one moment and think about how they would feel if, towards the end of their career, with maybe five or six years to go, they were told by the LNP, 'Sorry, you are no longer wanted in this state.'

When the members opposite were in government they cut police training, reduced firearms training and forced police, I am advised, to pay for their own body worn video cameras. How could they force police to buy their own body worn cameras? That is an absolute disgrace. Who sat around that CBRC table making those decisions?

Mr Mander: How about you getting nurses to pay for bandages?

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: What a shocking interjection from the member for Everton! He knows all about swearing on Bibles. We will continue to give the police the resources they need. We are expanding our police numbers on the Gold Coast—

Mr Hart interjected.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK:—and in Townsville. If the member for Burleigh had been listening to the Minister for Police, he would have had all the information he needed for his question. However, I am more than happy to repeat it for this House.

Tourism Industry, Projects

Mr KELLY: My question is of the Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail. Will the minister please update the House on the progress of Brisbane's largest tourism project?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for his question. I know that the member for Greenslopes absolutely supports the Queen's Wharf project because he knows that not only will it be a \$3.6 billion transformational project for our city, the tourism industry and our state, but also it will support more than 8,000 jobs, and that means more Queenslanders in work. If there is one thing we know about the Palaszczuk government, it is that we are 100 per cent committed to building jobs in our state for Queenslanders no matter where they live.

Today I am very pleased to announce that, since I last talked about this project and gave an update to the parliament, we now have three more cranes on Brisbane's skyline building this \$3.6 billion development. As we speak there are more than 250 workers onsite. I can also announce today as part of the ongoing move to construction that Fitzgerald Constructions Australia has won the Destination Brisbane Consortium tender to build the Neville Bonner pedestrian bridge. We know that this bridge will create a key link between Brisbane's north bank and south bank. It will be very exciting not only for QPAC but also for tourists and Brisbane locals to have this additional link between the two banks of the river. I know that is something for which many members of the House have been lobbying for some time. We are very proud that as part of the conditions for approval for construction the government insisted we have this new link. I thank the Star and Queen's Wharf for their commitment to the project.

While we are getting on with the job of creating jobs and building bridges, we know that there is a bridge just too far for the National Party to cope with, and that is having a female deputy leader of the National Party in Queensland. It is a bridge too far! We put these women in positions but as soon as they look like they might actually do something with them, we have to take it away from them and tear them down. We see that Bridget McKenzie is under a lot of fire right now from her own because there are too many blokes on the backbench who want to take down the woman at the head of the National Party. Does that sound familiar to anyone?

On a very serious note, one of the reasons we are seeing this unrest in the National Party is that, unlike those opposite, who will not stand up to Scott Morrison or the leadership in Canberra about the failed drought relief support—\$5 billion is sitting in a fund in the never-never of 2020 when we are in a drought right now—there are apparently some faceless, nameless men on the backbench of the National Party in Canberra who do have the guts to say—

"We are facing one of our biggest tests of government in this drought ...

"It has the potential to be a national disaster and needs our top minds in those positions of drought ...

I call on the Leader of the Opposition to tell us what she asked for to support the farmers of Queensland when she was in Sydney meeting with the Premier. Did she call on them, like the Premier did—

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

Ms JONES:—to bring forward the \$5 billion?

Mr SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

Ms JONES: I bet you she squibbed it.

Mr SPEAKER: The minister is warned under the standing orders.

(Time expired)

Racing Integrity Commission

Mr LANGBROEK: My question without notice is to the Premier. In light of the 7.30 ABC revelations last week about unwanted Queensland racehorses being senselessly butchered in a Caboolture slaughterhouse, can the Premier explain why the \$30 million Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, established by the Palaszczuk Labor government to protect animal welfare, has failed so badly?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Surfers Paradise for that question, because it is a very important question and one that I addressed this morning. Anyone who saw that footage would have been absolutely horrified and outraged, to say the least. That is why we have set up that independent inquiry to be conducted. I hope that all parties cooperate with that inquiry, because it is very important to clean up that aspect of the industry. We make no apologies for setting up that inquiry to get to the bottom of it.

As I said in this House, I was briefed that the biosecurity officers were out there on Friday, basically straightaway the next day. Both Minister Hinchliffe and Minister Furner addressed the media straightaway that day about this very important issue. Minister Hinchliffe is also today convening a meeting with some of the industry to talk through these issues. At the end of the day, we want to ensure that there is no animal cruelty.

In relation to the substantive part of the member's question about money going towards the Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, this was a recommendation of Alan MacSporran. It has been set up. It is being headed by Ross Barnett. From all my conversations with Ross Barnett, I can say that he is working diligently and hard, but I hope that everyone gets to the bottom of this. I look forward to receiving that report, which we will share with the public.

Mr SPEAKER: Before the next question, Minister for Innovation, I did not hear it at the time but I understand that you used some unparliamentary language in your comments. Can you please withdraw those.

Ms JONES: I withdraw.

Education

Ms BOYD: My question is of the Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations. Will the minister advise the House how the Palaszczuk government is delivering a world-class education to every Queensland child regardless of where they live in our state?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Pine Rivers for the question. She has a very keen interest in education in terms of giving every child a great start and is obviously very involved in the schools in her electorate. It was great to visit some of the schools in her electorate with her and it is great to see the great work that is happening right throughout our schools. I welcome the students in the gallery as Minister for Education in Education Week and thank them very much for visiting parliament.

There is no doubt that our record investment in schools and teachers is delivering a world-class education for Queensland children. We are delivering a \$1.5 billion infrastructure spend. We have record investment in education, but I am particularly proud of our strategies to help support delivering a great education in our schools. This year I launched the government's \$136 million Teaching Queensland's Future strategy. It is a five-year strategy that will ensure we have capable, confident and quality teachers and school leaders now and into the future.

As part of our rural and remote strategy, there is \$100 million and \$31 million for four Centres of Learning and Wellbeing, CLAWs, located in Atherton, Mount Isa, Emerald and Roma. They were established in 2018 and 2019 and now are fully operational. I have visited three of those centres and I look forward to visiting Atherton in the near future with the member for Cook. Also, it was great to open Emerald a couple of weeks ago. The unit provides that great support for teachers' learning and wellbeing, students and their families so that all children throughout the state, no matter where they live, get a great start.

When it comes to our kindergarten commitment, we have increased our participation from 29 per cent in 2008 to over 95 per cent today. That gives every kid a great start. You would think that the honours we are getting internationally from the Carnegie Foundation, the Grattan Institute, a number of professors from around Australia but in particular Glenn Savage—

Opposition members interjected.

Ms GRACE: I got there. The professor says that we are a standout with improvements. The Grattan Institute sees us as a star performer. You would think that those opposite at least would give us some credit, but all we hear from those opposite is talking down our education sector. How can we be surprised when they did not employ the teachers we needed? They put schools up for sale. They always say, 'We are going to do this and we are going to do that,' but in government they did absolutely nothing for education. It is this government that delivers for the students in the state, and we will continue to do so.

Cyclones, Insurance

Mr COSTIGAN: My question is to the Deputy Premier and Treasurer and the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships. With the start of the 2019-20 cyclone season now only days away, will the Treasurer commit to adopting the recommendations relevant to the Queensland government as per the inquiry by the ACCC in relation to the spiralling cost and availability of insurance for people in Central, North and Far North Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: I will allow the question. Again, on several occasions I have had to warn members that the preamble is bordering on being too long. The next member who has a long preamble will have their question ruled out of order.

Ms TRAD: I thank the member for the question. It is actually a very serious issue and one that I know Queenslanders in regional areas of our state are deeply concerned about. I know in some regions, because of the significant impact of natural disasters, Queenslanders have seen their insurance premiums increase from \$3,000 annually to more than \$9,000. Quite frankly, that is unacceptable. The report to which the member refers in fact is a draft report at this stage. The report has not been finalised by the ACCC and we are waiting for its finalisation. There could be changes between the draft recommendations and the final recommendations, but I will say that there is a fundamental and serious issue facing regional Queenslanders when it comes to insurance—that is, more frequent and ferocious natural disasters and the impacts of climate change.

Mr Boyce: That is absolute rubbish.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the member for Callide. We know that the member for Callide does not believe in the science of climate change. I am very pleased to report to the House that I had a meeting with the Australian Insurance Council, but it has produced public reports that make for sobering reading. They are predicting and are very concerned about the 'uninsurability' of some communities in Australia because of the impacts of climate change and more frequent and ferocious natural disasters. If that is not a wake-up call for those opposite, I do not know what is. The proxy member for the LNP, the member for Whitsunday, when he was a member of the LNP, we know did not support—

Mr COSTIGAN: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence to those comments of the Deputy Premier and ask her to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, will you withdraw?

Ms TRAD: I withdraw. Let me make clear that after the Townsville floods—and I want to thank every member in the area in Townsville, apart from the member for Burdekin, who petitioned me and asked me to make representations to the federal government around problems with insurance. I am yet to hear back from the federal Treasurer in relation to all those concerns. There is so much more we should be doing in this space. I am prepared to work cooperatively with the federal government in relation to this but, quite frankly, first and foremost we need to demonstrate to insurance companies and the people of Queensland that we take seriously action on climate change.

(Time expired)

Regional Queensland, Road Infrastructure

Mr SAUNDERS: My question is of the Minister for Transport and Main Roads. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government's record QTRIP program is supporting regional jobs, including in the Wide Bay region?

Mr BAILEY: I thank the honourable member for the question. There has not been a greater supporter of road and rail jobs in Maryborough in the last 20 years than the member for Maryborough. He has supported it all the way and he has been delivering. There is a record \$23 billion QTRIP in Queensland over the next four years—a record investment—and as a result more than 13½ thousand of those jobs are in regional Queensland.

I am very happy to report that our regional rail maintenance program is supporting more than 1,100 Queensland jobs across regional Queensland. The Wide Bay region will benefit from the recruitment of almost 300 road construction jobs for the Bruce Highway upgrades north of Maryborough. The Saltwater Creek upgrade is a jointly funded \$103 million project to make the Bruce Highway more flood resistant and safer between Maryborough and Torbanlea. Importantly, many of those jobs are giving apprentices the experience they need to build their skills to get them on the career path to a good life.

I absolutely welcome the 12 new apprentices being recruited by Downer in Maryborough at the rail workshops to support the work on the NGR trains that are coming—that is, the accessibility upgrades fixing them after they were ordered non-disability compliant by those opposite. Today, 53 applicants are being interviewed for those roles and I am advised that this is the largest intake ever by Downer of apprentices in Maryborough. That is a fantastic outcome and we look forward to them being on deck and being in the rail sector for many years to come. Bringing younger workers into our workforce is absolutely key to communities.

Let us be clear: the only reason those trains are going to Maryborough is the actions of those opposite. Maryborough had a bleak future under those opposite when it came to rail after 150 years of manufacturing trains because they were ordering trains from overseas—trains not built by Queensland workers but ordered from overseas instead of locally. We saw how they botched that one up. It is costing the Queensland taxpayer \$335 million to fix the LNP's botch-up of the NGR trains.

I am very happy to say that this government backed Maryborough workers, who are doing the quality work required. This proud Queensland rail town of Maryborough, with its 150-year history, is going to have a lot longer history of jobs and manufacturing because of the Palaszczuk Labor government. Up to 100 new jobs will be coming into the Maryborough rail workshops to do that work and other rail work, because we need a rail manufacturing sector in Queensland. It is this government that has backed it all the way. We will keep backing Queensland jobs and Queensland manufacturing to ensure a quality outcome for our rail sector right across this state.

(Time expired)

Coalmining

Mr BLEIJIE: My question without notice is to the Premier. Today the *Australian* has exposed under right-to-information laws that the Palaszczuk government is sitting on a secret proposal about closing down Queensland coalmines. Will the Premier commit to releasing information that has been blocked under the RTI Act given that the secret proposal could put tens of thousands of jobs at risk?

Ms PALASZCZUK: My understanding about the document in question was that it was prepared in response to a New South Wales court case. It is not being considered and has not been considered by cabinet.

Gas Industry

Mrs MULLEN: My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy. Will the minister update the House on the results of Queensland's domestic gas supply initiatives and is he aware of any alternatives?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Jordan for the question. It has been a great couple of weeks for Queensland gas. We have just had the double from Senex's Project Atlas. Jemena has completed its gas pipeline from the field to the gas processing plant and then Senex announced that gas is beginning to flow from its first wells. This means that, from the time this block was awarded to Senex in March 2018, the first gas flow has taken only 18 months, and this is an outstanding performance by Senex—a Queensland gas company. Project Atlas is the first gas development to be delivered from the Palaszczuk government's innovative domestic gas policy and it has proven to be an outstanding first step, but Senex is not alone. In another of our domestic release blocks, Central Petroleum has announced certification of 270 petajoules of gas. These are positive outcomes for Queensland and positive outcomes for Queensland manufacturing businesses. The Energy Users Association of Australia said recently that our policies were beginning to have a material impact.

That is an independent endorsement of the Palaszczuk government's gas policy and its domestic gas policy, and that is a policy that those opposite have denigrated. Instead, they would prefer to support the failed Turnbull-Morrison Australian domestic gas supply mechanism. That is a gas policy that is simply wind and noise. The LNP plan is like a suburban fireworks show in a Queensland summer downpour. They promised bright lights and they promised excitement, but instead it is a soggy Catherine wheel that they cannot light. In fact, the LNP resources policy is like a box of soggy fireworks—useless, absolutely useless!

In contrast, the Palaszczuk Labor policy will see gas flowing to domestic markets and industry, protecting hundreds of manufacturing jobs right across this state. The Palaszczuk government is working to bring more gas to market. Since 2015 the Palaszczuk government has released more than 39,000 kilometres of land for gas exploration, over a fifth of it guaranteeing that this gas will be for Australian consumers. This is leadership. Those opposite are lost—no policy, no ideas, no leader. The opposition leader has very good reason to be looking over her shoulder as the next rumbling will not be a summer storm; it will be the member for Broadwater knocking on her office door with other members following.

Agricultural Training Colleges

Mr PERRETT: My question without notice is to the Minister for Agricultural Industry Development. Nearly one year after the Queensland agricultural training colleges' closure was announced, we still do not have any answers on what program and courses will be available for school leavers looking for a career in agriculture. Can the minister explain to regional Queenslanders, who continue to struggle through drought, why their kids' education is not a priority for the Palaszczuk Labor government?

Mr FURNER: I am pleased that the member asked this question in respect of QATC and drought. Let me cover off on QATC first. No doubt the member would be aware of the decision made by the government last year when I and the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development travelled to Longreach in December and made that announcement at the college at Longreach. Since that time there has been open dialogue with the community and interested parties in terms of not only the Emerald but also the Longreach campuses in terms of the impact and also the services that are provided through those colleges throughout those communities.

I must commend Charles Burke for his considerable engagement and his conversations. I know that certain people and some members opposite have indicated to me that they are pleased with the level of discussion and collaboration that has been occurring as a result of that engagement through the establishment of a PMO in Longreach and also covering off the interests obtained through Emerald. I am satisfied with the process at hand and pleased with the appointment of Charles Burke, the previous CEO of AgForce, to lead that PMO.

No doubt the decision to close the college this year was made on the basis of the level of curriculum and the level of interest by students who had gone through QATC over a number of years. We know that when those opposite were in government for that short period of less than three years they were sitting on a report to close the QATC, yet they lacked the intestinal fortitude, like they always do, to table that report. It was through the integrity and the fortitude of the Palaszczuk government that steps were taken to ensure not only the continuation of an operation for educational training for agriculture but also the sustainment of those communities in those particular areas.

On the subject of drought, I want to make this comment. Last sitting week we had a debate in this place on a motion moved by the Palaszczuk government which those opposite abstained from voting on. I think from memory the member for Southern Downs voted against it—voted against this government calling on the federal government to bring forward money—\$5 billion of funding—to support farmers.

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Southern Downs!

Mr FURNER: Only the Palaszczuk government supports farmers in this House, and that is why I get the title of 'Furner, the farmers' friend'.

(Time expired)

Mr Lister interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The member for Southern Downs is warned under the standing orders. You will put your comments through the chair. You were repeatedly asked to cease your interjections.

Rockhampton, Ambulance Station

Mr O'ROURKE: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister update the House on the status of Rockhampton's Queensland Ambulance Service station?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for Rockhampton for what is an excellent question. I know that both he and the member for Keppel are very determined, as is everyone on this side of the House, to ensure that our communities have the ambulance services they need. Both the member for Keppel and the member for Rockhampton are passionate advocates for paramedics in their local areas. I know that just recently they attended the Rockhampton ambulance station to thank our hardworking paramedics for the work they do every day in taking care of all Queenslanders, but particularly those in Central Queensland. While they were there, they announced that the Palaszczuk government would invest \$10 million to upgrade the Rockhampton ambulance station.

Mrs Lauga: Amazing.

Dr MILES: I take that interjection from the member for Keppel. It is amazing. That refurbishment will see the station upgraded with a new operations centre as well as a high-tech space to train the ambulance officers of the future and help our paramedics keep their skills current.

The operations centre in Rockhampton services a wide and diverse part of Queensland. It takes triple 0 calls all the way from Agnes Water to Bowen and west to Winton and Windorah. The benefit of this upgrade will be felt not just in the city of Rockhampton but also right throughout Central Queensland. It will create jobs in construction. It will deliver a world-class ambulance station for the people of Rockhampton.

We on this side of the House invest in our ambulance services. We have already employed 31 more ambulance officers in the Central Queensland LASN and we will employ 16 more this year alone. Right across Queensland, we are employing more ambulance officers, building more ambulance stations, giving our officers the newest and best equipment that we possibly can. All the way from Yarrabilba to Mareeba, we are building new ambulance stations, because every member on this side of the House supports our ambulance officers.

While those opposite want to sack health workers, while those opposite want to privatise our health services, while those opposite have no plan for health and ambulance services, this side of the House invests in better health care for Queenslanders and invests in more and better ambulance services for Queensland. We announced that we were building a new ambulance station on the Gold Coast and the LNP opposed it. Can members imagine opposing an ambulance station in your own electorate? It is clear—

(Time expired)

Police-Citizens Youth Clubs

Mr HUNT: My question without notice is the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that not one Queensland police-citizens youth club will be forced to close by ensuring that resources will be made available to keep them operating and that fundraising proceeds will stay where they are raised?

Ms PALASZCZUK: The police minister advises me that they are a separate entity. We provide funding and I give a guarantee and a commitment to this House that our funding to the police-citizens youth clubs will definitely not decrease.

Police, Resources

Mr POWER: My question is to the Minister for Police and Minister for Corrective Services. Will the minister update the House on the actions that this government is taking to ensure that our frontline police officers have the resources they need to keep our communities safe?

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

Mr RYAN: I know that the member for Logan as well as all members on this side of the House are very supportive of the police. I know that the member is also very supportive of our government's investment in policing. That will manifest itself over the next nine months or so with 10 extra police being deployed to the Logan district. That is good news for the Logan district and also good news for community safety. The member for Logan is also very excited about an investment in a new police facility at Logan Village Yarrabilba, with the opening of the Logan Village Yarrabilba Police Station only a few months ago.


When it comes to investing in police resources, the people of Queensland can rely on the Palaszczuk Labor government. There are more police in Queensland than ever before. They are more resourced than ever before. That stands in stark contrast to those opposite, who did not invest in the front line, who forced police to buy their own body worn cameras.

(Time expired)

Mr SPEAKER: The period for question time has expired.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Ethics Committee Report, Apology

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (11.15 am): With reference to report No. 189 of the Ethics Committee tabled earlier today, I accept the findings of the report. I accept responsibility for the actions I took which led to those findings. I offer my unreserved and sincere apology to the House.

MOTION

Business Program

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (11.15 am): In accordance with sessional order 2B, I move—

1. That the following government business will be considered this sitting week, with the nominated maximum periods of time as specified:
 - (a) the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of 20 minutes to complete all stages;
 - (b) the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of four hours to complete all stages;
 - (c) the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, a maximum of six hours to complete all stages; and
 - (d) the Motor Accident Insurance and Other Legislation Amendment Bill to complete all stages; and
2. The following time limits for the bills listed in paragraph 1 apply:
 - (a) the minister to be called on to reply:
 - i. for the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by one hour before the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - ii. for the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 45 minutes for the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - (b) consideration in detail to be completed by three minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - (c) question on third reading to be put by two minutes before the expiry of the maximum hours;
 - (d) question on long title to be put by one minute before the expiry of the maximum hours;
3. If the nominated stage of each bill has not been completed by the allocated time specified paragraph 2, or by 5.55 pm on Thursday, 24 October 2019, Mr Speaker:
 - (a) shall call on a minister to table any explanatory notes to their circulated amendments;
 - (b) shall put all remaining questions necessary to either pass that stage or pass the bill or motion without further debate;
 - (c) may interrupt non-specified business or debate on a bill or motion to complete the requirements of the motion; and
 - (d) will complete all stages required by this motion notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders.

As members will see, there are three bills outlined in the motion before the House. The first has been allocated 20 minutes, the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as the second reading debate occurred during the last sitting and the remaining time will be dedicated to consideration in detail, which also commenced in the last sitting.

Four hours has been allocated to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill—a bill that is resuming debate with 41 minutes of the second reading already occurring. One hour has been allocated to allow the minister to reply and for consideration, including amendments to the bill, to be debated.

Finally, six hours has been allocated to the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. Consideration in detail time has been factored into these last two bills to ensure that adequate scrutiny occurs.


In relation to the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, members would know that the bill was introduced on 19 September 2019 and the House requested that it report by 4 November 2019. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee handed down its report, which was tabled yesterday, Monday, 21 October 2019, which is consistent with the order of this House to report by the date specified—in this case, 4 November 2019.

The Constitution of Queensland 2001 outlines provisions in relation to legislation to be considered by a portfolio committee. Pursuant to those clauses, the Legislative Assembly referred the bill in question to a portfolio committee for consideration and referred it for a period of at least six weeks. The act allows the Legislative Assembly to declare a bill urgent: when referring a bill to a committee for consideration of less than six weeks; when discharging a referred bill from a committee less than six weeks after the referral; or not refer a bill to a committee in the first place before it is considered and passed by a committee. In this case, the Legislative Assembly has, (a), referred the bill to a portfolio committee for consideration; and (b), in doing so, has set the period of the referral for at least six weeks to 4 November 2019.

It is evident by the tabling of the report that the committee has resolved without a motion of this House to report to the House earlier than the set date, which it is perfectly entitled to do. As such, on the reading of the Constitution of Queensland 2001 and the chronological facts that I have just outlined, there is no requirement for an urgency motion for this bill. Additionally, standing order 136(7) outlines—

When a Government Bill has been set down on the notice paper pursuant to (6), at least one day shall elapse until the commencement of the second reading debate, unless the Bill is declared urgent.

As the committee tabled its report yesterday, it is the government's intention to allow the bill to sit on the *Notice Paper* for at least one sitting day to conform to this requirement. As such and upon advice from the Clerk, on the collective reading of the legislation and the standing orders, an urgency motion is not required and, as such, will not be moved. I commend the motion to the House.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.18 am): The Leader of the House may not want an urgency motion but, by her own motion—by moving that the bill will be debated this week and start and finish this week—essentially, she is moving the urgency motion without having an urgency motion with respect to certain bills we are debating.

The Leader of the House has indicated that the Summary Offences Bill has to be passed this week. We are on to the civil liability bill. There are time restraints that will be put on these bills. Effectively, we are again gagging and guillotining debate. If we look at the bills we debated last week, we had nine members who were not afforded the opportunity to speak to the police discipline bill. I table a copy of our records.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Local Gov Bill' [\[1901\]](#).

We had 13 members who were not able to speak to the local government bill. In that particular situation the Leader of the House and I talked about ensuring there was maximum opportunity to debate the amendments. Who could forget that the minister had to move 170 amendments to his own bill, nearly beating the member for McConnel's record of 200 amendments to her racing bill. The member for McConnel will be the first to say, 'I wasn't the minister. I took it over as the racing minister.' That bill had over 200 amendments. The local government minister had 170 amendments and we needed to debate some of those amendments and we did not get the opportunity to because time ran down. I note the member for Noosa was on her feet and was not given the call to talk to the local government bill because the opposition and the government had discussed the opportunity to make sure there was enough time in consideration in detail. The crossbenchers missed out. I table our records showing 13 members, including yours truly, who were not given the opportunity to talk about the local government bill.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, speaking list titled 'Police Discipline Bill' [\[1902\]](#).

This is again another week of curtailing and abrogating the responsibilities of government because those opposite do not want to have the discussion. The Leader of the House did not talk about it, but I suspect at some time this week we are going to want to talk about the Ethics Committee report that has just found unanimously that the Premier is in contempt of parliament, for which she has just apologised. Where in the week are we going to be debating this report, or is the government thinking the apology given by the Premier is enough and that is all that is said on the matter? It is not enough.


At some stage during the week the Leader of the House should get up and move a motion pursuant to the Ethics Committee report, which has extraordinarily found the Premier in contempt of parliament and having an undue influence on other members of this House. When are we debating that report? When are we debating that important issue that has just come before this House? The Premier has just apologised, but I do not accept that that is the end of the matter. The report should be debated. I recognise that the crossbench will have something important to say on that particular report that has found the Premier in contempt of parliament.

I say to the members opposite: do not underestimate the seriousness of this Ethics Committee report and the findings and recommendations that have just been handed down against the Premier. It is not common for a Premier of the state—

Ms Simpson: When?

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the former Speaker. It is not common for a Premier to be found in contempt of parliament. That is serious. I did not hear the Leader of the House in her contribution explain when this week we are going to be having this important debate on that Ethics Committee report, because we should, as the report indicates.

Again we see this week the Leader of the House moving a motion to curtail the debate on various bills and, as I have always said and I will continue to say, members should be afforded the opportunity to have their say on important matters. There were lots of members who missed out on speaking to the local government bill. I wanted to talk about my local Sunshine Coast councils for various reasons, but we were not given the opportunity because the government wanted to rush it through and in the process completely mucked it up by having to move 170 amendments to the minister's bill, which would be a record, other than that of the member for McConnel, who moved 200 amendments to her racing bill. This motion should be opposed.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.23 am): I rise again this week to speak in support of the motion moved by the Leader of the House that will see us debate important bills this week and will see members get an important opportunity to contribute to these debates. Let me note a couple of matters raised by the member for Kawana. First of all, he raised the concern of the member for Noosa that she was unable to speak in a debate in the last sitting. Of course, it is the Manager of Opposition Business who is responsible for ensuring that members of the crossbench get that chance to speak and get that chance to represent their community. The fact that they are treated with contempt and disrespect by the Manager of Opposition Business—by all of those opposite in fact—is what results in them sometimes not getting that opportunity to speak. If the member for Kawana were better at managing opposition business, were better at managing his part of the debate in this House, then the member for Noosa would have had an opportunity to speak.


The member for Kawana, in opposing this motion, also, in effect, argued that we should have the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill passed later. After being out there in the public demanding that these laws should be brought in quicker he then comes into this House and demands that they be debated slower. He demands that we take more time to consider those important laws being brought to the House in this motion, which is the result of the consultation that occurred at the parliamentary Business Committee meeting yesterday afternoon. We will complete debate on the Workers' Compensation and Rehabilitation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. It is near the end of its parliamentary process already. Twenty minutes will allow us to complete all stages.

We will move on to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. We will have four hours to discuss it. The debate on that bill commenced when we all sat in Townsville. I know, Mr Deputy Speaker, you were very pleased to have us all up in Townsville at that time. We will then have a very substantial amount of time—six hours—to debate the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. That is the bill that this government knows is important and that the Premier has said will be passed this week. Thanks to this motion we will ensure that it is debated and considered this week.

By moving this business program motion, as we have almost every week of this term, we are ensuring that the business of the parliament is effectively managed, ensuring that important bills are considered and debated. In opposing it each and every week the opposition members show that they have no internal discipline, no ability to manage their own business, that the Manager of Opposition Business has no authority in his party room, no ability to manage their speaking list, to manage their time and to do the important job of making sure that the crossbench get to speak to matters that are important to their communities.

It is time for these theatrics to end. Every single week, having to have this debate, is like groundhog day. The member for Kawana gets up and makes the same speech at the business committee, makes the same speech in here, even though, ironically enough, he is the only person in this House to have moved an actual gag motion, which he did in the sitting before last. The hypocrisy is astounding. I commend the parliamentary business motion moved by the Leader of the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): I give a reminder to those members who have already been issued warnings.

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11.29 am): I rise to speak against the motion moved by the Attorney-General. Mr Deputy Speaker, if you will allow me a moment of indulgence, I wish to quickly talk about the city versus country shield that was won last night. I will put that aside.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Are you going to table that prop?

Mr MANDER: No, I will not table it, although this is historic. I want it on the *Hansard* record that the only time that I will ever put a 'like' symbol against a tweet of the Minister for Main Roads was last night. That will never, ever happen again.

On more serious matters, once again we come to this House to speak about democracy; to speak about the fact that we cannot speak as long as we would like on the issues that we would like to speak about. What makes this more appalling is that last week, again when there was limited time in which to speak about the issues of the day, the Minister for Police stood up and wasted the parliament's time by smearing a member of this side of the House. These are the things that waste parliamentary time.

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister has taken offence and I ask you to withdraw.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. When we have precious little time to speak about the issues that are so important to this side of the House, a minister gets up and wastes the parliament's time with information that has been refuted this morning by the member for Toowoomba North.

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take personal offence and ask the member to withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask you to withdraw, member for Everton.

Mr MANDER: I withdraw. The minister has a bad track record in this area. No-one will ever forget the Pullen family who, when the no-body no-parole laws were introduced by this—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The member has very much strayed from the motion before the House. I ask that he be brought back to the motion.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I was listening quite intently. Member for Everton, I ask you to come back to the motion at hand.

Mr MANDER: We are talking about the things that we would like to debate, and one of those things, which is very relevant to the police minister, is the crime situation in the state at the moment. Currently, the Summary Offences and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is before the House. It talks about law and order in this state. At the moment, we have a crisis right across the state. Townsville is like Dodge City at the moment—

Mr RYAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order in respect of the same question rule. The member is now debating a question before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, there is no point of order. We are debating the Business Program.

Mr MANDER: As I said, we are talking about law and order, which at the moment in this state is totally out of control. Townsville is basically Dodge City. Flights have been diverted because, with action happening on the ground, choppers are in the air to try to bring the crime situation under control. On the Gold Coast, people are getting shot again and bikies are coming back. We want to speak about law and order. We want to speak about the summary offences bill much more than we have at the moment. Every day in Brisbane, commuters are being disrupted and emergency services vehicles are being diverted. We need more time to speak to this bill. On this bill, every one of our 38 members would like to talk about how strong the LNP is on law and order and how the LNP would not allow something like this to take place.

Mr Janetzki interjected.

Mr MANDER: I take that interjection from the shadow Attorney-General: we will bring law and order back to the streets. Crime has gone through the roof in the past five years since the Palaszczuk government came to office and under the reign of the besieged Minister for Police. These are the types of issues that we want to speak about, because they are the issues that are causing greatest concern to Queenslanders. In some of our northern towns people cannot walk down the street without worrying about being assaulted. On the Gold Coast, many people are afraid to go to restaurants because of what might happen with bikie warfare. Of course, I have already mentioned the issue affecting this city and there are other issues that we would like to speak about as well.

In this state issues around integrity constantly come up and we would like to speak about them. The Leader of Opposition Business has already spoken about the ruling from the Ethics Committee today in relation to the Premier. There are other issues of integrity, such as dodgy polls used to find out what people think. The CCC said that the poll about election bunting should have been changed, but it was not changed. We want to ask more questions about the payments made to the head of bushfire recovery. For a 12-week appointment, five weeks of which he is on leave, he will receive \$57,000. Those are the types of issues that we want more time to debate, because Queenslanders want this government to be held to account. Only an LNP government will do that and only an LNP government will deliver what is best for Queensland.

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

AYES, 47:

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

NOES, 44:

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 2—Bolton, Costigan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.39 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House—

1. notes the Ethics Committee report No. 189, tabled in the House today;
2. finds the Premier in contempt for her actions in improperly influencing the KAP members, such actions including:
 - (a) the Premier's response to the question without notice on 22 August 2018;
 - (b) the statements quoted in the media on 22 August 2018;
 - (c) the correspondence to the member for Traeger on 23 August 2018;
 - (d) the speech at the ALP Queensland state conference on 2 September 2018; and
 - (e) the media release on 2 September 2018;
3. determines under section 38 (Decisions on contempt) of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 that the Premier's conduct be now dealt with by this House as a contempt; and
4. accepts the Premier's apology made today to the House as adequate, and the appropriate and final penalty in accordance with section 39—Assembly's power to deal with contempt—of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (11.41 am): by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, the Leader of the House be permitted to immediately move the motion for which I have just given notice relating to Ethics Committee report No. 189, with the following time limits to apply—

- total debate time one hour
- five minutes for all members.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PRIVILEGE

Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for Trade) (11.42 am): I rise on a matter of privilege. I will be removing myself from this debate.

MOTION

Premier and Minister for Trade, Finding of Contempt



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (11.42 am): I move—

That this House—

1. notes the Ethics Committee report No. 189, tabled in the House today;
2. finds the Premier in contempt for her actions in improperly influencing the KAP members, such actions including:
 - (a) the Premier's response to the question without notice on 22 August 2018;
 - (b) the statements quoted in the media on 22 August 2018;
 - (c) the correspondence to the member for Traeger on 23 August 2018;
 - (d) the speech at the ALP Queensland state conference on 2 September 2018; and
 - (e) the media release on 2 September 2018;
3. determines under section 38 (Decisions on contempt) of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001 that the Premier's conduct be now dealt with by this House as a contempt; and
4. accepts the Premier's apology made today to the House as adequate, and the appropriate and final penalty in accordance with section 39—Assembly's power to deal with contempt—of the Parliament of Queensland Act 2001.

In moving this motion, I note that the Premier and Minister for Trade has already made a statement to this House this morning, at the first available opportunity, fulfilling the requirements of the report which was tabled by the chairperson of the Ethics Committee this morning. The Premier should be commended for her swift response to the report, where she has apologised. This action and the time frame in which the honourable Premier has done so speaks volumes about the character of the woman who leads our great state. This is the same character she showed when she railed against those racist and xenophobic comments of former senator Anning.

After all, we were not elected to stand aside when we see wrongs. We were elected to stand up. That is what the Premier did last September. She stood up to be counted. She stood up against ignorance and fearmongering. She stood up for the values we hold dear in this state and in this country. She led and she showed the integrity that the people of Queensland expect from a premier.

Let us go back to the words of the Katter Australian Party's former senator Fraser Anning in his first speech. He said a plebiscite on immigration would be 'the final solution' to stop Muslims from coming to our country. He called Muslims criminals, welfare cheats and terrorists. He called for a return to the White Australia policy.

Did our Premier stay silent in the face of this attack on our values? No, she stood up. The then Anti-Discrimination Commission applauded the Premier's actions. It stated—


Her actions demonstrate that Anning and Katter's words are not who we are as a nation and that if we ignore these outrageous and troubling sentiments that appeal to xenophobia, we empower them.

It should be remembered that Anning's first speech was only a sign of things to come. He went on to blame Muslims for the Christchurch massacre. He used taxpayer funds to fly around the country to meet fellow alternative right figures. He attended a racist rally where some people made Nazi salutes.

The Premier called him out early and often. Other Australians made their opinions known as well. A million people signed a petition calling for Anning to be removed from parliament. In the last federal election former senator Anning received just 19 votes. The people of Australia spoke. The people of Queensland spoke clearly about what they thought of this individual's statements—that is, they do not reflect the views and beliefs of this great state and country. The people of Australia showed that we are people who are tolerant, respectful and inclusive and that we support diversity in this country.

The Premier is on the right side of history. She will also be on the right side of history by ruling out a preference deal with One Nation. I challenge the opposition: will they rule out a deal with One Nation? I am very proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government which takes a stand on the big issues. I am proud to have a real leader as our Premier. She is a premier who has delivered reform and a positive future for Queenslanders. She has led big reforms based on the best available evidence around serious and organised crime and tackling alcohol fuelled violence. She has introduced big changes to promote integrity in our political and electoral systems. She has delivered more than 200,000 jobs in this great state. She has restored frontline health and education services cut by the Newman LNP government. She has kept our assets in public hands, meaning cheaper electricity prices and a stronger economy. She has slashed payroll tax, invested in free apprenticeships, increased Queensland's health funding by billions and employed an extra 6,000 nurses, midwives and doctors.

This is a Premier I proudly stand side by side with, sit around the cabinet table with and follow around this great state to make sure we are acting in the best interests of Queenslanders. The Premier leads a government that is delivering for all Queenslanders. I am very proud to be part of that team.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (11.47 am): The opposition will be supporting the motion moved by the Leader of the House and recommended by the Ethics Committee. I say at the outset that the honourable opposition leader was one of the first to call out the comments made by then senator Fraser Anning. I congratulate her for that. I agree with the Leader of the House that we live in a multicultural society and that those comments should be condemned, as they were by the Leader of the Opposition.

That is not the subject of debate today. It was that those comments led the Premier, using parliament as her political plaything, to choose to do what she did because she was the Premier of the state. She threatened to withdraw funding. The Ethics Committee has handed down its report today. Make no mistake, the Ethics Committee is made up of members from both sides of parliament—Labor and Liberal National Party members. It handed down a unanimous resolution that the Premier be found in contempt of parliament because of her actions. It is the actions of the Premier that should be called into question—and not just on this issue. The Leader of the House talks about the character test. The Premier has failed the character test in her five-year premiership. We have had integrity scandal after integrity scandal.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister for State Development and Minister for Transport and Main Roads, your comments will come through the chair.

Mr BLEIJIE: The government wants to talk about character. We have had integrity crisis after integrity crisis of this government and of this Premier's own making. Let us not forget that it all started when Minister Bailey used the mangocube email account. There was an inquiry by the Crime and Corruption Commission. The Crime and Corruption Commission called him a fool. Do members remember that? Then we had ministers resign and we had ministers forced to resign. We also had in the last few months the Deputy Premier engulfed in her own integrity scandal from which I can tell the Deputy Premier she will never recover. Her integrity is in tatters. She will never, ever recover from that integrity crisis. So arrogant is the Deputy Premier that she could not bring herself to—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Clearly the member is way off the topic of this motion. I ask him to come back to the subject.

Mr SPEAKER: I agree with the point of order. I think you need to come back to the motion as it is written, member. I will give you some latitude to do that.

Mr BLEIJIE: Thank you, Mr Speaker. In responding to the comments of the Leader of the House, the integrity of the Premier and the character of the Premier goes to the heart of this motion—and it is about leadership. To me this is about leadership. If there were true leadership in the Labor Party in

Queensland, we would not have come to this position of an Ethics Committee referral and we would not have come to this position today where we are debating, for the first time that I can recall, a Premier being found in contempt of parliament.


This is serious. It is so serious that I agree with the Leader of the House: it is all about character and integrity. The Premier ought to consider her position because she has overseen in the last five years crisis after crisis of her own integrity. The Premier failed to act on those scandals. She then believed that she had the right to simply take and give as she chose with respect to taxpayers' money for the crossbenchers. Who knows whether that was then going to extend to the opposition office, which is under Ministerial Services. Who would know what this Premier may have done if she had got away with it. That is concerning, and it should be of concern to all members of the House.

If we look at the motion moved by the Leader of the House and the recommendation from the Ethics Committee on page 22, we see that the conclusion of the Ethics Committee is that the actions of the Premier 'amounted to an improper interference with the free performance by the KAP members of the members' duties as members'. Then it goes on to make various recommendations that the Premier has been found in contempt and should apologise, which she has done.

Recommendation 2 in the committee's report makes a further recommendation about the PCCC—and I want to touch on this point particularly. I have been concerned that the Crime and Corruption Commission, after doing a series of important investigations, is simply putting out press releases and making its determinations by press release. I think it is time, as this recommendation says, that the Crime and Corruption Commission put out proper reports on these important issues and not be issuing decisions by press release, as has been the norm now for the last five years, and I do not think that is right. I support recommendation 2 of the Ethics Committee investigation.

The Premier should not have done what she did. She has rightfully been found in contempt of the parliament. This is about leadership. Today, the Premier ought to be considering her position in government and in the state.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (11.53 am): The member for Kawana wants to talk about integrity and he wants to talk about leadership. If he had a skerrick of integrity then he would have addressed in his contribution to the House on this motion just then that it was the LNP that led the charge on this matter. An article in the *North West Star* quoted the Leader of the Opposition as saying—

"I urge the Labor Party conference to move a motion to compel the Premier to rip up her special deal that gives the Katter Party \$500,000 of taxpayer funded assistance beyond their entitlement ...

As is detailed in the report in paragraph 142(c), the Ethics Committee, which is comprised of members from both sides of the House, found that both opposition and government members of the Queensland Legislative Assembly called for resources to be withdrawn and condemned then senator Fraser Anning for his comments.


Those opposite need to be honest in this debate. They need to be clear and they need to be honest. If the member for Warrego, who was found by the Ethics Committee previously to have been in contempt and was promoted by the LNP, is making a contribution in this debate, then let us be honest. The Ethics Committee found that those opposite led the charge on this matter. They cannot come in here and rewind and erase history. They are front and centre of this issue.

Let us not forget what started this. Let us not forget the Premier's background. This is a woman who grew up listening to the stories from her grandparents who suffered under Nazi occupation of Poland. This is a woman who understood, from her grandfather's mouth, the horrors that were visited upon the people of her grandfather's country when it came to the Nazi occupation. Fraser Anning is no longer a senator thank goodness because the Queensland public decided to punt him with the second lowest vote in recorded history. They punted him because he stood up in the Senate and called for the 'Final Solution' when it came to immigration policy in this nation.

Both sides of politics repudiated his comments. As the Leader of the House has said, that was just a taste. He then went on to condemn non-European migration to this country. That means that people like me and other people in this chamber would not have been eligible to have come to this country. I condemn those comments. He then went on—and this is the most disgraceful comment of all—to blame Muslims, the victims of the Christchurch massacre, for the massacre when it was right

wing extremists—probably close friends of Fraser Anning—who committed the atrocities. This is a man who is disgraceful. This is a man who, quite frankly, should never have been elected to the Australian parliament. He is a dishonour to our population. He is a dishonour to our people. I absolutely support the Premier's call on asking everyone to repudiate his comments and to disown him because, quite frankly, this is not what Australia is about. This is absolutely not what we are about and it does not reflect Australian values.

Let me make this point. The Premier has stood in her place today and she has apologised. She has done more in terms of responding to this issue in the space of a couple of minutes today than those opposite have done in seven years of damage to this state. I absolutely stand by the Premier. She has completely acquitted the recommendations of the Ethics Committee in terms of her duty to this House when it comes to their findings. The Premier is someone whom we should all feel enormously proud of because, when people stand up and make racist statements, she will not let a day go by and let that happen. She will not allow racism to thrive in this state. I absolutely support the strong leadership against racism that the Premier has shown.

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (11.58 am): I am grateful for the opportunity to speak in this debate and on what seems to be a heavily qualified apology. In response to the findings of the Ethics Committee, it is good that the Premier has acknowledged her wrongdoings. Then we heard the speech from the member for Redcliffe, and the sentiment that came across there was that there was this background of disgusting acts that justified the need for it. To me, it was a heavily qualified apology, and I made that point at the start.

There has been a hell of a lot of talk about what caused this and what brought us to this point, and that is fine. I am offended by a lot of things in this parliament, but I am not able to intimidate or bully people into a position by virtue of my position. When the Deputy Premier talks about Australian values, they are relative. If you find that abhorrent, that is fine; you are entitled to that view. We find a lot of views from that side of the House abhorrent as well, but I cannot try and force them to vote in a certain way because they will have their staff taken off them, which is what we are arguing about here and the purpose of this debate.

The substance of this debate is the Premier's actions, and that is what we should be talking about. If we want to flash our moral self-righteous credentials in here, I am happy to do that. I am offended by a lot of things that go on in this parliament as well. It is very nice to make the association between us—because it must by imputation—and the Nazis. That is really kind. I take very serious offence to that. That has nothing to do with our position. By imputation—

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, I rise in relation to a matter of privilege suddenly arising. The member is claiming that I made certain statements. To be clear, I was simply quoting what Senator Anning had done.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr KATTER: I thank the Attorney-General for that commentary, but I think anyone who was listening would have made an assumption about what that imputation meant, and I take great offence to it.


We are talking about the implications of the Premier's actions. Let's dig into that, because that could have been Campbell Newman saying, 'I want you to vote for Strong Choices. Let's see how you vote for it. We might take some staff resources off you.' Despite what we think about Strong Choices, that is what we are arguing about. That is what was done, and that is what this parliament cannot abide. That is what we should be debating now. Yes, it is upsetting to hear those sorts of imputations coming from that side.

I think the Deputy Premier made a good point about the member for Warrego, who raised this in the first place. Everyone who thought it would be a bit of fun to try and pick on the KAP and get some benefit out of this is very much complicit in this whole initiative and perhaps even forced the Premier into a corner on that issue, so I think that was a valid point to make.

I am not sure there is too much more I can say. There has been a lot of discussion about this. The Ethics Committee report has taken a long time to come out. The implications would be very serious for anyone. I think it is really important for everyone in this House to stop and consider the implications. Regardless of our views, values or interpretation of any issue that comes before this parliament, how do we want to protect the democracy of this House? If people see that you can get away with threatening and bullying people by offering a simple apology it would set a precedent in this parliament. It has been

said by people outside of parliament that prima facie this looks like a breach of the Criminal Code, which is a very serious matter. We want these things dealt with properly. We have received an apology backed up by sentiment in subsequent speeches saying there was good reason for it in the first place. That seems to me to be a qualification on the apology. That is an interesting point to raise.

We have just received this. This is our first visual of any of this. Without resources in the parliament we are trying to read through this so we can comment. Quite clearly, we do not have the resources in the parliament to do that, so we will do our best to get our head around this and make a judgement from there.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for State Development, Manufacturing, Infrastructure and Planning) (12.03 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion, and I am proud to rise in the House today to speak in support of the Premier. I have known our Premier now for 30 years. She has been a great supporter of me and my family—including last weekend, when she came and paid her respects to my late mother. In public life I am proud to stand with the Premier to champion and defend those values that define our modern Queensland.


The Premier's term has been marked by a range of social reforms that have led the nation in building a fairer and more tolerant community, celebrating diversity and providing legislative validation for human rights. That is what moral leadership looks like. That moral leadership could not be seen with greater clarity, coming after a government that sacked the Parliamentary Crime and Corruption Committee in the middle of the night and referred to public servants in the most reprehensible terms. Queensland is fortunate to have a Premier who stands up for what she believes.

I want to take issue with what the member for Traeger said. The Premier's apology has not been qualified. The Premier's apology complies completely and fully with the report of the Ethics Committee tabled in the parliament today. The Premier's comments and her apology were unreserved, and she has said that in the parliament. We do not want this untruth about the Premier's apology to hang in the air. The Ethics Committee said that the Premier should say sorry for what she did. The Premier has done so. The Premier and the government respect and accept the findings of the Ethics Committee. However, I hope the Premier never says sorry for two things: her values and her beliefs. Can I say in the House today that her beliefs are my beliefs; they are the beliefs of all of the members of this side of the House; they are the beliefs of the Australian Labor Party.

All people are equal. All people have dignity. All people deserve respect, whatever the colour of their skin or whatever religion they follow. We will never, ever apologise for those beliefs. Freedom of speech and the right to be heard are not disconnected from the imperatives of civility. Citizenship carries with it responsibilities as well as rights. As I have said in this House previously, hate speech is not free speech: it is its nemesis. In the Premier, Queenslanders have a leader who will not—unlike the LNP—in the words of the former Queensland LNP senator George Brandis, 'stand up for the right of people to be bigots'. We will never stand up for these people. Our Premier will instead fight for the end of bigotry, as all members on this side of the House—and I hope all members of the House—will do.

Our Premier will not turn a blind eye or a deaf ear to calls for a 'final solution' on immigration, but she will stand up for the rights of all those who choose to call Queensland home because they want a decent life free from discrimination and persecution such as her very family, including her grandfather, who escaped a work camp in eastern Europe after the systematic, industrialised and bureaucratised death of six million people. Her family had to witness the industrialised murder of six million innocent people. When those words are said by a senator for Queensland, who we are ashamed to have represent our state, no wonder it strikes to the core of the Premier and her heart.

It is very, very pleasing that Fraser Anning served so briefly in the Senate. He was never elected to the Australian Senate, and that is the only thing we can take from his disgraceful career in public life in Australia. His views have, and will always be, condemned by right-thinking Queenslanders. His vile attack on the civil decency and acceptance that sits at the heart of our national identity was pushed back to the wilderness of the political fringe, and one can only hope that it never emerges again. I stand with the Premier and I support this motion.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.08 pm): Can I be very clear. We have always condemned hate speech. The LNP has done that. In fact, as the Manager of Opposition Business pointed out, it was actually I who started and pushed the Premier to denounce the comments of Fraser Anning. It was this side of the chamber that called them out first. The previous senator's comments were indefensible—and that has been spoken about—but that is not what we are here to debate today.

What we are talking about in this chamber today is the fact that the Premier has been found in contempt. No other Premier in living history that we are aware of has been found in contempt of the parliament. The Premier's apology is inadequate. It is clear that the Premier still does not understand the issue around this matter. The Premier's threats and intimidation of the crossbench members were premeditated and calculated and they were for personal, political gain.

Government members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Members, comments will come through the chair.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: The Premier's threats were made multiple times in this House and they were made at the Labor Party state conference. The only announcement in the Premier's speech at the Labor Party conference was a threat to withdraw resources from crossbench members unless they did what the Premier said they should do—and that is a threat. That is a disgraceful act of any person, let alone the Premier of this great state—a Premier who should show leadership when leadership is called for. To threaten the rights of an MP in this House is exactly why we are standing here today. This is a Premier who has been found in contempt of the parliament. The Premier has been rightly found to have committed a contempt of this parliament. The Premier has failed to take full responsibility for this, and it shows the character of this Premier.

This is not the first time this Premier has been found in contempt. I will quote from the report of the Ethics Committee in 2015, where it said that 'the Member for Inala's statements had an element of recklessness to them'—I repeat: an element of recklessness. The committee recommended that the member for Inala make a brief statement to clarify the statements she made. The report stated—

This privilege needs to be balanced with the responsibility of members to refrain from acting recklessly by making unqualified statements.

The Premier has form.


Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will cease her interjections.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is clear that the Deputy Premier has led the integrity scandals in this state, where the Premier has been unable to show strong leadership against the integrity scandals that are happening day after day after day under her leadership. It does not matter whether it is the Deputy Premier, the member for Toohey, the member for Keppel, the Minister for Employment and Small Business or the police minister. This is a Premier who fails to show leadership time after time. She is a weak Premier. The fact that we are standing in this chamber when a Premier has been found in contempt shows exactly the type of Premier we have here in Queensland—a Premier who is the weakest Premier that Queensland has ever seen.

Mr SPEAKER: Your closing remarks are unparliamentary and I ask you to withdraw them.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I withdraw.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail) (12.13 pm): I speak in support of this motion. Today we have heard words like 'character' and 'leadership'. There is one thing I can say about the Premier of Queensland and that is she has both and she has both in spades. Like many people in this House, we have known the Premier for many, many years, over two decades. There is one thing I can say about the Premier of Queensland: she stands up for her principles, she listens, she absolutely believes in a multicultural Queensland and she hates racism in all its forms.

She also has the strength and dignity of character to say sorry when she needs to. Today what we heard in this parliament, despite what some of those are saying opposite, is that the Premier stood in this parliament and unreservedly apologised to the House in line with the recommendations of the Ethics Committee. In fact, when the Leader of the Opposition made her contribution, you could almost argue that it is almost an infringement or a defence to the Ethics Committee that their decision was that she has to apologise unreservedly, and that is exactly what she did as soon as she was able to. That is exactly what we have come to learn from this Premier.

When we have a debate of this nature, we should reflect on comments that have been made before, such as—

The only thing necessary for the triumph of evil is for good men to do nothing.

That is what Edmund Burke said. Also—

You have enemies? Good. That means you've stood up for something, sometime in your life.

That is from someone I thought they would admire—that is, Winston Churchill. That is exactly what we are seeing here today. I know the Leader of the Opposition wanted to refer to some other Ethics Committee, but the one we are debating here right now is the one I will quote from. On page 19 at 142(a), it states—


The committee acknowledges that although the Premier intended her actions, she did not intend to commit a wrongdoing. The committee is cognisant that the Premier believed that her actions in calling out 'hate speech' and putting what she believed to be legitimate pressure on others to also condemn hate speech, was in the public interest'.

I absolutely stand shoulder to shoulder with the Premier in saying that, at all times, good leaders call out hate speech. They call out hate speech when it is about racism. The Premier absolutely has form. She was the first multicultural minister in the history of Queensland to introduce a multicultural policy. She fought hard for that, and the member for Woodridge and I saw that firsthand. It is now legislation. It is legislation in this parliament that our now Premier fought for. We saw her strong commitment to this firsthand.

As has been said today by the Deputy Premier and the Minister for State Development, all of us have seen on the public record the horrible, horrible comments not suitable for the people of Queensland made by an unelected former senator, Fraser Anning. The comments that he made after the tragedy in New Zealand are appalling and have no place in public discourse. So many of us have entered into parliament—and I hope to God on both sides of the House—because the one thing that should always bring us together is that at all times we stand up against those who preach hate and racism in Queensland. That is the fundamental reason we are standing here today debating this motion. Those opposite will try to muddy the waters but we know that is why.

The member for Woodridge, who has known the Premier probably the most out of all of us in this House, has talked about the Premier's own association and experience through her family of what the extremes of hate and racism can lead to. I am very proud to stand here alongside every single member of this government in believing that we have a Premier who will always fight for what she believes is right. As I said, the one thing that we know about the Premier and her leadership of this state is that she will always stand up for her principles, even when that means that you have to come up against those who will fight you every single step of the way. She listens to Queenslanders and she represents the views of the majority of Queenslanders who hate racism. She will always have the strength of character to apologise when necessary.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (12.18 pm): In regard to the apology, right from the beginning this is about the comments of a former senator and about staff being removed from the KAP as a result of a comment. I note from all of this that it relates back to staffing. It was the member for Warrego who raised the issue and prompted the Premier to take action.

The question is: why did the member for Warrego and the LNP target KAP staffing? The most important thing is to ensure that we are appropriately resourced. This apology would not have been required if this government and governments of the past had implemented the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report that basically stated that non-government members must be provided with appropriate resources and detailed information to enable them to supervise and scrutinise. The whole thing is about taking away KAP staffing. I do not know what they were trying to achieve—perhaps to weaken our position. I am not too sure.

What has come out from this report is that in 2018 the Crime and Corruption Commission recommended that the process to decide appropriate levels of resourcing for all members of parliament should be determined by an independent entity such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal. The position we are trying to get across is that the government should not make decisions about staffing resources for crossbenchers or the opposition. There is also the question of why the opposition raised the issue of removing our staff.

We take pride in the work we do in the parliament. We have introduced about 16 private members' bills. Last week we introduced a bill to support the visually-impaired and we have raised issues about supporting dairy farmers, particularly in rural and regional Queensland—


Mr Dametto: Vegetation management.

Mr KNUTH:—vegetation management—you name it. We do take great pride. We also took great offence that because of a comment made in Sydney there was great pressure coming from the opposition and the government to remove our staffing resources. If we go back and look at the

Fitzgerald report, we see that it recommended the creation of the electoral and administration review committee and that it conduct a review of the provisions of non-government members with appropriate resources of staffing and equipment, and proper access to information.

We want to hold the government to account. We want to scrutinise legislation. We have tens of thousands of amendments to scrutinise throughout the year. We want to be an effective opposition, but this is not a new argument to us. Back in 2013 at five minutes before the Christmas break then premier Newman walked in and changed legislation. What did they do? They removed KAP staffing. What happened last year as a result of some comment made in Canberra? They removed KAP staffing.

I think we need to look at what the Fitzgerald inquiry reported with regard to parliamentary crossbench staffing and focus on resourcing the whole parliament so that we have an effective opposition and robust debate here in the parliament.

 **Hon. SJ MILES** (Murrumba—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (12.23 pm): Let us be clear: former senator Anning's statements were disgusting. I am proud to serve in a government led by a Premier who was willing to take a stand, a Premier who was willing to do what was right and a Premier who personifies those values that other government members have spoken to. We on this side of the House respect the parliament and its institutions. We respect the Ethics Committee. We would never sack the PCCC in the middle of the night. We would never meddle with the estimates process, rendering it useless. We would never go to the High Court to hide millions of dollars of illegal donations.

Because we respect the Ethics Committee we accept its recommendations in this report. However, while we do so, there are others who should also take responsibility for their actions, and today is their opportunity to say sorry, too. In their glee in rushing to try to capitalise on the politics of this, the opposition, particularly the opposition leader, is guilty of embarrassing hypocrisy. Her speech made her look like a clown worthy of Luna Park.

Mr SPEAKER: Member, I ask that you withdraw those comments. I find them unparliamentary.

Dr MILES: I withdraw. It was the member for Warrego who demanded the very action that the Premier took and was the subject of this report. The member for Glass House, on 23 August, said—

It is repulsive that Annastacia Palaszczuk rewards the Katter party with five staff. It is time for the Premier to end this arrangement today—not to review it, to end this arrangement today.

The Ethics Committee report notes that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition called on the Premier to take this action. It notes, as the Deputy Premier has outlined, that the Leader of the Opposition demanded the Premier take this action. The action that she stands in this place today and calls disgraceful is the very action she urged the Premier to take. Today is the opportunity for them to back away from their galling hypocrisy. The member for Nanango—

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. The Minister for State Development will cease his interjections and put his comments through the chair.

Dr MILES: The member for Nanango, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Warrego and the member for Glass House should all apologise, too, because these findings apply as much to the action they demanded as they do to the Premier. We know that those opposite are unable to utter those words. They are unable to say sorry. They have still not said sorry for their brief term in office, which was described by Tony Fitzgerald as—

From behind a populist facade, it engaged in ... nepotism, sacked, stacked and otherwise reduced the effectiveness of parliamentary committees, subverted and weakened the state's anti-corruption commission, made unprecedented attacks on the courts and the judiciary, appointed a totally unsuitable Chief Justice, reverted to selecting male judges almost exclusively and, from a position of lofty ignorance—

Mr BLEIJIE: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. During my contribution the government pulled me up on relevance to the debate under the standing orders, as I am now doing. The issues the member is speaking about do not go to the heart of the issue we are currently debating.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kawana. As I ruled at that time, I allowed some latitude, and the member was allowed to continue.

Dr MILES: Tony Fitzgerald continued—


... from a position of lofty ignorance, dismissed its critics for their effrontery.

Those opposite and those I have named should not just apologise for demanding that the Premier take the action she did. They still have not said sorry to the 4,400 health workers they sacked. They have still not said sorry to their families. They still have not said sorry to the Red Cross whose funding they cut, to Diabetes Queensland, to Drug Arm, to the Eating Disorders association, to Kidney Support Network, to Mission Australia, to the Royal Flying Doctor Service—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Minister, I do ask you to come back, under standing order 236, to the motion at hand.

Dr MILES: There are so many things those opposite should say sorry for in response to this report. I am proud that our Premier took strong action in condemning former senator Anning and I stand proudly with her.

Mr SPEAKER: Before calling the next speaker, honourable members, I want to acknowledge the attendance in the public gallery this afternoon of the principal and student leaders from Alexandra Hills State High School in the electorate of Capalaba.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (12.28 pm): Firstly, I would like to thank the Ethics Committee for going through this in a considerable amount of detail and coming to what I think is the right outcome. Today, it was good to see the Premier stand up and apologise, though some of the comments from members on the other side of the House seem quite backhanded. This motion takes into account that a comment made in Canberra is detached from what happens in this place in Brisbane. That comment was used to attack the KAP at the state level, first by the LNP to point out to the Premier that the right thing to do would be to take away our staff. Unfortunately, it seems like this side of the House has fallen for that trick. From what I can see, they set the Premier up to make these comments.


The Premier followed through, feeling that after making the comments she had to take our staff. Perhaps our decision to let Fraser Anning go should have come earlier, but I will not be intimidated and bullied by threats from one side of the House to take our staff. I do not think anyone in this House should feel in such a way that they change their point of view on something just because someone holds a stick to their head. That is what happened to us. The Premier should use this time to apologise to the four hardworking Queenslanders who lost their jobs. They added quite a lot of value not only to the crossbench but also to what Queenslanders see as a different point of view in this state.

Mr Knuth interjected.

Mr DAMETTO: That is exactly right; I take that interjection. The regional work of the KAP crossbench is supported by these staff members. The reason we saw so much public outcry around this time was that people were calling our office saying, 'You guys help us day in, day out when neither side of the House does. Now your staff are gone, how will you be able to help us out?' We said, 'We will continue to support you, regional Queensland,' but it was damn hard and now for nearly 12 months we have been under-resourced. Congratulations to the LNP and to the Labor Party on trying to clip our wings, but we will continue to forge ahead. If the Premier's apology had intent, she would have taken on recommendation 3—

The committee recommends the Committee of the Legislative Assembly consider deploying guidelines for determining resourcing for the cross-bench.

This is where the independent tribunal would be. It could have been included in this motion this afternoon. They could have said, 'Let us put this in right now so we can have an independent body—separate from the Premier and separate from the government—making the decisions about where staff are allocated.' Taking away the opportunity for the government of the day to determine staff and where they are appointed across the crossbench or the opposition takes away such an opportunity to attack not only minor parties but also the opposition. There is no way in the world anybody in this House would support anybody who, in a mafia style or extortionist way, tries to change the point of view of members of this House.

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (12.32 pm): I rise in this House to speak in support of the motion. Obviously, when we get Ethics Committee reports like this there is no doubt that the parliament respects the findings, but every day of the week I will stand up in this House and defend the Premier. I will defend her integrity and character every day of the week. I believe that the people of Queensland will do exactly the same. I have known the Premier for many years. Her values and the manner in which she conducts herself are second to none when it comes to integrity.

Those opposite want to throw mud continuously. Week after week, we have had nothing in this House other than those opposite asking questions—and if members do not believe me they should read in *Hansard* the questions that they have been asking—that are only about throwing mud. That is

all it is. They have not stopped. Whether the accusations are sustained or not, that is all they do. We are getting to the point where we believe that is all they are good for. They want to be the alternative government in this state, but for weeks of sitting in this House there was not one question on policy or on what is happening in government. It has been nothing but mud throwing. After a while, it starts to stick. Members have commented that it is uncommon for this to occur.

The Deputy Premier and member for South Brisbane outlined the Premier's background. When everyone in this House heard the comments, they motivated a reaction in us all. I say to the students in the gallery, 'Always oppose hate speech, because it moves from one element to another.' It starts on one character, one organisation or one body and quickly it can come and get you. We on this side of the House unreservedly oppose hate speech. I was just as appalled as the Premier in relation to then senator Anning's comments.

Following the Ethics Committee report, the Premier rose in this House, unreservedly apologised and took full responsibility. That is the character of the Premier. In this report, she also outlines quite openly that she was motivated by the abhorrent nature of this speech. It was counter to the most basic human rights, including equality and freedom from discrimination, that the Premier holds dear. Her motivation was not to undermine the parliament but to stamp out hate speech, and that she did. Her conduct did not involve any element of dishonesty or fraud. She was motivated to stop these kinds of comments in the public arena.

She states that at the time she was unaware that her actions could constitute a contempt of parliament. As I said, today she has unreservedly apologised and taken full responsibility. That is the character of a good leader. That is a reason she is premier of this state and why she is a woman who will go down in history as the most ethical, transparent and best premier this state ever had.

When the committee brought down its response and findings, it made it clear that it acknowledged the mitigating factors in that she did not intend to commit a wrongdoing but was only motivated by that hate speech. The Premier's conduct openly in public did not contain any element of corruption. She was responding to calls from this House, from those opposite and from this side of politics. At paragraph 142(c) the committee says that she was led to believe that she had the support of the House in her actions. It was raised by the member for Warrego. We cannot escape the fact that both sides of the House raised this issue as being abhorrent and called for the actions the Premier took. I respect the Premier immensely. The people of Queensland respect the Premier immensely. She has apologised. She has taken responsibility. She is a great leader.

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

AYES, 85:

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, Lauga, Linard, Lui, Lynham, Madden, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Miles, Miller, Mullen, B. O'Rourke, C. O'Rourke, Pease, Pegg, Power, Pugh, Richards, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Stewart, Trad, Whiting.

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

Grn, 1—Berkman.

Ind, 1—Bolton.

NOES, 5:

KAP, 3—Dametto, Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Andrew.

Ind, 1—Costigan.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders



Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Leader of the House) (12.42 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, notwithstanding anything contained in standing and sessional orders, the member for Traeger be permitted to immediately move general notice of motion 1 standing in the member's name with the following time limits to apply—

- total debate time—one hour
- 5 minutes for all members.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Non-Government Members, Resources



Mr KATTER (Traeger—KAP) (12.43 pm): I move—

That this House notes that—

1. 30 years ago the Fitzgerald report stated that non-government party members must be provided with appropriate resources and detailed information to enable them to supervise and criticise;
2. the Fitzgerald report recommended the creation of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission (EARC) and it conduct a review of the provision of non-government members with appropriate resources of staff and equipment, and proper access to information in respect of government activities;
3. EARC's subsequent report recommended that the total staff establishment of opposition parties should be maintained at 20 per cent of the staff establishment of ministerial offices; reflect parity with the salary profile of ministerial staff; and the allocation of the opposition parties' staff establishment to particular opposition parties should be on the basis of the proportion of seats held by the party;
4. in 2018 the Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) recommended that the process to decide an appropriate level of resourcing for all members of parliament should be determined by an independent entity, such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal (QIRT);
5. to date the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report, EARC and the CCC have not been implemented;
6. the public interest would be served by ensuring independent, objective and consistent assessment of duties and resources of non-government members, and bring Queensland in line with NSW, Vic and SA; and
7. calls on the government to amend the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Act to give QIRT the function of deciding the resources of non-government members.

This motion relates directly to the issue that has been dealt with in the parliament this morning. My focus is on resources provided to non-government members of parliament. The other week I noted that everyone was fist-pumping the air and celebrating the 30th anniversary of the Fitzgerald report. A year ago I got a visit from Terry O'Gorman, who said that, conveniently, one of the most important recommendations has never been followed through on by either of the major parties. That recommendation was that decision-making regarding the allocation of resources to non-government members be taken away from the government of the day. It is quite convenient for the government of the day, but it does not serve the best interests of the Queensland people. That is what makes it a very important issue. Adopting this proposal would just bring Queensland into line with other states and the federal parliament.


Crossbench members facing the pressure of representing large electorates need resources to try to broaden the debate in parliament. We have electorate office staff who handle electorate issues, but in terms of parliamentary representation the government and the opposition are well resourced in terms of support. Today's debate of the Ethics Committee report is an example of what we face. On a very big issue, we were given a 23-page document to digest without any staff resources. We are writing our own questions on notice and handling electorate issues while we are here in parliament. It puts extreme pressure on us to perform. I do not think it is an adequate or fair allocation of resources.

I have heard criticism in this House that the crossbench do not stand for much. That was in the context of the policy fund created under the Newman government for the minor parties. One of the members of the major parties said that nothing serious comes out of the crossbench. I took great offence at that. The performance of crossbench members has shown the nonsense of that comment. The KAP has introduced a number of private members' bills and three of them have been passed by parliament. That is out of just 14 or 15 in Queensland's history. If judging worth on bill activity alone, we have proven that there is a lot of value to Queensland voters in broadening parliamentary resources beyond the two major parties. That is an important point to make.

A lot of the crossbench members are from rural and regional areas. Mine is the biggest electorate. I am resourced with an extra electorate officer—I am grateful for that—but there is still a pretty big disadvantage when 10 or 20 hours every week is spent in the car or on the plane and you are trying to get across issues for debate in parliament, when you are asked to give a good, educated view in front of media and when people are constantly seeking a voice outside of the position of Liberal or Labor. That is a pretty big imposition, given that a lot of us are rural and regional members. It is very difficult.

Further evidence of the value the crossbench provides is that we get a lot of deputations from people. They come to see us and say, 'We have talked to both sides, but we would really like you to voice this in parliament.' As a result of that we have raised some really important issues, such as access for the visually-impaired to disability parking permits. People come to us to raise issues in parliament when other members are not getting across them. We provide a very valuable resource. I would say that we provide very good value to the taxpayer. Additional resources can only enhance debate in the parliament. I think we would all appreciate having a broader discussion of issues. I think it can only be better for Queenslanders to allocate resources fairly across non-government members.

It is time for the crossbench to force the major parties in this parliament to do what they have been instructed to do for the past 30 years since the Fitzgerald report: take decisions relating to non-government resources away from political decision-makers.

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Treasurer and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (12.48 pm): On behalf of the government, I am pleased to inform the House that the Palaszczuk Labor government will be supporting this motion. In doing so, I refer members of Katter's Australian Party to Ethics Committee report No. 189, tabled today in the House. I draw their attention to one of the annexures, which is a letter from the Premier of Queensland and Minister for Trade. Unfortunately, the date is not on there, but I have sourced that the date of the letter is 16 September. That is exactly one month before this motion was put on the *Notice Paper* during the last sittings. In that letter addressed to Mr Kelly, the chair of the Ethics Committee, the Premier writes—


I will take whatever steps are necessary and possible to transfer the decision-making in respect of staffing for crossbench members of Parliament to an entity independent of the government of the day such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal;

The Premier has already determined that this is something that the government will support, and that is particularly on the basis of the recommendation or the commentary from the CCC which came down on 27 September last year in which the CCC stated—

The CCC acknowledges that the government of the day has authority to determine appropriate resourcing for Ministerial and other office holders.

However, following the assessment, the CCC is of the view the process to decide an appropriate level of resourcing for all Members of Parliament should be determined by an entity independent of the government of the day. This would serve the public interest by ensuring an objective and consistent assessment of the duties of Members of Parliament. The CCC recommends the Parliament should consider this further.

That is exactly what we are doing now. We are fulfilling both the recommendations of the CCC and we are responding proactively to the Katter's Australian Party request for the independent determination of resourcing for crossbenchers. Let me end my commentary in support of the motion by saying that the Palaszczuk Labor government will be supporting this motion from the Katter's Australian Party as the Premier has already indicated to the Ethics Committee in her letter dated 16 September.

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (12.51 pm): I can see what the government wants to do. It wants to get all of these issues out of the way today because the motion on the *Notice Paper* was meant to be moved for debate tomorrow. It was interesting listening to the Deputy Premier and the Treasurer of the state talk about the Crime and Corruption Commission recommendations. The reason the Crime and Corruption Commission made those recommendations that the Deputy Premier spoke about was because of the Deputy Premier's actions when she thought she would look at the allowances under the budgetary process herself. Members will recall that when we were looking at the relief staff budget for our hardworking electorate officers the Treasurer made the comment that she was going to give with one hand and take with the other, and then of course the CCC made the recommendation that the Treasurer and Deputy Premier ought not have the power to be able to do that.

There is a real contradiction here. I am going to seek a ruling, Mr Deputy Speaker Weir, on this from you, because there is a motion that has just passed the parliament with respect to the Ethics Committee report. The Ethics Committee report made the recommendation that the Committee of the Legislative Assembly consider developing guidelines for determining resources for the crossbench. The motion moved by the member for Traeger at item No. 7 calls on the government to amend the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Act to give the QIRT the function of declaring the resources for non-government members. Is this motion talking about all non-government members—that is, the shadow ministry and the opposition leader's office? The opposition office and shadow ministers come under the Ministerial Services Branch, but this motion contradicts what the House just decided with respect to the Legislative Assembly.

Ms Trad: No, it wasn't.


Mr BLEIJIE: If the government is supporting this motion, perhaps it may want to clarify when talking about the QIRT determining the functions and deciding resources for non-government members when the Ethics Committee report highlighted crossbench members. Are we now talking about the QIRT determining for non-government members—that is, opposition members? That would include opposition travel, opposition shadow minister travel—

Ms Trad: It's all about the travel.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. This is serious because the Committee of the Legislative Assembly has already met with the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal about such matters and I would hate to think that we have moved a motion which contradicts a motion that the House has just determined and decided on, so all I am seeking is clarification. If the government is supporting this motion and will legislate for the remuneration tribunal to look at these issues, then all we are seeking is clarification of who it applies to. If it is that the motion applies to every member of this House, that is fine. I understand that. All I am seeking is clarification as to whether, as the Deputy Premier has said with regard to the fact that the Premier has looked into this, the government is going to support this motion and to let us know how it is not a contradiction.

If the Committee of the Legislative Assembly is not now determining these matters and if it is the QIRT, then members should have the right to know. Perhaps the Katter party may want to clarify, if it has further speakers to this motion, with regard to item No. 7 in terms of the resources for non-government members, because that will change the way the Ministerial Services Branch operates with the opposition office and all of the resources for the opposition office and staffing resources which the QIRT, the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal, has said to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly that it is not responsible for. If it is going to be responsible for it, all we are seeking is clarification. If it applies to everyone, that is fine. We just seek some form of clarification on that because the Ethics Committee report said that the Committee of the Legislative Assembly should look at the issues with respect to the crossbench, and that is at the heart of the debate here about the crossbenchers and having their resources taken away by the government.

I agreed with the Crime and Corruption Commission at the time when it put out the report saying that the government should not willy-nilly, just because it may have heard something that a member of parliament said that it disagreed with, take away a right of that member, because it does impugn the rights and liberties of members of the House. It is quite serious and, as I said, before determining one way or another—before we determine whether we are supportive or otherwise of this motion, and I understand the background to the motion that was going to be moved tomorrow—we are simply just seeking clarification from not only the mover but also the government, which is supporting the motion. Does it apply to every member of the House, including the opposition office, which comes under the Ministerial Services Branch, because that is quite different to what the Ethics Committee had recommended in the report that we have only just debated and discussed in the House?

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail) (12.56 pm): I thank the honourable member for the question posed during his contribution to this debate. As the Deputy Premier has outlined on behalf of the government, we will be supporting the motion moved by the member for Traeger. As the Deputy Premier also said in her comments, the Premier has already provided written advice to that end in a letter that was provided, as I understand, over a month ago.

I note that the motion moved by the member for Traeger talks about the Fitzgerald report. As we know, it has been 30 years this year since the Fitzgerald report. In 1989 I was 10 and I remember the Fitzgerald report vividly. I am sure that all members of parliament can relate to this, but when we go to a school or go to talk to a school group—in fact, it only happened to me last week—they ask, ‘Excuse me, Miss. Why did you want to become a member of parliament?’ There are two reasons that I state and have consistently stated, and stated in my first speech when I was first elected in 2006.

One reason I joined the Australian Labor Party was that I could not sit silent when Pauline Hanson came out and made the racist comments she did in 1996, when she was the then Liberal endorsed candidate. I give John Howard his due in that he did disendorse her. He just did it a little bit too late so her name would not be taken off the ballot paper, but that is another story. The other reason I cite is that I grew up in Queensland. I am a born and bred Queenslander and a fifth generation Queenslander.

I remember when the Fitzgerald inquiry dominated our news growing up. Everyone watched it. Do not forget that when the Fitzgerald inquiry was initiated it was initially expected to last six weeks. It ended up taking two years and investigated the long-term, systemic political corruption that was rife in Queensland at the time. In all, 339 witnesses were called and it sat for more than 238 days. Finally, in July 1989, the 630-page Fitzgerald report was tabled citing 100 recommendations. It also saw four ministers of the Crown jailed for corruption. That is the Queensland that I grew up in. It is not the Queensland that my children are growing up in.

After listening to the member for Kawana speak, I always find it fascinating that Queenslanders of my age who saw all of this unfold still thought when they were 15 or 18, ‘Do you know what? I’m going to join the Liberal National Party of Queensland!’ It always beggars belief to me, because we saw

the very worst of what poor government looks like in our state and it unfolded on the news for more than two years when they thought in a cynical exercise it would only last six weeks. We absolutely support this motion and the recommendations cited with regard to the independent review. There has also been a lot of talk today about unprecedented behaviour. It is pretty unprecedented to be the premier for only three years because you lost government after having a 66-seat majority. How did they do that? Why was that history made under the Newman government?

Debate, on motion of Ms Jones, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.00 pm.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance; Liberal National Party, Policies



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.00 pm): The LNP is counting down the days to the next state election. There are just 375 days to go until Queenslanders get to have their say on this incompetent Palaszczuk Labor government. After five years of failure, Queenslanders are saying that they have had enough of this Labor government. They have had enough of Labor's health crisis, they have had enough of Labor's nine new or increased taxes, they have had enough of having the highest unemployment rate in the nation and they have certainly had enough of the Palaszczuk Labor government full stop. Queenslanders want a government with the energy and the ideas that this state desperately needs. That is what the LNP will give them.

On Sunday, along with my deputy, I was delighted to welcome the endorsement of Amanda Cooper as the LNP candidate for the electorate of Aspley. There is no-one better to represent the people of Aspley in this House than Amanda Cooper. She has an outstanding record of public service and is a powerful champion for her community. Amanda has served her community and the people of north Brisbane for more than a decade as their local councillor. She was one of the many LNP councillors who have helped run Brisbane with competence and vision since 2008. Like me, Amanda is a working mum with three kids. She will bring valuable insights and experience into this House.

Amanda shares my passion for improving education. She knows that kids cannot concentrate in sweltering classrooms. Amanda knows that teachers cannot teach in sweltering classrooms. That is why the LNP will air-condition every state school classroom in the Aspley electorate. We will make it easier for kids to learn and teachers to teach, because we know that cool kids are smart kids. We will further support our hardworking teachers by decluttering the curriculum. The LNP will ensure that teachers are able to concentrate on literacy and numeracy in the classrooms. We can then get our NAPLAN results moving in the right direction.

Amanda Cooper also wants to see action to improve patient care at the Prince Charles Hospital. Under the Palaszczuk Labor government, waiting times for surgery at the Prince Charles Hospital have doubled.

An opposition member: What a disgrace!

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. What an absolute disgrace! That is what the Palaszczuk Labor government has delivered for the people of Aspley. I promise the people of north Brisbane that we will fix their health system. We will cut waiting times by partnering with the private sector. That will ease the pressure on our hospitals and give more support to our hardworking doctors and nurses. We will also bring back the targets that Labor has now scrapped, because targets are needed to drive performance and accountability. Queenslanders should not be waiting longer than clinically recommended times to get to hospital. It simply is not good enough.

Amanda Cooper's other priority for Aspley will be busting congestion. Thanks to years of transport neglect by the Labor government, Amanda Cooper has seen the north side almost grind to a halt. As a former LNP councillor, Amanda Cooper knows that all levels of government have to work together to deliver better roads and better public transport. It is only the LNP that will stop the political games that have held back infrastructure in this state. We will get traffic moving again. We will work hand in hand with the councils to bust bottlenecks and plan new roads across the south-east.

The LNP has the people and the plan that this state needs. The contrast with the Palaszczuk Labor government could not be any clearer. Labor does not have the right people and it certainly does not have the right plan. That is why, just in the last year alone, the Palaszczuk Labor government splashed out an astonishing \$67 million worth of taxpayers' money on private consultants—in the last

12 months, \$67 million to tell these incompetent ministers how to do their jobs. That was \$67 million to outsource the ministers' jobs over there. More than \$17 million was spent by Queensland Health and HHSs. Treasury spent more than \$10.5 million on external consultants. Queensland Rail spent \$8 million. The Premier's own department spent \$1.5 million.

Queensland already has more highly paid Public Service executives than it has ever had before, yet the Palaszczuk government still cannot operate without hiring another \$67 million worth of help. The Palaszczuk government has even hired consultants to advise on how it should cut back on consultants. This is all good news for those consultants.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection. Honestly, it is laughable—\$67 million to tell ministers how to do their jobs. We know that this is all good news for consultants, but it is seriously bad news for Queensland taxpayers.

Worst of all, this spending spree is not delivering better services. Our health and education services are going backwards, not forwards. Crime is increasing. We only need to read the terrible stories about Townsville and the Gold Coast in the past 24 hours.

It is a familiar story for Queenslanders. Under this Labor government, people are paying more and they are getting less. Queenslanders always have to foot the bill for Labor's consultants, but they rarely get to see the consultants' reports, because the Palaszczuk government has an unhealthy culture of cover-ups, secrecy and hiding.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: They love redactions. Time and time again reports that should be in the public arena have been kept under lock and key. Unlike Labor, the LNP believes in open and transparent government. That is why I have called for the Palaszczuk Labor government to release all the information it is holding in relation to Paradise Dam and why it made the decision to release so much water down the drain in one of Queensland's worst droughts without thought for those people who are not in a position to grow crops with the so-called free water. The people of Queensland are looking forward to electing an LNP government because it is only an LNP government that can get Queensland working again.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Members, joining us in the chamber today are students and staff from Dutton Park State School in the electorate of South Brisbane. We welcome them to the people's house.

Building Safety



Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works, Minister for Digital Technology and Minister for Sport) (2.11 pm): When will the LNP learn? The opposition leader has come in here and talked up their candidate for Aspley, another candidate tainted by Campbell Newman. Come on! Really, Leader of the Opposition? I want to move on.

Last night on the ABC's 7.30 program a story was aired exploring the safety of buildings in New South Wales and Victoria. Previously *Four Corners* also revealed the extent of risks to building safety imposed by dodgy aluminium composite panels. Consistently Queensland has led the way in making sure buildings are safe. Queensland is leading national work on ways to address the issue of nonconforming building products, whether domestically manufactured or imported. In fact, it was Queensland that acted first while the LNP coalition in Canberra decided to sit on its hands.

Two years ago the Queensland government established an audit task force to conduct a targeted investigation into buildings using ACP cladding and other combustible products and all the while the LNP coalition in Canberra did nothing. Whilst Bronwyn Weir and Peter Shergold, authors of the *Building confidence: improving the effectiveness of compliance and enforcement systems for the building and construction industry across Australia* report, were talking about sirens in the street rather than simply alarm bells, the Prime Minister of this nation did nothing to stop the importation of dangerous, dodgy combustible cladding. Buildings burned in Australia. People tragically lost their lives in London. Still, this Prime Minister has decided to take no action about this risk.

In stark contrast, the Palaszczuk government has taken another important step forward to ensure investment and confidence in the building industry here in Queensland; another important step to protect the jobs of Queensland's 230,000 construction workers; another important step to protect the

single biggest investment that most Queenslanders will make in their home. Today I can announce that a ban is now in place to prevent the use of combustible cladding on Queensland apartment buildings. In addition, we have ensured continued confidence in the sector by ensuring that certifiers can continue to operate despite an historic correction in the Australian insurance market. Our actions are part of our two-pronged approach to provide a lifeline to the state's hardworking certifiers caught up in the shrinking insurance market. Our actions will ensure that investment continues to flow into the Queensland property market.

There is a further action that today I am calling on the Prime Minister to take. I call on the Prime Minister to take action to protect Australians and introduce an importation ban on all aluminium composite panels with a PE core. I have made numerous calls on the Commonwealth to ban this combustible cladding at the border. Prime Minister, the time is over to keep dodging responsibility to the people of this nation. The Prime Minister cannot keep dodging the opportunity to back in Queensland and Australian manufacturing workers. This is an opportunity to both reduce risk and back Australian manufacturing jobs, an opportunity that the Prime Minister should be jumping at. We already have some outstanding Queensland based manufacturers who are ready to provide safe, compliant building products. Because of the inaction of the LNP in Canberra, local manufacturers are being forced to compete with cheap, dodgy imported goods.

What this nation needs is jobs and I call on those opposite to join our call on the Prime Minister to back in a nationwide prohibition on the importation of dodgy cladding products to protect Aussie jobs and ensure the safety of our built environment. The Palaszczuk government will not rest until this scourge, allowed to seep into our nation because of a preference for profits over safety, is eliminated. I am pleased to announce that our government will be supported in its efforts through our Safer Buildings Taskforce and its newly appointed chair, Mr Peter Koutsoukis. I am looking forward to working alongside Mr Koutsoukis in our continued efforts to ensure all Queensland buildings and homes are free from combustible cladding.

Under our Safer Buildings program over 20,000 building owners have registered their buildings, with 16,648 of these exiting the program with their building declared safe. To date, of the buildings remaining in the program, 24 buildings have been identified that require some sort of rectification. That is less than one per cent. These buildings require rectification by 30 June 2021. In the event that action is not taken by building owners, we will legislate to require rectification. Under our regime, I can confirm that 879 government buildings have also been investigated. Of those, 46 have already been rectified and a further 25 are undergoing additional rectification.

Our government has led the world on the response to combustible claddings. I am pleased to report that our system is being adopted in Dubai and in London, the site of catastrophic building fires caused by these dodgy products. The Palaszczuk government is investing in building to keep our economy strong and we reiterate our calls on those opposite to join us in our call on the Prime Minister to take action to back in Queensland tradies.

Racing Integrity Commission



Mr LANGBROEK (Surfers Paradise—LNP) (2.16 pm): This morning the Leader of the House said—

We were not elected to stand aside when we see wrongs. We were elected to stand up.

I rise as shadow minister for racing. Last Thursday in just 49 minutes Labor's \$30 million continuing disaster of racing integrity and welfare was exposed. That is how long the ABC's 7.30 program took to turn Queensland Labor's racing oversight body into a nightmare. This program graphically, horribly, sickeningly showed hapless horses undergoing unimaginable torture minutes before their often excruciating deaths. This should have been stopped years ago by Labor's \$30-million-a-year Queensland Racing Integrity Commission, QRIC, whose own website states that its job is overseeing the integrity and welfare standards of racing animals and racing industry participants in Queensland.

QRIC has failed abysmally on both counts due to Labor and its ministers having no oversight interest and the senior staff at QRIC having no racing knowledge. At a cumulative cost of \$100 million since being formed, QRIC has been unable to uncover what amateurs have. QRIC's commissioner said there have been five prior complaints about the Caboolture abattoirs which he said had been investigated and resolved over the past 18 months and now this at the same place, and this torture has been going on for years.

Yesterday Bart Sinclair, the doyen of Queensland racing journalists, talking with Steve Austin on 612 ABC claimed that QRIC received the five complaints about the abattoir but referred them on as it was not in its jurisdiction. It is all very well to announce an inquiry today, but QRIC already has its focus on welfare as its aim. Let us have a look at today's announcement of an inquiry. QRIC overseeing is inappropriate. QRIC is where the trouble started. How can QRIC be the solution? QRIC is the problem. It is Caesar judging Caesar.

Labor is holding an inquiry to clean up the mess that QRIC had a bound duty to know about. Logical independent choices to head the inquiry would have been John Schreck or Terry Bailey, two former interstate chairmen of thoroughbred stewards. No-one at senior levels at QRIC knows anything about horses. That is what we have seen from the integrity arm of QRIC with failed prosecutions which I outlined last week in the House. QRIC's strategic plan advises that the MacSparran review has provided heightened industry awareness of welfare and industry obligations. The industry maybe, but not QRIC. The racing minister said, 'QRIC is delivering strong and effective oversight of Queensland's racing industry across the three codes.' Really? It is like being in *Alice in Wonderland* listening to the hapless minister: 'Why, sometimes I've believed as many as six impossible things before breakfast.'

QRIC is empowered to collaborate with other agencies responsible for investigating and prosecuting animal welfare offences and to promote high standards of integrity and animal welfare and to respond to breaches of the Racing Integrity Act and Racing Act. Despite \$30 million a year for almost four years, QRIC has failed. It has the advantage of coercive powers, working with the Queensland Police Racing Crime Squad, a veterinary team, an investigative squad with body worn cameras, search warrants, Crime Stoppers, the RSPCA and other Labor agencies such as the department of agriculture, yet it was upstaged by amateur sleuths.

The minister said that the key responsibility needs to be on people who own those racing horses. No, minister! For \$30 million a year, it is QRIC's responsibility. This is another Labor fail. QRIC's powers extend to countless measures of equine welfare, all sadly and pathetically kicked to the curb under Labor's watch. Despite what Commissioner Barnett said in a press conference, QRIC's powers as per their animal welfare strategy 'are to ensure that racing animals are well cared for before, during and after their racing careers'. Labor's failure writ large!

On the day after the 7.30 story, I was pleased to meet with the New South Wales racing minister, Hon. Kevin Anderson, to discuss racing matters and hear details of the actions New South Wales put in place some time ago so that such an expose would not work there. Then I met with the CEO of Racing Australia, former New South Wales premier the Hon. Barry O'Farrell. The contrast between our two jurisdictions could not be starker. I want to table what New South Wales under a Liberal government has put in place in terms of animal welfare.

Tabled paper. Media release, dated 18 October 2019, from Racing NSW titled 'Racing NSW Response to ABC 7.30 Report [\[1903\]](#).

New South Wales is the only state with a rule of racing prohibiting horses being sent to a knackery if predominantly based in that state. Horses can be seized on welfare grounds. Through the racing industry, there is a specific fund with one per cent of all prize money assigned to horse welfare, and it goes on.

QRIC says that racing animal welfare remains its highest priority. Last year they had 84 media releases in the QRIC annual report, but not one was about rehoming race horses. Nathan Exelby pointed out that one can hear only crickets coming from Queensland whereas New South Wales and Victoria responded rapidly.

Gladstone Electorate, Health Services



Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (2.21 pm): I rise to speak about one of the most important issues in my electorate: health services. Delivering health services is complex and challenging work that is made even more challenging when you are faced with obstacles such as a serious shortage of general practitioners in regional areas such as mine and a federal government that is abandoning its responsibilities. As the state government, we are committed to improving health services. We are working to overcome the challenges and to improve health service delivery in Gladstone, but that will not happen overnight and we cannot do it alone.

The Palaszczuk government has invested more in the Gladstone Hospital in the past few years than has occurred in previous decades. When I first nominated to represent the people of Gladstone, the No. 1 issue raised with me was upgrades to the Gladstone Hospital. People were sick and tired of

health funding being allocated somewhere else. The Palaszczuk government listened and, over the past four years, we have delivered a \$42 million commitment to a brand-new accident and emergency department, which is set to be the best in regional Queensland by far. We have delivered a \$4 million step-up step-down facility in my electorate, a \$1.25 million upgrade to our maternity ward in the hospital after the closure of the Mater hospital and we have recently announced \$1.1 million for a new specialist outpatient department. We are now calling on the people of Gladstone to tell us what they would like in that facility.

Beyond that capital investment, staffing numbers have also increased and are continuing to improve. In the past five years, we have increased doctor numbers from 18 to 50, nurse and midwife numbers from 198 to 275, and total staff numbers at the hospital from 347 to 498. Our reliance on locum doctors has drastically reduced, which has been no small feat.

Only the Palaszczuk Labor government is serious about improving health care in Queensland and only this government is delivering the investment that is needed for our hospitals. All this is happening while the federal government has cut \$316 million to Queensland hospitals in this year's budget. Not only is our hospital facing increasing demand and treating more people than ever before; it is also expected to do more with less from our federal government. While Ken O'Dowd and his LNP mates keep cutting the health budget, the Palaszczuk government has stepped up and is doing the heavy lifting in Queensland when it comes to building and funding our hospitals.


To make matters worse, the federal government has recently declared that Gladstone is no longer a priority area for general practitioners. Tell that to anyone who has tried to get an appointment with their local GP, let alone tried to be bulk-billed! The GP shortage in Gladstone is serious and now the federal government has made it even more difficult to attract GPs to clinics in areas of regional Queensland such as Gladstone. That means that people in my community are not able to access the primary care or the preventive health care that they need, and they are unable to adequately manage ongoing medical conditions. Instead, they are presenting to the Gladstone Hospital to have their needs met.

The federal government must be kidding if they think that we have a health workforce that is meeting community needs in Gladstone. The Palaszczuk government has stepped up and also has plans for this. Following the establishment of the specialist outpatient department, in 2022 we will be opening the Central Queensland and Wide Bay medical school. That is an incredibly important step, because we know that when medical practitioners train locally they stay locally. We need to grow our own medical professionals in the Gladstone area if we want to begin to address the skills shortages that we see right across regional Queensland.

Finally, I say this to the people of my electorate: I acknowledge your community sentiment and I acknowledge your passion, because I too am passionate about improving services at the Gladstone Hospital. We are on a journey and we have come a long way, but there is still further to go. The investments secured since I have been the state member for Gladstone demonstrate that I am a strong advocate for the hospital. I know there is certainly more work to be done, especially in the area of patient experience and increasing communication to the community. Patients rightly expect their health needs to be met with compassion, professionalism and competency.

I will certainly continue to work with the Minister for Health and the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Board to ensure that this occurs. In conclusion, I acknowledge that the board of the Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service has three members from the Gladstone area. Huge kudos goes to the members of that board.

Drought

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (2.26 pm): In rising to speak, I declare I have an individually droughted property declaration or IDP, as noted on my register of interests. Queensland's drought is critical and catastrophic. Farmers and their communities have been hurting for years. There is no reprieve on the horizon after a dimly dry winter and a forecast below-average wet season. As at 1 September, 66.1 per cent of the state, 33 councils, four partial council areas and 23 IDPs in another eight local government areas are drought declared.

I understand drought. I have lived and breathed it. Those in drought are disgusted with the Premier's and state government's blame-shift about the management and assistance of drought support by claiming that Canberra is failing Queensland farmers. Attacks on the federal government's revolutionary \$5 billion Future Drought Fund are a disgrace and show a tin ear to the needs of our

regional and rural communities. They are an exercise in dissembling, spin, buck-passing and manipulation of the facts for base political purposes. They deserve to be called out. AgForce CEO, Mike Guerin, said—

Either the premier doesn't comprehend the concept of a future fund or she is being politically mischievous at the expense of thousands of farmers across the state currently crippled by drought.

He said—

The entire industry will be furious if the state government is allowed to touch a single dollar of that investment.

For the Premier to dress up her demand as if she is acting in the interests of droughted farmers is disingenuous at best and entirely wrong. Devastating drought should be tackled by all levels of government. We need a comprehensive approach to support affected farmers and their communities, not cheap political finger-pointing. It is rich to hear the Premier and Labor lecture about drought support when, at the same time, they oversee cuts to future freight and fodder subsidies for farmers trying to keep their stock alive. It is rich that Labor has \$50 million less in forward drought support funding and fails to build and deliver water infrastructure.


We need to futureproof the state from drought. The government's opposition to dams and water infrastructure is so entrenched that they are tearing down the walls of Bundaberg's Paradise Dam and overseeing the rapidly shrinking Rookwood Weir project near Rockhampton. Millions of litres of water are being irresponsibly poured into the ocean when towns and farmers desperately need it. It is callous and wasteful. The government claims that drought funding increases year on year. More and more farmers are forced to accept support. That does not mean that government has increased funding. Budgeting less in the forward estimates is not an increase.

Since Labor came to government there have been no new measures or additional support for drought-affected farmers—nothing. A review into drought policy has not delivered any new measures, just future cuts. It is time to work with the federal government to support our farmers and drought-affected Queensland. It is time to stop playing petty and destructive politics and start the heavy lifting. The government should do its job.

The political game does not stop here. The Premier, the minister and the government continue to play political games with weed management. The culture of secrecy and arrogance is an embarrassment and a disgrace. In March I wrote to the chair of the State Development, Natural Resources and Agricultural Industry Development Committee requesting the finalisation of the parliamentary inquiry into the impacts of evasive weeds in Queensland. The inquiry which started in 2016 has been buried by Labor. On 8 April the chair committed to finalising the release of that report, saying that the committee would soon be able to organise a release date. Soon is a long time coming. It is more than seven months later and still there is no report. I wrote again last week requesting the report's finalisation and release.

It is sheer arrogance of the issues facing farmers and landholders to do nothing other than to leave that report to gather dust. Does Labor fear a report prepared by a Labor dominated committee might highlight that they might have to do something? This morning Minister Furner told the parliament, 'It is a lack of intestinal fortitude to not release a report.' Labor is trying to bury its record on weed management by burying the report. It is not surprising, as those opposite have form. The minister tried to deceive Queenslanders on his commitment to fund the fight against prickly acacia. Pest and weed management is underfunded. It is time to stop the games and put up the promised funds.

Drought

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (2.31 pm): I also want to speak about the tragedy that Queensland is currently experiencing with 60 per cent of our state drought declared. This is a tragedy for Queensland, but it is a daily tragedy for those long-suffering graziers, selling the last of their stock just to pay their bills, or the farmers facing another year where they cannot plant a crop due to a lack of soil moisture.

I thought help was on the way when I heard about the Morrison government's \$7 billion Future Drought Fund. With the extended drought in many places in Queensland the worst ever, the coalition has been talking up big its \$7 billion drought package to support struggling family farmers. But, as my federal colleague Joel Fitzgibbon, the federal member for Hunter, has said, the Future Drought Fund is the 'most audacious lie' he has ever heard in politics, and I agree.

After sustained pressure from the media, the federal government recently provided a breakdown of how they say the \$7 billion figure is made up and how it will be spent. The bulk of the \$7 billion figure is attributable to the government's \$5 billion Future Drought Fund that was passed in the federal parliament in July 2019. This \$5 billion comes from an initial \$3.9 billion credit which was reallocated from an infrastructure fund set up by the Rudd Labor government in 2018 called the Building Australia Fund. They are simply rebranding an existing fund.

The \$3 billion will eventually become \$5 billion as interest on the fund is reinvested into the drought fund until the balance reaches \$5 billion, but this will not be until 2028-29. The word 'future' is the operative word in the Future Drought Fund. The \$3 billion will grow to \$5 billion in 2028 and spending from the fund will not begin until July 2020, and when it does it will be capped at a miserly \$100 million a year.

How does \$5 billion become \$7 billion? David Littleproud, the member for Maranoa and Minister for Water Resources, went some way to explain this. He said that \$2 billion is being spent 'in the here and now'—whatever that means—with \$1 billion attributed to the Regional Investment Corporation, dubbed 'Barnaby's Bank', established in 2018.

The next biggest spending figure is the pre-existing \$750 million for the National Water Infrastructure Development Fund. That is how the \$7 billion Future Drought Fund, which is really \$6.7 billion by the way, is funded. All this money is committed from previous budgets or from future interest payments. Joel Fitzgibbon is right that the Morrison government has created a \$7 billion Future Drought Fund but it is an audacious lie. It does not have to be this way.


Ms BATES: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The word 'lie' is unparliamentary and the member has used it twice. I ask that he withdraw.

Mr MADDEN: I withdraw. Drought is something that can be prepared for. The Queensland government's Drought Relief Assistance Scheme has been in place for many years. Producers can access DRAS as long as the drought lasts. Another Queensland government scheme, the Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate, allows assistance for primary producers in drought-declared areas for water infrastructure to keep stock alive.

One very effective federal assistance program that helps keep struggling property owners on their land is a social security payment called the Farm Household Allowance. About 1,300 Queensland farmers currently receive this allowance. It is a modest \$489 a fortnight. To achieve their long-desired surplus, the Morrison government is in the process of withdrawing this payment and capping it at a maximum of four years. As a result, 200 Queensland primary producers have been kicked off the payment in the last two years. Not surprisingly, farming groups are up in arms and have voiced their concerns.

I implore my friends across the chamber to talk to their federal colleagues. It does not matter what colour politics one has; Queensland primary producers deserve the support of everyone in the chamber. The Morrison government needs to put in place a drought policy that looks after primary producers by removing the four-year limit for the Farm Household Allowance and start releasing the \$7 billion Future Drought Fund now and not wait until July 2020. I say to my colleagues across the aisle to talk to their friends in Canberra—talk to the David Littleprouds and the Scott Buckholzs—and ask them to give our drought-affected Queensland primary producers a fair so we can keep them on the land.

Health System

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.36 pm): When Premier Anastacia Palaszczuk was elected in 2015 she promised openness, integrity and accountability to the people of Queensland. What we have seen is anything but that commitment and in reality what can only be described as just a token commitment to transparency—all talk and no action. We have seen ministers doing government business via email, we have seen secret reports buried when it is bad news the government does not want Queenslanders to know about, we have seen the Premier's chief of staff leave his role under a CCC assessment of a taxpayer funded grant to a company he was a shareholder in and, of course, who could forget the Deputy Premier's integrity scandal this year which led to a damning report by the CCC, including recommendations for the creation of new criminal offences?

In relation to health services, the biggest portfolio in the government, we have a minister who is fast becoming the king of cover-ups. In the last two days, I have sent two letters to the Speaker about the Minister for Health failing to answer questions on notice about health failures that he is responsible for. These are questions that are critical to the operation of a transparent government which is open to scrutiny.

The rollout of the integrated electronic Medical Record under eHealth Queensland is the biggest IT project since Labor's Health payroll debacle a decade ago, but it is fast becoming just as bad. We have seen doctors speak out, concerned about the impact on patient safety. We have seen the former CEO leave the role under a CCC investigation. We have seen a \$256 million blowout and a scathing Auditor-General report. We have seen critical system failures that have caused chaos in our hospitals.

As a nurse, I feel for our hardworking nurses, doctors and midwives who have to put up with Labor's latest IT debacle while trying to provide world-class care for our patients. As the media reported in September, the ieMR crashed at 14 hospitals across the state for three hours, with nurses having to scramble and use paper charts amongst the chaos. Sadly, this was yet another bungle in a long series of issues with the failed rollout of this project. Impacted hospitals included the Lady Cilento, or Queensland Children's Hospital as it is better known nowadays, the Princess Alexandra Hospital and QEII Hospital and the Logan, Redland, Ipswich, Gold Coast University, Sunshine Coast University and Townsville hospitals. As the media reported at the time—

One source at Redland Hospital said patients could not be properly triaged at emergency, there were delays identifying Category One and Two patients and wait times were blown out as doctors were forced to order scans through slower manual processes.

...

'It's chaos here in ED. So unsafe,' the source said ... 'We don't know where the patients are located or who is looking after who.'

At the time, Queensland Health refused to answer questions on how a scheduled 'planned vendor upgrade' managed to take out the network for three hours, nor whether any investigation has been launched to ensure it does not happen again. Things are that bad that the rollout to other hospitals in Metro North and the Darling Downs hospital and health services, including the Prince Charles Hospital and Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, has been delayed until 2021 following a damning Queensland Audit Office report released late last year.


While the Premier ordered an investigation following that incident, Queenslanders are none the wiser to what happened, why it happened and what the Palaszczuk Labor government are doing to ensure it does not happen again, safeguarding patient care. On 18 September I asked the minister to answer important questions about the failure and the investigation announced by the Premier including (a) the cost of fixing the failure, (b) the terms of reference for the investigation, (c) the budget for the investigation, (d) the date when the investigation will report and (e) a list of hospitals impacted by the critical failure. In response the minister referred me to an answer to another question asked which said—

The investigation found the technical root cause of the issue was that the maximum number of connections configured in the MQ Series Max channel was reached. The vendor, Cerner has now increased the max channel threshold and will provide advice to Queensland Health regarding any other configuration thresholds that may now need to be changed.

In what can only be described as a Monty Python moment from the minister, he stated that the failure on 10 September impacted only those hospitals where the program was rolled out. Well, what a revelation! A digital hospital failure only impacted the hospital where the digital program had been rolled out. What a relief! This would be funny if the issue was not so serious.

I call on the health minister to release the investigation report. Otherwise, it is just another Palaszczuk Labor government cover-up. Taxpayers paid for these reports and they deserve to be able to see the outcome. They deserve a health minister who takes responsibility for his own failures. Queenslanders deserve a world-class health system, not more Labor digital disasters.

Ipswich Electorate, Jobs

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (2.40 pm): Today I wish to provide an update on the job growth we have seen in Ipswich over the past 12 months. In so doing, I want to touch briefly on how the Palaszczuk government's focus on creating jobs is really paying off in Ipswich. On 20 September I had the pleasure of attending a Skilling Queenslanders for Work graduation ceremony at the Ipswich Knights Soccer Club. The ceremony was an extremely proud moment for the 30 women who participated in the Get Set for Work childcare certificate III program. It was delivered by PCYC Ipswich in partnership with Sapere Pty Ltd. Every graduate who attended that night got a job upon completion of the program. There were a lot of very happy women in that room, and the joy was contagious.

Each and every one of those women benefited from the valuable training and career support provided to them by the PCYC Ipswich. They are now all set on a career path in a rewarding industry. It is a fantastic achievement and one which our government can also be very proud of. I want to take a moment to congratulate those women again for their achievement and wish them well in their careers.

I want to mention the PCYC Ipswich team and their program coordinator, Beck Field, who supported those women throughout the course. You could really feel the relationship that had developed there and the support she had given.

Participating in the Get Set for Work program opened a window of opportunity for these women, as it has done similarly for thousands of other men and women across Queensland who have benefited from the program. I, probably along with many of my colleagues on this side of the House, love going to the Skilling Queenslanders for Work graduations. You really get to see and experience the way these programs have turned lives around and given participants a sense of hope and achievement.

In fact, around 2,100 people in Ipswich who have engaged with the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program can celebrate the fact that they have gone on to find a job or enter further training upon completion of the program. All of these people have skills and talents which can be used to benefit our economy and our society, and left untapped these skills go to waste. That is exactly what would have happened if those opposite had had their way. They were not in government even for a year or two before they cut this program. It was one of the first things that they cut when they were elected. What a missed opportunity for thousands of people despite it being a famous program about which Deloitte Access Economics reported that for every \$1 investment from government there was an \$8 return to the community. Shame on them for cutting that program. It has turned people's lives around in my electorate.

When we give people a chance to reach their full potential, we see what our communities can become. When we provide people, especially those from disadvantaged backgrounds, the opportunity to improve on their skills and contribute their labour in a meaningful way, it is not just the individuals who benefit but all of community and all of society. That is why our government is investing in people, because we know that it benefits all of us in the long run.


The Palaszczuk government has invested \$420 million over six years in the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program up until 2020-21, and it has helped 54,000 disadvantaged Queenslanders transition to work. I want to mention the Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development, the Hon. Shannon Fentiman, for her exceptional work in this space.

We are giving year 12 school leavers the opportunity to take up free TAFE courses and providing free apprenticeships for those under 21. We are investing in Queenslanders, and the results speak for themselves. Since 2015 the Palaszczuk Labor government has created 226,800 Queensland jobs. That shows that our government's economic plan is working, and it is working in my community in Ipswich. Recent labour force data from the ABS showed that 2,800 new jobs were created in the Ipswich region over the past 12 months. Unemployment in Ipswich has fallen 1.1 per cent in the past 12 months. Job growth over the past year is up by 1.7 per cent—higher than the state average.

In addition, we are seeing an improvement in youth unemployment. Since the Palaszczuk government was elected in 2015, youth unemployment in Ipswich has dropped four per cent. It is still too high, but I am certain that we can decrease it even more with our range of job-creating initiatives like the Skilling Queenslanders for Work, the free apprenticeships for under 21s and free TAFE for high school leavers—which are incredibly well received in my community.

The Leader of the Opposition was talking earlier about counting down the days to the next election. I would like to reassure her that in my community people have not forgotten the many things that were cut including the Public Service jobs and this incredibly important program. Our government's Youth Boost payments which help employers hire young jobseekers are also increasing youth employment outcomes in Ipswich. It all adds up, and we are seeing results.

Law and Order

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (2.45 pm): I rise to speak about government making choices and setting priorities. Clearly when a government does not maintain funding levels for one of its services you know that it is not its priority. Of course I am talking about law and order. Of course I am talking about the police. Yesterday I had a disturbing conversation with a friend of mine from North Queensland who was in Brisbane for business. I showed him what was going on in Townsville. He immediately stopped talking, picked up the phone, called his wife and said, 'Get off the street. If you go through a crossing, check carefully before you pull out, even if the light is green.' He was scared that his family would be in danger simply driving around Townsville. This is a despicable situation that this government has allowed to happen.

How on earth can a government say that it takes law and order seriously when it will not fund the previous budget levels, when it runs its frontline staff down by 610 officers? We hear announcements of officers being posted to different places at some point in the future. What we do not see is the number of officers climbing. What we do see climbing since the Palaszczuk government was elected and the Premier became the leader of this state is crime rates. Robberies have skyrocketed by 76 per cent. Unlawful use of motor vehicles is up 66 per cent. Assault has risen by 33 per cent. Unlawful entry is up by 28 per cent. These are the statewide numbers.


More concerningly, there are some communities being hit harder than others, and Townsville is certainly one of those. Townsville is being hit hard. Additional police officers were promised before the last election and hopefully will be delivered shortly before the next election so that the hardworking officers in Townsville can finally put the resources on the ground that they need to get a grip on the crisis that is going on there. In Townsville, robbery is up 137 per cent. Unlawful use of a motor vehicle—we saw some terrible vision of that yesterday—has increased 74 per cent under the Palaszczuk Labor government. These are the numbers that the police officers on the front line have to deal with.

It is even worse than that. If we have a look at the prisons and the overcrowding that is going on in Townsville, we find that prison officers are being assaulted to the point where the union is looking at walking off the job because there is a crisis not only in arresting the criminals but also in containing the criminals. I do not understand how on earth anybody can take a look at this government and think they can be serious about law and order. We have had the watch house debacle. We have had the breach of bail conditions taken away from juvenile offenders. We are 375 days away from an election. I know that the people of Townsville and the people of the Gold Coast are particularly interested in making sure that this government does not get a single day past that.

On the Gold Coast, assaults are up 117 per cent, shop stealing is up 87 per cent, robbery has increased 68 per cent, and unlawful use of a motor vehicle is up by 52 per cent. We all know the bikies are back. If anybody is unsure, they only need to go and check the bodies with the bullet holes in them down on the Gold Coast. It is horrendous for the people who live there. People should not be sitting in their homes at night listening to gunfire. This is Queensland. What has happened to law and order in Queensland under this Palaszczuk Labor government? We have seen a weakening of the laws. Consorting laws are not worth the paper on which they are written. Under Labor's consorting laws there have been over 1,000 official warnings made by police, 10 charges and only two habitual convictions. This is terrible.

The people of the Gold Coast demand action. They are looking for officers. They are not looking for officers to be transferred from the south Gold Coast to the north Gold Coast or from one station to another. They are looking for more boots on the ground. Where are the 610 missing officers? We know that when the LNP was in office there were 245 officers per 100,000 people and there are now 233. The minister can say all he likes that he is increasing the police service, but it is not keeping up with population growth. In fact, if we were keeping up with population growth there would be 610 more officers in Queensland today and there are not. This minister needs to get serious on crime and the government needs to stop being so weak.

Theodore, Mr EG

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.51 pm): I rise today as Queensland's multicultural affairs minister to acknowledge that 100 years ago today Edward Granville Theodore, our first premier from a culturally and linguistically diverse background, ascended to that role. His father, Vasile Teodorescu, numbered among Australia's first Romanian immigrants. 'Red Ted', as he became known, is one of the most influential and impactful Queenslanders, full stop; one of the most extraordinary Queenslanders, full stop. In 1882, Vasile, son of a Romanian Orthodox priest, met Annie Tanner on the ship to Australia. She had been a child labourer in the hellish Lancashire cotton mills. Surely his parents' experiences informed Edward Theodore's own leadership of Australia's organised labour movement.

Born in South Australia in December 1884, his fortunes were tied to his parents' until he was 12 years old, when school ended and his working life began. In 1900 he was on the Western Australian goldfields and by 1903 he was calling the mines of South Australia home. Three years later outside of Cairns when Theodore was mining and prospecting he became the voice of organised labour in Far North Queensland. In 1907 he helped establish the Amalgamated Workers' Association of North Queensland and was instrumental in its merging with the Australian Workers' Union in 1913. He was to become its state secretary and the driver behind both the AWA's and the AWU's affiliation with the Labor Party.

By 1915 politics had become his true passion and he was part of the team that ousted Liberal premier Digby Denham. Under TJ Ryan he was made deputy premier and treasurer and was the natural choice as successor in 1919 when Ryan entered federal politics. At the time of his becoming premier—as I said, 100 years ago today—Theodore is described in the *Australian Dictionary of Biography* as cutting ‘an impressive figure. Wide-shouldered, deep-chested, thick-necked and almost six feet tall, he might have been a rugby front-rower.’ I hear that Country might have used him last evening.

Theodore’s legislative legacy is impressive and intensive and includes: introducing the first Labor Exchange Act in 1915 to address unemployment; introducing the Fair Rents Act in 1920 to regulate the private rental market and create the Fair Rents Court for tenant disputes; introducing the Main Roads Act in 1920 to provide for the construction and maintenance for our roads with a view to Queensland’s development; abolishing the Legislative Council through the Constitution Act Amendment Act 1922—an enduring reform; setting judges’ retirement age at 70 years in the Judges’ Retirement Act 1921—another enduring reform; and providing unemployment benefits, travel assistance and technical training for unemployed workers through the Unemployed Workers’ Insurance Act 1922.

Theodore resigned as premier in 1925 to seek federal office. In Canberra he rose to serve as federal treasurer, only to have his opportunity to respond to the Great Depression in his way cut short by the Mungana affair. Then the world of publishing beckoned and, with Frank Packer, Consolidated Press was born publishing the *Australian Women’s Weekly* which was printed on the AWU’s Sydney printing press. Theodore served his nation, chairing the Civil Construction Corps during the Second World War directing key infrastructure workforces to support the war effort.

While he was keen to be seen in so many ways as a ‘proper’ British subject, the reality is that his injection of diversity was what Queensland needed. He is a great example of someone who came from simple beginnings, but he was able to use collective action, working with his comrades—I use that term advisedly—to achieve great ends and the great, enduring reforms that still serve this great state to this day. I think it is appropriate that we acknowledge this centenary.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): That concludes matters of public interest.


MOTION

Non-Government Members, Resources

Resumed from p. 3449, on motion of Mr Katter—

That this House notes that—

1. 30 years ago the Fitzgerald report stated that non-government party members must be provided with appropriate resources and detailed information to enable them to supervise and criticise;
2. the Fitzgerald report recommended the creation of the Electoral and Administrative Review Commission (EARC) and it conduct a review of the provision of non-government members with appropriate resources of staff and equipment, and proper access to information in respect of government activities;
3. EARC’s subsequent report recommended that the total staff establishment of opposition parties should be maintained at 20 per cent of the staff establishment of ministerial offices; reflect parity with the salary profile of ministerial staff; and the allocation of the opposition parties’ staff establishment to particular opposition parties should be on the basis of the proportion of seats held by the party;
4. in 2018 the Crime and Corruption Commission (CCC) recommended that the process to decide an appropriate level of resourcing for all members of parliament should be determined by an independent entity, such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal (QIRT);
5. to date the recommendations of the Fitzgerald report, EARC and the CCC have not been implemented;
6. the public interest would be served by ensuring independent, objective and consistent assessment of duties and resources of non-government members, and bring Queensland in line with NSW, Vic and SA; and
7. calls on the government to amend the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal Act to give QIRT the function of deciding the resources of non-government members.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail) (2.56 pm), continuing: I did note before we went to the lunch break that the honourable member for Kawana was trying to imply that somehow this would also have an impact on the opposition. The opposition’s resourcing has been well-established over some time. I refer to the letter from the Premier to the committee where she clearly states—


I will take whatever steps are necessary and possible to transfer the decision-making in respect of staffing for crossbench members of Parliament to an entity independent of the government of the day such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal.

Once again, that was a nice try, honourable member for Kawana, but very clearly the whole basis of the motion moved by the Katter party—and last time I checked, it was a minority party—is support for crossbenchers, not the opposition.

It does give me the opportunity to talk about exactly how those opposite treated the Labor opposition when they were in government. As all members are aware—needless to say, I was not there but from what I was hear—it was pretty miserable. First of all, they kicked the Labor opposition out of parliament. That was a charming act! Opposition members and staff were forced to work in meeting rooms with their own personal laptops and phones. They think they can act in the best interests of democracy by not even providing the opposition of the day with phones and laptops!

They then kicked the opposition out of Parliament House to offices in 'Miserable House'—I mean, Mineral House—which Lawrence Springborg later said were inadequate. I will give Lawrence his due. They also allocated the former men's toilets to the opposition leader and a bedroom in the Annexe—charming! I think it is worth putting on the record what they did when they were in power. When Ray Hopper quit the LNP to join the Katter party, they banished him to an open office with public access behind the barbecue area. Then they condensed the estimates hearings, which are normally spread out over two weeks, down to a couple of days.

(Time expired)

 **Ms BOLTON** (Noosa—Ind) (2.58 pm): Equity is a word that we often use in debating policies and procedures; however, at times it is missing in our actions and systems. To ensure that equity in representation is achieved for Queenslanders, I ask that you consider our motion for an independent tribunal to be appointed to review the resources allocated for non-government members of parliament.

The role of the opposition in parliament, including crossbench members, is integral to ensuring that diverse viewpoints are heard and that legislation proposed is investigated in depth to ensure any changes are in the best interests of all Queenslanders. These members represent significant constituencies, perspectives and needs. As identified in New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia, the most impartial and effective methodology for resource allocation is through an independent entity.

I will not go into the current standard for resources for Queensland MPs, as we are very familiar with them and the inequity that exists. Other Australian jurisdictions provide equitable resourcing. New South Wales maintains one of the most established, impartial and transparent systems for the allocation of staff resources for members. According to section 18 of the New South Wales Members of Parliament Staff Act 2013, the number of staff that members are entitled to is determined by the New South Wales Parliamentary Remuneration Tribunal. In 2018, in addition to the two staff members employed at each electorate office, the tribunal found it necessary to allocate an additional staff member to each electorate office. The tribunal, having received a submission on the matter, also determined that the additional staff member allocated to crossbenchers should be at a research assistant level.

In Victoria, each member is entitled to 2.5 electorate officers. Following an inquiry in 2018, the Victorian Ombudsman suggested the establishment of an independent entity to regulate the staffing entitlements of members, and in 2019 the Victorian government established the Victorian Independent Remuneration Tribunal. In addition, they established the distribution of parliamentary advisers under the Victorian Independent Remuneration Tribunal and Improving Parliamentary Standards Bill 2019. Clause 68(2B) of that bill states—


Each person who is an independent elected member of the Parliament of Victoria is entitled to employ the equivalent of one Parliamentary adviser in respect of so much of each financial year that the person is an elected member.

The Victorian system ensures that all members receive these allocations, including minor parties and independents.

In South Australia, the Electoral Services advised that all members of the House of Assembly are allocated two full-time staff members and one trainee. Independent members of the House of Assembly receive an additional part-time research officer. Members of the Legislative Council are offered one full-time officer and one trainee. Independent and minor party members receive an additional full-time-equivalent research officer. As well, additional research officers are provided to independent members in both houses of parliament, as they consider these members to be under-resourced in comparison to major party members.

In 2018 the CCC recommended that the process to decide an appropriate level of resourcing for all members of parliament should be determined by an independent entity of the government of the day. Mr MacSporran further said that this would serve the public interest by assuring an objective and consistent assessment of duties of members of parliament. He then recommended that parliament

consider this issue further. In light of precedents set and the recommendations from the Fitzgerald report, the EARC and the CCC, I ask that all members on both sides of the chamber support this motion for a review of the current staffing allocation system and the appointment of an independent entity to do so—not, per se, the CLA as recommended by the Ethics Committee report No. 189. In closing, I want to thank the following people: the Premier and the Deputy Premier for their support of this motion; the member for Traeger and the crossbench; and my intern, Nathan, who worked with me on this as it has been a long journey.

 **Hon. MC BAILEY** (Miller—ALP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (3.03 pm): I rise to support the motion and acknowledge the importance of resourcing for this parliament. It is important for the functioning of democracy that all parties are adequately resourced. I acknowledge the previous work that the motion is based on in terms of EARC, and I acknowledge the former member for my seat, Matt Foley, the former member for Yeronga, who was a great light when it came to the democratic reforms in the early 1990s. He was the chair of the parliamentary EARC at the time, which stemmed out of the Fitzgerald inquiry. I remember the Fitzgerald inquiry very well. As part of my early involvement in politics, I attended the Fitzgerald inquiry public gallery so I understand this issue quite well.


This is an appropriate motion to deal with something that has not been dealt with by a range of governments over time. I think it is a good thing that the government is supporting this motion. This deals with an issue around resourcing that has had a tortured history. We saw the previous Newman government's use of resourcing as a weapon on the opposition of the time, where the government booted the opposition out of parliament. In fact, it was so bad that, when they returned to opposition only three years later, Lawrence Springborg said that those resources were inadequate for him as an opposition leader. It is better if the resourcing issue is removed from political partisanship and removed from the political spectrum, and that is what this motion intends to do and I think that is appropriate, especially considering that record.

Let me look at that record. The previous government denied the Katter party official party status. They had three members but that government prevented them from getting resources after the 2012 election. The Deputy Premier at the time, Jeff Seeney, introduced special laws in 2012 to make sure that Katter's Australian Party did not get party status, even though their numbers increased from two to three. It is that sort of thing that this motion seeks to address, and I think that is a good thing.

This is not just a matter of the crossbench; it is also a matter of the opposition. Governments change at times, and it is important that this is settled and is done in an independent way. I think that will add to the improvements to our legislature and our parliament, whether it be for the crossbench or the opposition. Of course, the wise use of resources in opposition and on the crossbench is always a matter for those involved, and I certainly do not see the opposition using their resources well currently in this parliament. We will have to see whether that improves at all.

What we need here is a reasonable system. What we have seen through the Ethics Committee report is two issues conflated. We have seen the Premier's very deep and passionate commitment to equality. Everyone knows her family background and her strong stance against racism and fascism, just as I stand and everyone on this side stands against racism and fascism. We have seen her commitment there in terms of standing up for those things in relation to resources. I acknowledge the leadership of the Premier today and I support her very strongly in terms of her response to it. It shows real leadership from the government that we are dealing with a much bigger issue that has been squibbed by many governments on both sides of the chamber, including the previous government and previous governments from this side, to be quite frank.

This is a true democratic reform. It is taking the circumstances of today and turning them into a win for this parliament and a win for this state. It is settling an issue that has been about now for a number of decades. To that extent, I think this is very positive. I am a very strong supporter of democracy and our democratic system and the improvement of it. We must always strive to continue to improve the functioning of our democracy and the faith of people in our democracy. We can never take that for granted. There have been some quite scary polls at times around the new generation being a bit ambivalent about support for our system. We have to make sure we continue to earn the faith of the public, and that means continuing to improve our legislature and our parliament. This motion does that. I think it is to everybody's credit who supports and votes for it today.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (3.08 pm): It is nice to see this welcome development where we now all agree that adequate resourcing of all MPs in here, including the crossbench, is fundamental to a well-functioning democracy. That is especially so in Queensland where we are deprived of the broader proportionate representation that other states enjoy by virtue of having an upper house.

The role of the crossbench in this parliament is increasingly important and not only when the government considers it might need to rely on crossbench support to pass legislation. At present, as we all know, the Premier doles out resources as she sees fit, leaving the whole process open to political interference and culminating in ultimately a contempt of parliament, as we have seen described in this Ethics Committee report No. 189. This is precisely what we saw in the last parliament when the KAP was relied on after Billy Gordon and Rob Pyne jumped ship, leaving the ALP in the surprise position of being a minority government. Those resourcing arrangements just rolled over into this parliament, but this only became public knowledge after I asked a question in estimates last year.

The role of the crossbench is integral even when there is a clear majority in this House since that majority does not reflect the diversity of views in the Queensland community more broadly. The raw numbers of staff in government, opposition and the crossbench offices are frankly alarming. These are in addition to the two electorate officers that all of us have. The numbers are: 217 staff for the government, including 34 for the Premier; 22 staff for the opposition, about 10 per cent; and zero for the crossbench. In a state with no upper house, a frighteningly weak committee system and extremely limited scrutiny by the media, such a massive imbalance is generally terrible for democracy.

Crossbenchers can represent far more than just their seat. For instance, I as the member for Maiwar take my job representing my electorate very seriously, but I am also here representing the 270,000 Queenslanders—10 per cent of the state vote—who voted for the Greens at the last election. Our electoral system means that the two old parties—Labor and the LNP—garnered less than 70 per cent of the vote but ended up with 94 per cent of the seats in parliament, whereas the Greens got 10 per cent and ended up with one per cent of the seats. These figures clearly demonstrate the urgent need for democratic reforms to address this disproportionate representation, but that is a conversation for another day.

When Labor sells out on progressive values like they are doing with their laws against peaceful protests, I am left as the only MP in here holding them to account. If I and other parties outside government rely on the good favour of the Premier for the resources we need to do our jobs most effectively, democracy suffers across the state. I will be the only MP, as far as I know, standing in here opposing those laws against peaceful protest. I am the only MP calling for 100 per cent publicly owned clean energy, the only MP campaigning to ban corporate—

Mr KELLY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order under standing order 118, relevance.

Mr Bleijie: That is in question time. There is no 118—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McArdle): Member for Kawana, I am just about to address the chamber on a point of order. I do not need your assistance, so please do not do so again. Member for Maiwar, you are straying from the motion. Please come back to the motion.

Mr BERKMAN: Thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. The point I am making is that the role we play as crossbenchers is far beyond just as representatives of our local communities. The fact that we are not representing the views of Queensland on issues like banning corporate donations, cash for access meetings and putting a tax on property developers so they pay their fair share is a failure of this parliament; we are failing to reflect the will of the people on those issues.

On the other hand, just this morning we have seen a striking example of the real benefits that come from an active crossbench. This week we will be debating the government's bill to implement some recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. That is a bill that the government introduced after I introduced my own private member's bill dealing with effectively the same issues, but the government's bill had some really striking omissions. Just this morning the government announced that they will amend their bill to adopt some of my proposals, which is a huge win for survivors of child sexual abuse. I am not here seeking credit for this win. I am not expecting any fanfare—


Mr KELLY: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order around anticipation of a bill before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have taken advice on that. That is the case, member for Maiwar. Please do not do so again but come back to the terms of the motion before the chamber.

Mr BERKMAN: Thank you, again, for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. Again, the point I am making is that any honest observer will accept that the crossbench plays an important role in making political progress for the good of all Queenslanders, not just the ever-dwindling number of people who can hold their nose and bring themselves to still vote for the old parties and not just for the big corporate donors who continue to buy access and influence from those same old parties.

I support this motion and I welcome the move from the Premier to put the question of non-government party staffing in the hands of the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal. Indeed, I wrote to the Premier in August 2018 calling for more support for all members of the crossbench so we can better fulfil our functions. In response to the Manager of Opposition Business I say that I do not support any amendment to the motion that would restrict the new independent oversight to just the crossbench.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (3.14 pm): I rise to speak to the motion moved by the member for Traeger. This motion seeks to provide an independent assessment in deciding the resources of non-government members. As noted by previous speakers, the Premier has previously indicated that she supports the subject matter we are currently debating, and the government today is supporting the motion in the House.

The motion refers to the Fitzgerald report. I know that the Premier has a strong, deep commitment to the principles of the Fitzgerald report like no other. We must never forget the Fitzgerald report. Any Queenslander of my generation will recall the horror when known but unspoken truths were laid out on the table for all to see. At that time I was training in Newcastle and it was profoundly distressing to watch from afar. The eyes of the nation turned north to watch the methodological exposure of an administration that had turned Queensland into its own plaything. I recall so vividly when the disinfectant of sunlight forced Queensland to emerge from the shadows of the past into the modern era of public administration.

This government is always seeking to improve public administration in this state. This government stands on its record any day, particularly when compared to the record of those opposite. Whilst we support this motion, I note that this motion has been surrounded by unfair comments regarding our Premier. This is a Premier who stood against hate speech—hate speech that only serves to divide, hate speech that only serves to hurt—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Stafford, I am finding it hard to link your comments to the motion before the House. Would you please return to the terms of the motion?


Dr LYNHAM: As I said before, this motion moved by the member for Traeger is something that this government will be supporting. This government always recognises that we need to stand on our record before the people of Queensland. As I said before, it is a strong record.

I remember being in opposition, sitting on those crossbenches and looking at the resources we had in opposition—opposition from Mineral House—under-resourced and trying to mount a strong campaign, and undoubtedly a successful campaign, against the members on the government benches. I remember the antiviolence campaign that my colleagues and I fought very hard which was totally ignored by the Newman government, viewed as some irritating sideshow. However, they were the resources that we had and we worked with them. I understand the member for Traeger and the members of the Katter party again are seeking resources. The Premier has supported those resources so that they, too, can mount effective campaigns and can represent their members not only as individual members but also as members of a political party, the Katter party, within this House.

We shared a vision in opposition for a better, gentler society where people could come home safely of a night, where people sought protection from violent partners. We fought hard and with limited resources we mounted a very successful campaign to get us into government. I have seen how as a government we have worked hard with the Premier to deliver her vision of a better Queensland, and I share her deep and driving commitment to honesty and integrity. I came to understand this very well while campaigning with the Premier. I remember the campaign in Stafford, six weeks side by side with the Premier campaigning to put those initiatives in this House. It was only when I came into this House that I realised how discriminated against we were as a party from those opposite, so I know full well what the members opposite and the member for Traeger are asking for in this motion which the Premier is supporting.

We worked tirelessly with the resources that we did have—very limited resources from those opposite. It is hard for me to stand here talking about those times when those opposite decry the position they are in at present and the resources they have—the member for Kawana did—when we were fortunate with very limited resources to run a very effective opposition. What an effective opposition that was to see us return to power with a majority that spread all the way around the chamber to those benches over there.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KNUTH** (Hill—KAP) (3.19 pm): I fully endorse and support the member for Traeger's motion. I also acknowledge and congratulate the member for Noosa on her hard work in this respect. Oppositions and governments should never be in a position to make decisions on staffing resources in the parliament of Queensland. I acknowledge the minister's speech in which he indicated that those resources were moved, I believe, to Mineral House and that it was unworkable at that time. The government provided 22 staff to support the opposition. There were seven members. We had three members. Only five minutes before Christmas speeches, under Campbell Newman the LNP suspended standing orders and introduced legislation to take our staff away from us. About four or five years later, we see exactly the same thing. That is why this should have been addressed 30 years ago. I do not know why—I probably do know why—the opposition and government delayed this Fitzgerald inquiry recommendation for 30 years.

You need a third force and you need alternative views. The KAP is proud to have introduced 17 private members' bills into this parliament. Both the government and the opposition were not prepared to take on some of that legislation. We did the heavy lifting. At the same time, if you want robust debate, an accountable government and an accountable opposition, you need to ensure that the crossbench is resourced and has almost the same opportunities as the present opposition and the government. We will never be able to match what the government has. We understand that the government has to respond to thousands of letters, a lot of information, bills and legislation. At the same time, it is so important that we have that opportunity.

Thirty years ago, there were only one or two Independents. I cannot recall too many apart from Liz Cunningham, who was elected in 1995. They must be resourced like everyone else. If you try to do all your committee work, deal with legislation and issues right across this state—and companies and charity groups come to us—and then are told, 'Well, we cannot help you here because we just do not have the resources,' that is discrimination. We talk about workplace health and safety. Electorate staff have enough issues and work in terms of dealing with 36,000 constituents on the electoral roll and looking after an electorate office, but having parliamentary work at the same time is too much for them. This motion is resolving a workplace health and safety issue and also notes that—

30 years ago the Fitzgerald report stated that the non-government party members must be provided with appropriate resources and detailed information to enable them to supervise and criticise.

The member for Kawana raised a point in terms of the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal and what EARC recommended, namely—

... Opposition parties should be maintained at 20% of the staff establishment of ministerial offices; reflect parity with the salary profile of ministerial staff; and the allocation of the Opposition parties' staff ...


I cannot estimate what the opposition gets at this present moment, but I think it is 10 per cent. I believe that the opposition would have a better deal if this motion gets over the line.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr McArdle): Member for Kawana, thank you.

Mr KNUTH: The opposition moved to take away our staff. Is the opposition worried about the sacrifice it would have to make in this regard? 'Oh no, we cannot support this.'

(Time expired)

 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Local Government, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (3.24 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion. This reform is part of that broad suite of reforms that support and enhance Queensland's democracy and the capability of this parliament to do its work for the people of Queensland. I acknowledge the contributions of previous speakers who have seen that and put this in the context of a broad suite of matters. I will put that maybe into a broader suite.

We heard members talk about the last 30 years, representing that period where Queensland modernised. This is yet another step as part of modernising Queensland, our political and parliamentary institutions in order to better serve the people of this state. Let us be clear: members on all sides, including crossbenchers, currently have a level of resourcing. That did not always exist in the history of this parliament. The concept of electorate officers and electorate office staff was only introduced in the mid-1970s. I am given some advice that the allocation was originally for one staff member, one desk, one chair and one filing cabinet. That was the nature of the office allocation for electorate office staff when that was first instituted in the 1970s.


There is a level of resources for all members of parliament across the board, but it is good to see the way in which that has progressed and been added to where it is appropriate to add to the debate and capacity of this parliament and chamber to debate issues important to the state of Queensland.

That is why I very much welcome the moves and the measure that the Premier has taken to support this motion before the House. For the avoidance of doubt—because there has been a bit of misunderstanding by some people here—the government supports the intent of this motion. The Premier has indicated in her correspondence with the Ethics Committee that she will step in to transfer the decision-making in respect of staffing for crossbench members to an entity independent of government. The correspondence states—

I will take whatever steps are necessary and possible to transfer decision-making in respect of staffing for crossbench members of Parliament to an entity independent of the government of the day such as the Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal.

There will be no changes of resourcing for the opposition; that is not the intent of the government's actions here. That is why it is important that we clarify that matter. It is equally important that we follow the spirit of what is before us in this motion in terms of continuing that commitment to the Fitzgerald report, its precepts and its establishment of the modernising of Queensland to which Labor governments have made the singular greatest contribution over the past 30 years. That is what we continue to do in this commitment to this reform today. That is significant, because we have seen what has occurred on other occasions when other parties held the reins over the decision-making in this sort of context and we see the negative impact that has had on alternative parties in this House.

I have great confidence in the Premier's commitment in relation to this matter, because I have great confidence and stand by her integrity, having known her for more than 30 years as a person who is absolutely committed to the best possible standards of democratic performance and principles in this state. She is someone who shares with me a great passion for and commitment to this institution of parliament in that the parliament should provide for all members all opportunities for their fullest contribution on the policy issues of the day. The support of the government for this reform, in order to ensure that crossbenchers are appropriately looked after with an independent decision-making process to deliver that, is a reform that I am very pleased to be supporting today.


 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (3.29 pm): Thirty years ago Tony Fitzgerald handed down his watershed report and asked us all to remain eternally vigilant so that history would never repeat itself. We on this side of the House are absolutely committed to upholding its values and maintain a strong commitment to accountability and transparency in government. That is why we are supporting this motion today.

Ethics Committee report No. 189, handed down earlier today, found that there was a lack of regulation and scrutiny afforded by the discretionary way that additional parliamentary resources are provided to the crossbench and that it was problematic. That is why we are supporting the intent of this motion as it relates to the resources provided to the crossbench. In response to the questions raised by the member for Kawana, I can confirm that there will be no change to opposition resources and that we support this motion as it relates to the resources provided to the crossbench.

The Premier this morning stood in this place and accepted the findings of the Ethics Committee and unreservedly apologised to the House. As has been said a number of times today, this is a premier who always conducts herself with the utmost integrity. In fact, the Ethics Committee noted in its report that she believed that putting legitimate pressure on others to condemn hate speech was in the public interest. Let us not forget where this started: the appalling actions of Fraser Anning calling for a final solution on immigration. This is a premier who stays true to her values and stands up for all Queenslanders. I am proud to serve in a government with the Premier and my colleagues who believe that all Queenslanders belong here regardless of faith, race or cultural background. I am also very proud to serve in a government that believes in and acts in accordance with the Fitzgerald legacy of transparency and accountability in government.

Let us not forget about the LNP's track record when it comes to resourcing of non-government members. Let us remember how the LNP treated the then Labor opposition when it was in government. When Campbell Newman was premier and the member for Nanango was his proud apprentice, they kicked the opposition out of the parliamentary opposition offices, forcing members and staff to book meeting rooms so they could work. They were working with their own personal laptops and phones. This was a government that removed internet access and phones from opposition staff. It was not just the opposition. Of course, who can forget that they also kicked the media out of this place when they were in government? They condensed the usual two-week-long estimates process into two days, stretching opposition members to the limit and preventing proper scrutiny. How dare they go on about integrity!

Let us not forget what Tony Fitzgerald said about the Newman government, warning that it would be 'sheer folly' to vote for a political party that refuses to accept that there are limits on the proper exercise of democratic power. He went on to say that the Newman government had 'flaunted its disdain for democracy and good governance' by attacking the independence of the judiciary and the state's Crime and Misconduct Commission. We on this side of the House are absolutely proud to uphold the principles of Fitzgerald. That is why we are supporting this motion today.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (3.33 pm): I rise to speak in support of improving the parliamentary and electorate resources made available to non-government members, especially to those who are non-aligned members. I thank the member for Noosa and the member for Traeger for bringing this matter forward today.


The government has 20 ministers, all with significant additional staff who can in turn be seconded to support other government members as required. Each minister is backed by a department, with all of the accumulated wisdom and knowledge made directly available to each member. Every government member has access to the government's researchers, yet I note that, even with all the extra researchers, the government itself still fails to produce the details for public consideration when rushing matters through this unicameral house of parliament. The opposition members have an allowance of 20 per cent extra staff, who in turn can lend support to opposition members. However, these arrangements leave members non-aligned to these two major parties bereft of additional assistance.

It becomes incredibly problematic for non-aligned members to give the parliamentary program the level of scrutiny that is possible for the major parties and their members. Members will be well aware that the parliamentary *Notice Paper* lists a significant number of legislative matters during sitting weeks. No fewer than 10 bills are listed to be debated, along with committee reports and other matters to be considered in detail. So often, it is not until late on the evening before or even after we have begun a sitting that significant changes to the orders of the day are known. These last-minute changes are manifestly unfair, especially on the crossbench members, who are afforded the resources of just two electorate staff. Crossbench members are thus at a tremendous disadvantage both in the House and in the level of services they can reasonably deliver to their electors, especially in the larger regional and often remote electorates.

It is true that Queensland electors are increasingly demanding that they be represented by more non-aligned members of parliament. The reasons are many and varied, but the trend is undeniably clear. It is therefore incumbent upon the government to reassess the existing system of staff allocations which discriminates unfairly against a class of members duly elected to have access and influence on government, its organisations and its actions. It is clear that the lack of regulation and scrutiny afforded by the discretionary way that additional parliamentary resources are provided to the crossbench is problematic. The discretionary nature of the decision-making process and the lack of scrutiny has the potential to undermine public trust in the parliament.

In light of Ethics Committee report No. 189 and the findings that the Queensland Premier was able to use her position of power to threaten and intimidate minority members in an attempt to disadvantage their office's capacity to perform its duties, it is essential that minority members have access to adequate staffing allocations to continue to allow all members to perform their duties to the best of their ability.

The Ethics Committee recommends that parliamentary resourcing for crossbench members be supported by an agreed framework for the application of that discretionary power in order to uphold the principles of equal representation and equal ability to participate in the democratic processes of the parliament. Equality of representation is the oldest tenet of parliamentary government. It goes all the way back to the Magna Carta of 15 June 1215. To deny this ability runs contrary to almost 800 years of representative government. This issue is at the very core of democracy and this situation must be addressed.

 **Mr DAMETTO** (Hinchinbrook—KAP) (3.37 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the member for Traeger relating to the allocation of staff resources to the crossbench and opposition. Thirty years ago the Fitzgerald report stated that non-government members should be allocated resources by an independent tribunal. It has taken 30 years, a premier being found in contempt of parliament and a lot of pressure being applied by the media and the public to finally see some movement on this. I welcome the support of both sides of the House for this motion. It seems that finally we will move into the modern era.

Crossbench members are understaffed in parliament. Members of the public think we have 100 staff members here—just like the government and opposition have staff in their offices. They say to crossbench members, 'What do you mean you can't do this for us?' We say to the constituent—or

someone a thousand kilometres outside our electorate—that we have only two staff members. They say, ‘I can’t understand how this works.’ We say, ‘Neither can we.’ This should have been tidied up a long time ago. New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia sorted this out long before us.

In federal politics Independents in the lower house have the resources to represent not only their party’s beliefs and their party’s stance inside the parliament but those resources are used to help the betterment of their cause in the community.

For too long both sides of this House have worked to silence the crossbench. Do members know what? They have clipped our wings in the last 12 months, and they have done a pretty good job of it, but public support has been building for Independents, crossbench members and our party, the KAP, and inadvertently I believe that that clipping of our wings has helped us. This has shone a light on the inequities for those on the crossbench and for Independents and the people of Queensland looking to have their views heard. In closing, I want to acknowledge the hard work done on this motion by the member for Noosa and I want to acknowledge the member for Traeger for standing up for not only himself and the KAP but the whole crossbench when asking for the allocation of staffing to be put to an independent tribunal.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.


WORKERS’ COMPENSATION AND REHABILITATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Consideration in Detail

Resumed from 17 October (see p. 3402).

Clauses 29 to 33, as read, agreed to.

Clause 34—


 **Mr BLEIJIE** (3.41 pm): Having reflected on the issue over the weekend since we finished the debate, I am satisfied with the clauses.

Clause 34, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 92, as read, agreed to.

Schedule, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (3.42 pm): I move—


That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

 **Hon. G GRACE** (McConnel—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Industrial Relations) (3.42 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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


Motion agreed to.

CIVIL LIABILITY AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from 12 June (see p. 1947), on motion of Mrs D’Ath—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Toohey—ALP) (3.43 pm): I rise in the House to support the passing of the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I will at the conclusion of my contribution to the debate be recommending that the House supports this bill and that the bill become legislation. I want to commence by acknowledging the members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and, on behalf of the committee, thank those individuals and organisations that made written submissions on the bill and provided further evidence to the committee and acknowledge the difficult and personal experiences which were shared during the committee's hearings. I also want to thank our Parliamentary Service staff and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General which assisted the committee at its public briefing.

The Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was introduced into the Legislative Assembly and referred to the committee on 15 November 2018. The committee was to report to the Legislative Assembly by 28 February 2019. On 21 November 2018 the committee invited stakeholders and subscribers to make written submissions on the bill. Eleven submissions were received. The committee received a public briefing about the bill from the Department of Justice and Attorney-General on 3 December 2018. A transcript was published on the committee's web page and I refer to the committee's report and in particular appendix B for a list of officials in attendance. The committee received written advice from the department in response to matters raised in submissions and the committee held its public hearing on 11 February 2019. The submissions, correspondence from the department and transcripts of the briefing and hearing are all available on the committee's web page.

The main objective of the bill is to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 in response to recommendations 91 to 94 of the *Redress and civil litigation report* of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. In the conclusion to the debate on this report I have set out what these recommendations of the *Redress and civil litigation report* are and, if time permits, may refer to them. This includes amendments to the Civil Liability Act to require an institution to prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution to avoid legal liability for the abuse—that is, reverse onus—and introduce a framework for the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to meet any liability incurred by the institution. The bill also proposes amendments to section 64 of the Civil Proceedings Act 2011 to ensure that a person under legal incapacity may recover the cost of trustee management fees in the award of damages for wrongful death of a member of the person's family.

The explanatory notes state that consultation on the bill included a publicly available issues paper and targeted stakeholder consultation on the draft provisions of the bill. The government issues paper, the *Civil litigation recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse: Redress and civil litigation report—understanding the Queensland context*, was released by the department on 16 August 2016 and canvassed issues relating to the reverse onus and the proper defendant recommendations of the *Redress and civil litigation report*. Twenty-three submissions were received from stakeholders including private citizens, a small number of legal professionals and a number of support and advocacy providers, a few religious organisations and private education institutions. The department advised the committee that the submissions had not been published.

A consultation draft of the Civil Liability Act amendments in the bill were provided to a range of stakeholders including government, legal, church, education, victims' representatives and community organisations and feedback was incorporated in the finalisation of the drafting of the bill. The department advised that draft bill provisions which would displace the operation of the Corporations Act 2001 were provided to the Legislative and Governance Forum for Corporations. The amendments proposed by the bill continue actions already begun in Queensland in acknowledging the impact of institutional child sexual abuse, providing fair access and outcomes to survivors. Queensland, unlike many jurisdictions of Australia, had a redress scheme for survivors of institutional child abuse which commenced in May 2007 following the Forde inquiry, the Commission of Inquiry into Abuse of Children in Queensland Institutions.

The Queensland government established the \$100 million Redress Scheme to acknowledge the abuse and neglect suffered by children placed in Queensland institutions and to provide ex gratia payments to those who were harmed. More recently, the Palaszczuk government delivered on its commitment to participate in the National Redress Scheme as proposed by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse with Queensland's participation commencing on 19 November 2018.


There have also been further reforms in response to the royal commission's recommendations in its *Redress and civil litigation report*. In 2017, the government removed the limitation period for commencing an action for civil damages in relation to child sexual abuse to enable people who have

experienced child sexual abuse to bring actions for personal injury damages despite the length of time that has passed since the abuse occurred. The Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 seeks to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes for people who have experienced child sexual abuse and who wish to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse.

I will now deal briefly with the background to the amendments in this bill and touch on the Australian government's Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse final report. The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse was announced on 12 November 2012. The royal commission was directed to inquire into and report on the institutional responses to allegations and incidents of child sexual abuse and related matters. Before publishing its final report in December 2017, the royal commission released an interim report and three other reports focusing on different aspects of its inquiry.

The *Redress and civil litigation report* was published in 2015 and it was informed by consultation conducted through private sessions, public hearings, issue papers, private round tables, expert consultation and information gained through summons. The *Redress and civil litigation report* highlighted the importance of fairness to survivors of institutional child sexual abuse, for equal treatment and access to redress processes, and acknowledged that the civil litigation system's and past and current redress processes have not provided justice for many survivors. The report made 99 recommendations, including the establishment of a national redress scheme and changes to processes for pursuing civil liability claims. These recommendations were included in the royal commission's final report, which made 409 recommendations.

As I said, this civil liability bill is in response to recommendations 91 to 94 of the *Redress and civil litigation report*. These recommendations were proposed to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse who wish to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from that abuse. As part of my contribution, I think it is important to acknowledge the people who attended our hearings. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (3.53 pm): I, too, rise to speak to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. For many people, this bill has been a long time coming, particularly those who have been the victims of institutional child sexual abuse and their friends and loved ones. The bill implements the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in its *Redress and civil litigation report* in order to address power imbalances between those who are victims making a claim and institutions. I will talk more about that during the course of my contribution.

The recommendations made by the committee aim to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse wishing to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse. It achieves that in two ways. I note that this morning the Attorney-General said that there will be some further additions to the bill. I understand that one of those concerns a broadening of the classification of 'abuse'. I thank the Attorney-General for that.

The bill introduces a reverse onus of proof—and that will be applied prospectively, not retrospectively—under which an institution must prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution to avoid legal liability for the abuse. That is the statutory duty of institutions. The bill also establishes a statutory framework for the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to meet any liability incurred by the institution.

As the law stands currently, a victim of institutional child abuse must prove their case in court. In that situation, the power imbalance that I mentioned before is particularly stark because, in many situations, the respondent—the institution—is powerful and is able to conduct a well-funded defence and the victim may not. The act of proving one's case in court can be traumatic, particularly with the kinds of matters to which this bill applies. I certainly would not want to go into court to face a large and powerful defendant and make claims of deeply personal abuse. I am sure that is something that would be very difficult to do.

The bill inserts a new section 33D into the Civil Liability Act to provide that an institution has a duty to take all reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child by a person associated with the institution while the child is under the care, supervision, control or authority of the institution. We expect institutions to take all reasonable steps to prevent that. A person associated with an institution includes

an officer, representative, leader, member, employee, agent, volunteer, or contractor of the institution, religious leader of the organisation, a delegated entity or a delegated individual. Obviously, you need to be able to find a defendant if you want to mount a case.

If the duty is breached, the onus of proof is reversed. I think that is a good thing. The reverse onus of proof is favourable because, as I say, it addresses the power imbalance and ensures that the survivor does not have to prove the wrongdoing, which is the truly difficult part for someone in those circumstances. The reverse onus of proof also has the effect of encouraging institutions to engage in higher standards of compliance. That is always a good aspect of law—to make sure that the prospect of sanction motivates those who may do the wrong thing, or may be negligent, to improve their game.


The bill provides a variety of mechanisms by which defendants may be liable including, among other things, the liability of an incorporated institution that was unincorporated at the time of the abuse, the liability of current and former office holders, court discretion in allowing a claim to proceed against trustees and the satisfaction of a judgement from assets of an associated trust. This is intended to overcome the difficulties that a victim may face in identifying a proper defendant to sue—for example, owing to the lack of perpetual succession in unincorporated institutions. This amendment also overrides the Ellis defence that organisations have been relying upon to protect institutions from being recognised as a legal entity and, therefore, from being sued, as the assets in trust accounts have been protected. I acknowledge the press conference held by the Attorney-General this morning where I believe she said that the definition of ‘abuse’ will be expanded in the amendments in this bill to include all forms of abuse. I think that is a very good thing.

I would like to pay tribute to some of the people who were involved in the committee process and provided valuable input into this bill. I refer to people such as a constituent of mine, Mr Kelvin Johnston, from the Queensland Child Sexual Abuse Legislative Reform Committee. Mr Kelvin Johnston has been very generous with his time and has been a tireless advocate in this space and made an interesting contribution to the committee process.

Although I cannot mention this person by name because they wish their name to be suppressed, there is a person who made a submission, submission No. 7, who was particularly generous with their time in helping myself and also, I would say, my honourable friend, the member for Lockyer, who is also on the committee, to understand the issues. This person has a uniquely insightful perspective on these matters and has a real ability to convert the complex and emotional tenets of these subjects into something which is constructive for a legislative purpose. That person provided a 70-odd-page submission which is excellent and I pay tribute to them. I know they are probably watching and I would like to thank them sincerely for the great good they have done for the community.

There is also the question of strict non-delegable duty. The commission recommended that states and territories impose a non-delegable duty of certain institutions for institutional child sex abuse, recommendations 89 and 90. The commission recommended that the non-delegable duty should apply to all institutions that operate the following facilities or provide the following services and be owed to children who are in the care, supervision, control or authority of the institution in relation to the relevant facility or service: a day school or a boarding school; a detention centre under the Youth Justice Act; a residential facility; a facility operated by an entity for profit that provides services for children and involves the entity having the care, supervision, control or authority over the children; an institution that is a religious institution—a facility operated by the organisation at which a service or activity is provided by the participants of that organisation; but does not include a facility at which foster care or kinship care is provided. I am not certain yet what the government’s intentions are. I believe that there will be some amendment in that space as well, which I will look forward to seeing.

For many people who have worked in advocacy in this field, the coming of this bill is a very important moment. My own understanding of the issues associated with this bill and the royal commission has improved a great deal from my contact with those who participated in the committee process and I am grateful to them for their time. I would like to put on record my sorrow and regret that our society has let people down. It occurs to me how vulnerable young people are when they are in the care of an institution and how helpless many found their situations in times past. Whilst it is difficult to amend wrongs once they have been done, we can try to various extents. I think it is vital that we do all we can to ensure that the evils perpetuated on children that have been identified and which have led to this legislation never be repeated, and that we be eternally vigilant in caring of our most vulnerable, our children. The LNP looks forward to seeing the amendments. This is a good bill. I support it. I thank those who have been involved and I commend it to the House.

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (4.03 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I would like to start by acknowledging the work of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, the secretariat and support staff. I would also like to thank the 11 organisations and individuals who made submissions to the committee and the four organisations that attended and made submissions in the public hearing. Following on from the public briefings and hearings, the committee made one recommendation: that the bill be passed.

The introduction of this amendment bill is about ensuring that Queensland delivers on recommendations 91 to 94 of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. These recommendations themselves were contained within the *Redress and civil litigation report* released by the royal commission which included the recommendation to establish the National Redress Scheme. I am proud to be part of a Labor government that made and has come good on its commitment to participate in the National Redress Scheme. This bill seeks to improve the capacity of survivors of child sexual abuse who seek to pursue a claim for civil damages and personal injuries caused by institutions at the centre of the offending.

I note the announcement made by the Attorney-General earlier today that amendments will be moved during consideration in detail to extend the definition of abuse applicable under this act to include serious physical and psychological abuse as well as sexual abuse. I note that this was a recommendation of several submitters, including knowmore, Care Leavers Australasia Network and Australian Lawyers Alliance. I thank the Attorney-General for considering these submissions.

Firstly, the bill will introduce a reverse onus of proof on institutions to prove that they took reasonable steps to prevent sexual abuse of a child in their care by a person associated with the institution. I am well aware that applying a reverse onus of proof, even prospectively, is not something to be taken lightly and as a committee we had to consider a potential breach of fundamental legislative principles against the objectives of the bill and who would benefit from such an application. On the prospectivity issue, I understand that several submitters sought to have this particular provision made retrospective. I can advise the House that the prospective effect of the proposed duty of institutions was a specific recommendation by the royal commission in the *Redress and civil litigation report*. In the case of this bill, the committee felt that the departure from such fundamental legislative principles around reverse onus of proof was justified primarily because this amendment is designed to address the power imbalance that currently exists for victims and survivors accessing the justice system. The idea that a single litigant could gather and obtain the required information about an institution to validate their claims on their own meant that the prospect was daunting, exhaustive and ultimately too difficult in many instances. The royal commission also felt that this reverse onus of proof in this instance was justified.


Further, the practical effect of this amendment means that a greater level of governance is required by all relevant institutions in that they will need to keep and maintain greater focus on ensuring all necessary policies and procedures are in place to ensure the safety of children and that these should be clear and overt. Where an institution clearly fails in its obligations, where it has been negligent, where it has not taken reasonable steps to protect a child, then it should be held liable.

I will take this time to outline what may be considered when determining whether reasonable steps have been taken: the type of institution, the resources available to that institution, the nature of the relationship between the institution and the child and the position which the alleged perpetrator was placed in by the institution and their access to the child. I note that the list of reasonable steps is not proscriptive or exhaustive, and it is not meant to be. While some organisations sought a more concrete definition of reasonable steps, a submission by the NGO knowmore, an organisation specifically created to help survivors engage with the royal commission, stated that a narrower definition would be unhelpful. The department stated that as all organisations are different, reasonable steps would vary from institution to institution.

The second significant amendment in this bill is the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to address the liability incurred by that institution. In many instances a victim seeking to take on an institution will have difficulties in identifying a defendant when making an application to the court, particularly where the organisation is or was unincorporated at the time of the offending behaviour or the offender previously employed by the institution is now deceased. This amendment will allow unincorporated institutions to nominate a person as a proper defendant. On this particular issue I must point out and make it clear to all Queenslanders who have taken on roles on a board or a committee, whether paid or voluntary, that the nomination of the proper defendant being sued in these instances is in the name of the office only and not in a personal capacity and that the personal assets of the office holder cannot be accessed.

There are also further aspects of this amendment that address the issue of institutions who fail to nominate a proper defendant or who structure their organisations in such a way as to escape liability, which again improves the survivor's access to justice through the courts. As I said, the bill is about fairness and access to justice for our most vulnerable.

In standing here we must admit that while this bill seeks to provide fairness and access to victims of child sexual abuse, we in this House must acknowledge what it cannot do. It cannot rebuild a broken child. It will not prevent the nightmares. It will not remove the fear and anxiety that follow like shadows, as unwanted lifelong companions, and it will not restore lost faith. These and many things we cannot change no matter how many bills we pass. However, it is incumbent upon us in this House to influence and change the things that we can. It is one of the reasons why I stand here today in this House and it is bills such as this that seek to make justice available to all. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr McDONALD** (Lockyer—LNP) (4.10 pm): On 14 September 2015, the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse handed down its final report and findings, detailing a horrifying history of almost systemic abuse within some of our most valued institutions. Time has done nothing to diminish the sense of shame and horror we feel when trying to come to terms with those findings. The crimes committed against society's most vulnerable by people those victims often most trusted are simply abhorrent and nothing can take back the pain and damage that they have caused.

As renowned American author Stewart Stafford once said, 'Adulthood is an attempt to become the antithesis of the wounded child within us.' I believe it would be difficult to argue that any child is more wounded than one who has suffered the horrors of sexual abuse. Those are the ones who require our support as they ascend into adulthood and attempt to leave the trauma of their past behind. Sadly, with this bill as it currently stands, a generation of those victims may fail to receive the proper legal support they require.

In this House, as the few chosen to serve our communities and fight for their concerns we have discussed these findings before. We have sought to provide the victims with as much support as possible and we have debated legislation aimed at ensuring that the horrors of the past are never repeated. Today I stand here to contribute to the debate on the latest bill seeking to rectify the wrongdoings of the past. The Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 intends to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 in line with recommendation Nos 89 through to 94 of the royal commission's *Redress and civil litigation report* and, I must say, not before time.

The amendments proposed in the bill are twofold. Firstly, the bill would require an institution to prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution to avoid legal liability for the abuse. Secondly, the amendments propose the introduction of a framework for the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to meet any liability incurred by that institution. The bill also proposes to amend section 64 of the Civil Proceedings Act to ensure that a person under a legal incapacity may recover the cost of trustee management fees in the award of damages for the wrongful death of a member of the person's family.

The objectives of this bill are certainly noble and well-intentioned, which is why the LNP will not be opposing it. Unfortunately, good intentions do not always mean good legislation and this bill happens to fall short in that category. While it does take steps towards achieving its goals, it falls flat in a number of critical areas that I will outline in more detail shortly.

Before doing so, I thank my colleagues on the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee, our secretariat for their work and the over 20 submitters for their contributions. I personally extend my thanks to those contributors with whom we have met throughout the inquiry process. I thank you all for your courage and I express my sincere and heartfelt sorrow for the pain that you have been subjected to and continue to live with.

As my colleague the member for Southern Downs also recognised, I appreciate especially the time and consideration given to us by submitter No. 7 and thank them for their articulation of complex matters within which they are directly and seriously affected. Your voice and those of the other submitters have been the voices of the many who have not been able to speak on this matter as the pain is too much for them and for those who have taken their own lives. Thank you also to the member for Southern Downs for his assistance on the statement of reservation.

Concerning the reach of this bill, witnesses outlined to us serious concerns, particularly around the absence of retrospectivity, making past cases of abuse ineligible to be dealt under the proposed legislation; the definition of 'abuse' being confined to sexual abuse only and not including serious physical or other serious abuse; and the absence of provisions for vicarious liability consistent with

recommendation Nos 89 and 90 of the 2015 *Redress and civil litigation report*, as previously described. I sincerely thank the shadow minister and member for Toowoomba South, Mr Janetzki, for his contribution on 12 June 2019, in which he also articulated the concerns of the submitters and witnesses. I thank the shadow minister for his fight for amendments to the bill. I acknowledge that the Attorney-General has publicly advised that today amendments from the government will be introduced. I plead with the minister to address the concerns raised by submitters and witnesses.


The possibilities that this bill could have offered to victims of abuse are too lengthy to mention today. Unfortunately, in its current form the bill falls short of its potential. While it does provide for more certainty and support for future victims of child sexual abuse, it lacks retrospectivity, leaving past victims wanting. Any victim of child sexual abuse perpetrated prior to the assent of this bill as it currently stands would be unable to access the same support or receive the same treatment as the victim of an identical crime perpetuated following the passing of this bill.

The bill states that an abuse claim 'means a claim arising from the sexual abuse of a child by a person associated with an institution while the child was under the care, supervision, control or authority of the institution'. While this definition adequately serves to define claims of institutional sexual abuse, it fails to recognise other forms of abuse that may also be perpetuated.

I welcome the amendments to be moved by the Attorney-General. As we discovered through our inquiry process, physical abuse is often one of the stages of abuse in the process of demoralising a victim, sometimes as part of a grooming process for later sexual abuse.

A final critical flaw of the bill is its failure to provide a provision for vicarious liability consistent with recommendation Nos 89 and 90 of the royal commission's report. Without making this provision, the bill fails to fully implement the report's list of recommendations for the duties of an institution. Recommendation No. 89 states, 'State and territory governments should introduce legislation to impose a non-delegable duty on certain institutions for institutional child sexual abuse'. This recommendation would place pressure on an institution to ensure its staff or anyone associated with it acts in an appropriate manner, as should they fail in this duty the institution itself may be held vicariously liable for the crime committed. The failure of this legislation to provide amendments to implement those recommendations limits the effectiveness of those it seeks to implement. The royal commission did not compile its report and develop the recommendations for governments to cherry-pick, like those opposite seem content to do.

It is clear from the attempt that this bill makes that those opposite do have some desire to try to protect children from institutional abuse. As I stated earlier, the LNP will respect this attempt by not opposing this legislation. The bill is far from perfect, but it may be the best we can get from this Labor government at this stage. I look forward to the amendments to be moved by both the Attorney-General and the shadow Attorney-General to help fix this half job. Fortunately for Queenslanders, there is not a long time until the next state election.

 **Ms McMILLAN** (Mansfield—ALP) (4.19 pm): The Palaszczuk government absolutely desires to protect children from child sexual abuse. I find the member for Lockyer's comments quite disturbing. I stand, like him, before the House today to make my contribution to the debate on the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. This bill aims to expand the capacity of the justice system for survivors of child sexual abuse who pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse. This bill addresses recommendations 91 to 94 of the 2016 Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

In the commission's *Redress and civil litigation report* recommendations were made to improve the capacity of the justice system in order to provide fair access and outcomes for survivors of child sexual abuse. This bill will largely amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 in order to incorporate the recommendations such as introducing a reverse onus and establishing a statutory framework for nominating a suitable defendant. This complements the Palaszczuk government's actions in the previous parliament when it removed the statutory limitation period that previously applied to victims of institutional abuse.

Firstly, the bill seeks to reverse the onus of proof where the defendant must show that all reasonable steps were taken to prevent the sexual abuse of a child. Originally, in civil matters the onus usually rests with the person commencing the proceedings—that is, the person who suffered the damage. However, this amendment aims to take the burden off sexually violated children when they wish to commence proceedings. Although this amendment potentially breaches the fundamental legislative principle that legislation have sufficient regard to an individual's rights, it is well justified. This

is mainly due to the fact that the commission discovered that countless institutions failed to take reasonable steps to prevent abuse from occurring, despite the abuse being suspected, reported or even confirmed.

The reverse onus addresses the power imbalance between an abused child and the offender or an institution associated with the offender. Introducing a reverse onus also makes sense in a practical way as the commission is satisfied that institutions are in a better position to demonstrate steps taken to mitigate harm to children. Also, this responsibility placed upon institutions provides greater incentive for institutions to incorporate higher standards of governance in their own efforts, as well as their compliance with the requirements of insurers.

Significantly, we will see a change in the institutions' regulations, as we should, as their liability can be discharged where they can prove, on the balance of probabilities, that all reasonable steps were taken to prevent child sexual abuse from occurring. Therefore, in introducing this reform, children harmed are allowed equal and fair access to justice where they are not burdened by the current onus to demonstrate that an institution breached its duty of care.

The second reform I wish to address in this bill is the establishment of a statutory framework for nominating a suitable defendant. This amendment will allow the court to order a claim to proceed against trustees of an associated trust of the institution if there is no nominee for the institution or the nominee does not have sufficient assets to satisfy an award for damages. Again, this reform can be viewed as a breach of fundamental legislative principles, however this departure is more than justified.


This amendment intends to overcome the barriers that a victim may face if an institution does not nominate a proper defendant or if an institution's assets are not held by the institution itself but in an associated trust. We have seen many examples of this. In doing this, survivors will be able to recover financial support and assistance from the proper defendant which they were rightly entitled to.

It is heartbreaking to think that some survivors cannot receive compensation as the current law will not allow them to recover it where a proper defendant cannot be confirmed. An award for damages will never right the wrong that these survivors have suffered and endured. However, compensation will assist these survivors seek the support and counselling they require to navigate the challenges in their life.

As a former principal, I spent many years dealing with and supporting our young people who had been victims of abuse.

Mr Stewart interjected.

Ms McMILLAN: I take the interjection from the member for Townsville. I am sure he too has supported many young people. We know that this kind of abuse can affect our children, their families and their lives. It is vital that there is adequate legislation to enliven equal access to justice. I commend the commission for recommending the above reforms as well as the Palaszczuk government for its efforts to consult with a range of stakeholders, including government, legal firms, church groups, educational institutions, victims' representatives and community organisations. In engaging with varied perspectives, I am confident that this bill offers a well-rounded approach in providing support and access to justice by those sexually abused children. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr ANDREW** (Mirani—PHON) (4.26 pm): I rise to speak in the debate on the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. I thank my fellow members of the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee and the parliamentary secretariat for their efforts and members of the public for their contributions to this amendment bill.

While it is clear that the abuse of the weak and powerless in society should not be tolerated under any circumstances, I have residual concerns about how these changes to the law will impact in practice. May I suggest that imposing a reverse onus of proof could impart a serious, unintended impact on the long-term operation of the not-for-profit community based and small business based providers that are typically lean and simple operations. Whilst I am sure an extremely high percentage of these institutions and staff strive to deliver the best care and uphold and comply with the law, due diligence with regard to a reverse onus of proof will almost certainly add to their risk management. In effect, this will add another layer of legality for facility managers and staff, with significant costs and liabilities involved, just to cover a potential, but otherwise exceptional, failure.

Those who sit in this House represent small and medium business operators who would regularly point out how hard it is to administer future risk, along with the increasing costs of legal affairs that, in the worst case, could take down a business in a short time. Hence, I hold fears that the added burden will devalue the quality and surety of care provided—the fundamental purpose of these businesses—whilst putting a wall of mistrust between the provider's staff and its clients.

In effect, the reverse onus of proof will increase the cost of care going forward and likely threaten the viability of not-for-profit and smaller organisations that, by their nature, have not got the resources to manage the additional statutory and legal requirements. The impact of any government imposition multiplies the further the organisation is from George Street, Brisbane. This impacts unfairly on small, decentralised organisations.

Furthermore, the explanatory notes state, 'The reverse onus amendments may result in more cases involving the State being litigated.' The obvious outcome is that a future government could seek to reduce the risk and avoid this financial liability by exiting the sector at the very time the cost-effective and flexible community sector is downsizing capability.


Where will all this lead? Straight into the hands of an oligopoly of large and often multinational corporate providers. By virtue of limited operations remaining, they will set the price and terms by virtue of commercial-in-confidence—indeed, a nasty predicament that could lead to the complete opposite of the original intent of these changes. Furthermore, it could leave a future parliament to unscramble the egg with a huge reinjection of public funds to restore balance and accountability.

To conclude, whilst I appreciate the principled intent of reversing the onus of proof, I am uncomfortable with flipping the legal process on its head. Perhaps the best long-term approach need only be to fund more legal support to provide fair access to justice for every client but under the existing legal frameworks.

I have in front of me the amendments to be moved by the Leader of the House. Amendment No. 26 amends the bill to insert a new part 4 and part 5, expanding the removal of the limitation periods in relevant acts and defining 'abuse' of a child to mean—

- (a) sexual abuse or serious physical abuse of the child; or
- (b) psychological abuse of the child perpetrated in connection with sexual abuse or serious physical abuse of the child.

My father grew up in an institution and was flogged every day—and that did not happen just for days; it happened for years. He had to be taken out of school at age 11 to go into the cane fields to cut cane. He was flogged so severely that his mother used to check inside his pants every afternoon and then flog him again. It was a very terrible time for him. Hopefully, this legislation will sort some of those situations out. It is a bad thing when you have a young kid who will not come in out of the cold and has to be so hungry to go in and face the music and then do it all again the next day. This is good legislation.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (4.31 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I would like to pay tribute and thank the member for Mirani for his contribution and for sharing that very personal story. The story that he told is the precise reason we are here today debating this bill. In speaking in support of this bill, I want to acknowledge the Central Queenslanders who attended St Joseph's Orphanage at Neerkol near Rockhampton. I also acknowledge the immense bravery of all of those who have shared their horrific stories in the royal commission and also through the Redress Scheme legislative process.

Neerkol was a horror movie in real-life for the children who lived there. The Rockhampton region must never forget the awful, horrendous and appalling treatment of children in a place where they were supposed to be cared for by people they were supposed to be able to trust. The Neerkol nuns' reign of terror ran for decades. It was only brought to an end by the orphanage's 1978 closure. It was the royal commission that revealed the full horror of what went on in the dormitories, the yards, the dining halls and the priests' quarters not so long ago.

Children were routinely slapped, flogged, starved, sodomised and ridiculed by nuns. There were public floggings. There was walking on children in high heels and forcing bed wetters to stand hungry in the dining room with their urine soaked sheets draped over their heads while the other children ate breakfast. About 4,000 children, mostly state wards, passed through the orphanage over its 93 years of operation. I have personally met with many of these children, now adults, who experienced this horrific abuse at Neerkol and also others who experienced abuse in other institutions, and they have told me how important not only the Redress Scheme is but also this bill is.

This bill finally acknowledges the harm suffered by those children which is so important to their healing. I extend my gratitude for the immense bravery of all of those children, now adults, who have shared their stories and to those who have provided ongoing support to them including organisations like Micah Projects and Lotus Place, and also the departmental officers, some of whom I met with earlier this week to get a briefing on the Redress Scheme. Their bravery, courage and determination to see those victims receive the compensation that they deserve is really quite admirable as well. Whilst no amount of money can compensate for their suffering, this bill is an important step towards healing.


The royal commission's historic inquiry revealed widespread, systemic failings of institutions to protect children and respond appropriately to child sexual abuse. Although the royal commission was specifically looking at institutional child sexual abuse, we heard from many victims and survivors of physical and psychological abuse who had also experienced lifelong trauma from their treatment at the hands of adults who were supposed to protect and care for them. Unfortunately, the National Redress Scheme does not offer compensation to victims and survivors of physical or psychological abuse which has meant that some people who have experienced physical or psychological abuse have felt overlooked. This bill will make it easier for the survivors of all kinds of child abuse to sue the institutions where the offences occurred.

Under these reforms, it will be easier for child abuse survivors to claim for civil damages or personal injury now and in the future. This will be achieved by removing some of the loopholes which institutions were using to avoid being sued. In particular, a defendant can now be appointed in claims against unincorporated institutions and survivors can target the assets of associated trusts of the institution. We have also removed the limitation periods for survivors to commence a civil action against an institution. Survivors will also now be able to seek damages for serious physical abuse and connected psychological abuse as well as for child sexual abuse.

To try to prevent new abuses, there will now be a reverse onus duty on institutions. They will have to prove that they took all reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of children in their care to avoid legal liability. These reforms will provide another avenue for people who had experienced institutional child abuse to seek justice. These reforms are especially important to people who experienced physical or psychological abuse while in institutions in Queensland, as it will give them a way to seek compensation for the suffering they have experienced.

While I am on my feet, I would also like to call upon all of those institutions who have not yet signed up to the National Redress Scheme to do so. I believe that in Queensland there are about 20 institutions who have not yet signed up to the scheme, so the victims at the hands of those institutions are not currently able to lodge an application with the scheme because those institutions have not signed up. I would strongly encourage all of those institutions to sign up, to sign up now, so that those victims can seek the compensation that they deserve.

Our message to everyone who has experienced institutional child abuse is: we see you, we believe you and we support you. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (4.36 pm): This time last year the Prime Minister, the Hon. Scott Morrison, delivered a national apology to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. On behalf of the government and all Australians, Mr Morrison apologised to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse, as well as their families, supporters and all those affected.

Today I rise to make my contribution to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2019—a piece of legislation of great gravity. This bill that we are debating in the House today seeks to make very important changes and implement the recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in the *Redress and civil litigation report*. The recommendations made by the commission aim to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse who wish to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse.

This bill amends the Civil Liability Act 2003 to introduce a reverse onus, applied prospectively, under which an institution must be able to prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution. Otherwise, the organisation will be held legally responsible for the exploitation. The reverse onus also has the effect of encouraging institutions to engage in high standards of compliance.


The bill also launches a constitutional framework which will require an independent institution to nominate a proper defendant to meet any accountability incurred by the organisation involved. This is intended to overcome the difficulties that a victim may face in identifying a proper defendant to sue and also overrides the Ellis defence, which organisations have been relying on to protect institutions from being recognised as a legal entity and therefore from being sued as the asset in trust accounts have been protected.

I am unreservedly supportive of implementing the commission's recommendations. I am also supportive of the passing of this important bill which makes important changes. That is why I was concerned that those opposite had neglected two of the royal commission's recommendations. Why? That is the only question on everyone's mind.

The bill failed to adopt the recommendation to introduce a strict non-delegable duty and, in relation to the liability of institutions, it also failed to do as suggested and include physical abuse as well as sexual abuse in the definition of child abuse, as is in the case of New South Wales and Victoria.

This reform was intended to implement national consistency, but without these two key elements it does not deliver on this goal. That is why the LNP will move amendments in an attempt to have these recommendations rightly applied. It is positive news that the Attorney-General will also move amendments to finally address these shortfalls.

The royal commission undertook extensive research and stakeholder engagement, but the government overlooked the justification of experts and chose only to implement certain sections that would best and most easily suit them. If enacted in its current form, this bill would set Queensland apart from other states which have correctly listened to the commission and implemented the recommendations. Victims of systematic physical abuse would suffer, and that is not good enough. Dealing with an issue as serious and important as this should be well above politics, and it is positive to see the government finally listen to LNP members and bring amendments in order to pass a bill that implements all of the recommendations to protect our most vulnerable.

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (4.40 pm): I rise in this House to support this bill. For many it has been a long time coming, and for so many it is simply too late. I want to share the very personal story of my friend, who is currently in the legal process. He has described to me his experience as one of coping and survival. He shared his story with me so I can share it with the parliament as we debate this important piece of legislation in the hope that a real life story, one that demonstrates the gravitas of this legislation, will go some way to address such horrific wrongs. He knows a number of men who have not survived. It has taken him a long time to get to this point in our legal system today and his journey will continue.

In the early 1980s he attended a small Catholic school. For the two years he was there he was sexually abused by a number of men who were attached to the school and the church. He was only eight years old when it first began and 10 years old when it finished. It was very confusing for him to think back, as he did not realise it was wrong. He now knows the shame that is child sexual abuse. When his father found out he said that he would try and 'beat the gay out of him'. He never really understood what he had done wrong, but his dad blamed him for the abuse. He can only wonder what the institution told his dad. He was petrified because every time the grim reaper ads came on he was told he would get AIDS as a result of the sexual abuse.

Throughout his teens he was happily back in the state school system dating girls, and he said he was 'relieved I was not gay after all'. During high school he watched his dad slide into depression. When he was 18 his dad finally apologised for physically assaulting him in his preteens. His dad broke down; he was so remorseful. He finally squarely laid the blame back on the school and the church. Unfortunately, he was never able to rebuild that relationship with his dad. His dad committed suicide shortly after he turned 18. He said that his dad's death was such an extremely difficult time for him. He tried to understand how the sexual abuse and his broken father had all happened. He was crippled with guilt. Honestly, it is just heartbreaking to think that he felt guilt not only for the sexual abuse but also for the loss of his father. The impacts of that are just unfathomable.

He did not seek any help to recover from the abuse; he simply did not know how. He did not know how to acknowledge any of this. After his dad passed he found a coping mechanism: he buried himself in his career and his studies. He had failed at high school, but he went through the TAFE system and later progressed through university; however, he was never able to sustain his career path as the triggers kept mounting. He changed jobs constantly. He had failed relationship after failed relationship, but he did eventually marry and his wife is just a delight. It was after the birth of his first child, a little boy, that his mental health really started to suffer. Prior to that he had some really detrimental coping mechanisms, but he was coping nonetheless. The year after his son was born all of the triggers—the memories of his childhood and the nightmares—consumed him entirely.


It was after he reached what he describes as rock bottom that he finally reached out for help, and he began the long journey. He continued to struggle to find a healthy and sustainable form of coping. He chose to seek advice through legal services, but unfortunately it was not as easy as seeking a lawyer on the internet. He encountered what he felt were untrustworthy lawyers and an untrustworthy system and process. The first one he ended up settling with was in Sydney. He did not think it was a safe process, and the lines of questioning led to a further inability to cope. He ultimately withdrew from the legal process and simply tried to focus on survival. It took another few years until he engaged advice provided through the royal commission. This was a much safer approach, with the journey mapped with a social worker and all of the appropriate supports in place.

He began attending a support service that exists entirely to support men who were sexually abused as children. Up until that point he thought he was the only victim. Of course we know that he was not and this was not the case, but he had never encountered others with similar stories. As we all know, who would want to share this story? He started to realise that none of those men had coped throughout their lives. This was something that was never spoken of in public or what anybody ever wanted to hear. It challenged people's faith and it was revolting to even imagine. Again he commenced a civil process with a lawyer endorsed through the royal commission. Now he has much more trust in his legal representation and the system.

He told me that the legislation we are putting forward today is another way of making the system better for others. His support systems are much stronger. He says that the civil legal system is a very challenging process. Every few months he is reliving the abuse over and over again, and it takes him weeks to recover emotionally at every step. He is determined to continue, even when he feels that he is up against it with a juggernaut like the Catholic Church. He is reconciled that he will live with this diagnosis and mental illness for the rest of his life, which was borne of the sexual abuse he suffered as an eight-year-old and institutional cover-ups. He knows that he will never reach his full potential in his career and that he has a disability which evolved from the time he was an innocent eight-year-old. He is exhausted, but he is determined not to transfer his illness and trauma to his beautiful children and to be the absolute best father he can.

The amendments that will be moved during consideration in detail to include physical and emotional abuse are very important. This bill goes a long way to making things right. This bill is in response to the civil litigation recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in the *Redress and civil litigation report*. It will improve the justice system for all victims of such horrific crimes and provide opportunities for fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse.

I reiterate the sentiments of the member for Keppel with regard to those institutions that have not signed up for the Redress Scheme. I implore you to sign up. It is the right thing to do. I commend this bill to the House.


 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (4.47 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. The Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee recommended that the bill be passed. The bill implements recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in the *Redress and civil litigation report*. The recommendations made by the commission aim to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse wishing to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse.

There is currently no statutory duty of care for institutions regarding child sexual abuse. This means that a survivor must go through the process of proving to a court that a duty of care to prevent child sexual abuse was owed to the person by the institution. This bill adopts recommendations to resolve this by inserting a new section into the act to provide that an institution has a duty to take all reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child by a person associated with the institution while the child is under the care, supervision, control or authority of the institution. A person associated with an institution includes an officer, representative, leader, member, employee, agent, volunteer or contractor of the institution, religious leader of the organisation, a delegated entity or delegated individual.

If the duty is breached the onus of proof will be reversed, which would require that an institution prove that it did not breach its duty to prevent child sexual abuse as recommended by the commission at recommendation 92. The reverse onus is favourable because it addresses the power imbalances and ensures that a survivor does not have to prove the wrongdoing. The reverse onus also has the effect of encouraging institutions to engage in higher standards of compliance. The statutory duty of institutions to prevent child sexual abuse will be prospective in nature—that is, to apply only in future acts. Both New South Wales and Victoria have adopted this principle to apply prospectively.

I note that today Labor has adopted the LNP position to extend the definition of abuse to include physical abuse, not just sexual abuse. This is good news and is a result of the lobbying of victims and our foreshadowing of the same amendment when the second reading debate commenced in June. The inclusion of physical abuse adopts the position of all other Australian jurisdictions that have legislated on the duty of institutions, including New South Wales and Victoria.

There were 11 stakeholders who made submissions. The stakeholders included government, legal, church, educational, victims, representatives and community organisations. This bill relates to recommendations 89 to 93 of the report made by the commission after extensive inquiry into the matter. In closing, I note that it has taken, sadly, two years for Labor to be dragged kicking and screaming to get to this point, but at least we are now here.

 **Ms HOWARD** (Ipswich—ALP) (4.50 pm): I rise today to give my full support to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I want to take this opportunity to commend the work of the Attorney-General for introducing the bill to implement recommendations 91 to 94 of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in its *Redress and civil litigation report*. I also want to acknowledge the contributions that I have heard since I have been in the chamber from the member for Mirani and also the member for Redlands, who spoke of her friend. It is very humbling to hear the personal reports of survivors of child sexual abuse.

In many ways, this bill gives a voice to survivors of institutional child sexual abuse by issuing reforms that allow fairer access to justice by making it easier for survivors to seek damages against institutions which failed to provide proper care for them many years ago. For childhood abuse survivors, seeking justice can mean having to relive the trauma and horrors of the past. It means going up against powerful institutions to right the wrongs that were done to them. This significant power imbalance has discouraged people from seeking compensation they should have been afforded for past sexual abuse. This bill will correct that power imbalance.

The bill amends the Civil Liability Act 2003 to prevent institutions avoiding their liability by hiding behind unincorporated status or complex trust arrangements, and it will remove legal roadblocks that prevent institutions accessing their trust accounts. The bill also makes institutions liable if they fail to take all reasonable steps to prevent abuse from occurring. This will ensure institutional governance is improved in the long run, affording greater protection to children in their care. The reverse onus presented in this bill ensures that the obligation shifts to the institution to demonstrate that they took all reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in their care.

We have got to where we are today because of the landmark Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, which finally gave a clear voice to survivors of childhood sexual abuse. Its recommendations are now transitioning into meaningful and positive legislative changes which are helping victims all over the country. The commission has lifted the lid on many terrible cases of abuse in orphanages, schools and churches. For instance, we heard about the Neerkol orphanage run by the Sisters of Mercy in Rockhampton, which saw 4,000 children pass through its doors over 93 years. The commission heard from 53 former residents of the orphanage who came forward to provide information about the sexual and physical abuse they suffered at the hands of the priests, sisters and former employees during their time living at the orphanage. Many courageous men and women—former residents of Neerkol—came forward to give testimony of the brutal sexual and physical abuse they suffered at the hands of the adults who were meant to protect them.


The royal commission also heard from survivors who lived at the Salvation Army Home for Boys in Indooroopilly and the Riverview Training Farm in Ipswich. The boys in the Salvation Army's care were brutally beaten and subjected to excessive physical punishment and sexual abuse. While some of those instances of sexual abuse and rape were reported to staff at the time, nothing was done about it and more often than not it was unlikely to be believed. The commission also heard about the case involving 44 child sexual assault offences against 13 girls committed by a teacher at a Catholic primary school in Toowoomba over the years 2007 to 2008. The commission heard that the systemic procedural failures at the school led to the abuse, yet the school employed and re-employed the teacher despite the credible and serious allegations made against him that he was sexually abusing girls.

Overall, the evidence given at the royal commission related to 3,489 institutions. It heard from 8,000 witnesses in private sessions and received 1,344 written accounts. These figures are absolutely staggering and show the vast extent of the abuse and trauma that was going on in our institutions right under our noses. It is timely that we present this bill on the first anniversary of the national apology to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. The Palaszczuk government is taking tangible steps to make it easier for survivors of child sexual abuse to sue institutions for the serious sexual abuse they endured.

It is heartening to hear today that an amendment has been made to the bill to extend the definition of abuse to include serious physical and psychological abuse. Survivors of abuse—sexual, physical or psychological—will now no longer come up against legal loopholes and roadblocks when they seek

damages for the suffering they endured as children. On top of the legislation we are introducing today, our government has previously introduced legislation to remove the limitation periods for survivors to start civil proceedings against institutions.

Furthermore, last year we adopted the National Redress Scheme for survivors of child sexual abuse in institutions, committing \$500 million to support our participation in the scheme which commenced on 1 July this year. The National Redress Scheme has already received more than 5,040 applications nationwide, offering on average payments of \$80,000 to 746 cases. Because of the amendments made in the bill today, many more survivors out there who suffered lifelong trauma at the hands of institutions will come forward to seek justice. Their stories still shock us and it grieves us to think that every day they still have to live with the consequences of that abuse. As members of parliament, it is our duty to enact legislation that makes it easier for them to achieve justice for the abuse they suffered. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (4.56 pm): I rise to speak on the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. This bill results from the recommendations made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The commission's report, titled *Redress and civil litigation report*, made recommendations to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse who wish to pursue a civil damages claim for personal injury arising from the abuse.

The main objective of this bill is to amend the Civil Liability Act 2003 in response to recommendations 91 to 94 in the report. According to the explanatory notes, this will be achieved by the following: introducing a reverse onus, applied prospectively, under which an institution must prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution to avoid legal liability for the abuse, and establishing a statutory framework for the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to meet any liability incurred by the institution.

The LNP is concerned that the government has not adopted recommendations 89 and 90 of the report. These two key concerns include that the liability of institutions for child abuse only relates to sexual abuse, not physical abuse, and that the government failed to adopt the commission's recommendations to introduce a strict non-delegable duty.

We have to always be aware of unintended consequences from legislation. Submissions from stakeholders raised concerns about organisations that will be caught up under broad definitions of institutions and who is a person associated with an institution. Queensland Cricket identified that—

... the reverse onus of proof may result in an additional burden being placed on community cricket clubs ...

These clubs are often run on a shoestring by volunteers who have only basic administrative systems and resources. Queensland Cricket said—

Should a case be brought forward it will require significant time and resources to demonstrate the measures they have taken at their local club and is likely to be incredibly stressful for the office bearer of the day who would be expected to represent their club in a court of law.

This is a stark example of the increasing load and complexity faced by today's volunteers and not-for-profit organisations, particularly involving interaction with children, which acts as a deterrent to volunteering in a local sporting club.

Queensland Cricket also highlighted that there could be unintended consequences leading to people being unwilling to volunteer in their community clubs. If people take on an executive position, they could be taking on all the risk for defending future claims about past incidents.

Independent Schools Queensland also raised concerns about the extensiveness of the definition of institutions and described it as 'extremely broad'. It said that this could impact schools where activities are offered at the school or utilised school facilities but are not necessarily directly run by the school. We are talking about activities such as holiday cooking classes, after school care et cetera.

The Queensland Catholic Education Commission submission drew attention to who will be included as a person associated with an institution. It noted—


This definition will cover all individuals engaging in activities in a school, whether paid or unpaid and whether employed by a CSAs or not.

It pointed out that students' education is enhanced by the involvement of volunteers, parents, carers and community members. They are encouraged to be involved in individual student activities and broader school activities as well as sometimes sharing their knowledge and experiences. The QCEC said—

It would be an unfortunate outcome of the proposed legislation if this important aspect of school life was diminished due to liability and insurance concerns.

These reforms are supposed to deliver national uniformity. This bill does not. Queensland will have a different framework from other states which have followed the royal commission's recommendations. The government has cherry-picked the recommendations to suit itself. The government has effectively ignored the extensive research and input of stakeholders. It has ignored the justification of experts. It has ignored recommendations which would see certain institutions strictly liable for the criminal acts committed by those associated with the institution.

We have to ask ourselves: why is this government not listening to the commission? Going it alone could mean that ultimately the victims of systemic sexual and physical abuse will suffer the consequences. In the interests of national uniformity I urge the government to support the LNP amendments. I do not oppose the bill.

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (5.01 pm): I rise to make a short contribution on the debate regarding the bill before the House. I note that the committee that reviewed the bill made one recommendation, and that is that the bill be passed. We know that for many years the issue of child sexual abuse, institutional or otherwise, was spoken of and reported on many occasions before the royal commission commenced its hearings in 2013. We also know that many institutions, including the Catholic Church, used the Ellis defence and other manoeuvres to avoid if not liability then certainly a damages payment being made to a child who had been abused by one of their members.


I think it is important that when we look at the history of child sexual abuse in relation to what we are considering today we remember that it was Julia Gillard in November 2012 who actually announced the royal commission. I may not applaud Ms Gillard on many occasions, but when one considers what she put in train on that occasion and what has flowed from that royal commission, she deserves the praise of every Australian. Without that royal commission, there would be many people today who would not have access to the Redress Scheme and also access to a better understanding of what they went through when they were children.

The final report of the royal commission was delivered in 2017 and that, in part, comprised the 99 recommendations that were placed in the 2015 redress and civil litigation document. The commission in the redress and civil litigation document made this comment with regard to civil litigation: civil litigation systems and past and current redress processes have not provided justice for many years. The bill before the House draws upon recommendations 91, 92, 93 and 94 of that redress document.

Under the general principles of law, if a person is to be successful in a claim for damages, whether a survivor in this case or otherwise, they must show three things: firstly, that a duty of care exists; secondly, that the duty was breached; and, thirdly, that the breach resulted in damages. We know that the history of child sexual abuse in relation to institutions has seen multiple moves by churches and other organisations to block any attempt to find information, to establish vicarious liability, to establish an asset base controlled by the defendant and then to obtain moneys from that asset base. What this bill does is put in place a reversal of onus of proof; that is, where a plaintiff in a normal case would need to prove that a duty was breached, it is now upon the institution to prove that it did not breach its duty of care. If it can do that, it can establish that it took all reasonable steps to prevent the abuse from occurring. This is a monumental step and only applies to matters that are brought before the court post the passing of this bill; it is not retrospective.

It has been argued by submitters and referred to in the report that that is unfair, and I can sympathise with that. I can understand how a person who suffered abuse for many years still is required to satisfy the terms of a claim under the law prior to the bill being passed by this House. However, I think it is also very clear that there needs to be a finite end or a finite conclusion and/or a finite start in relation to a new regime. That is why the reverse onus of proof will only apply to prospective claimants before the court.

I said at the beginning that the issue of child sexual abuse has been in the headlines and reported upon and discussed on many occasions in the past. The member for Macalister in her contribution this afternoon made the point very clearly that though this may rectify or attempt to rectify some of the sins of the past, it will never take away the pain. It will also never stop child sexual abuse in the many forms that we know it, both sexual and physical, in institutions and other places. It is true that the bill will attempt to put in place a regime to give better access to damages and better access to recovery; however, I think the member's comment about the future is also important. This House must never lose sight of the fact that child sexual abuse will go on and on and on. We must be constantly aware and constantly vigilant that we need to review our legal system, review our protections and make certain that those to whom we owe the greatest obligation—our children and grandchildren—are protected to the highest possible level. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (5.08 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018. Before commencing my contribution I would like to place on record my thanks to the Attorney-General and Leader of the House for the immense amount of work the Attorney and the Department of Justice and Attorney-General have put into this bill. May I also acknowledge that today is the one-year anniversary of the national apology to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. May I reaffirm that I am sorry and that we believe you, and what happened to you was not your fault.


This bill represents a very important and extensive body of work to assist victims of institutional child sexual abuse get justice. The Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in its *Redress and civil litigation report* made recommendations for improving the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes to survivors of child sexual abuse wishing to pursue a claim for civil damages for personal injury arising from the abuse—and this bill does that. The bill includes amendments that will: introduce a reverse onus to be applied prospectively under which an institution must prove it took reasonable steps to prevent the sexual abuse of a child in its care by a person associated with the institution to avoid legal liability for the abuse; and establish a statutory framework for the nomination of a proper defendant by an unincorporated institution to meet any liability incurred by the institution.

When a court is considering whether an institution has taken reasonable steps, a court will consider the matter of the institution, the resources that were reasonably available to the institution, the relationship between the institution and the abused child and the position in which the institution placed the person in relation to the child, and issues that may be relevant, such as authority, power, trust, control and the ability to achieve intimacy with the child. The issue of nominating a proper defendant to sue has been a difficult matter for survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. Many not-for-profit institutions and churches are unincorporated, with no legal personality, and consequently cannot be sued. Another problem for survivors is that the assets of institutions are often bound up in trusts and are not able to be accessed for civil claims.

The bill proposes amendments that are intended to overcome the difficulties a survivor may face in identifying a proper defendant. The bill provides for the liability of an incorporated institution that was unincorporated at the time of the abuse, the liability of the current office holder where there is a cause of action against a former office holder of the institution which was unincorporated at the time the cause of action occurred and is currently an unincorporated body, nomination by an unincorporated institution or a person as the proper defendant to meet the institution's liability and, if no nomination is made within 120 days or if the nominee is incapable of being sued or has insufficient assets, a court may order, where appropriate, the claim to proceed against the trustees of an associated trust of the institution.

There is authority for an institution which has a liability under a judgement in settlement of a child sexual abuse claim, if it elects to do so, to satisfy the liability out of the assets of the institution and the assets of an associated trust that the institution uses to carry out its functions or activities, and there is the continuity of institutions or officers where an institution or relevant office holder has changed over time.

The bill also includes an amendment to section 64 of the Civil Proceedings Act 2011 with the objective of ensuring that a person under a legal incapacity may recover the costs of trustee management fees in the award of damages for wrongful death of a member of the person's family. This amendment clarifies the law resulting from conflicting court decisions and ensures that an amount awarded to a child for the loss of a parent following a tragic car accident will not be significantly depleted by the cost of managing the funds. These are very important reforms for survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BERKMAN** (Maiwar—Grn) (5.13 pm): I rise to speak to the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill on this significant day, the anniversary of the national apology to survivors and victims of institutional sexual abuse. This bill was introduced in a bit of a rush on 15 November 2018, hot on the heels of my having introduced the Civil Liability (Institutional Child Abuse) Amendment Bill two weeks earlier, on 31 October that year, just days after the national apology. It is unfortunate that survivors of abuse had to wait in limbo for almost a year for the government finally to bring its own bill to this stage, but the bill is welcome now that it has finally arrived.

The Attorney-General is to be commended for the many amendments to the government bill, including the last-minute announcement this morning that the government has finally listened to stakeholders and experts who have long been calling for legislation to extend equal rights to survivors of horrific physical abuse. I welcome the government's adoption of amendments to provide for the

survivors of physical and associated psychological abuse consistent with clauses 3, 6 and 9 of my private member's bill. This is such an important amendment for survivors, and I thank the government on their behalf for bringing these amendments. I also commend the shadow Attorney-General and opposition for strongly supporting the reforms that apply to physical abuse, as proposed in my bill. I congratulate the shadow Attorney-General for his intention to introduce amendments to that effect.

The inclusion of physical abuse in this bill is long overdue and comes after three long years of advocacy by prominent survivors and NGOs including: the Queensland Child Sexual Abuse Legislative Reform Council, Bravehearts, Micah Projects, Care Leavers Australasia Network, Blue Knot, Survivors and Mates Support Network, Tzedek, End Rape on Campus, Beyond Blue, Protect All Children Today, and a number of individual survivors of abuse. Applying these reforms to physical abuse has also long been recommended by eminent independent legal bodies including knowmore legal services and the Australian Lawyers Alliance, among others.

I take this opportunity to extend special recognition to Mr Rob Pyne, the former Independent member for Cairns, who in 2016 introduced the first bill in Queensland to propose that physical abuse and associated psychological abuse be included in royal commission reforms. Today's important amendment by the government has its roots in that early version introduced by Mr Pyne. The government is to be commended for having the sense and good reason to adopt these entirely appropriate reforms. There is, of course, some work that remains to be done. I draw to the House's attention the statement of reservation in the committee's report which, in addition to the issue of physical abuse, also emphasised stakeholder input that the government bill does not have retrospective effect and fails to legislate strict liability.

I have been provided with a letter written by prominent survivor advocacy groups. Signatories to the letter include many of those NGOs I just named. In this letter, in addition to the issue of physical abuse, these groups are united in identifying other major flaws in the government bill, and they plead with the government to amend the bill. I table a copy of that letter in case it has not already been tabled.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 5 October 2019, from multiple authors to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, and the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice, Hon. Yvette D'Ath, regarding the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2018 [[1904](#)].

Their first concern is that the bill fails to legislate strict liability, as outlined in recommendations 89 and 90 of the royal commission report. As a matter of principle, there should be a very high bar set for any government to ignore the recommendations of a properly constituted royal commission, particularly one that has operated for five years nationally, costing half a billion dollars and receiving evidence from all stakeholders and with an unprecedented level of national buy-in and legitimacy. Certainly, any government intent on turning its back on the recommendations of such a royal commission owes it to the community to explain its actions thoroughly. As I understand, this government is yet to offer any satisfactory explanation for ignoring the royal commission so blatantly in this respect.


Without strict liability, this bill will deliver fewer rights to survivors of abuse than they already have under common law. The 2016 High Court decision in *Prince Alfred College v ADC* delivered vicarious liability with retrospective effect. The Attorney-General acknowledged this in the House on 12 June this year; however, that judgement, like all case law, dealt with one specific case. It is not all encompassing. Case law such as this cannot be expected to apply to all survivors. Legal experts have advised that the Queensland government should legislate strict liability to ensure that the statute is in addition to and preserves existing vicarious liability at common law. By way of example, I recommend to the House the approach taken in New South Wales at section 6H of its Civil Liability Act.

The other main concern raised by NGOs is the Attorney-General's proposed amendment to the Civil Liability Act to prevent in all circumstances an apology from being tabled in court as potential evidence of an admission of liability. Such an amendment does not sit comfortably with this bill at all. The purpose of this government bill is to legislate the duties of institutions and to enshrine the rights of victims of abuse. It therefore would be grossly inappropriate for this government to use this bill to create a coverall shield of immunity for institutions that denies victims of abuse the right simply to put their evidence before the court to be properly tested. To do so, particularly today, on the anniversary of the national apology, seems striking.

The principle of every government should be that justice is best served by the presentation of evidence before the court for the court to properly rule on on a case-by-case basis. The proposed amendment, by having the effect of obstructing evidence from being properly tested by the court, risks bringing the administration of justice into disrepute. Quite simply, the best way to resolve any question around liability would be for the Attorney-General to legislate statutory liability as per recommendations 89 and 90 of the royal commission. Then the issue of an apology letter would be irrelevant since liability would be established by statute.

In closing, as others have in this debate, I extend my sincere personal thanks to the advocates and survivors who have fought so hard to achieve whatever justice can be afforded to survivors in the circumstances. In particular, I want to thank Kelvin Johnston and submitter No. 7, who has chosen to remain anonymous throughout this process. Their assistance and input have been absolutely invaluable, as others have noted. I commend them for all of the work they have done over so many years.

If our institutions are to survive, it will be because they lift their standards and performance to the level expected by the community, not because they continue to hide behind improper and unjust protections provided by this parliament. I stand with the survivors and advocacy groups, who are the experts in this field and should be listened to. I stand by the community, which has invested considerable public resources in a five-year national royal commission and which expects to see that effort result in lasting and effective change that will ensure our institutions are child safe and trustworthy. It is long overdue that this House affords survivors of serious physical abuse the same rights and access to justice that are afforded to survivors of sexual abuse. I commend this bill to the House. I am honoured to have been able to help make these amendments a reality.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (5.21 pm): I rise to speak in support of the important reforms being made by the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. As I do, I acknowledge the work of the Truth, Healing and Reconciliation Taskforce and the Historical Abuse Network. The Historical Abuse Network has, since the Forde inquiry, helped successive Queensland governments understand the changes we need to make to protect children from serious abuse.

As always, I applaud the courage it takes survivors to share their experience and their trauma. Without their courage to bring this abuse to light, none of what we are doing today would be possible. I also want to acknowledge the community of supporters and advocates around them who have joined the fight for justice. In particular, I acknowledge the work of Karen Walsh and Lotus Place. In my previous ministerial responsibilities I had the opportunity to work with survivors on issues raised by the royal commission. Even before being elected as the member for Waterford, I saw firsthand the lifelong effect child sexual abuse has on survivors whilst volunteering as the secretary for the Centre Against Sexual Violence.

Australia's Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse was a watershed moment for our nation. The recommendations are helping to break the harmful litigious tactics, stonewalling and disbelief that were an all-too-common experience for victims when they reported child sexual abuse. As outlined in the Queensland government response, we are committed to the vision laid out by the commission's recommendations and have worked in partnership with the community to implement these reforms.

This bill addresses two key reforms that I am pleased Queensland is now moving ahead with: reversing the onus of proof so that an institution must prove it took reasonable steps to prevent sexual abuse of a child in its care; and establishing a statutory framework for the nomination of a proper defendant to meet any liability incurred by an institution. These reforms go to the core of what the royal commission's recommendation on civil litigation hoped to achieve.


Not only will these changes ensure victims can more effectively pursue civil litigation; they will go a long way to preventing institutional child sexual abuse. Together, these changes focus institutions' attention on their responsibilities to children in their care, similar to the way they would consider any workplace health and safety issue for their workers. With the introduction of modern workplace health and safety laws we have seen huge decreases in workplace injuries. Similarly, with these changes we can have confidence that children will be better protected from sexual abuse and that many cases of abuse will be prevented.

The clear majority of matters before the royal commission revealed a failure by institutions to prevent abuse, even when it was suspected, reported or even confirmed. The commission heard evidence from a number of defendants and defendants' lawyers to the effect that they now consider that the litigation should have been handled differently, with far more compassion. As the commission recommended, it is time for our laws to be recast to make sure we learn from past mistakes. That includes reversing the onus of proof for institutions in civil litigation alleging that the institution was negligent. This will mean that if a survivor proves that they were abused in an institution it is now for the institution to prove that it took reasonable steps to prevent the abuse. These policies are there to make sure that institutions are safe for children and that employees know how to report and respond to concerns of suspected abuse.

The commission also highlighted the difficulties victims faced when seeking to identify a proper defendant. Too often, victims able to prove abuse and negligence on the part of institutions were left with no civil recourse because the institution responsible simply no longer existed in any form or was structured in such a way as to make civil claims against past employees impossible. The commission's case study on the Catholic Church's Towards Healing approach heard evidence of one prominent survivor, Mr John Ellis. Mr Ellis's case highlights the injustice of the current system as he was left without any legal entity to seek redress from. It was a cruel matter of history that others would use the so-called Ellis judgement to defend litigation brought against them to shield institutions. Those arrangements end with these reforms.

Additionally, the Attorney-General has announced amendments that will extend the definition of 'abuse' to include serious physical and psychological abuse as well as sexual abuse. This is an important win for many survivors whose serious physical abuse was often overlooked and dismissed by our legal institutions. I want to acknowledge the advocacy of survivors like Allan Allaway and many others who have fought for the inclusion of physical violence. In his submission he stated that 'true justice can only be served through the recognition that civil liability should not only be for the child sexual abuse, but all other forms of insidious abuse'. The inclusion of serious physical and psychological abuse validates the experience of survivors who experienced multiple forms of violence and often had difficulty separating the harm caused by the different types of child abuse. These amendments are in line with the intent of the royal commission, which acknowledged violence in all its forms, and they bring Queensland into line with Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia.

The reforms in this bill are a welcome addition to Queensland's ongoing response to the protection of children and the support for survivors of child abuse. These laws will go a long way to further the government's response to the royal commission and this parliament's ongoing commitment, made in 1999, to do all we can to ensure children in our care are not subject to abuse and neglect. I commend the bill and the amendments to the House.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (5.27 pm): In continuing the reforms and amendments proposed by the bill, we acknowledge that work has already begun to address and deal with some of the impacts of institutional child sexual abuse. This is a difficult subject and piece of legislation for us to deal with today; however, we have an obligation to those Queenslanders who need our support in continuing the staged implementation.

We know that the Civil Liability and Other Legislation Amendment Bill endeavours to improve the capacity of the justice system to provide fair access and outcomes for people who have experienced child sexual abuse and who elect to progress a claim for civil damages, dealing with the amount of time which has passed since the abuse occurred. I note today that Labor has adopted our amendment to extend the definition of 'abuse' to include physical abuse and not just sexual abuse. This is good news and is a result of lobbying by victims and our work in highlighting the same amendment when the second reading debate commenced in June, some four months ago.

Labor has also extended the definition to 'psychological abuse'. This is supported by many of the lobby groups. It is not yet clear how our other amendment will be responded to, but we look forward to the minister making a comment during her speech in reply. It is important that we highlight that it has taken two years to get to this point. We as parliamentarians must deal with all recommendations in a timely manner.

In speaking to the bill, I renew my calls for immediate action to address youth sexual abuse, particularly in Indigenous communities. We all recall the tragic suicides of five Indigenous girls across the country over nine days. The government must take more urgent action to prevent further suffering and deaths. It is horrifying to hear how the lives of so many young people have been cut short. Clearly, more needs to be done to prevent this from continuing.

Debate, on motion of Mr Bennett, adjourned.

RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT (FEES) AMENDMENT REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

 **Mr CRISAFULLI** (Broadwater—LNP) (5.29 pm): I move—

That the Recreation Areas Management (Fees) Amendment Regulation 2019, subordinate legislation No. 197 of 2019, tabled in the House on 15 October 2019, be disallowed.

'I believe this is a poor decision that goes against trying to attract more tourism to Straddie.' Those are not the words of the member for Oodgeroo, a great champion for that part of the world. They are not the words of the member for Clayfield, who has been a frequent visitor there for many years, and both of those gentlemen will articulate why this tax is so terrible. They are the words of the member for Capalaba, and they are true words because it is a poor decision. It is a poor decision because Straddie is hurting, and I know that because I have been over there with the member for Oodgeroo on several occasions. We have sat down and had fish and chips and spoken with business owners and talked to locals. We know that because we have spoken with the Straddie Chamber of Commerce—a great, dynamic organisation on the island that is reflecting the views of its members and which for some strange reason was left off the strategic planning committee and therefore the voice of business was kicked off that committee. This is about trying to energise an island at a time when it is doing it tough, yet the chamber of commerce was kicked off the group tasked with trying to get it going.

It is a poor decision because the transition from sandmining is in tatters. For three years the government has spoken about 23 projects that were designed to get the island's economy going and just two of the smaller ones have been completed. During estimates we revealed that of the \$5 million fund that was to be distributed to workers just 10 per cent has been distributed. Regardless of one's views on sandmining and the transition—and the views are varied because there were people who wanted it ended immediately, there were people who never wanted to see it end and there were people who chose different points in time—a decision was taken and a transition strategy was put in place and the government has taken its eye off the ball.

It was a poor decision because the consultation has been non-existent. People woke up to news that within a month the government would triple the fees for people to be able to go over and enjoy what they have done for generations and those businesses that have relied on that army—that influx—to put some money through the tills to help in those soft periods. To wake up and find out that those fees have been trebled, is it little wonder why the member for Capalaba was so vehement in his criticism! There is good news: the member for Capalaba will be speaking to this motion today and that will be his opportunity, because the member for Capalaba roars in the Redlands but he whispers in William Street. Today is his day to stand up and say things like, 'Mr Deputy Speaker, this is a poor decision that goes against trying to attract more tourism to Straddie and, as a result, I will be voting in favour of the disallowance motion because I am going to put my community ahead of my political allegiance,' and we will be waiting—

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I take the interjection from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, who said it would be the first—and indeed it would!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Pause a moment. Put your comments through the chair please.

Mr CRISAFULLI: It would be a poor decision because I ask those opposite: what benefit could possibly be derived from increasing these fees threefold? Those opposite will say that money will be collected and will be reinvested, but, as the member for Oodgeroo will explain, the issue is not the collection of money; the issue has been spending that money.

There has been a pile of money put aside for a transition strategy and just two of the 23 projects have been delivered. Money is available. What is missing is the will of the government to see this through. To wake up and suggest that the only way to deliver for an island is to tax the very people who are going over to try and underpin that economy shows either complete and utter flawed logic or is there a hidden reason as to why this is occurring? Is there some sort of secret plan that is being hatched that really the government does not want people going to Straddie?

Government members interjected.

Mr CRISAFULLI: I welcome the giggles because, on any fair analysis, there is no reason and there is no benefit to increasing a fee by three times. It is not a case of money that needs to be found to be delivered. The quantum of money is there. It is not a case that the island's community has been crying for this. What did the consultation look like? Business did not know. Business woke up and read about it in the paper. Council did not know, and the mayor, to her great credit, has stood up and said that the decision shows a lack of understanding of the island. Again, those opposite will criticise people in local government for standing up for their community. I am sorry, but, if the member for Stafford does not believe the mayor's responsibility is to stand up and call out bad policy, I would suggest to him that he does not know a lot about local government.

What did consultation look like? Were the four-wheel drive clubs brought into the picture? No. They also read about it in the paper. What about the residents? What about the long-suffering residents who have been part of some sort of political football, who have been tossed from one side to another, who have been at the whim of groups being given bits of funding here and bits of funding there but no overarching proper strategy and no time line on the delivery of these projects? What about those residents who just want to see two things: they want to see an island where the look and the feel and the culture remains as it is, but they want a job for their kids. They do not want their kids to have to pack a lunch box and head off every day and they certainly do not want their kids to have to leave the island to be able to find employment.

The government promised us rivers of gold as part of the economic transition. We were told about ecotourism jobs. In fact, the current tourism minister, then in a different portfolio, told us about these hundreds of jobs that would be coming over the hill. I believe it was 400 jobs in ecotourism, and that was predicted 10 years ago.

Today the minister can explain how many of those 400 jobs have been delivered. If the minister does not, the local member will, because in this local member that community has found somebody who has risen above the hurly-burly of the deadline of sandmining. The member for Oodgeroo has made the decision and said, 'I might not agree with the time line, but I will do what is right by my community.' He has secured an extra \$11 million for the economic transition strategy, but still the money sits there. Through the local press he has continued to call for those projects that the community is crying out for. He has continued to engage with organisations such as the chamber, such as the traditional owners, and they are all looking for one thing, and that is an island that has an economy, a hope and a future. That is not too much to ask.


If it is not some sort of secret deal, if it is not some sort of lack of understanding, why will the government not swallow its pride and support this disallowance motion? Why do we need another new or increased tax? Why is it that every time this Treasurer and this government hands down a budget we wake to news of another tax on families? The government says that its taxes do not affect mums and dads. We are seeing that play out right before us at the moment with the waste levy. Businesses are passing on the cost and the government is not reinvesting the bulk of that money into environmental initiatives. Almost nine cents in every 10 cents—almost 90 per cent—of that levy is going back to the government in some way, shape or form. Here we have another tax.

For all of the commitments that the Leader of the Opposition has made, for all of the pledges, for all of the vision about making sure that our kids are cool, about making sure that people can get on and about delivering jobs across the economy and certainty for the mining industry, the best commitment that has been made is no new taxes from 2020. The Queensland that I want my kids to grow up in is a Queensland where people can invest with certainty, where people can know that their household budget can be upheld without there being a constant attack on the bottom line.

This increase might be only small when we compare it to the \$1.2 billion from the waste tax, but it means a lot to families. It means a lot to the mum and dad who will throw their kids in the car and head over for an experience that those children will remember. I say to the member for Capalaba and, indeed, to the member for Redlands and the member for Springwood that this is their opportunity to show that that island's economy is very fragile. It is a special part of the world that people love to call home. It is a part of the world where people love to go and have an experience.

This tax will hurt. If the member for Capalaba stands up today and tries to say that somehow he has garnered a commitment from a minister to spend rivers of gold on the island, I say that that is not what they want. The money has been set aside. People want the member for Capalaba to work with the member for Oodgeroo to deliver on the projects that have been outlined, to get the chamber of commerce back to the table and to axe the Straddie tax, because it is not good policy. It is not fair policy. It is not needed.

The consultation was a sham. Business did not know about the increase. The council was blindsided by it. For the member, in an unguarded moment, to stand up for his community and then come into this House and backtrack, that will haunt him for a long time. The member's constituents know how very special North Stradbroke Island is. If the member truly believes that this increase is a poor decision, I urge him to support this disallowance motion. If the member truly believes that this increase is a poor decision for lifestyle, if he truly believes that it is a poor decision for the economy and if he truly believes that it is a poor decision because of a lack of consultation, this is his opportunity to support a motion of substance and a motion of fairness. If the member for Capalaba chooses not to, I sense that, in 12 months time, there will be a decision made by his community to that effect.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for Natural Resources, Mines and Energy) (5.44 pm): I rise to oppose the disallowance motion moved by the member for Broadwater. The Palaszczuk government is delivering on its commitment to phase out sandmining and transition North Stradbroke Island, or Minjerribah, to a more sustainable and diverse economy. Recreation areas, such as the one established on Minjerribah, are popular Queensland coastal or island areas generally used for a diverse range of nature based recreational activity—camping, four-wheel driving, birdwatching, bushwalking and beach fishing. A number of members in this chamber would have enjoyed Minjerribah immensely with their families over the years.

The Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 provides for the establishment, maintenance and use of recreation areas with the purpose of providing and coordinating integrated and approved recreational planning, recreational facilities and management. Such management takes into consideration a range of values, including the conservation, cultural, educational and recreational values of these areas. Generally, the management of recreational areas is performed by the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service. I note that the management of recreational areas occurs partly on a user-pays basis, with fees for camping and vehicle use helping to offset the costs of management. The camping fees and vehicle access permit fees are prescribed under the Recreation Areas Management Regulation 2017.

In July 2011, the Federal Court recognised the Quandamooka people's native title rights and interests over the majority of Minjerribah, Peel Island, Goat Island, Stingaree Island, Crab Island and the surrounding waters of Moreton Bay. To support the native title determination, the Queensland government entered into an Indigenous land use agreement and an Indigenous management agreement with the Quandamooka people over the lands and waters within the determination area.


My department has the lead for implementing the Quandamooka Indigenous land use agreement and facilitating land actions critical to the Quandamooka people's aspirations. In recognition of the 2011 native title determination over Minjerribah and in the spirit of a continued partnership with the Quandamooka people, the Queensland government, through the Department of Environment and Science, has a service agreement with Minjerribah Camping—a business established by the Quandamooka Aboriginal corporation following the creation of the Minjerribah Recreation Area.

Consistent with this agreement, Minjerribah Camping manages the Minjerribah Recreation Area, including the administration of camping and vehicle access permits and undertaking maintenance, pest management and compliance activities. Management activities funded by the vehicle access permits include the provision and maintenance of camping areas, visitor facilities, managing access to the area, compliance and permit administration—all very important functions provided by the Minjerribah group.

There are seven recreation areas in Queensland established under the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006. They include Fraser Island, Green Island, Mulgumpin—also known as Moreton Island—Bribie Island, Inskip Peninsula, Cooloola and Minjerribah. The vehicle access permit fee of \$52.75 brings Minjerribah into line with a vehicle access permit fee to go to Moreton Island. It simply aligns the two islands. The yearly fee of \$158 is also consistent with the fee at Bribie Island and it is cheaper than the yearly fee for Moreton Island.

Most people would realise that I love going to Rainbow Beach in the Cooloola area. For us up there, the yearly fee is not \$158; the fee is \$265.30. The member for Gympie is the local member for the Cooloola area. He has not decried the increase in fees. The fee at Cooloola, at \$265.30, is much more than the \$158 fee on Minjerribah. The member for Gympie understands that the \$265 is money well spent because he knows that that money goes towards maintenance of the camping areas, the vehicle tracks and the recreation areas. That money contributes to the facilities that everyone enjoys at Cooloola. To sort out this argument the member to Gympie simply has to have a chat to the member for Oodgeroo. Maybe the member for Oodgeroo could visit Cooloola to see how wonderful it is. The \$265 fee has been used for maintenance. It will be fantastic for the Quandamooka people on Minjerribah to have access to these funds to undertake the necessary and vital maintenance of facilities at this very beautiful spot.

As I said before, most families who go to Minjerribah for annual holidays will pay only an additional \$4.90 above the current fee. Travelling to Minjerribah for a yearly holiday to go four-wheel driving is still more affordable than most other islands—and more affordable than Cooloola. In the past two years we have seen an increase of more than 1,000 permits being issued to go four-wheel driving on Minjerribah. The demand is there. The use of the facilities has increased. The Quandamooka people will be very busy indeed maintaining these facilities. The fee of \$158 is necessary to maintain and improve the facilities needed for visitors and tourists at Minjerribah. Without doubt Minjerribah is a beautiful place and these fees will help keep it a beautiful place.

 **Dr ROBINSON** (Oodgeroo—LNP) (5.51 pm): Labor's secret Straddie tax proves that you cannot trust Labor and you cannot afford Labor. The long-suffering residents of North Stradbroke Island also know this. The latest kick to the residents is Labor's tripling of the four-wheel drive beach access fee, or Straddie tax. Sadly, Deputy Premier Jackie Trad has thrown over 300 workers out of work in recent years because of Labor's opposition to Queensland's resources sector, but now she is crueling the island's last remaining economic lifeline—its tourism industry—through this tax.

For generations families have flocked to North Stradbroke Island because it has been affordable. Tradies in their Toyotas and Tritons could have an affordable camping holiday with the kids, enjoying Straddie's pristine wilderness beaches. Labor has long abandoned working people for the kale munchers of their Extinction Rebellion allies in the hipster coffee shops of West End. Locals and tourists alike have let my office know what they really think.

In a short period of time more than 900 people have signed my petition against Labor's secret Straddie tax. One person estimated it will cost their family \$600 by the time they pay the ferry fee and the beach access tax for their four-wheel drive and camper trailer, and that is before they pay camping fees or pick up supplies from local island businesses. Clearly this is one of many families who will now struggle, from 1 November, if this tax goes ahead, to come back to the island. However, in a show of admirable restraint this person on Facebook refrained from punctuating their comments with swearing emojis. Yes, the emojis have made a comeback.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! May I caution the member. Please stick to the item at hand, thank you. Let us not go down that path.

Dr ROBINSON: A prominent business person said, 'Small businesses feel like Labor is deliberately attacking them.' They feel like there is a vendetta against them and their ability to make their own living. It hurts locals who need beach access to get to their favourite fishing spots all year round. It hurts loyal tourists who fish all year round and recreate on the island. These people are the baseline customers of island businesses. Labor's tax hike is a wilful vandalism of the island's marketing strategy, a strategy built around encouraging people to come back year in, year out as a family tradition.

Straddie Kingfisher Tours owner, David Thelander, said people who had been visiting the island for 20 years told him this would be the last year they would visit because of these increasing costs. This is tragic. Instead of consulting about impacts, Labor developed the Straddie tax in secret. They blindsided everyone: local businesses, the community, most of the Quandamooka people, the council and even their own members of parliament. Redlands mayor Karen Williams said the decision was symptomatic of the government not understanding the need to engage with the Straddie community. I agree with the mayor.

Then there is the member for Capalaba, who was initially aghast like the rest of us. He said the Straddie tax was 'a poor decision' and he was going to take it up with the minister. For a brief moment it looked like he might side with those who cannot afford a private holiday home at Point Lookout, but he was quickly rounded up and re-educated by Deputy Premier Jackie Trad. Sadly, the members for Capalaba, Redlands and Springwood have failed to stand up for the community.

It makes one wonder though what the \$31 million for economic transition is for and where have the millions gone to date because nothing has been built in three years. Where are the legacy projects? What about a major redevelopment of Dunwich harbour? What you could do or have done with that money! Tourism minister Kate Jones promised 400 ecotourism jobs.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member! Please use correct titles.

Dr ROBINSON: The member for Cooper promised 400 ecotourism jobs. Minister, I am happy for you to provide even a handful—which you have not even done.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Oodgeroo, put your comments through the chair. You know the rules.


Dr ROBINSON: The recycled minister and member for Cooper still has not provided any jobs. The Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad, said there would be 1,100 construction jobs at Cleveland harbour.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Oodgeroo, you know the standing orders about using titles. Please use correct titles.

Dr ROBINSON: The member for South Brisbane and Treasurer said there would be 1,100 construction jobs at Cleveland harbour that would save North Stradbroke Island, but where are these jobs? Locals are still waiting. Soon the last resource sector jobs will be gone. Nothing will be left but Labor's empty promises. No wonder locals call it 'Trad-broke Island'. Labor simply cannot be trusted.

By keeping the workers in their four-wheel utes away, celebrity Labor MPs who do not want to mingle with the proletariat can soon holiday in peace without being pestered for selfies with tradies and their families. One does not want the view spoiled by resource workers in high-vis gear when you are on holidays. The four-wheel drive tourism tax on Straddie is the last straw.

In 2018-19 more than \$8 million was taken in beach access fees in South-East Queensland. How much more tax do Queenslanders have to pay under this government? The tripling of the Straddie tax is simply a money grab by a desperate Treasurer who thinks she can tax her way to growth. Locals are angry towards this government that does not care about people whose modest family budgets only allow them simple camping holidays. In conclusion, locals and tourists alike know you cannot trust Labor and you cannot afford Labor.

 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Cooper—ALP) (Minister for Innovation and Tourism Industry Development and Minister for Cross River Rail) (5.58 pm): If those opposite want to talk about the last 10 years—and it has been 10 years—then let us talk about it. There is one thing that has not changed, and that is that the LNP has never supported Minjerribah going back into the hands of the traditional owners of Minjerribah. From day one they were opposed to it. I would love all the new members on both sides of parliament to read the *Hansard* of the original debate when we made the right decision—and I will own it here today and it will be with me until the day I die—to sign the ILUA to hand back responsibility and ownership of this land to the traditional owners of the land, the Quandamooka people.

Dr Robinson: You sacked Aboriginal workers! Why did you sack them? What do they do about a job?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member for Oodgeroo! Your interjections are not being taken.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. Do members know how many people now work under QYAC, the prescribed body corporate and owners of the land? Over 100 people are employed by QYAC! Those are real jobs for the traditional owners of that land. Do not come in here and say—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection from the member for Broadwater, because he knows only too well his record when he was a minister in the Newman government. We know what they did. They wound back the economic transition strategy. They did not spend one dollar—not one dollar—on trying to transition the economy, which we knew was moving away from mining. Why did we start having the conversation? Because the company, Sibelco, said that they were going to close down their mines. They had a time line to close down the mines on the island. A responsible government—excuse the pun—does not put its head in the sand. It sits down, just like I did, with the company and talks through what a transition looks like. It was the company that was moving away from the end of life on a number of those mines. Yes, unlike those in the LNP, we sat down with the traditional owners and talked through a time line that they wanted for their community and we listened. That stands in stark contrast to those opposite—

Mr Crisafulli interjected.

Ms JONES:—and once again the member for Broadwater is trying to rewrite history. He does that a bit. There was absolutely no consultation by the then LNP government with the traditional owners of that land when it made the decision to ruthlessly legislate over the top of the Quandamooka people's ILUA to extend mining on that island for 25 more years.

Dr Robinson interjected.

Ms JONES: I take that interjection. The member for Oodgeroo may want to have this conversation with the traditional owners of the island who maintain to this day that there was absolutely zero consultation by the Newman government with the traditional owners before it came in here and legislated over the top of their hard fought for land rights on an island that has been theirs since forever.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! Member for Oodgeroo, you are still interjecting. You have already had a chance in this debate. I caution you.

Ms JONES: If members are wondering why the member for Oodgeroo keeps on interjecting on me, it is because he does not want to hear the truth. He does not want the people of Queensland to listen to the facts about what they did in parliament—and it is why they are now sitting in opposition, because they use their bullyboy tactics on everybody—having had no consultation with the traditional owners of the land who already had a legislative right to their land under an ILUA.

Dr Robinson: And we support it.

Ms JONES: No, you do not support it, because you came in here—

Dr Robinson interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Oodgeroo, you have been cautioned a few times. I now warn you under the standing orders.

Ms JONES: I am advised by the traditional owners, not by the member for Oodgeroo, that the LNP government came into this parliament and legislated over the top of the ILUA, which was recognised under the country's native title legislation that I thought everyone in this House supports, but it turns out that not all do. That government legislated over the Quandamooka people's rights and it extended mining on that island for 25 more years with no consultation.


I say all of this because it goes to the heart of the matter: they do not want the traditional owners of Minjerribah to have the right to determine their own future on their own land. That is exactly what this motion is about. The fees that we are talking about have been requested and done in consultation with the traditional owners of that land. Where does the extra \$5, which I am advised is the difference, go back to? It goes back to maintaining those lands. It goes back to maintaining the pathways and the tracks on that island, which people are using. Despite what they may say, we know that 1,000 extra permits have had to be issued in the past two years because tourism is growing on the island.

I will acknowledge that they are absolutely right: I would love to have more jobs and tourism on the island than we have today, but when you lose three years of progress, when you have a government that comes in here and legislates over the top of the traditional owners, that tears up the economic transition strategy and that rips all of the dollars out of that pond and puts it into God knows what, of course you go backwards. Thank God the people of Queensland saw their heartlessness for what it was. People saw their heartlessness in everything that they took an axe to, including the rights of the Quandamooka people on their very own lands—lands that our national government recognises as their lands. In actual fact, shamefully, the Newman government made the traditional owners go all the way to the High Court, at a cost of hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars, to enable them to assert their rights. Since 1993, as a country we have acknowledged that those Aboriginal and First Nations people are the rightful and traditional owners of the country that they so graciously let us be a part of.

I say to everyone who is listening to this debate: see this for what it is. From day one the LNP in Queensland has never ever supported the traditional owners of Minjerribah having self-determination over their own lands. They have never ever committed one dollar to help with the transition away from mining to a more sustainable future for the island, which from the conversations I have had with their elders and representatives I know is a great wish of the Quandamooka people. They have never recognised that the reason why the Bligh government even sat down at the table with Sibelco was that it was closing down the Enterprise mine. That is a fact. They can dispute it all they want but that is a fact, unless the guy from Sibelco was lying to me when I met with him. I cannot remember how many times we met, but it was many times.

There is one side of politics that will fight for and recognise the path to healing in this state. QTIC, the Queensland tourism body of our state, has said that they want 2020 to be the year of Indigenous tourism. They recognise that tourism can play a crucial role not only in the economic growth of our state as a whole but also for the economic prosperity of First Nations people for whom Queensland is home. More excitingly for me, I think it is going to be a crucial way to build true healing in our state, so that we can move forward together as a cohesive people and stand up for our traditional owners, our Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander First Nations people.

I call on everyone in this parliament to act in the state's best interests and to listen to what the traditional owners want, and they want this. They want these fees, because they want them to go back into the maintenance of their lands. I call on every single person in this House to not use this chamber again to override the self-determination and wishes of the traditional owners of those lands. I know that will fall on deaf ears, because despite what those opposite may say their actions tell a very different story. Not once have they sat down and listened to what the Quandamooka people have said and then used this chamber to enact that. However, we will.

 **Ms SIMPSON** (Maroochydore—LNP) (6.07 pm): How extraordinary it is that the tourism minister would try to turn a Labor tax into some equivalent of land determination and Indigenous ownership. This is a Labor tax. How extraordinary! That was the most disgraceful contribution, but there was one very interesting little nugget that came out of that contribution from the tourism minister, which we need to amplify. The minister said that there were 100 jobs created in one of the Indigenous organisations on the island, but she had hoped that there would be more. This Labor government claimed that they were going to create 400 tourism jobs, so where are we at today? I believe that there used to be about

300 people employed within Sibelco and today that number is down to about 100, although I am not sure of the exact number. There has been a loss of about 200 jobs as mining was fast-tracked off the island without a proper economic transition.

There is a net loss of jobs which is a burden for the people still on the island who are trying to get work. They know that jobs are going. They are trying to deal with cost-of-living issues. What is this government's answer in terms of economic transition? It brings in a great new tax. For the tourism minister to advocate for a new tax for a community that is hurting is unbelievable. It is a disgrace. We find out that this Labor government did not consult with the wider community and the business community on this new tax, which is three times the previous beach access fee. Guess what? There are a number of Indigenous people in that community that run businesses.

The Indigenous people have a proud and wonderful history on this island. I am very grateful to the Indigenous people of North Stradbroke Island. I possibly would not be here today if it were not for their ancestors who ensured a safe passage for the ships that our earlier settlers came on. One of my ancestors was on one of those ships which they averted from near disaster.

In cooperation we want to provide strong support to the people who are on the island today. We want them to have jobs.

Government members interjected.

Ms SIMPSON: It might be a laughing matter for some government members, but a tax is not the answer. To increase this fee without consultation and then arrogantly tell people that it is good for them does not wash.

We know that it is expensive for people to go on holidays. Maybe the elite in the Labor Party who like to go to Whistler and those sorts of places and have their friends in highfalutin jobs subsidise their holidays do not get it. There are a lot of tradies and ordinary working-class Queenslanders who love their holidays on North Stradbroke Island, who want to support the tourism industry there and who want to put their hard-earned money back into the community of North Stradbroke Island. They want to ensure that they not only have a good holiday but that the people there have jobs into the future.

Labor's answer is not the way. It is elite, arrogant and breathtaking that it has not understood the impact this will have. Where is the economic impact statement and where is the regulatory impact statement for this tax? We know that there was no consultation with the chamber of commerce. They knew nothing about this. The business community—those hardworking mums and dads who are trying to maintain their businesses in the face of a declining population—know that this will have an impact, but the government has not done a regulatory impact statement to assess its real impact on jobs in this community.

During estimates we asked about the economic transition package and the funds the government said it was going to spend because it wanted the island to be sustainable. The government confirmed that of the \$5 million transition fund only 10 per cent had been spent. What we have seen is that more people have left the island. Those opposite do not count the people who have left the island. They do not care about the people who have left the island.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Members, please direct your comments through the chair and not across the chamber.

Mrs Wilson interjected.

Ms Fentiman interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Pumicestone and member for Waterford, I have called you both to order.

Ms SIMPSON: We have a Labor government that promised to help this island community transition when it fast-tracked the closing down of mining on the island which resulted in job losses in the local community, but it has failed to keep its promise. It announced funding that it has not spent. It has failed to ensure the projects it announced have been delivered. There is a long list of projects to still come about. What has it done? It has brought in a great big, fat new tax that will hit the very people the island needs to come and visit—that is, the workers and the mums and dads and their kids who camp on Straddie and whom we want to ensure continue to have their holidays on Straddie.


The permit fee has gone from \$47.85 to \$158. That is a huge increase. The government does not think that is a big increase. That is probably because a lot of them are on pretty big salaries and they like to go for holidays in some pretty exclusive places. I have news for them. We talk to the people

who like to take camping holidays, who love to get out with their kids and who love this island. They say that this fee will stop them doing the very thing that they have traditionally done and have loved doing. These people have long had a connection with this beautiful island.

We want to see a fair dinkum economic transition. This is not fair dinkum. It is an insult. It is a rip-off. It is a disgrace. We have not yet heard a proper explanation of how the government could do this without consultation with the very community and businesses that are now going to be paying the price as more and more people fail to come through their doors.

This Labor government has upwards of 10 new or increased taxes. The Straddie tax is just one of those. This government does not get that it cannot tax its way to growth because it will stall the economy. This community is struggling. It is concerned about having a sustainable future for the kids where they are not dependent upon government welfare and where they can create jobs through their own businesses. It has been hit around the head yet again. If the government had delivered on its promises and announcements to date, people might have listened and thought is there a greater plan, but they have not. The government has failed to deliver on a number of the things that it promised as part of the economic transition.

This government is like a headless chook. We never know which minister is in charge. It has had changes of ministers. There are a number of ministers who are supposed to be responsible for this. We go to the machinery-of-government documents to work out who is in charge of what. Those opposite do not know. They flick ministers from one area of responsibility to another. The government has dropped the ball with regard to this precious issue of people's futures by not ensuring that there is a proper economic transition that will deliver jobs and see people continuing to visit this island. This new tax should not be a barrier to people enjoying this place and supporting the businesses that this community needs.

 **Mr BUTCHER** (Gladstone—ALP) (6.16 pm): I rise to oppose the disallowance motion moved by the member for Broadwater. The Quandamooka people are the traditional custodians of the Quandamooka estate, which includes the waters and islands of the central and southern Moreton Bay and the coast land and streams between the Brisbane and Logan rivers. These are the people who own the land on which we are talking about. The Quandamooka people comprise the Nughi, Nunukul and Gorenpul clans.

On 4 July 2011 the Quandamooka people were recognised as having native title rights and interests, as Minister Jones has said previously, in 54,408 hectares on land on Minjerribah—North Stradbroke Island.

Mr Stewart interjected.

Mr BUTCHER: It is a lot of hectares. I will take that interjection. As part of this native title determination, the state government of Queensland and the Quandamooka people, through the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation, entered into a joint management partnership to manage the Minjerribah protected areas.

I can still remember my first visit to North Stradbroke Island. It was very special. I went over with the mayor and opened a wastewater facility. This is where I got my first plaque as the state member for Gladstone. It was a special time in my parliamentary career. It was critical infrastructure for a developing island. The council knew more and more people were heading to North Stradbroke Island for their yearly trip.

My son is one of those people. He owns a Nissan Patrol. He loves getting over there once a year. I said to him, 'The permit you will have to get and pay for is a monthly permit and it is only going to cost you \$5 extra. It is going to be \$52.70.' He said, 'So?' He knows how important it is when he goes over to these islands in his four-wheel drive, which he does in my electorate—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Everyone knows the standing orders about interjecting across the chamber. Please direct your comments through the chair.

Mr BUTCHER: When he goes to these places, he knows how important it is to make sure that people are doing the right thing—and a lot of them do. He and his mates do. However, there is a certain element within society who do not and, with the amount of traffic on Straddie, we need our Indigenous people to be looking after the land and repairing it when things go wrong. When I told him about this, as I said before, he was more than happy to pay \$52.70 a month for his trip to North Stradbroke Island.

Joint management is a specific model of land management arrangements over national parks which comprises significant involvement of traditional owners across a range of land management activities on the protected area. Joint management on Minjerribah empowers the Quandamooka people to be involved in the management of their own country, as we have heard tonight, and to profile their country and history to the island's estimated 400,000 visitors a year. It has enabled the Quandamooka people to start to meet their aspirations by building an economic base, enhancing their cultural practices and connecting with their country.

In the spirit of this partnership between the state and the Quandamooka people, the Minjerribah Recreation Area was established in 2011 and with it Minjerribah Camping, which is a private company created and 100 per cent owned by the Quandamooka Yoolooburrabee Aboriginal Corporation. They own it, run it and look after it. I have a fair bit to do with our land sea rangers in the Gladstone region, and they do a fantastic job. I pay tribute to Kerry Blackman today because he is leading the charge with those young Indigenous kids, getting them into those land and sea ranger programs. They are the future for this island. They will be getting these jobs to look after the island that they own.

Minjerribah Camping manage permits for camping and vehicle access within the Minjerribah Recreation Area and utilise the revenue to administer and manage that area for its ongoing use and protection for all visitors—as I mentioned before, about 400,000 people a year. The vehicle access permit fees, which are the subject of this disallowance motion tonight, are a key part of revenue used by Minjerribah Camping to manage the recreational areas on the island. This revenue enables the Quandamooka people to continue to care for their own country. They are the best managers of their own land and they do it really well.

The revenue also provides employment opportunities, as I said, for young people in particular and ensures that natural and cultural values are kept on the island where they belong and kept in the best possible condition. It also allows for infrastructure and facilities to meet visitor expectations, with increasing visitor numbers that we see each and every year heading over to North Stradbroke Island.

Queensland is lucky to be home to some of the country's best four-wheel drive spots. As I said, I have heard about most of them because my son tells me about them all the time. From inland tracks at Sundown to the pristine beaches on Minjerribah, Queenslanders love to indulge in ecotourism, and key to that is maintaining and providing good access for them when they get to these places.

More and more people are embracing what nature has to offer, and we are seeing an increasing number of four-wheel drives and campers spending their holidays in the great outdoors. I make particular mention of one of the four-wheel drive areas that my son tells me a lot about, and that is where they go and get bogged at Inskip Point down the coast, but that is what these vehicles can do to the beach. They can damage the beach and destroy the area. They all think it is fun. It might be fun to some people, but someone has to fix it. That is what this permit will do. It will supply jobs so that it will make it easier for people who do not have big four-wheel drives to access those areas.


When I speak to four-wheel drivers in my electorate, I am constantly hearing about the need for good tracks and access to pristine beaches, as well as about the need for maintained facilities and camping areas when they finally get to those places. That is what this is all about. It is about giving our local people opportunities to go to great places like North Stradbroke Island to see our countryside, to see our beautiful beaches and to see our inland tracks and do it for a monthly fee of \$52.70. If you take that one holiday a year, it is a monthly rise of about five bucks. As I said, my son said to me that that is quite fair for what he is going to get back. He will get value for his money.

Despite the majority of drivers doing the right thing and using the areas safely, we know that some drivers do the wrong thing, whether it be on purpose or due to inexperience, which a lot of it is, and this can cause problems for other drivers. When you have so many drivers, as we are seeing on North Stradbroke Island, it can become quite a problem. That is why, as part of the need to maintain and improve track access, there is also a need for more safety signage. This is something that I know the state government is investing in right now.

We want visitors and tourists to be able to escape the city and experience the best beaches that we have. We want families to continue their family holidays, fishing and camping on the beach like they do at North Stradbroke Island. This is all part of the Queensland way of life and something that we want more people to be able to enjoy. There is nothing more Queensland than hitting the sand on some of nature's best highways looking for gutters to throw a line in and catch a fish.

Regular four-wheel drivers—and there are many of them here in Queensland—and campers alike, are happy to pay their fair share to access our islands. That is why there has been a need to bring the Minjerribah permit fees up to a comparable rate with other recreation areas around Queensland.

We have also heard reports from visitors complaining about more and more rubbish that is being left behind by the increasing number of campers. That is why it is critically important that we see local Indigenous people on the ground making sure that these places remain pristine like they are, no matter whether there are 10 cars and four-wheel drives or a thousand of them. This is why we are investing in the island's protected areas because we want to ensure that tourists, families, four-wheel drivers and campers have the best experience when visiting such a wonderful island here in Queensland.

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (6.25 pm): I am very happy to rise to support the disallowance motion. There is nothing more Labor than increasing a tax. You can forget about getting in your car and going for a fish or a camp in Queensland. Under Labor, you pay more and you get less. The member for Gladstone was just talking about his son. He said, 'I spoke to my son and he said, "I have to pay five bucks a month more for my beach permit."' I was talking to my son, I was talking to my second son and I was talking to my daughter, and I said, 'Do you know what they are doing? They are increasing the charges to drive on the beach over at Straddie.' They said, 'Dad, there's nothing like a commie to do it in for all of us, is there!'

I have listened to a lot of drivel in this place, but what I have heard for the last 45 minutes just about tops the list. We are hearing that this money has to be equalised. I knew the equalisation argument would come up: 'It is the same as Moreton but less than Rainbow Beach because we need to spend the money to make sure that the tracks and everything are all looked after.' I have been to Rainbow Beach and I can tell you that this government is not spending the money anywhere along those camp sites through that part of the world. Drive along and see the rubbish sitting behind the dunes. Drive along and see the toilet paper that litters the place. Drive along and see the fireplaces, the glass and the rubbish. There is no maintenance being done at Rainbow Beach, Minister Lynham.

An opposition member: None.

Mr NICHOLLS: None whatsoever. Do you know who looks after the roads over on Moreton Island? It is not the state government; it is the Brisbane City Council. They are the ones who spend the money. They are ripping you off on Moreton—I know because I have just been over there. Now they are going to rip you off on North Stradbroke Island because there are two beach access points. One is at the end of George Nothling Drive and the other is beside the Adder Rock campground as you go on to the beach.

I have been going to North Stradbroke Island for 40 years and those tracks have not got any better over all of that time. The camping spots are not getting any better over all of that time. If you want to get into the Keyholes off Main Beach, it is now blocked off. You cannot get there. You cannot get to Blue Lake either.

This fee is a farce. There is no explanation of where the money is being spent. If it is being spent the same way it is being spent on Moreton Island and Rainbow Beach and the coloured sands, it is being wasted yet again.

I have been visiting North Stradbroke Island, Minjerribah or, as it is most and best loved and known, Straddie for almost 40 years. My wife has been visiting her entire life.

Mr Power: Where's your tinnie?

Mr NICHOLLS: Just sit down and listen. You will learn something.

Mr Power: Where's your tinnie?

Mr NICHOLLS: Just sit down and listen and learn. Stop talking and listen, mate. You have two ears and one mouth—use it that way.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Whiting): Order! Member for Clayfield, you know the standing orders. Put your comments through the chair.

Mr NICHOLLS: I was just taking an interjection, Mr Deputy Speaker. My wife's father visited almost his entire life—in fact, since 1947, when his mother bought a fisherman's shack just below the lighthouse at Point Lookout, a place we still go to holiday many times a year. 'Timbin Timbin' has been a family tradition for our family for 72 years, and all of our kids, their cousins and extended family could not imagine not going to Straddie. My daughter recently had her friends over for a year 11 pre schoolies, following in the tradition of her two older brothers, although with substantially better behaviour.

I mentioned my father-in-law, Robert Paterson, for good reason. Despite his early and untimely death in 2003, his love of the island, of fishing and whales, permeates everything that our family does on Straddie to this day. He was the first what I would call 'scientific' whale watcher at Point Lookout. Back in the early 1980s before it was trendy, before the University of Queensland was there, before the

marine department was there—before anyone else was there—he was watching and counting whales from Point Lookout. His research was published in such reputable magazines around the world as *Nature* because of the work that he did there.

In 1980 he saw probably the first whale that had been sighted from North Stradbroke since the end of whaling because tragically people thought those magnificent beasts of the ocean had been lost. He was also appointed honorary curator of whales at the Queensland Museum because of his studies. He held authority to collect dead whales from all Queensland beaches and in fact received the Queensland Museum medal for his work in researching the eastern Australian humpback whale. The reason I know all of this is because I spent a lot of time over there courting his daughter, staring out to sea looking for a whale blow. There would be days and days where all we would do is drink green tea and look at whales. Eventually we were both successful: he saw whales and I married his daughter!

But he was no woolly-headed idealist. He was pragmatic, informed and realistic. He would see this regulation that increases fees for what it is: nothing more—and this is the key point—than an admission of failure by an incompetent government and a tax grab considered in secrecy and imposed on an unsuspecting public. Make no mistake: this is no altruistic move by the government or some mythical equalisation the minister referred to. It is a stark admission of the failure of the Economic Transition Strategy for Straddie. The fact is that at some stage in the next two to three years the money will run out. The six-year Economic Transition Strategy and the \$27 million assigned to it will come to an end, and everyone will be wondering what to do next because it has not worked.

Despite the glossy brochures, the happy snaps and the self-promotion, Straddie is struggling and businesses are struggling. My family and I go to that island many times a year, and we have seen the vacant shops at Dunwich and the closure of the Reach Out chemist at Point Lookout. The fact that the bakery at Point Lookout and the local street shop down at Dunwich have been for sale for five years is all indicative of the economy falling over because this government's Economic Transition Strategy is not working. You do not have to ask me: I went online and had a look. The one completed project on the Minjerribah Futures website is the Peel Island access project. As stated on the website—

An independent preliminary options report produced by Kellogg Brown & Root, which included the findings of the earlier ... regulatory and financial constraints associated with construction and maintenance of all of the access options investigated. **Based on this report, Peel Island access will remain unchanged at this stage.**

That is the extent of the completed reports. Then I had a look at the Minjerribah Futures website and the Dunwich Master Plan: 'Consultation in 2018. No update provided since.' We are still waiting. Then I had a look at the public transport study being undertaken by the department. Public consultation finished at the end of July 2018: 'Draft public transport study to be introduced before the end of 2019'. How is that going? We are two months away and no-one has heard a word about it. Then I had a look at the Minjerribah Futures Research Program, reports 1 and 2, to see what the major hesitations going over to the island are. The report states—

Improving the Experience

- Online survey panelists who did not intend to visit—

they are the ones you do want to go there—


were asked to suggest improvements that would entice them to visit it. The most common suggestions fell into three key areas (i) improving visitor information; (ii) improving accessibility; and (iii) reducing the cost.

When you go to section 3.2.5, 'Reasons for not visiting', the No. 1 reason, which 13.2 per cent of respondents gave—guess what it is—was 'too expensive'.

This is not a sustainable strategy. This is not a strategy that is driven by a plan. This is not a strategy that addresses business needs. In fact, when I look at the Minjerribah spring update—with a nice picture of the minister on the front there—it says that the second round of visitor research is out now. What do most people come for? We heard the minister talk about the Indigenous experience. What does the report actually say? They mostly come for the beach. For the beach! What is mostly on the beach? Cars driving on the beach going fishing and camping. This states—

Looking to take your business to the next level? The Minjerribah Futures team will be working closely with island businesses ... to understand their business needs and interests.

I would have thought that is pretty simple: customers who spend money. That is what you need for businesses to work over there. This is a tax, nothing more. It is a tax on working families; it is a tax on locals; it is a tax on everyone on the island, Indigenous and non-Indigenous. For that reason it should not be supported in this place.

 **Mr BROWN** (Capalaba—ALP) (6.35 pm): The rewrite of history by those opposite has been spectacular. I have to address a couple of things before I get to my contribution. Guess when the Vance mine closure happened? 2013. Where was the Economic Transition Strategy? Nowhere to be found. Where was the workers' assistance package? Nowhere to be found. Let's go to 2014 when the Yarraman mine closed. Where was the transition strategy then? Nowhere. Where was the workers' assistance package when the workers were sacked? Nowhere. They did not care about Straddie mine workers; they never have. What they did care about is what they got in 2012: donations from Sibelco to help Campbell Newman get elected in Ashgrove, and that is all they have ever cared about when it comes to sandmining at Minjerribah. They did not care when those two mines were closed and when workers were sacked. They did absolutely nothing!

In his contribution the member for Oodgeroo said there was a delay and the loss of 1,100 jobs in Cleveland. Guess where the delay has come from? The federal LNP has delayed environmental assessments when it comes to the Toondah project, but where has the member for Oodgeroo been? Has he picked up the phone to call the federal member for Bowman? No, he has not. Has he picked up the phone to call the federal environment minister? No, he has not. For three years they sat and did nothing with regard to that project, but they come out here and say it is the Labor government's fault for delaying those job programs. Give me a break!

I will turn to the contribution of the member for Broadwater. We went to the first of the reunited Straddie Chamber of Commerce breakfasts, and it was a good occasion. The member for Redlands was there, the member for Oodgeroo was there and so was the federal member for Bowman. It was a round table situation. Guess what businesses raised at that forum? Internet connectivity. I went over there the night before and tried to pay for my accommodation with a credit card. Guess what happened? It did not work. 'The internet is down, sir. Sorry, our EFTPOS machine is not working.' Telecommunications were their No. 1 issue followed by blackspots and mobile drop-off. The third item was facilities such as toilet blocks and rubbish collection. They were the main issues raised by the chamber of commerce, and that is federal government, federal government and local government. That is what they said at that meeting.

I love Straddie. I have been going to Straddie since I was a kid. I have been going there for as long as I can remember and I have enjoyed all of its natural beauty. I was an enthusiastic four-wheel drive owner in my early 20s when I first bought a Jeep Wrangler. I bought a white one and my brother bought a black one and we used to love going over to Straddie.

Mr Minnikin interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): Member for Chatsworth, your interjections are not being taken.

Mr BROWN: We went over to Straddie and many other sand islands—Double Island Point and Fraser as well. We enjoyed the fishing and cruising down Main Beach looking for gutters, and also the inland tracks. Some people do not realise how beautiful Straddie can be from up the top. At over 200 metres above sea level, you can get views to Moreton and the Glass House Mountains and through to the city and down to Jumpinpin. We enjoyed that aspect when we owned four-wheel drives.

I was taken by surprise by the announcement and I did read it in the paper. What I did was make sure that I sat down and consulted with my constituents, that I lobbied with the minister and that I sat down with the Quandamooka leaders. We have invested \$1.4 million back into the island, including the following: \$370,000 into Blue Lake facilities, including a platform, footbridges and an interpretive centre; \$400,000 for the clean-up of Herring Lagoon and a cultural centre; \$105,000 for beach access improvements and the important upgrading of tracks and pullover areas for four-wheel drive access; and \$220,000 for Main Beach and Flinders Beach defined areas. The feedback I got from my local constituents was mixed.

Mr Mander interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Everton, your repeated interjections are not being taken. You are warned.

Mr BROWN: They told me as well about that need for extra funding. For the benefit of the House, I table photos of illegal campsites and the rubbish that is left behind, as well as four-wheel drives on non-four-wheel drive beaches.

Tabled paper: Photographs depicting Stradbroke Island [[1905](#)].

That is what is contributing to these extra costs. I took note of what the member for Gladstone said. Someone has to clean this up. Someone has to enforce these types of measures. I am glad to hear that in the lead-up to Christmas nearly all the camp site permits are taken for Christmas. This has not had an effect on the number of visitors who want to go over there this Christmas and enjoy the island itself.

I have sat down and lobbied with the minister and expressed the concerns and views of my constituents. There are some important things that have come up in those consultations, and that is why I am proud to make this announcement. I note the contribution made by the member for Clayfield, and the government is proud to announce that we are committed to reopening Fisherman's Track to enable access down to the Keyholes. I know how important that track is. That is where this fee is going. It is ensuring that four-wheel drives and the locals on the island—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr BROWN: I do not understand why they are complaining about it. They just asked for it in a contribution and we are going to deliver it. We are going to ensure that the safety upgrades that need to occur on that track will occur. I believe that will be done before Christmas. I am happy to announce that today.


The other announcement I want to make today as a result of the lobbying relates to an issue that is dear to my heart and to a lot of beach fishermen and four-wheel drive enthusiasts. I am talking about the creation of a multi-area vehicle permit. We should work towards ensuring that we are not playing winners and losers, especially for interstate travellers. It costs over \$1,000 a year to get every single permit in the south-east corner. This means we will be able to sit down with the community and the traditional owners and work together to come up with a multi-area vehicle permit. I am glad we can announce that and we are working towards creating that. This will mean that interstate visitors can go to Fraser, Moreton and Straddie and not have to pick winners and losers. That will benefit tourism numbers.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr BROWN: I take the interjection. I do not know how the member for Clayfield knows that figure because he does not know the vehicle access of those four-wheel drive enthusiasts. We need to make sure we open up the areas for beach access. We have the best and most beautiful sand islands across South-East Queensland. We need to ensure we work together to make it attractive to go to all of these places. I am glad we are announcing that commitment today.

Those opposite have come in here and have tried to drum this up as a big new tax and that it is an outrage. It is going towards four-wheel drive enthusiasts and beach fishing enthusiasts for increased infrastructure and increased facilities. I do not support the disallowance motion moved by the member for Broadwater.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: For the benefit of the House, I note that those members on a warning are the members for Oodgeroo and Everton.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (6.45 pm): It was with some grimacing that we had to sit through the contribution of the poor member for Capalaba. I have to assure the member that it is great you can go against a party to get all those wonderful announcements for the electorate. It is great to see the pork-barrelling is back to where it needs to be. I want to go back to some of the contributions. There is no way you can spin that this new big tax is somehow going to solve the problems of all the inland tracks and pay for all this infrastructure. As the member for Clayfield said, anyone who spends any time on any of our beaches in any of our national parks will know that the money is not hitting the ground.

For example, I can tell the House that the roads on Fraser Island have only got increasingly worse over 20 years. The environmental degradation continues. For years, not one cent has been spent on the tracks that we bump along on. They talk about deaths over there. There is no way that you can justify and try to spin a yarn that this is somehow going to fix the Quandamooka people's lot or, more importantly, the lot of four-wheel drivers.

With access to some of the best beaches in the world, who wouldn't want to get out there and go on an off-road adventure with friends and family? Beach driving is a great adventure and provides affordable holidays for many Queenslanders. That same opportunity has now got a lot more expensive with the new Stradbroke Island tax. That is why I am supporting the disallowance motion on this subordinate legislation. It should be disallowed because it is a bad tax and will create a bad situation for all involved.

In Queensland, we are lucky to enjoy a number of great sandy driving locations. Many of these popular recreation areas are within or adjacent to national parks. From North Straddie all the way up to Fraser Island, we are always subject to the department's influence—an ever-increasing influence in our lives. This new Straddie tax is going to have a big effect on tourism and jobs on the island, as has been said here this evening. Can members believe that there was no consultation with businesses, residents or families who enjoyed the connection with Straddie? Worse still, the local council was left in the dark. I believe that Labor are so quick to increase taxes and charges on everyday Queenslanders that they do not even know what good governance or consultation is. Many have spoken out about this new tax; it is not just us on this side. The owner of Straddie Kingfisher Tours, Dave, said that people who had been visiting the island for 20 years had previously told him this would be the last year they would visit because of the increasing costs.

Labor's tax will drive up costs for the island's residents and drive away the visitors and the local experience. This is another problem that this long-suffering community is dealing with, including the botched transition from sand mining. We have heard many times in this place over the last five years about the problems associated with the North Stradbroke Island transition when the mine shuts down. There may be some administrative reason being used to justify this big new tax, but slugging the island with taxes is not an economic strategy. It does not grow tourism numbers or create jobs, and it certainly does not create an environment of hope for the future. That hope included promises of a \$5 million transition fund back in 2016 for workers on Straddie. We know now that only 10 per cent has been allocated. We have to wonder what is going on.

I know the member for Capalaba tried to spin a yarn this afternoon. However, honourable members should remember that the member for Capalaba slammed his own government on Twitter saying it was a poor decision that goes against everything that would attract tourism.

I turn now to the Redlands mayor, Councillor Karen Williams. I do not know the mayor, but I believe she is a lot more attuned to the community than some of those members who have made a contribution this evening. She said that the decision was symptomatic of a government not understanding the need to engage with the community. That is pretty damning evidence from a mayor who obviously understands the true ramifications.

Issues of increased costs to access our many beaches in Queensland are nothing new, but there is a common theme of successive Labor governments in terms of revenue raising. Many of us who enjoy recreational activities on our beaches and national parks can attest that they are not maintaining those sand roads or providing the infrastructure in a lot of those key areas. It is important to discuss the fees and the taxes because we have issues on Straddie and many others areas in Queensland that need attention. If we are going to get revenue from a big new tax, let's deal with some of the areas and challenges that should be addressed.


On behalf of those four-wheel-drive clubs that have approached us, I say that we need to deal with vehicle sizes on roads. Larger vehicles cause a lot more damage. Axle loading impacts heavily on the sand roads, and road maintenance has been spun here this evening. I can assure honourable members that there has been a lot of exacerbation in terms of the amount of sedimentation runoff, particularly in those areas that are not being maintained and have not been maintained for a long time.


We know that in Queensland there are plenty of new taxes. Who would worry about another new tax on top of the \$3.5 billion worth that Queenslanders are already being slugged? Along with the big new Straddie tax we could talk about the LNG royalties, \$500 million; three separate land tax hikes, \$1 billion; payroll tax, half a million dollars; betting tax, \$366 million; property investors tax, \$132 million; car tax—and on it goes. Who could forget the waste levy of \$1.3 billion? The cost of doing business in Queensland is now getting too expensive, and we know that. With 10 new taxes ripping all these billions of dollars out of the community, what else could the people of Straddie expect?

We have to oppose the government continually putting out its hand. I cannot believe how many times we hear that we can afford to pay a little bit more. We have guaranteed no new taxes, something of which we are really proud. It was interesting that earlier members talked about Sibelco and about the Quandamooka people. We all have a transition goal and aspiration that we share. However, I cannot believe that the 300 Sibelco workers are now down to a hundred and only 10 per cent of the transition money has flowed. That is really despicable.

There have been conversations tonight about comparable fees. We know that the businesses are going to do it really tough. The government cannot keep dealing with this economy in this way. This transition is failing. The utilisation experience is already too expensive, as we have heard tonight. It is really important that we get back to basics about what is good taxation or good areas of expertise in our national parks.

I have to say again tonight that the government could have spoken a lot more seriously about the implications of this instead of trying to spin a yarn that somehow the maintenance of the island or the opportunities for the Quandamooka people are going to be better, because clearly that is not the case. Evidence points out that we are not even on the right track in terms of what are the economic drivers for Straddie. As we know, this is a big, new tax on Queenslanders. It should be disallowed for all the right reasons.

 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algera—ALP) (Minister for Environment and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister for Science and Minister for the Arts) (6.52 pm): Under standing order 260 and on advice from the Clerk of the Parliament, I declare that I am a Quandamooka woman, a fact that I have already declared in my record of interests and I declare now for the House.

 **Hon. SM FENTIMAN** (Waterford—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Small Business and Minister for Training and Skills Development) (6.52 pm): I rise in opposition to the disallowance motion moved by the member for Broadwater. We have heard here tonight the LNP's scare campaign about a threefold increase. Let me reassure the people of the House and those families—those mums and dads—who go on their camping trip once a year to Straddie that they will pay less than \$5 more. This is what this new fee means. It means that mums and dads, ordinary families, who go on their annual camping holiday will be paying less than \$5 more.

I want to be very clear about this because the opposition are running a campaign that somehow this means—and we have heard it here tonight—that mums and dads who love their fishing will now not be able to afford to go camping for their annual holiday. We have introduced a new monthly permit, which means that those mums and dads who go once a year will be paying less than \$5 more. Those regular visitors, those four-wheel drive enthusiasts that we spoke about, who want to buy an annual permit will be paying more. As we have heard from the member for Capalaba, there is a desperate need to reinvest in the infrastructure for four-wheel drives and the camping facilities on Straddie.

This is the first comprehensive fee review in nearly a decade. Over the past two years we have seen an increase of over 1,000 new permits for North Stradbroke Island. We have heard reports from visitors complaining of more and more rubbish being left behind by an increasing number of campers. These fee increases are necessary to maintain and improve facilities for visitors and tourists.

I want to again reassure the House that a permit is not required to visit beautiful Minjerribah and the amazing attractions it has to offer. I absolutely refute the argument from the opposition that this is a great new tax. This decision was made to make the fees on North Stradbroke Island comparable to other recreation areas in South-East Queensland. As Minister Lynham said, Moreton Island has an annual permit of \$265 and Bribie costs \$50 for one week. These new fees will mean that it is still more affordable to go four-wheel driving on Straddie than on any other sand island. As I said, for most families the increase will be less than \$5.

I reject the claims that the change in permitting arrangements is a tourism tax grab. The costs of managing the recreation and protected areas still far outweigh the revenues generated. I also want to take this opportunity to reassure members of the House that the fees collected through vehicle access permits are invested directly back into the management of the recreation area. In fact, that is a requirement under the Recreation Areas Management Act. Typically, in recreation areas the fees are used by Parks and Wildlife Service to deliver the infrastructure that four-wheel drivers and campers require. However, as we have heard in the debate tonight, the Quandamooka people through their company Minjerribah Camping now collect those permit fees and reinvest that revenue back into the recreation area. These fees will mean they can employ more rangers. That means they can do more compliance activity to make sure that our campers are doing the right thing. We saw the member for Capalaba table some of the concerns that his constituents have had with the behaviour of some of the campers. Of course, we have also heard from the member for Capalaba about some of the fantastic spend that this government is investing to improve the wonderful recreational areas for tourists.

We are investing \$1.4 million in the next financial year across the island's protected areas because we want tourists to enjoy beautiful Stradbroke Island. This will include improvements to beach access for four-wheel drives and upgrades to Main and Flinders beach camp sites. That is underway right now and will be complete in time for Christmas when mums and dads go for their annual beach holiday, and they will only pay less than \$5 more. Over the next 12 months new projects include improved vehicle access, track maintenance, new walking tracks, upgrades to the lookout, improved—

Mr Nicholls: A walking track with vehicle access?

Ms FENTIMAN: I take that interjection from the member for Clayfield. This is the investment to make it a more attractive place to visit for all tourists. It involves upgrades to the four-wheel drive tracks, but it also involves upgrades to lookouts. It also involves improved access to Brown Lake. It also

involves improved facilities at Blue Lake. As we have heard from the member for Capalaba, we will be reopening the Keyholes track before the end of this year. These fees mean that we can properly invest in the infrastructure that tourists and four-wheel drivers alike want to see on this beautiful island. It will mean that in the next few months four-wheel drivers will be able to safely access another part of Straddie that has been a favourite in the past. It is something that we have heard tonight that the opposition have called for and the member for Capalaba responded almost immediately to say, 'We're absolutely onto it. We're doing it and these fee increases make it possible.'

As we have also heard from the member for Capalaba, we are committed to creating a multi area vehicle permit in consultation with traditional owners and the community. This came up at my recent meeting with Shane Rose, the president of Four Wheel Drive Queensland. He said many of his members are very passionate about working with us to create one permit for multiple recreation areas. He is also very keen to work with us and QYAC on involving his members in volunteer activities to help improve tracks and to make sure that they can assist with clean-ups. Mr Rose was very pleased to hear of the investment we are making on Straddie and how the members who travel regularly to the island will soon be benefitting from better four-wheel drive access tracks and camping facilities. We will continue to work with Four Wheel Drive Queensland to ensure their members can continue to safely explore the beautiful sands of North Stradbroke Island.


In relation to consultation, I take members opposite back to their consultation when they decided to reverse ending sandmining on Stradbroke Island—which was none. In relation to the member for Maroochydore's contribution, she has her maths wrong again; in fact, 26 employees of Sibelco were made redundant, not 150. She has the numbers wrong again. I absolutely oppose this motion. These fares will mean better facilities for tourists, better access for our four-wheel drivers and better camping facilities for our families. For our families travelling once a year, it will cost less than \$5.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Pugh): The time for the debate has expired.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Correction to *Record of Proceedings*

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (7.00 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising under standing order 248. I made an interjection when the member for Capalaba was talking regarding the number of visitors to the island. I said that 95 per cent of people come from within 50 kilometres of the island. That was incorrect. In fact, 93.2 per cent of visitors are from Queensland and 76 per cent come from within 50 kilometres of the island. I wish to correct the record.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Clayfield.

RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT (FEES) AMENDMENT REGULATION

Disallowance of Statutory Instrument

Resumed.

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

AYES, 38:

LNP, 36—Bates, Batt, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyce, Crandon, Crisafulli, Frecklington, Hart, Hunt, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Lister, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, Mickelberg, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Purdie, Robinson, Rowan, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Watts, Weir, Wilson.

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.

ADJOURNMENT

Southern Downs Electorate, Drought

 **Mr LISTER** (Southern Downs—LNP) (7.06 pm): I rise in the House tonight to speak about the issue of drought in Southern Downs. One of the tragedies of the drought in Southern Downs and all over my electorate is that many residents live outside of the towns and rely on tank water for their drinking water supply. Of course, when there is no rain there is no inflow to the tanks. When that is added to the fact that many people who live outside the towns have spent all of their funds trying to keep their stock alive—and have had no income at the same time—their situation is particularly difficult.

I express my sincere thanks to the charities in Southern Downs that do such great work getting water and other supplies to those in need.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, there is way too much noise in the chamber. I ask members to leave the chamber quietly in order to hear the speaker on his feet.

Mr LISTER: The difficulty is that the charities involved need support. As I mentioned in a debate last week, I have asked for state government assistance to one particular charity, Granite Belt Water Relief, in providing material and transport support. This was based on a request I had received from the charity in which it was said that its purpose was to help Granite Belt rural residents who cannot afford or do not have access to clean drinking water. For the benefit of the House I table that document, along with the charity registration for Granite Belt Water Relief.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 September 2019, from the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, to the Premier and Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, regarding drinking water to residents in the Stanthorpe area [[1906](#)].

Tabled paper: Document, undated, from the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission webpage titled 'Granite Belt Drought Appeal' [[1907](#)].


The reply I received from the Premier suggested that there was a misunderstanding in that the request applied to drinking water for the town. There was a refusal on that basis plus a suggestion that the task was not one suitable for assistance from the Australian Defence Force, one of my suggestions. Coming as I do from the Air Force, I know that at RAAF base Amberley the Air Force and Army have a lot of water trucks and a lot of equipment. I would have thought that might be appropriate.

During the debate I made a number of remarks about the mayor of Southern Downs Regional Council. I regret that I did so. I withdraw those comments and apologise to her. I express my great concern that council and the state government could be doing a lot more to help Granite Belt Water Relief. I table the letter I received in reply from the Premier.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 25 September 2019, from the Premier and the Minister for Trade, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, to the member for Southern Downs, Mr James Lister MP, regarding drinking water to residents in the Stanthorpe area [[1908](#)].

I ask that the Premier reconsider on the basis of the request being for water for those out of town. I will be very happy to assist in any way I can to put government in touch with this particular charity to assist it in its great work for those desperate people who need water for their stock and for their tanks.

Redlands Electorate

 **Ms RICHARDS** (Redlands—ALP) (7.09 pm): The Redlands coast has more islands than just Minjerribah. We have our beautiful southern Moreton Bay islands. Last week I had the opportunity to be briefed on the new ferry terminal upgrades. The Palaszczuk government is delivering \$34.1 million of ferry terminals with Redland City Council. We are working in partnership to upgrade and open up gateways and opportunities for those who want to come and visit our islands. They are spectacular. The designs were terrific. We had in the architects and the engineers giving us this briefing. So far, the feedback from our communities has been terrific as well. They are very excited. The Russell Island jetty will be first underway, and its existing jetty infrastructure will be retained for recreational boating, fishing and all the things that people love coming to our islands to do. That is really fantastic news. That will be great for passengers, too, and for the close to 10,000 people who live across those islands.

Also last week I had the pleasure of joining with Minister Ryan. Two new police officers for Russell Island started three weeks ago, and last week we had the commissioning ceremony for our beautiful new barge and jet boat. It was a really lovely and fitting tribute. The jet boat has been named after fallen officer Sondra Lena and the barge after fallen officer Stewart Kerlin. It was a terrific event and it was lovely to talk to Sondra's mum, Sandy. Sondra's locket is on display inside that barge. It is terrific.


A week and a half ago Mental Health Week was celebrated on the islands. Our BIMSARA guys put together a fantastic day on Russell Island. Heaps of people came out. There was a great sausage sizzle and great performances, kids were playing sport—all of those things we need to do to make sure our people have better mental health. I also give a shout-out to Ken Meldrum. He was instrumental in arranging a whole range of events across Redlands.

AITC, our trade college, held their employer night. It was great to be out there to talk about all of the great work our Palaszczuk government is doing in delivering free apprenticeship and traineeship costs to employers. The feedback there was fantastic. Employers know that they will be able to put on more apprentices and trainees. This is great work from our government, delivering jobs in our community. Principal Toni and the team are also doing a fantastic job.

We are heading into the end of the school year. Christmas is fast approaching. Santa is not that far away. I know that everybody in this chamber has a lot of graduation ceremonies coming up. It is World Teachers Day. I give a massive shout-out to all of my teachers. As all of our year 12s are getting ready to finish this year, I remind them about the free TAFE opportunity—another initiative of the Palaszczuk government. This government is absolutely 100 per cent focused on delivering jobs for people in our communities. You really could not ask for more effort in that space. I know that our young people and our employers are grateful.

(Time expired)

Rite Journey; Polished Man


 **Mr BATT** (Bundaberg—LNP) (7.12 pm): Two Fridays ago my electorate office was overflowing with 60 year 9 students from Bundaberg Christian College as they spent the day out and about in our community. Their visit to my office was part of the Rite Journey, a unique year-long school program designed to develop responsible, respectful and resilient adults. As part of the challenge, the students visited a number of local businesses and service providers in order to work on their personal communication skills and their ability to ask difficult questions. The students visited me in 10 groups of six, and each student introduced themselves with a firm handshake and asked me what services my office provides, what challenges we face, what values I look for in an employee and what advice I would give to positively influence a young person in their shoes. I explained my role and what kinds of matters my office deals with on a day-to-day basis. I also explained that I believe it is so important to always be honest, to be adaptable and to follow your heart.

One young man asked me why one of my fingernails was painted blue, which presented me with a fantastic opportunity to tell the students a bit about the Polished Man campaign, a movement that seeks to raise awareness and funding to help stop violence against children. Worldwide one child dies every five minutes as a result of violence, and that is one too many. The young man's question is exactly why the Polished Man campaign encourages people to paint one fingernail for the month of October and why I have been proud to do this myself. Fingernails spark conversations and conversations inspire donations, which then allow for trauma recovery and trauma prevention to take place around the world. In fact, my polished nail has sparked quite a lot of questions and interest around the halls of parliament in the past two weeks, so the campaign is obviously working.

While I am on my feet I would like to give a shout-out to Bundy's Polished Pub Rock Choirboys—Ken Venus, Lester Lewis and Adrian Brookes—who have been working hard over the past few months to raise awareness of this very important cause. On 11 October they hosted a sold-out fundraising event at Bundaberg's amazing Oodies Cafe and raised over \$2,800 for the Polished Man campaign. Gentlemen, it is a credit to you to dedicate your time and efforts to this very worthwhile cause, and I thank you.

I would also to thank the Bundaberg Christian College for inviting me to take part in their Rite Journey program. It was a pleasure to sit down with each of the students and talk to them about what I do and what I think is important in their journey in life. For a young person in this complex world, asking questions and engaging with people you do not know can be really daunting. The students all did a fantastic job, and I hope my contribution was beneficial.

Gold Coast, Infrastructure

 **Ms SCANLON** (Gaven—ALP) (7.15 pm): Economists are calling for the federal government to partner with states like ours to green-light shovel-ready infrastructure projects to stimulate the economy. On the Gold Coast we have a number of projects ready to go because of our government's planning work. On top of the work happening to upgrade the Oxenford interchange at exit 57 and the four M1 upgrades, we have committed nearly \$100 million to upgrade the Yatala exit 41 and Pimpama exit 49.

We all remember the dispute we had with the federal government over M1 funding. We came to a decision which was a fifty-fifty split. We have put 50 per cent of the funds on the table for these two exits, but unfortunately now the federal government has contributed only 25 per cent. On the light rail stage 3A to Burleigh we have committed \$351 million, which is nearly half of the total cost. Unfortunately, again we are seeing the lowest contribution ever from the federal government—only 16 per cent. We are not asking them to match us on this particular project. We are only asking for what they contributed for stage 1 of the light rail.

I understand that the Premier has written to the Morrison government in relation to these projects, asking for more investment in the Gold Coast from the Morrison government. I urge those opposite to stand up for our community and do the same. I do not have an awful lot of faith, given their track record. After not a single new dollar was spent on the M1 under the previous LNP government, Campbell Newman's assistant treasurer, Deb Frecklington, bizarrely made a comment in the *Albert & Logan News* earlier this month, now blaming our government for fixing the M1, saying that we should instead focus on the second M1. It is absurd to say that this government is wasting time fixing something that they ignored for more than three years. Unlike those opposite, we can actually do two things at once. We are widening the M1 from Mudgeeraba to Varsity Lakes and then we are widening it all the way down to Tugun as well as progressing the planning works and business case for the second M1, with money allocated in this year's budget.

I am a little uncertain about what the LNP's position is on the second M1, because it keeps changing. First they stopped the project from progressing when they were last in government. Then they decided, when they were kicked out of power, that they wanted it but did not actually allocate enough money to build the thing. Now they are trying to slow it down before the shovel is even in the ground—


Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Coomera and member for Burleigh, if you wish to speak during this adjournment debate, seek the call. Otherwise cease your interjections.

Ms SCANLON:—with the member for Theodore now calling for the second M1 to be an 80-kilometre road, only to have the LNP deputy leader, on the same day, travel down to the Gold Coast to say that he disagreed with his own team member on that position. It is incredibly embarrassing. They are a dog's breakfast when it comes to infrastructure on the Gold Coast. Frankly, we need MPs who will advocate for fair funding. I certainly hope that we start to see that from the federal government, that we can come to a resolution and get Gold Coasters home sooner.

Gold Coast, Crime


 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (7.18 pm): Crime is out of control under this Palaszczuk government. We saw this play out yesterday in Townsville and, sadly, in my electorate of Burleigh it played out over the weekend. On Friday night I was out at an event. I came home at about eight o'clock and sat on the lounge with my wife to watch the news and catch up with daily events. Just after nine o'clock my wife muted our television and said, 'Did you hear that? That was gunshots.' A few minutes later we started to hear sirens.

Unfortunately, that noise that we heard was the ending of somebody's life within close range of my house. Two men lost their lives that night—two men whom we now find were members of the Comanchero bikie group. This government needs to take responsibility for changes that it made which softened the law around bikies. When the LNP put in place those laws—the VLAD laws—we drove the bikies out of this state, yet now they are back with a vengeance. In 2016 the Palaszczuk government introduced its soft organised crime laws. There are 28 declared bikie gangs in Queensland and we are finding that these consorting laws just do not work. Villains gang member Harley Barbaro successfully challenged Labor's consorting notice legislation in the Southport Magistrates Court in March of this year. Not one consorting notice has been issued ever since. This means that bikies can consort whenever they like and, apparently over the weekend on Friday night, they were consorting in my electorate and I do not want them there.

Under this government, the spending on our police force is down and crime is up. In fact, assaults on the Gold Coast are up 117 per cent, shop stealing is up 87 per cent, robbery has increased by 68 per cent, unlawful use of a motor vehicle is up 52 per cent and on the weekend murder was up by at least two people, and my understanding is that the police are now looking for a third person who may have

been involved in that and may have been wounded as well. It is only the LNP that will be tough on crime. The Labor Party is completely soft on crime and the people of Queensland deserve better. They deserve an LNP government.

Townsville Electorate, Education Week


 **Mr STEWART** (Townsville—ALP) (7.21 pm): Happy Education Week! I know that many members in this House love visiting the schools in their electorates, and the member for Bundaberg spoke very finely about the kids who came to visit him. It is the same with me. I went to Railway Estate State School on Friday and it was a bit of a special day because that was a school affected by floods. Flooding destroyed one of its playgrounds, but it was a playground previously made out of Koppers logs and the termites had decided that they would get amongst it and, unfortunately, it was not able to be repaired. I was able to talk to the minister and she gave the school \$100,000 to build a brand-new playground. I went to the opening of that playground and saw kids on that playground, and those kids were so happy. They could not stop climbing over the apparatus. They thought this was the absolute bee's knees.

Mr Crandon: Did you get on with them?

Mr STEWART: If I went on the slippery slide I think I might break it, so I left it up to the kids. These are the fine things that we do in each of our electorates. When we can deliver little simple projects like this where we see smiles on kids' faces, it is worth what we do. When I listen to a lot of members in this House they are married to teachers or they knew a teacher at some stage because they taught them how to read and write. The teachers that we have in our lives each and every day—and some of us are married to them, but fortunately I am not; my daughter is a teacher as well, member for Burleigh—play an important role in our lives. They really shape our kids.

When I was working in the industry, in high school particularly, time and time again some of the most stabilising people in kids' lives were teachers. There were a number of times that kids would go to teachers about some really personal advice—beyond what they would get from their parents. They were looking for someone who would give them that advice for life. Sometimes they would ask them some really tough questions like, 'When's the right time to have sex?' Those are some of the things that kids rely on our teachers for. This week is Education Week and I thank each and every teacher who has walked into a classroom and who has impacted upon the lives of our kids right across our communities since the day dot when Queensland was declared a state. I also want to thank each and every minister—both current and previous—who has had an impact on shaping education across the state because I think they have done an outstanding job as well.

Drought Assistance

 **Mr KATTER** (Traeger—KAP) (7.24 pm): Recently the Premier, as I understand it, was talking to Alan Jones about the drought and discussing the effect of the federal government and the Premier made the assertion, 'I'd look at anything I could to help people in drought.' I want to offer the parliament and the Premier some suggestions of what we should be doing, and I think I can say this with some authority. I chaired the Rural Debt and Drought Taskforce in the last parliament and have made a personal study of it for a number of years, so it is something pretty close to me. The government quite generously gave close to an \$80 million package towards that and some things were done in that period, but I want to put on record what could be done right now to help these people in drought. It is a massive issue and I think there has been some complacency by the federal MPs who represent those areas because there seems to be an attitude that keeps coming up that perhaps these people just need to learn to move on.


I do not care how good a producer you are: if you are hit with seven or eight years of no rain, you deserve to be there but you cannot. That is exactly what governments are for—that is, to iron out the bumps for those people to keep them there. It is not a fluid industry where they will move out and another good producer with equal experience will just move in. Communities are very fragile in those areas and so we need to be careful how we manage this issue. We need to look at this industry as a very precious resource, as are the participants in it. If we let them fall over, that is a big problem for everyone. I do not think this parliament and successive governments have really given enough weight and consideration to what happens if we do not nurture or look after these industries and iron out those bumps.

I have a few ideas on what needs to be done and what can be done. Firstly, we need a reconstruction board, and we have done a bill on this issue before in Queensland. The loan facilities that are there at the moment are of no value. They are not much beyond what the normal banks can

provide, but with a reconstruction board it would be different. We sold the last one in Queensland for something like \$1.5 billion. It was a benefit to the taxpayers. At the moment there are still people in south-west Queensland paying eight per cent or nine per cent. They are decent producers. The government can put them on four per cent or five per cent and still make a profit for the taxpayer but get these people out of trouble and carry them through this tough time.

Governments cannot access cheap molasses, tyres or diesel; they can access cheap money and provide that to those people. That is a cost-effective way for the taxpayer to help those people in trouble right now. If they are not paying a big debt, they can go into debt to try to get themselves out of trouble. That is something that can be done. The mulga lands can also be addressed. There is a resource there sitting dormant. Let them access these. There needs to be greater flexibility around the use of that mulga. The Premier alluded to that. If we do that, that is a free resource for the taxpayer and those producers that is sitting there right now. It is something that can be done immediately. I urge the Premier to take that matter into her hands to help save some of these people.

Yatala Enterprise Area, M1

 **Mrs McMAHON** (Macalister—ALP) (7.27 pm): I stand here as a member of government determined to fight for jobs for residents in my area, and one of the largest geographic employment areas for Macalister residents is the Yatala Enterprise Area just over the river. The Yatala Enterprise Area is home to many large national and international manufacturing and construction support industries as well as transport and warehousing industries. The major arterials for the Yatala Enterprise Area are the Stapylton Jacobs Well Road and Stanmore Road, with the M1's exit 41 being the primary feeder for businesses along these arterials.

Exit 41 has not kept up with the growth of the industrial area and on any given business day during regular commuting hours traffic both north and south bound on the M1 will be backed up from the exit and on to the M1. Often for hundreds of metres vehicles will be pulled over in the emergency lanes prior to the exits. This is a massive safety risk for those vehicles and users of the M1, so of course these exits have become a political football. The cost to upgrade both exits 41 and 49 has been costed at just under \$200 million. The federal government announced in February this year with much fanfare a \$50 million commitment to the exit upgrades, so a quarter of the cost.

Mr Crandon interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Coomera, you are warned under the standing orders for the second time today, and I have already given you some guidance during this adjournment debate.


Mrs McMAHON: Mind you, that \$50 million is spread out over a four-year period. I could go on about how for some reason here in Queensland this major component of a freight highway only attracts a fifty-fifty federal and state funding split whereas in New South Wales the feds kick in 80 per cent, but, no, here in Queensland our taxpayers have to stump up to cover the costs for the fed's stinginess.

The federal government has also had the gall to turn around and demand that the state government make its contribution. We did. We put the whole—close to \$100 million—on the table in the state budget back in June. That is our fifty-fifty—our whole 50 per cent. This government is ready and our commuters are ready and waiting for these upgrades.

The Palaszczuk Labor government commenced the design work to upgrade the exit some time ago. We have already spent \$1.1 million designing this upgrade. Now, we have a shovel-ready project. The federal government keeps calling on the states to provide shovel-ready projects. Exit 41 is ready and waiting for the federal government's missing cash. Businesses, hesitant to expand and grow jobs, will not do so until they have that vital transport infrastructure, which is needed to support their business plans, locked in place.

If the Morrison government is serious about jobs, if the Morrison government is serious about supporting infrastructure for our growing communities and if the Morrison government is serious about supporting Queensland businesses, it will release the outstanding \$40 million and get the exit 41 upgrade started before the year is out. Many of the residents of my electorate utilise the Yatala Enterprise Area for travelling to and from work. This is a safety issue and more than just a political football. We need to see that extra cash to make sure that the residents of my electorate can get to work safely.

Coomera Railway Station

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (7.30 pm): I rise to update the House on issues relating to Coomera Railway Station. Recently, I wrote to the minister asking what he is doing with the \$15 million that the federal government committed on 18 May in relation to Coomera station. For the benefit of members, I table my correspondence to the minister.

Tabled paper: Email, dated 12 July 2019, from the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, to the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding the upgrade of the Coomera Railway Station [1909].

Five weeks later I received a response from the minister, in which he says—

... park 'n' ride ... facilities will play a key role in supporting the future transport task.

He is absolutely right. The response states further—

As mentioned in my letter of 11 December 2018—

six months prior—

... the Department of Transport and Main Roads ... is undertaking a planning study to investigate opportunities to improve access to Coomera station, including PnR expansion and bus facilities.

...

It should be noted that any potential PnR expansion and bus improvements will be subject to further design funding availability and statewide prioritisation of transport infrastructure investments.

I table the response.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 15 August 2019, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, Hon. Mark Bailey, to the member for Coomera, Mr Michael Crandon MP, regarding the upgrade of the Coomera Railway Station [1910].

There is \$15 million sitting there from the federal government waiting for this minister to do something with it. What have we seen now? This is one example. I have a photo of one of the people who has parked in a particular location. I table that for the benefit of members.

Tabled paper: Photograph of a car parked under an overpass [1911].

It is a very safe area for people to park. Indeed, just recently Queensland Rail told me that TransLink is no longer issuing fines because it understands the issues at Coomera Railway Station.


I wanted officers of Queensland Rail to meet with me on site so that I could show them where we could improve the parking—where we could probably get another 40 car parks out of the existing location. They could not meet with me. They referred me to the Department of Transport and Main Roads. I have been asking the minister for several weeks now to meet. His office keeps on saying, 'We'll get back to you.' In fact, I received feedback five weeks ago. The last response from his office was, 'We get a lot of emails, you know.' That is where the situation is at. I am still waiting, which is fairly typical of this minister.

But wait, it gets worse. The Department of Transport and Main Roads no longer issues fines, so now the Gold Coast city council has stepped in and people are copping fines from the council. I have an example where a resident was hit with a \$106 penalty. Wait for it: it says it is for stopping a vehicle on a footpath or nature strip in a built-up area. This so-called built-up area is inside the railway station area. As indicated, it is a perfectly safe location.

The bottom line is that that issue needs to be fixed. The minister has been given \$15 million to fix it and he says that any potential park-and-ride improvements are subject to funding availability. I say to the minister that the money is there. If the LNP wins government next year, it will fix Coomera Railway Station.

(Time expired)

Education Week; World Teachers' Day

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (7.33 pm): This week is State Education Week. It is a great opportunity for me to acknowledge my son, Callum, who graduated this year with a Master of Teaching. I congratulate Callum. He has a really proud mum. Callum is teaching at Aviation State High School at Hendra and he is loving his new job in this fast-paced environment at a state-of-the-art, great school specialising in aviation. Callum, like all teachers across our great state, works hard to give our kids great educational outcomes. I thank him and all the teachers across the state—in particular, of course, on the bayside—given that it is World Teachers' Day on Friday.

I want to tell the House how proud I was to hear Minister Grace earlier today tell us that the Queensland Department of Education had been honoured by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching in the United States of America. The department was only one of three recipients from around the world to receive this prestigious award. I say congratulations and, may I say, very well deserved, because I know how hard each and every member of the department works.

There is no better time than this week to reflect on Queensland's education sector, with the Palaszczuk government delivering on its ironclad commitment to give every child a great start and a world-class education. Across the bayside, our kids are really benefiting from this commitment by the Palaszczuk government, with new buildings growing right in front of their eyes.

Lota State School has seen over \$1.3 million in investment to refurbish learning areas and to build a new prep building with two learning centres. The very much loved Darling Point Special School, under the great leadership of Charmaine Driver, is well into planning for the new \$1 million building for general learning areas. Right across the bayside schools are benefiting—from \$300,000 to Wondall Heights State School for a new outdoor learning centre and over \$800,000 across local schools for maintenance and minor works. These projects mean not only that our kids' schools continue to be the best in the state but also jobs. Investing in infrastructure means jobs for local tradies, chippies, plumbers, sparkies, painters and landscapers.

I thank all teachers. I wish them all a fabulous World Teachers' Day. Finally, I congratulate Callum on choosing such a worthy and important profession. I know that he will bring so much to his students with his generosity of spirit, his good nature and passion for state education.

The House adjourned at 7.36 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Andrew, Bailey, Bates, Batt, Bennett, Berkman, Bleijie, Bolton, Boothman, Boyce, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Costigan, Crandon, Crawford, Crisafulli, D'Ath, Dametto, de Brenni, Dick, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hart, Healy, Hinchliffe, Howard, Hunt, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lister, Lui, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McDonald, McMahon, McMillan, Mellish, Mickelberg, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mullen, Nicholls, O'Connor, O'Rourke B, O'Rourke C, Palaszczuk, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pugh, Purdie, Richards, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Scanlon, Simpson, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Trad, Watts, Weir, Whiting, Wilson