**PROOF ISSN** 1322-0330

# RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

**Hansard Home Page:** http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard
**E-mail:** hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
Phone: (07) 3406 7314 Fax: (07) 3210 0182

Subject **FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT** Page

## Wednesday, 22 August 2012



FS SIMPSON
SPEAKER

N J LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

L J OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents — Wednesday, 22 August 2012

# WEDNESDAY, 22 AUGUST 2012

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

Madam Speaker (Hon. Fiona Simpson, Maroochydore) read prayers and took the chair.

## PRIVILEGE

### Correction and Apology

**Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (2.02 pm): Yesterday in question time I was asked about courthouses and I referred to 73 courthouses and centres in Queensland being closed by the Labor Party. I do apologise to members and correct the record. It was in fact not 73; it was 79. I do apologise to members for that mistake in my calculations.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

**Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (2.02 pm): Yesterday morning in this chamber the Leader of the Opposition declared that the Minister for Housing and Public Works has planned to close three government owned caravan parks. The minister has at no stage announced any plans to close the parks in question and has made it clear, both in this chamber and in the media, that his plans do not involve closure. As such, I believe that the opposition leader's remarks constitute a deliberate and cynical misleading of the parliament. I therefore ask you to refer the matter to the Ethics Committee.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Hervey Bay, please write to me about that matter.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

**Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (2.03 pm): Yesterday morning the member for Bundamba asked a question of the Minister for Housing and Public Works. In it she alleged that the residents of the Lazy Acres Caravan Park were about to be sent into the street. The government's plans do not involve the closure of the caravan park in question and, as such, any suggestion that residents will be forced onto the streets is deceptive and misleading. I believe that the member has misled the parliament and I request that you refer the matter to the Ethics Committee.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Hervey Bay, please write to me about that matter.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Ministers

**Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (2.03 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege regarding the answer given by the honourable the Premier to a question without notice asked by the Leader of the Opposition on 21 June 2012 and a statement made on 11 July 2012 during debate on the Waste Reduction and Recycling Amendment Regulation (No. 1) where the Premier referred to debt of $100 billion. I will be writing to you regarding this as it may be a case of misleading. I also will be raising with you a matter of privilege regarding the Deputy Premier in subsequent debates, as well as the Minister for Police and Community Safety.

## PRIVILEGE

### Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier

**Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (2.04 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege regarding an answer given by the Premier on 1 August 2012 in response to a question without notice asked by the member for Woodridge. In his response to the question the Premier made a number of comments about the

former Labor government's record on roads and public transport infrastructure. I believe that the Premier may have misled the House and his comments may constitute a breach of standing order 266(2) and a contempt of parliament. In light of the significance of this issue, I will draw this matter to your attention for referral by you to the Ethics Committee for further advice. I will be writing to you in this regard.

## PRIVILEGE

### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by the Premier

**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 1 June 2012 I received a complaint from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt, about a statement made to the House by the Premier in answer to a question without notice from the member for Woodridge. I table relevant correspondence regarding this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 1 June 2012, from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP, to the Speaker regarding statements by the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the House on 29 May 2012 [757].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 15 June 2012, from the Premier, Hon. Campbell Newman, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [758].

I will not be referring the matter to the Ethics Committee. I seek leave to have incorporated the statement circulated in my name regarding this matter.

Leave granted.

Allegation of reflection on the Chair and the House

On 1 June 2012 I received a complaint from the Leader of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt, about a statement made to the House by the Premier in answer to a question without notice from the Member for Woodridge.

The question related to the cost and source of funding for an additional Minister and 14 extra committee positions.

In short, the Premier in his answer indicated: firstly, that one of his government's commitments was to restore s.57 of the Criminal Code to ensure in the Premier's words 'things that we say in this Chamber will matter again'; and secondly, that he would not give detailed answers to questions such as the one asked, because he wanted to be 100 percent confident in the answers he gave and that questions like the one asked should be contained in questions on notice.

The Leader of Opposition Business' complaint is two fold.

The first complaint is that the Premier by saying that restoration of s.57 of the Criminal Code will mean that things said in the Chamber 'will matter again' could mean that the Premier was saying that without s.57 what was said in the House did not matter.

I make it very clear that what is said in this House does matter, regardless of s.57 of the Criminal Code. To deliberately mislead the House is a serious matter, as it is a contempt. Members are also under an obligation to correct the record, even if their statements are not deliberately misleading but simply misleading or reckless. However, in the context of the Premier's statements, I do not believe that anything the Premier said in this regard amounts to a recognised contempt.

The second complaint is that the Premier by saying that that he would not give detailed answers to questions such as the one asked, because he wanted to be 100 percent confident in the answers was also in contempt in that (a) it was an affront to the authority of the Speaker (and a possible reflection on the Speaker) in that the Speaker determines the appropriateness of questions and (b) it was an affront to the authority of the House.

I am not persuaded that there was anything wrong in what the Premier stated. In essence what the Premier was saying was that questions requiring detailed answers should be asked on notice, not without notice, and that he would generally not answer such questions as he did not wish to mislead the House. Ministers have long answered questions without notice that require detailed answers in such a manner.

There is no contempt. The matter borders on the trivial or frivolous.

## PRIVILEGE

### Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Minister

**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 28 June 2012 I received a complaint from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt, about statements made by the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing. I table relevant correspondence regarding this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 27 June 2012, from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP, to the Speaker regarding statements by the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing, Hon. Steve Dickson on 20 June 2012 [759].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, undated, from the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing, Hon. Steve Dickson, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [760].

The first complaint relates to a criticism by the minister about a media release issued by the member for Rockhampton concerning funding cuts to the Police Citizens Youth Club. The Manager of Opposition Business takes umbrage with the minister saying that the member was 'scaremongering'. I have looked at the material in this matter. I am convinced that these are simply points of view on an issue being traded between members. It is trivial and not worthy of further consideration.

The second complaint relates to a charge that the minister deliberately misled the House by referring to a figure of $100 billion of debt in Queensland. The Manager of Opposition Business then refers to other occasions where he says the minister discusses a $100 billion debt. On 21 August the

minister made a statement to the House apologising for any misunderstanding he may have caused. He corrected the record and clarified that the original context was in reference to the Commission of Audit projected debt. I accept the minister's statement and do not believe there is evidence that the minister intended to deliberately mislead the House. I will not be referring either matter to the Ethics Committee.

# PRIVILEGE

## Speaker's Ruling, Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by Ministers and Members

**Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on 27 June 2012 I received a complaint from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt, about statements made by five members: the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry; the Minister for Housing and Public Works; the Minister for Energy and Water Supply; the Leader of the House; and the member for Morayfield. The essential complaint is that each member had deliberately misled the House by referring to debt of $100 billion in Queensland. The Manager of Opposition Business argues that there is no actual debt of $100 billion but that this is a projected figure based on assumptions in the Commission of Audit. Each of the members named in the allegations has responded to me in writing. I table relevant correspondence regarding this matter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 27 June 2012, from the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP, to the Speaker regarding statements by Ministers McVeigh, Flegg and McArdle, and Mr Ray Stevens MP and Mr Darren Grimwade MP to the House on 19 June 2012 [761].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 16 July 2012, from the member for Mermaid Beach, Mr Ray Stevens MP, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [762].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 16 July 2012, from the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, Hon. John McVeigh, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [763].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 17 July 2012, from the member for Morayfield, Mr Darren Grimwade MP, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [764].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 18 July 2012, from the Minister for Energy and Water Supply, Hon. Mark McArdle, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [765].

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 19 July 2012, from the Minister for Housing and Public Works, Hon. Bruce Flegg, to the Speaker regarding allegations raised by the Manager of Opposition Business, Mr Curtis Pitt MP [766].

Two of the members named—the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry, and the member for Morayfield—have, in accordance with their undertakings in their correspondence, corrected the record and apologised to the House on 31 July 2012. Two members who are the subject of the complaint argue that their speeches, read in context, were referring to the projected debt of $100 billion in the Commission of Audit report. Each of these members rose on 21 August 2012 to correct and clarify the respective statements to ensure the contextual correctness of their earlier statements.

With regard to another member, the Minister for Housing and Public Works, I accept his argument that he was referring to the projected debt and his statement, 'The Commission of Audit interim report says it all: $100 billion in debt for a state government ...' is a direct quote from the report. I am satisfied that each of these members has corrected or clarified the record for the benefit of the House and that there is no intention to mislead the House. I will not be referring any of these matters to the Ethics Committee.

# PETITIONS

The Clerk presented the following paper petitions, lodged by the honourable members indicated—

**Ayr-Home Hill, Department of Transport and Main Roads Office**

**Mrs Menkens**, two petitions, from 1,474 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a Department of Transport and Main Roads office situated in the vicinity of Ayr/Home Hill [767, 768].

**Local Government Electoral Act 2011**

**Mr Knuth**, from 95 petitioners, requesting the House to amend s.34 of the Local Government Electoral Act 2011 and allow a by-election for the Tablelands Regional Council Division 6 [769].

**Beerburrum-Nambour, Rail Corridor**

**Mr Wellington**, from 19 petitioners, requesting the House to revise the timetable currently set for the 2026-2031 rail duplication works from Beerburrum to Nambour and to resume the project as a matter of high priority [770].

**CSG Industry**

**Mr Wellington**, from 14 petitioners, requesting the House to place a 12 month moratorium on coal seam gas projects while further scientific tests are carried out to ensure that industry techniques pose no threat to prime agricultural land, drinking water and human health [771].

**Nambour Hospital, Car Park**

**Mr Wellington**, from 18 petitioners, requesting the House to build a multi-storey car parking facility at Nambour Hospital [772].

**Finance Industry**

**Mr Pitt**, from 2,481 petitioners, requesting the House to take all practical steps to support and encourage a strong and comprehensive finance industry in Queensland by ensuring jobs are not sent offshore to third party providers [773].

**Bundaberg Regional Council, Water Fluoridation**

**Mr Bennett**, a paper and an e-petition, from 1,025 petitioners, requesting the House to reverse the requirement that the Bundaberg Regional Council add fluoride to its potable water supply [774, 775].

The Clerk presented the following paper and e-petition, sponsored by the Clerk in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and (4)—

**Brookfield, Optus Mobile Antennas**

1,034 petitioners, requesting the House to direct Optus to not plan to install mobile phone antennas at 63 Kintyre Street, Brookfield [776, 777].

Petitions received.

# TABLED PAPERS

MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Health (Mr Springborg)—

778 Response from the Minister for Health (Mr Springborg) to a paper petition (1940-12) presented by Mr Wellington, from 256 petitioners, requesting the House to build a multi-storey car parking facility at Nambour Hospital

MEMBER'S PAPER

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

Member for Algester (Mr Shorten)—

779 Non-conforming petition regarding the Boronia Heights State School

# MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

## McComb-King, Mrs Y

**Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (2.10 pm): I rise to express my deepest sympathy to the McComb-King family for the recent loss of Yvonne McComb-King AM, OBE and acknowledge Yvonne's noteworthy contribution to community and politics in Queensland. Aged 91, Yvonne passed away in Brisbane on 9 August 2012—a wife, mother, sister, grandmother and great-grandmother in a large and loving family but also, and with distinct relevance in this place, Yvonne McComb-King became the first female state president of a major political party in Queensland—in this case, the Liberal Party. Yvonne joined the Liberal Party in the 1940s and was state president of the party from 1976 to 1980, after being vice-president for some years. Her devotion and loyalty to the party was substantial, but her contributions to society were equally as weighty. As a member of the Australian War Memorial Council who worked to make the memorial a centre of research and appointed a life member of the National Seniors Foundation Trust after years of significant contribution, Yvonne has left a noteworthy legacy. In a public expression of the character of the lady, her family asked that in lieu of flowers at the celebration of her life held on 17 August 2012 donations to the Royal Flying Doctor Service Queensland division were welcomed. As one of the most significant political figures in Queensland throughout the 1970s with a steadfast commitment to the community, Yvonne will be fondly remembered.

## Ministerial Expenses, Report

**Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (2.12 pm): I lay upon the table of the House the public report of ministerial expenses for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012.

*Tabled paper:* Public Report of Ministerial Expenses for the period 1 July 2011 to 30 June 2012 [780].

This report outlines ministerial expenditure by both the current and former governments. The report outlines that the former government had ministerial expenses of $27.2 million from 1 July 2011 to 24 March 2012 while this government has had ministerial expenses of $8.2 million to 30 June 2012. These figures show that my government is very focused on its own expenses, especially given that the number of ministers and assistant ministers has increased. Major areas of expenditure for 2011-12 were employee related expenses at approximately $22.5 million, accommodation and utilities at approximately $5.7 million, and travel and car fleet expenses at approximately $2.6 million. I commend the report to the House.

## Red-Tape Reduction

**Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (2.13 pm): This government is committed to reducing red tape to assist business over the next six years. We promised to establish the Office of Best Practice Regulation within the Queensland Competition Authority as part of our plan to cut red tape and regulation by 20 per cent. I am pleased to advise the House that the Office of Best Practice Regulation was established on 2 July 2012. The Office of Best Practice Regulation is responsible for measuring and reporting on our progress in reducing red tape and regulation. It will also ensure that government is adequately informed of the impact on business of new regulatory proposals. To help kick-start action, in early May I requested that all ministers identify ways to redress red tape, time-consuming and non-essential rules, forms, regulations and procedures that could be implemented, or at least started, within 90 days. Ministers have identified 130 initiatives and are reporting back to me on the progress of this on a regular basis.

We are commencing major reviews to reform and streamline regulation in business sectors such as tourism, planning, construction and real estate, the small mining sector, liquor licensing and gaming. We are implementing better approvals processes so our big resources projects can get going faster while still of course meeting stringent environmental requirements. We have a new, energetic Coordinator-General in place who is ploughing through the work to get these approvals moving. We are streamlining grants and applications and approvals to make applying for the available funds easier, putting many applications online. To give Queenslanders better access to recreational and outdoor activities, we are streamlining the permit system for access to national parks and we are working to make sure licensing requirements for legitimate gun owners are rigorous but not too onerous.

As promised, the government has repealed the previous Labor government's industry waste levy, saving business and local councils an estimated $297 million over the forwards. We have amended the sustainable planning regulation which will mean substantial time and cost savings when applying for development approvals. These amendments remove numerous triggers for development applications to be referred to state agencies and will mean 1,500 fewer referrals a year. I thank the Assistant Minister for Planning Reform and the Deputy Premier for their work in this area.

I have also requested that ministers who bring forward regulatory proposals that impose a new burden on small business provide at least one and up to three options to reduce the regulatory burden on small business as a compensator. I know that my government's red-tape reduction initiatives continue to be well received in communities across Queensland. At a recent forum with real estate agents in my Ashgrove electorate we spoke about the benefits of axing Labor's ill-conceived sustainability declarations and further incentives that would benefit the real estate industry, including streamlining home sale contracts. The government is closely monitoring all of these processes and I am confident that Queensland businesses and the community are already seeing benefits from these reforms. There will be many more to come as we continue to get out there and listen to Queenslanders and get this state back on track.

## Office of the Leader of the Opposition, Report; Galilee Basin

**Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (2.17 pm): I table the public report of office expenses for the Office of the Leader of the Opposition for the period 1 July 2011 to 23 March 2012.

*Tabled paper:* Public Report of Opposition Office Expenses for the period 1 July 2011 to 23 March 2012 [781].

Our government has a clear commitment to economic growth and a very clear policy to develop the Galilee Basin. Clive Palmer's China coal project is only one of a number of projects in the Galilee Basin and his comments in recent days have been misleading and I want to place some facts on the record today. The LNP had publicly espoused a clear position on proposed rail corridors in the Galilee Basin before, during and after the last state election. On taking government, I immediately initiated meetings and extensive discussions with all Galilee Basin mine proponents to find a solution to the hopeless mess that the previous Labor government had made of this important economic issue. I informed those proponents that it was the government's strong view that rail developments should be coordinated to achieve an efficient and cost-effective transport outcome—one that would minimise the impact on communities and landholders and provide the maximum benefit to all stakeholders in the Galilee Basin.

The government clearly indicated that its preference was for a common rail corridor, or corridors. I asked the various parties, including Clive Palmer's China First coal project, to enter into good-faith negotiations to see if they could agree among themselves to find an outcome on that basis. Unfortunately, they all informed me that they could not reach an agreement themselves. After further extensive discussions and consideration, I wrote to all mine and rail proponents in June to inform them that the government would support two rail corridors, an east-west alignment and a north-south alignment. I table for the benefit of members of the parliament a copy of that letter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 6 June 2012, from the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jeff Seeney, to the Chairman of Mineralogy, Mr Palmer, regarding the Galilee Basin, proposed common rail corridors [782].

We sought to arrive at a result where all Galillee mine proponents would have an opportunity to pursue their projects. The east-west path would provide staged development of rail infrastructure for the short to medium term and the government's preference for this corridor was within the vicinity of the lines being pursued by both QRN and Adani. Given the advanced stage of the Alpha Coal Project, including the Coordinator-General's conditional approval of the proposal, the government would identify a north-south corridor in the vicinity of Alpha Coal Project's environmental impact statement study corridor. This policy position was based on a range of considerations, such as which projects were most advanced, which could provide opportunities to other parties, which could meet the government's broader policy objectives, and these considerations were clearly outlined in the correspondence to all parties.

On Friday, I received a rather confused letter from a law firm acting on behalf of Clive Palmer's China First project. I table a copy of that letter.

*Tabled paper:* Letter, dated 17 August 2012, from HopgoodGanim Lawyers to the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, Hon. Jeff Seeney, regarding Waratah Coal Pty Ltd and the Galilee Basin rail corridors [783].

The government has made it clear that it would support only two corridors. In other words, the government's power to compulsorily acquire land, if it were needed, would be exercised only to effect our policy outcome. The power to compulsorily acquire land would be exercised only in the areas that we identified. Indeed, it was also made clear that the government policy position was not an endorsement by the government of a particular project and any corridor established would also need to be available to other proponents.

The policy position does not preclude a mine proponent building a rail project somewhere else, but they will have to do so without government support. Indeed, I am advised that the Coordinator-General is currently assessing Clive Palmer's China First coal project for an environmental impact statement and for an infrastructure facility of significant application, as is the normal process. Let me add that the normal process has and will be followed through all developments in the Galilee Basin. Our government is very keen to deal with anyone interested in investing in the Galilee Basin—we are very keen to deal with anyone interested in investing in Queensland—but we will deal with all of those people on a fair and equal basis. We will deal with all of the proponents in the Galilee Basin on a fair and equal basis and Clive Palmer and his China First project will be dealt with exactly the same as every other proponent in the Galilee Basin.

## Overseas Trade Mission

**Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (2.22 pm): Today I would like to inform the House of a great success story for a South-East Queensland transport company. As members of this House would be aware, my recent trade mission took me to Japan, China and the United States. In China, I witnessed the signing of an agreement between Gympie based heavy haulage transport company J Smith and Sons—

**Mr Gibson:** Hear, Hear!

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I hear the member for Gympie echoing his support. He is a well-known supporter of this company. I know he knows Kerryn Smith up there in Gympie. Inner Mongolia North Heavy Industries Group Corporation, a company involved to a substantial degree in heavy industries work and manufacturing in China—in Inner Mongolia, in fact. Under this agreement, the Chinese company will use J Smith and Sons developed proprietary technology to build its first 60-tonne tipper trailer by the end of this year. The agreement also holds significant opportunities for J Smith and Sons to use Inner Mongolia North to build its designed products for export outside of Australia.

I am highlighting the signing of this agreement for a number of reasons. Firstly, J Smith and Sons represents the best of Queensland business—a company with a 110-year history and a reputation built on ingenuity and hard work—

**Mr Gibson:** Hear, hear!

**Mr NICHOLLS:** A company well known in Gympie and well supported by the local member, Mr David Gibson. Secondly, the agreement illustrates a great partnership between the Queensland government and business in securing deals that benefit the state. J Smith and Sons has an extensive relationship with Queensland, with our government, and with Trade and Investment Queensland. TIQ's Brisbane and China offices worked extensively with the Gympie based company to develop a relationship with Inner Mongolia North, subsequently leading to this deal. In fact, I am reliably informed that it involved lots of entertainment in Mongolian tents—I think they are called yurts or something like that—in Inner Mongolia.

The deal also shows how many opportunities are available to Queensland companies in countries like China. That is the reason I opened our new Trade and Investment office in Beijing. In talking this deal through with Kerryn Smith on the night that the documents were signed—and Kerryn is the

managing director of J Smith and Sons—it was apparent the great value that was placed on Trade and Investment Queensland's involvement, from helping with an interpreter in China, and our interpreter in China spent five days working with the company to actually secure the deal, to actually facilitating the signing of the document. The presence of a minister there and a deadline also ensured that the deal was signed in time. I want to congratulate Kerryn, who acquired the nickname 'Bob' while on this delegation, and his team for their persistence and dedication in achieving this tremendous outcome.

**Mr Stevens** interjected.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I will tell the Leader of the House why in a minute—young Bob. This shows what Queensland based companies can do in a highly competitive world market. Eight per cent of China's state owned companies are based in Beijing. Queensland's new office represents a significant step forward for Queensland companies looking to get a foothold in the ever-expanding Chinese market. Our office will not only enhance the Queensland government's government-to-government relations but it will give Queensland businesses a point of contact at the coalface, ensuring that we capitalise on the very many opportunities that are available.

The trade mission succeeded in its aim: to build on existing relationships with our major trading partners, to reinforce the state as an attractive investment destination and to highlight trade opportunities for Queensland businesses. The Newman government realises that our international partners are vital to our plans to grow a four-pillar economy and we will continue to work to grow opportunities abroad for the Queensland business community. Under a Newman government, Queensland is, once again, open for business.

## Queensland Floods, Independent Review of Seqwater Report

**Hon. MF McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (Minister for Energy and Water Supply) (2.26 pm): The Newman government is committed to implementing the recommendations of the Queensland's Floods Commission of Inquiry. To date, 19 recommendations have been completed across the state government. As part of progressing through the recommendations, I wish to inform the parliament of the independent review of Seqwater's March 2011 event report into the January 2011 floods. This review is being jointly conducted by the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Army Corps of Engineers. The independent review was a key recommendation—No. 16.3—of the final report of the Queensland Floods Commission of Inquiry, which required an appropriately qualified and independent person be engaged to review the March 2011 flood event report. The government's preference was to use Australian dam and flood mitigation experts. The department searched extensively for a reviewer who is both independent and appropriately qualified, as recommended by the commission of inquiry. The appointment of the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the United States Army Corps of Engineers provide significant expertise in dam safety, flood risk management, engineering, science, research, and support services related to dam and water resource management.

The Bureau of Reclamation will focus on issues about the safety of Wivenhoe and Somerset dams while the Corps of Engineers will focus on flood operations. Queensland residents, especially flood victims, can have absolute confidence in the independence and integrity of this important review. Four experts from the corps of engineers were in Queensland from 4 August to 11 August to undertake the review. The final review report is due by 24 September 2012, to allow the government to meet its commitment to identify any dam safety issues before the 2012-13 wet season. Any other issues identified by the review will be included as part of the ongoing long-term review of the flood mitigation manual.

The United States Bureau of Reclamation is the largest wholesaler of water in the United States, operating 457 dams and dykes, including the Hoover Dam. The United States Army Corps of Engineers owns and operates more than 600 dams and maintains 20,000 kilometres of commercial inland navigation channels and is the USA's environmental engineer and the number one federal provider of outdoor recreation.

# MOTION

## Amendments to Standing Orders

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (2.29 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That the Standing Rules and Orders of the Legislative Assembly be amended by replacing Part 6 (Financial Procedures) with the new Part 6 circulated in my name and that such amendments become effective immediately.

**AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES AND ORDERS**

1. Omit Part 6, insert new Part 6:

**'PART 6 FINANCIAL PROCEDURES**

**CHAPTER 30 INTRODUCTION OF APPROPRIATION BILLS**

**174. Appropriation proposal to be recommended**

(1) No proposal (including a Bill or a motion) for an appropriation that falls within the meaning of s.68 of the *Constitution of Queensland 2001*[1] shall be introduced unless first recommended by a message of the Governor as required by that section.

(2) No amendment of a proposal recommended by a message of the Governor shall be moved which would increase, or extend the objects and purposes or alter the destination of the appropriation so recommended, unless a further message is received.

**175. Governor's message to be read prior to first reading**

(1) When a message from the Governor, recommending that an appropriation of money be made for a Bill is required, the message shall be presented to the Speaker and read to the House immediately prior to the question for the first reading of the Bill.[2]

(2) When a message from the Governor, recommending an amendment be moved to a Bill for the appropriation of money is required, the message shall be presented to the Speaker and read before the amendment is moved.

**176. Annual Appropriation Bills—Cognate Bills**

Where two or more annual Appropriation Bills are introduced together, they are to be treated as cognate Bills for the following stages:

(a) the second reading;

(b) consideration in detail; and

(c) the third reading and long titles.

**CHAPTER 31 ESTIMATES TO BE CONSIDERED BY PORTFOLIO COMMITTEES**

**177. Annual Appropriation Bills to portfolio committees**

(1) After the Annual Appropriation Bills are read a first time in accordance with Part 5 Chapter 22, the Bills are set down on the notice paper for their second reading stage in the House. Debate on the question "That the Bill be now read a second time" shall not commence until at least one whole calendar day has elapsed.

(2) After the Annual Appropriation Bills have been read a second time the Annual Appropriation Bill stands referred to the portfolio committees (as set out in Schedule 6) for investigation and report and the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill stands referred to the Committee of the Legislative Assembly to conduct a public meeting and report.

(3) Each portfolio committee shall consider the Appropriation Bills and the estimates for the committee's area of responsibility.

(4) The House is by Order to:

(a) allocate the dates for each portfolio committee's estimates hearing and the public meeting to be held by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly; and

(b) set the dates by which each portfolio committee and Committee of the Legislative Assembly is to report to the House.

**178. When portfolio committees may hold public hearings in respect of estimates**

Portfolio committees may only hold hearings and take evidence on the dates allocated by order of the House at times agreed to by the committee between 9.00am and 9.30pm.

**179. Open hearings**

A portfolio committee's estimates hearings are open to the public unless the committee otherwise orders.

**180. Opening hearing procedure**

(1) In a portfolio committee's estimates hearing and the public meeting held by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly:

(a) the Chairperson is to call on the estimates of the proposed expenditure for the area of responsibility which the committee is to examine and declare the proposed expenditure open for examination; and

(b) the Chairperson is to put the question "That the proposed expenditure be agreed to".

(2) In respect of Government Owned Corporations and statutory authorities, a member may ask any question which the committee determines will assist it in its examination of the relevant Appropriation Bill or otherwise assist the committee to determine whether public funds are being efficiently spent or appropriate public guarantees are being provided.

**181. General Hearing Procedure**

In a portfolio committee's estimates hearing for the areas of responsibility for which the portfolio committee is responsible (as set out in Schedule 6):

(a) the responsible Minister is to be present at all times for the areas for which the Minister is responsible is under consideration and may have advisers present to assist the Minister;

(b) the responsible Director-General is to be present at all times for the areas for which the Director-General is responsible is under consideration;

1. Section 68(2) of the Constitution of Queensland 2001 provides that a message from the Governor in respect of a vote, resolution or Bill for appropriation must be given to the Legislative Assembly during the session in which the vote, resolution or Bill is intended to be passed.
2. Sections 64 to 68 of the Constitution of Queensland 2001 provide for the appropriation of funds. Section 68(1) of the Constitution of Queensland 2001 provides that the Legislative Assembly must not originate or pass a vote, resolution or Bill for the appropriation of (a) an amount from the consolidated fund; or (b) an amount required to be paid to the consolidated fund; that has not first been recommended by a message of the Governor.

(c) a Chief Executive Officer, (as set out in Schedule 7) is to be present at all times for the entity for which the Chief Executive Officer, is responsible is under consideration;

(d) a committee member may ask the Minister, Director-General or Chief Executive Officer questions;

(e) a member who is not a member of the portfolio committee may, with the committee's leave, ask questions;

(f) advisers may answer questions referred to them by the Minister, Director-General or Chief Executive Officer; and

(g) a member may ask any question which is relevant to the examination of the Appropriation being considered.

**181A. Public Meeting Procedure**

In the Public Meeting regarding the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill:

(a) the members of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly will take questions from any Member of the Legislative Assembly who is not a member of that Committee either on notice or at the public meeting;

(b) the Clerk of the Parliament will also be present to take questions and may have advisers present to assist or to answer questions referred to them by the Clerk; and

(c) a member may ask any question which is relevant to the examination of the Appropriation being considered.

**182. Questions on notice prior to the hearings**

(1) Members of a portfolio committee may, at a reasonable time prior to public hearings regarding estimates, put a combined total of twenty questions on notice to each Minister.

(2) Of the questions referred to in (1), at least ten questions are to be allocated to non-Government members.

(3) The Minister shall provide to the committee answers to the questions referred to in (1) by at least 10.00 am on the day before the committee's allotted hearing day.

(4) The rules applying to questions on notice and questions without notice contained in Chapter 20 also apply to questions on notice prior to portfolio committee hearings regarding estimates.

(5) The Chairperson of the committee has the same power as the Speaker regarding questions.

(6) The Minister may refuse to answer questions which place unreasonable research requirements on their portfolios or are unnecessarily complex.

(7) All answers to questions on notice shall be in writing unless the committee otherwise allows.

(8) Answers to questions on notice are deemed to be authorised for release by the portfolio committee and published upon the commencement of the committee's hearing, unless the committee expressly orders otherwise.

**183. Questions taken on notice at the hearing/public meeting and additional information**

(1) A Minister may, at their discretion, inform a portfolio committee at an estimates hearing or at the public meeting that an answer to a question, or part of a question, asked of them or of someone else on their behalf at the hearing will be taken on notice and provided later to the committee.

(2) A Minister may, at their discretion, also give the committee additional information about an answer given by them or on their behalf.

(3) The answer or additional information:

(a) is to be written;

(b) is to be given by a time decided by the committee, or if no time has been decided by the committee, within 48 hours after the close of the committee's hearing;

(c) is taken to be part of the proceedings of Parliament;

(d) may be included in a volume of additional information to be tabled in the House by the committee; and

(e) may be authorised for publication by the committee prior to the material being tabled in the House.

(4) A Minister or a Director-General or Chief Executive Officer may decline to answer a question in which case the committee may report that fact in its report.

**184. Availability of transcripts and tabled documents**

(1) The Chief Reporter is authorised to release the transcript of a portfolio committee's estimates hearing or public meeting as it becomes available, subject to any express direction of the committee.

(2) A Minister or any witness may only table a document at a portfolio committee's estimates hearing only with the leave of the committee.

(3) Any document tabled at a portfolio committee's estimates hearing or at the public meeting, is deemed to be authorised for release by the committee unless the committee expressly orders otherwise.

**185. Power of the Chairperson to order withdrawal of a disorderly member**

(1) At a portfolio committee's estimates hearing or at the public meeting of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly, the Chairperson may, after a warning, order any member whose conduct in their opinion continues to be grossly disorderly or disruptive to withdraw for a stated period.

(2) A member ordered to withdraw in accordance with (1), shall immediately withdraw for the stated period.

**186. Portfolio committee and Committee of the Legislative Assembly must report on estimates**

(1) A portfolio committee must make a report at the end of its deliberations of the estimates of its portfolio area.

(2) The Committee of the Legislative Assembly must report in respect of the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill.

**187. Content of report**

(1) A committee's report on estimates must state whether the proposed expenditures referred to it are agreed to.

(2) A reservation or dissenting report by a committee member may be added to the committee's report after it is adopted by the committee.

(3) A reservation or dissenting report must be provided to the Research Director within 24 hours after the committee's report is adopted or prior to the date that the committee's report is required to be tabled, whichever is the earlier.

**187A. Content of Appropriation (Parliament) Bill report**

(1) The Committee of the Legislative Assembly's committee's report on the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill must state whether the proposed expenditures referred to it are agreed to.

(2) The Committee's report must include all issues raised in the public meeting and the Committee of the Legislative Assembly's response to them,

**188. Effect of failure to report**

If a committee does not report on all of the proposed expenditures referred to it, the committee is taken to have agreed to the proposed expenditure that it does not report on.

**189. Tabling and consideration of reports**

(1) The Chairperson of each committee must table in the House the committee's report on the proposed expenditures stated in the Appropriation Bills and referred to the committee together with the minutes of committee meetings relating to the proposed expenditures and any other additional information which the committee agrees to table.

(2) The Chairperson of each committee is deemed to have satisfied the requirements of (1) if they present the committee's report, minutes and any other additional information to the Clerk when the House is not sitting in accordance with SO 217, in which case the report is deemed to have been tabled and authorised for publication by the House on the date it is presented to the Clerk.

(3) The report is to be received by the House without debate and its consideration deferred until the consideration of the Bills in consideration in detail.

(4) One whole sitting day must elapse between the committee's report or reports being tabled and consideration of the Bills in detail.

**190. Effect of consideration in detail**

Consideration of a committee's report in consideration in detail is taken to be consideration of the provisions of the Appropriation Bills so far as the provisions authorise the proposed expenditures referred to the committee.

**191. Procedure in consideration in detail**

In consideration in detail, for the report of each committee report:

(a) the Speaker must put the question "That the report of <name of committee> be adopted";

(b) a member may speak for no longer than five minutes on the question;

(c) in reply to the debate, each responsible Minister may speak for no longer than five minutes; and

(d) the debate is to continue for no longer than one hour.

**192. Receipt of material by nominated officers of the Leader of the House and Leader of the Opposition**

Unless a portfolio committee otherwise expressly orders, or a Minister has requested confidentiality, its Research Director is authorised to release copies of the following documents as they become available to an officer from the offices of the Leader of the House and Leader of the Opposition (nominated by them) or the office of a committee member:

(a) questions taken on notice by Ministers during its hearing;

(b) responses from Ministers to any pre-hearing questions on notice and questions taken on notice during the hearing; and

(c) additional information provided by Ministers to supplement answers given by them, or on their behalf, at the committee's hearing.'

In moving that motion I would just like to explain, for the benefit of the House, that in all previous examinations of the parliamentary appropriations, the Speaker has appeared before the relevant estimates committee. In 2011 the Speaker appeared before the Finance and Administration Committee, the committee responsible for the Premier's portfolio under which the legislation pertaining to the parliament falls. With the amendments to the Parliamentary Service Act 1988 in August 2011 the CLA assumed the overall responsibility for the management of the Parliamentary Service, including deciding major policies to guide the operation and management of the Parliamentary Service, prepare budgets and decide the size and organisation of the Parliamentary Service and the services to be supplied by the Parliamentary Service and supervise the management and delivery of services by that Parliamentary Service.

The proposed amendments to standing orders will allow the CLA, operating as a board management, to hold a public meeting at which members of parliament will be invited to ask questions in relation to the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill prior to the broader estimates hearing process. It is proposed that the CLA will report to the House on the issues raised in the meeting regarding the Appropriation (Parliament) Bill including the transcript of proceedings and any documents tabled.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

# COMMITTEES

## Estimates Hearings

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (2.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, in accordance with standing order 177(4), the dates for each portfolio committee's estimates hearing, the date for the Committee of the Legislative Assembly's public meeting and the dates by which each committee is to report to the House as set out in the order circulated in my name be agreed to.

---

**2012 ESTIMATES COMMITTEES—ORDER SETTING DATES FOR HEARING AND REPORTING**

(1) The dates for each portfolio committee's hearing and report dates are as follows—

| Portfolio Committee | Ministers | Date of hearing | Report date |
|---|---|---|---|
| Finance and Administration Committee | Premier<br>Treasurer and Minister for Trade | 9 October 2012(to start after 10.00am) | 29 October 2012 |
| State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee | Deputy Premier, Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning<br>Minister for Energy and Water Supply<br>Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games | 10 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |
| Legal Affairs, Police, Corrective Services and Emergency Services Committee | Attorney-General and Minister for Justice<br>Minister for Police and Community Safety | 11 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |
| Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee | Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry<br>Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection<br>Minister for Natural Resources and Mine | 12 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |
| Education and Innovation Committee | Minister for Education, Training and Employment<br>Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts | 16 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |
| Health and Community Services Committee | Minister for Health<br>Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services<br>Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing<br>Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander and Multicultural Affairs and Minister Assisting the Premier | 17 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |
| Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee | Minister for Transport and Main Roads<br>Minister for Housing and Public Works<br>Minister for Local Government | 18 October 2012 | 29 October 2012 |

(2) The date for the Committee of the Legislative Assembly's public meeting and report date is as follows—

| Portfolio Committee | Date of hearing | Report date |
|---|---|---|
| Committee of the Legislative Assembly | 9 October 2012 (to be concluded by 10.00am) | 29 October 2012 |

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## MOTION

### Amendment to Standing Orders

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (2.30 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That standing order 136(5) be amended by omitting 'seven days' and inserting in lieu 'one day'.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

## REPORT

### Office of the Leader of the Opposition

**Ms PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (2.31 pm): I table the public report of the office expenses for the office of the Leader of the Opposition for the period 26 March 2012 to 30 June 2012.

*Tabled paper:* Public Report of Opposition Office Expenses for the period 26 March 2012 to 30 June 2012 [784].

## QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

**Madam SPEAKER:** Question time will go to 3.32 pm.

### Skilling Queenslanders for Work

**Ms PALASZCZUK** (2.32 pm): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Will the minister outline why he has axed the Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative, a scheme that has been independently evaluated and found to have helped 57,000 Queenslanders gain jobs and provides return on investment within 12 months?

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I made it very clear yesterday that Skilling Queenslanders for Work was a program that only Queensland was funding to the quantum that it has been funded at $57 million, or whatever it is that we are going to save in the next financial year. Admittedly there was more than that this year because of some significant funding given by the federal government to augment that money. South Australia spends $6 million to help long-term unemployed or people in danger of falling through the cracks. Victoria spends about $1.1 million. Queensland was spending $57 million a year on this. This is a federal government responsibility.

As I said yesterday, I have written to the federal ministers, Bill Shorten and Senator Chris Evans, to say that this is a federal government responsibility. In the past, even people who work within Skilling Queenslanders for Work in the department have said to me that there were Labor members of parliament who advocated for particular programs under Skilling Queenslanders for Work for which there were no documented outcomes. There were no outcomes that were proven in some of these arrangements. Some of them were worthy programs and we have acknowledged that. I said that yesterday. The Premier knows that as well. We have been to Townsville and Proserpine. In fact, we should be inquiring into some of the outcomes of some of these organisations that were funded year after year by those opposite in their irresponsible way of dealing with the budget.

It is obvious that there were members opposite who decided to go to ministers and say, 'We really need this for my electorate. Don't worry about the outcomes. Just keep funding it.' That is how those opposite worked when they were in government and that led us to the budget situation that we found ourselves in with a $4 billion deficit. What we are hearing from those opposite is, 'We want our programs to stay in there. We know the budget is in a bad position.' In fact, those opposite do not even acknowledge it. Yesterday the Leader of Opposition Business said it was rubbish that there was any suggestion that our budget was under any pressure at all or that the situation we find ourselves in is anything other than to do with their making given that they were in for the last 20 years.

We are very sorry about these programs. We are constantly working with those who run them. I met with someone from the Sunshine Coast at lunchtime today who is wanting to work with the government and community organisations to make sure that the great work that these organisations do is not lost, that we do not lose the power of communities to work with the federal government, which

should be resourcing this to a greater level than it currently is. It is obvious that the state Labor government was doing things that the federal Labor government should have been doing and should be doing. I exhort those opposite to write to Bill Shorten and Senator Chris Evans and say 'show us the money', as we are asking Peter Garrett to do with the Gonski review.

## Skilling Queenslanders for Work

**Ms PALASZCZUK:** My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. I refer the minister to page 3 of the Skilling Queenslanders for Work evaluation and I ask: will the minister provide details of the significant social benefits that this program has provided for tens of thousands of Queenslanders? I table a copy of the Deloitte report for the minister.

*Tabled paper:* Deloitte Access Economics report, dated 23 July 2012, titled 'Evaluation of Skilling Queenslanders for Work: Department of Education, Training and Employment' [785].

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the honourable Leader of the Opposition for the question. I actually have a copy of that report from Deloitte. I have already seen it so I do not need to see a copy.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Have you read it?

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I have read it. Of course it shows that these programs certainly have some value. As a government with lots of money and resources we would love to be able to continue supporting these sorts of programs.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** It keeps people out of the youth justice system.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** We acknowledge that there are lots of things it does. As I have said in this place before, there are things we have to have and there are things we would like to have. Under the former Labor government, which put us into a budget deficit situation of $14 billion worth of deficits over the next couple of years and $65 billion worth of debt, there were a number of programs, and Skilling Queenslanders for Work is one of those programs, that unfortunately have to be terminated because it is a federal government responsibility.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** We say that to those opposite, but they just do not seem to hear it. No other states were doing it. South Australia funds this to a quantum of $6 million, but only those fiscal incompetents opposite could somehow justify that we should be spending 10 times more than any other state in the Commonwealth to fund something that really should be funded by the federal government.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** It works.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** It will work if the federal government funds it as well and that is the important point. The federal government, which is spending $1.9 billion on employment and has the responsibility, should be funding it.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I am going to warn members on my left. There are too many interjections and I will start naming them under the standing orders.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** We want to work with organisations who want to work with us and other community groups in their electorates to make sure that the great work that these organisations are doing is able to continue and, subsequent to the budget being restored to good order, as the Treasurer and honourable Premier have said, we may well be able to revisit these sorts of programs. Making sure the federal government lives up to its responsibility is something that those opposite should be saying to their Prime Minister and the responsible ministers at the federal level instead of saying, as state Labor did for the best part of the last 15 years, 'Just ask and you shall receive' because that is not how we are doing it. This government is not putting everything on the Bankcard. That is why the Treasurer is going through the budget line by line and why all ministers have to go to the Cabinet Budget Review Committee and justify everything in their budget. I am happy to do it. It is important to do it. Those opposite did not do it. We need to do it to get Queensland back on track.

## Jobs

**Mr KING:** My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier please advise the House on the prospects for employment opportunities in Queensland?

**Mr NEWMAN:** I thank the honourable member for his question, which dovetails with earlier questions from the opposition. I am encouraged by new federal government data that supports this government's view that the resources sector is growing in terms of Queensland's prospects into the future, as are other parts of the economy. I have some figures, that I will table in a moment, from the Australian Workforce and Productivity Agency 2012 report into the resources sector's skill needs, which

shows that over the next five years we are in the box seat for jobs growth. This is the second annual report about the demand for skills in the resources sector, the supply of skills to meet those needs and the options to address skills shortages.

At the moment there are some concerns about the international economic environment. Whilst that has been occurring, still there has been a substantial increase in committed investment in resources. That is where firms are actually making the final investment decision. The report I am talking about confirms that it will lead to a significant increase in the demand for skills for project construction, as well as longer term jobs in mining operations and gas operations as new project streams come on. What does the report say? It says that Queensland is second only to WA when it comes to new resource sector construction projects in terms of both numbers and value, with $75.3 billion worth of new projects set to come online.

**Mr Mulherin:** We were saying that too.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** I take the interjections, because we are also focusing on other things. While I am talking about resources and energy at the moment, we are also focused on things such as agriculture, tourism and construction. Those opposite never bothered about those things. The report states that, over the next five years, 222,280 jobs are expected to be created. I reckon that is pretty good. Those jobs are not just operating a dragline or driving a truck; they are in all sorts of fields such as healthcare, social assistance, retailing spin-off jobs and education jobs. One would think those opposite would be happy: one minute they pretend to be interested in programs and they talk about the Deloitte reports, and the next minute they are not listening, as usual. I am trying to impart some information to them and they are chiacking and carrying out.

I table the report on job growth opportunities. I note that in Queensland the main growth areas are projected to be Brisbane and the Gold Coast. Again, with our four-pillars approach, we intend to spread the opportunities right across this great state so that everyone profits from the mining resources boom.

*Tabled paper:* Table, titled 'Projected Industry Employment Growth by Region, 5 Years to 2015/16 Queensland' [786].

## Government Borrowings

**Mr MULHERIN:** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier detail the purposes of the government's latest borrowings of $1.65 billion, announced on 2 August, and will he outline his government's total borrowings program for 2012-13.

**Mr NEWMAN:** I am intrigued by the question, because yesterday in this House we spoke at length about the financial position with which the state is currently faced. I am talking about the Queensland government's finances. We talked about the Commission of Audit report, we talked about the Moody's Investors Service report, I recall we talked about the former government's own projections and we talked about things that a former minister, Cameron Dick, has said. We know there is a real inconsistency there.

We know that Cameron Dick is clearly on the comeback trail and he has been talking about confessing their sins. As a former cabinet minister and someone who wants to re-enter the political fray, Cameron Dick is admitting mea culpa. Those opposite will not do that, but he is saying, 'We, the Labor Party, are guilty. We are the guilty party. We lost the AAA credit rating and we should say 'sorry'.' He is ready to take the seat of Woodridge when the current sitting member decides to retire in the next year or so. Meanwhile, day after day the debt and deficit deniers come in here and say that it is bunkum. It is an interesting dichotomy.

**Mr PITT:** I rise on a point of order under standing order 118(b). The question was specific around borrowings of $1.65 billion of debt. I do not believe that the Premier is answering that. I ask for your guidance, Madam Speaker.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I do hear the Premier talking about the issue of debt and I ask the Premier to answer the question.

**Mr NEWMAN:** And answer the question I will. I am enjoying myself immensely, building my case about the financial ineptitude of those opposite. Cameron Dick said—

I do think Labor fell into error, or seriously miscalculated and under-estimated the desire for Queenslanders to hold onto the AAA credit rating. And I think the concerns Queenslanders had generally about government debt and deficit.

What were the borrowings for? At the moment, the borrowings are the normal borrowing program and borrowings to finance capital expenditure in the state, but also to keep the lights on; to pay for the huge yawning operating deficit that we have been given by those opposite. We know that three of them, in particular, were responsible. Three of those opposite were members of the cabinet. They are truly the guilty ones. We will forgive the member for Rockhampton and even the member for South Brisbane, because they were not there, but the other five were there and three of them were members of the cabinet.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr NEWMAN:** They are interjecting; they do not want to hear the truth. This year we will have a—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! There are too many interjections across the chamber.

**Mr NEWMAN:** This year, the operating deficit will be at least $4 billion. It will probably be a lot more that; maybe even $5 billion. That is why we have to borrow, to fill the black hole that they created.

## Mining Industry, Housing

**Mr JOHNSON:** My question is directed to the Honourable Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier advise the House what action the government is taking to address the housing crisis in Queensland's mining communities?

**Government members:** Good question.

**Mr SEENEY:** It is a good question from the member for Gregory, who understands the housing crisis that exists in so many of Queensland's resources communities and so many of the communities within the electorate of Gregory. The previous government did nothing to plan for the development of viable communities in Queensland's resource regions. They were all too keen to take the benefits of the resources sector, but they did not do any planning at all. There was a complete failure to plan for the future of towns such as Moranbah, Blackwater, Emerald, Wandoan, Miles, Chinchilla and others, which have borne the brunt of the resource industry development. At the urging of the members who represent those areas, members such as the member for Gregory and the member for Condamine who have been talking about these things for a long time, we have moved very quickly to solve the basic problem, that is, to make sure that there is a supply of buildable land in those communities, that there is a supply of buildable land for the private sector to invest in to build the houses and the accommodation that is necessary. That is basic planning that the previous government would not or could not do.

The ULDA was set up to address this issue. They tinkered around the edges, they played around with social engineering, but they did not deal with the basic problem, which is land supply. I can tell the member for Gregory that we have moved quickly in communities such as Blackwater and Moranbah. We have announced that we will be providing 85 new building blocks in the next six months. That is the challenge we have set ourselves to make sure that there is a supply of buildable land in those communities. However, that is only the first step. We will be ensuring that there are considerably more building blocks available in those communities, because that is what will make them viable communities. If we can achieve a normalisation of the property market and a normalisation of the rent market, then the jobs that the Premier has been talking about this morning will be able to be delivered to Queenslanders who want to go and work and live in those communities, live with their families in those communities, contribute to those communities being viable, vibrant rural communities in regional Queensland, as they can be if the planning and the infrastructure is delivered as a responsible government should deliver it.

*Tabled paper:* LNP document, undated, titled 'Cando Action: Costings and Savings Strategy: Part of our plan to get Queensland back on track' [787].

We will also be moving to ensure there are opportunities for non-resident worker accommodation facilities to be built in an appropriate way and in appropriate places so those communities are not overrun by people seeking short-term accommodation but are places where people can raise their families and contribute to a viable community in a community that can offer a great lifestyle.

## Queensland Economy

**Mr PITT:** My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the LNP government's plans to lift debt to $85 billion by 2014-15—a level described by the Treasurer in June as a debt binge. Given the Premier's election commitment to pay down debt, I ask: will the Premier detail the purpose of the extra $20 billion in debt his government plans to incur?

**Mr NEWMAN:** This is the most interesting line of questioning I have heard in a month of Sundays in this place, even though I am pretty new to it. Let us go back to the beginning. I have said time and time again that what we have inherited is like an aircraft diving from 30,000 feet into the debt. We are there—particularly the Deputy Premier, the Treasurer, the Attorney-General and me in CBRC—in the aircraft. We are in this power dive into the financial abyss, and we are straining on the control yoke. We are all pulling back hard trying to pull out of this power dive.

We have been here for less than 180 days and we are doing everything we can to turn this around. The reason we will have in excess of a $4 billion operating deficit and a $10 billion fiscal deficit this financial year is because of those opposite. The member for Mulgrave, the member for Mackay and other members opposite set the course. They are the ones who pushed the control yoke forward, they put the plane into a dive and then all jumped out with their parachutes on. We are rescuing Queensland

from their financial incompetence. We are making tough decisions. We acknowledge, sadly, that people are being hurt by the decisions on job cuts but that is why it is occurring. It is happening because we are trying to cut the cloth so that it is affordable. We do not want to impose $1,000 per man, woman and child in Queensland to bridge the budget deficit that these people have created.

I might pre-empt the next question: what is the total of the LNP's election promises? It is $2.79 billion. This year a fiscal deficit of $10 billion will occur. It has got nothing to do with it. They can stop the spin that we hear day after day. The question yesterday was the line from the opposition that there was no financial problem, but today it has been thrown back across the chamber that somehow there is a problem. It is because of these people. They created the problem and we are going to fix it. We have a plan to sort this out. We have a plan to make sure that Queensland is restored to a balanced budget position. We will see the debt level out at $85 billion in 2014-15. It will not go to $100 billion, which it would have under those opposite. We will pull out of the power dive. We will get the AAA credit rating back in the years to come and we will invest in the infrastructure and services that the people of this state deserve but were not getting from the financial incompetents opposite me.

## Queensland Economy

**Mr WATTS:** My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the House of the Newman government's fiscal consolidation plans and the need to find $4 billion in savings in the next three years in order to stabilise debt?

**Mr NICHOLLS:** I thank the honourable member for Toowoomba North for his question about how we can stabilise the debt. I can tell the honourable member that it will be my pleasure to inform the House about how we will stabilise the situation here in Queensland. I have been listening with some delight to the questions asked by those opposite of the Premier today in relation to the state's financial situation. In particular, they question the trajectory that they set us on. As captains of the good ship Queensland, the Labor Party—I am going to use a different metaphor, Premier; I am not going into the financial abyss—took us over Niagara Falls and there they go, steady as she goes, straight for the waterfall, the sail set full and all rowing in the same direction as they head for Niagara Falls. How do we know that they all set down that way? Because here we have Moody's investment report from October 2011—not any time when we were in charge.

**Ms Trad:** What did Moody's say about your council budget?

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for South Brisbane under standing order 253A and ask for interjections from my left to cease.

**Mr NICHOLLS:** As they set sail for the edge of Niagara Falls, over they go heading towards a debt burden of between 140 and 150 per cent of revenue. We know what Moody's said two weeks ago.

We now have the member for Mulgrave, the shadow Treasurer, promoting the myth that in some way, shape or form this is a result of our election commitments. He did it again yesterday and he has been sending it around the place that these changes are a result of our election commitments. I would recommend that the member for Mulgrave read the LNP costings and savings strategy, because that completely details our costings which are, as the Premier said, $2.8 billion over three years, rising to $4 billion over four years. Madam Speaker, you will not be surprised to know that I have seven copies available again today. I have tabled it once before but I hand them over for the benefit of those opposite.

One knows that counting up to seven would challenge them. They do not even get to taking off their shoes and socks to count to that number. Let us compare that document to what the Labor Party put out—a costings document which is one page and a bit. Here is the former Premier Labor's fully funded election costing plan—

*(Time expired)*

## Regional Cancer Centres, Funding

**Mrs MILLER:** My question is to the Minister for Health. I refer the minister to the facilities being established in Toowoomba, Hervey Bay, Bundaberg, Rockhampton, Townsville and Mount Isa under the Commonwealth-state regional cancer centres program, and I ask: will he advise the House of any proposed cuts to the state funding component of this vital program?

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** I thank the honourable member for her question. I think it is a bit rich coming from those members opposite who left Queensland with a $65 billion debt, heading towards an $85 billion debt under their own projections. As per the Commission of Audit report laid down by Peter Costello and the two other people who assisted there, it would be $100 billion if corrective action were not taken. Then overlay on top of that other issues such as the ongoing deficit situation with regard to our budget.

It would be pertinent for the honourable member opposite who just asked the question to indicate to the House what she is going to do to help us recover the $1 billion which has been lost as a consequence of the negligence of the former government of which she was a part with the health payroll system in Queensland. It is a situation which is causing us to review our budget for Queensland Health. Not only that, we are having to look at doing it at the expense of jobs in Queensland.

It is also true that there are some significant challenges which Queensland Health is facing in regard to meeting some of its commitments for capital upgrades and maintenance. We will be hearing a little about that as the week goes by. That creates some challenges with regard to some of the commitments which we have with some of the capital works which will need to be rolled out over the next little while.

I can assure the honourable member opposite who asked the question that very, very important projects which deliver health care in Queensland will continue to be rolled out in this state—absolutely, 100 per cent. The best thing the honourable member can do is ensure that when commitments are made by the Commonwealth government there is an ongoing commitment of funding as well. What we are seeing with regard to a range of projects which have been developed in Queensland is that the Commonwealth government is very happy to come forward with some of the seed money, but then a little bit further down the track it pulls the rug out from under the state and leaves the state having to recraft its budgetary situation as a consequence.

In conclusion, the greatest thing I can say to the honourable shadow minister for health today is to encourage her to go online to the *Courier-Mail* and actually be one of those people who votes to get the Leader of the Opposition to release that legal advice. If we could get that legal advice released—

*(Time expired)*

## Hospitals, Complaints Handling

**Mr WOODFORTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Last month the Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee tabled a report by Richard Chesterman QC about the handling of complaints and the enforcement of standards in Queensland hospitals. Can the minister inform the House of the steps he has taken to implement the recommendations of this report?

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** I thank the honourable member for his question. As honourable members are aware, the report from Richard Chesterman QC was tabled in this parliament recently. Whilst it found no systemic evidence of failure with regard to the complaints-handling process in Queensland, it certainly recommended some changes. In responding to the report, I said that because of the national jurisdictional issues, three of its four recommendations would need federal support. I am still waiting for evidence of that support.

When health complaints are made, clear lines of responsibility are necessary. Certainty about the process and the reporting of outcomes is essential. The Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency, AHPRA, holds the relevant files and must identify those that are within the scope of the Chesterman recommendations. Last month I wrote to the federal Minister for Health and provided her with a copy of the report. I am yet to receive any response. I have written to AHPRA's CEO also seeking full cooperation, and this week I wrote to the Medical Board of Australia requesting confirmation that access to files will be granted. Queensland Health officers have also met with AHPRA to seek its assistance.

I move to the four recommendations. I was to seek the opinion of the Solicitor-General about the drafting of federal laws which control the Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency. Once AHPRA provides its input, I expect to receive the Solicitor-General's advice in the next couple of weeks. In relation to recommendation 2, in appointing members to the Queensland Board of the Medical Board of Australia the number of medical practitioners was to be reduced and other members increased. This is a recommendation I intend to implement.

The other two recommendations were as follows: an imminent legal practitioner was to examine complaints to the former Medical Board of Queensland, the current Queensland Board of the Medical Board of Australia and AHPRA to decide if criminal charges should be laid; and a panel should be required to review the timely handling of certain complaints by the current Queensland board. Mr Chesterman has been consulted on draft terms of reference to resolve the proposed scope and purpose of each review. Unfortunately, I am advised that preliminary inquiries by AHPRA to quantify the scope of the work remain incomplete. Unless an estimate can be made about how long the process may take, I am unable to appoint the necessary legal professional or panel of reviewers to progress the matter. Queensland Health has identified potential candidates subject to my approval in the areas of senior criminal barristers, legal practitioners expert in regulatory matters, senior medical practitioners and individuals who have served on regulatory boards. This is a convoluted process affecting issues with a high degree of public impact. Public confidence in medical services and the associated complaints process must be improved. I call on the federal government to assist us.

*(Time expired)*

## Gladstone Electorate, Department of Transport and Main Roads

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport. It has been acknowledged in this chamber that the Gladstone electorate is experiencing exponential growth. Will the minister increase staffing levels at the transport department office in Gladstone as constituents are facing unacceptable waiting times and staff are having to accept public criticism and frustration because staffing levels are too low for the region's growth?

**Mr EMERSON:** I thank the honourable member for the question. I know she has been a passionate and effective advocate for her electorate since she was elected in 1995. Anyone who has been to Gladstone—and I have been a regular visitor to Gladstone over many years—would acknowledge the growth that has occurred there. I think the first time I went to Gladstone was in the late 1980s when I was at university working on the *Gladstone Observer* as a journalist. I was back there a couple of months ago and to see the changes over those years is quite remarkable, so I do acknowledge the growth that is occurring in that area. Gladstone is an important area for Queensland and Queensland's future. We are still going through this process of reviewing what we are doing in terms of TMR and those offices, but I am very conscious of what the member is talking about.

I want to remind the House of what this government has already promised to do for areas like Gladstone and what the previous Labor government did not do and what it says it will not do in the future. We have already done our Roads to Resources Program, with $285 million for roads over the next four years. That is for those resource communities like Gladstone that are under real pressure from communities. What about the Bruce Highway? The Bruce Highway is such an important lifeline for places like Gladstone and we have committed an extra billion dollars over the next 10 years for the Bruce Highway, as long as the federal government steps up to the table.

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr EMERSON:** I hear the mutterings from Labor, and I will mention again what they have said about the Bruce Highway. How much money does Labor want to spend on the Bruce Highway? What is it? How much? Zero. What did the Manager of Opposition Business in this House, the shadow minister for main roads, tell the local paper in Cairns? He said that any money the state government spent on the Bruce Highway was a misspending of state money. We promised an extra billion dollars, but Labor call it a misspending of state money. That is Labor's policy on the Bruce Highway—no money for the Bruce Highway from the state. What a disgrace coming from someone who is a shadow minister for main roads—

**Mr Crisafulli:** He lives up there!

**Mr EMERSON:** I take that interjection from my colleague. He is from that area and he knows that area well. He said that any money being spent on the Bruce Highway by the state government is a misspending of money. That is what the Labor Party thinks. I say to the member for Gladstone that I acknowledge the pressures up there and we are working through this. We have inherited a very difficult situation from Labor, but I do appreciate her advocacy on the part of her community.

*(Time expired)*

## Police Service

**Mr PUCCI:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Can the minister please advise the House on the progress of policing initiatives particularly in the south-eastern policing region?

**Mr DEMPSEY:** I would like to thank the member for his interest in community policing efforts, particularly in South-East Queensland, and I would like to thank him for his kindness on my recent visit to Logan when I visited and spoke with many police officers, Neighbourhood Watch members and volunteers in police. Those volunteers have an active interest in the Logan area and they stand up for their community. They assist the hardworking police in Logan. I know through Superintendent Noel Powers, whom I have worked with myself, that they are doing a terrific job even without receiving the resources they needed over the last 20 years. That was reflected even in the debate last night when we saw the disgraceful seven members vote against protecting the police. Did they think of the local community?

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr DEMPSEY:** To return to the question, as I said, I am pleased to take this opportunity to advise the House of the great work the police are doing in this area. Just this week I also had the opportunity to go to the Gold Coast to launch the new contract between the Westpac Life Saver Rescue Helicopter Service and the QPS. This contract will be for a 13-week period with 20 hours allocated flying time per week. So far the helicopter has proven to be very effective. This is a great partnership between the Queensland surf-lifesavers and that other magnificent organisation the Queensland Police Service.

During the trial period to 5 August 2012 the helicopter undertook 1,498 tasks over a total of 504 flights—very dedicated people. This helicopter is fitted with a high-definition FLIR camera, electronic mapping, synthetic vision and high-powered tracking spotlights. This will give the police a powerful eye in the sky to combat crime and keep people safe on our roads and in their communities.

While on the Gold Coast I also had the privilege to release the myPolice blog, which is doing a terrific job. It is modern technology linking police with their community, reducing the fear of crime. It is a modern tool. This government will provide the police with more modern technologies and tools so that they can get on with their policing jobs. We will reduce red tape so that police can get back on the beat, raise the already high standard of accountability and ensure that we meet the expectations of all Queenslanders of doing the job and serving the people of Queensland.

## Education, National Curriculum

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. The rollout of the national curriculum has proven to be a disaster for remote students. Course materials are incomplete and the level of work is too high, which has made it difficult for parents—

**Madam SPEAKER:** I am going to ask the member to start his question again because there is noise coming from the backbenchers that is audible from here and it is disrupting the asking of the question. Please let him ask his question in silence. I call the member for Dalrymple and ask him to start again.

**Mr KNUTH:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. The rollout of the national curriculum has proven to be a disaster for remote students. Course material is incomplete and the level of work is too high, which has made it difficult for parents of isolated students to teach their children. Many parents are concerned about the political ideology contained in the subject material. Will the minister allow isolated and remote students to return to the open access units until issues with the new material have been resolved?

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I thank the honourable member for the question. There is no doubt that it has been a difficult year for people in the Queensland school system and not just for people using distance education resources. They have had to deal with the transfer of maths, English and science into the national curriculum. C2C contains the elements that the Queensland education department have been working on to provide resources for not just people in distance education but also people throughout our school system. It has been very, very challenging because we have basically put all the resources for 10 years worth of education—P-10—into one year. We have had to do all that preparation work in order for people to be able to teach the national curriculum. That has been a big job.

The first thing I did as Minister for Education, Training and Employment was to go to the school of distance education. I personally have experienced distance education when I was living in New Guinea for two years as a year 6 and 7 student. So I know the difficulties that I faced and that I know lots of parents and students studying through distance education have faced. I have met with representatives of the Isolated Children's Parents Association and their executive. I have listened to their concerns and I have made sure that I have asked my department about the concerns being expressed by that association. I understand that they are holding a conference in September in Goondiwindi. I think my assistant minister, the member for Mount Coot-tha, is actually going to that conference

**Mr Springborg:** So am I.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** The Minister for Health is also going to that conference in Goondiwindi, which is in his electorate. I know that past ministers have not been to those conferences. I want to thank both of my parliamentary colleagues for attending.

I have also met with representatives of the seven distance education schools. Mothers from those groups have come to see me to speak about the problems that they have encountered, about the difficulties of understanding and passing on curriculum to their school-age children when they are not teachers but are teaching in the home environment and the frustrations they feel. I went back to the executive principal at the school of distance education via my department to ensure that in those classrooms of people who are working on these resources—and there are literally scores of people in these classrooms writing the curriculum that is then being passed on to our students in distance education—we are making sure that we are working with people online as hard as we can to ensure that the resourcing is delivered to them not only on time, that is obviously imperative, but also in a language they can understand so that they can then pass it on to their students. We do not want them to feel isolated geographically or intellectually because the language used is not appropriate for nonteachers. We will work on all of those things and we have given a commitment to keep working on this. Next year history will come into the national curriculum as well. We are now working at a ministerial level on bringing secondary subjects for years 11 and 12 into the national curriculum for the years beyond that as well.

This is our commitment: to work with these people and to listen to them. Unfortunately, previous ministers did not do that. We are committed to doing it so that we can get Queensland parents in isolated situations back on track as well.

## Dalby, Coal Fire

**Dr ROBINSON:** My question is to the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Can the minister please provide an update to the House on remediation of the coal fire near Dalby?

**Mr CRIPPS:** I thank the member for Cleveland for his question about this issue which is of public interest. I am pleased to say that the Newman government has acted swiftly to protect public health and safety on the Darling Downs following a weekend incident involving a fire on a resource tenement. Public safety was our first priority and I make absolutely no apologies for that. I can report, weather permitting, that work will begin immediately to extinguish a slow-burning fire in an abandoned exploration drill hole north-west of Dalby.

Yesterday a meeting of the Department of Natural Resources and Mines officers and local resource companies developed a plan to remediate the site. Officers from the Petroleum and Gas Inspectorate within my department will oversee a remediation operation that will safely extinguish the flame, stabilise the former exploration site and then seal it to ensure public safety is protected. Local resource companies will provide equipment and technical expertise. However, P&G inspectorate officers will be on the site at all times. I welcome the cooperation of local companies and thank them for their proactive approach to helping to provide a solution to this situation.

Earthworks will begin as soon as possible to prepare the site for the heavy equipment that will be needed later in the week to drill out the exploration hole. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines will make it a priority to provide regular updates to local landholders and the community to counter the irresponsible information and inaccurate speculation being spread by groups opposed to the coal seam gas industry. I have been very disappointed to hear constant uninformed commentary about this situation from anti-CSG activists when an investigation is on foot and underway to establish the facts surrounding this incident. In the past 24 hours the efforts of departmental officers and resource company personnel to effectively deal with this situation in the interests of public safety have been described by these activists as absurd and irresponsible. I fail to see how the protection of public health and safety can be seen as anything but the highest possible priority. It is, in fact, the criticism of this approach by these activists that is absurd and irresponsible.

I assure the local residents of Dalby and the surrounding district that we are taking urgent action informed by factual information to ensure that this site is made safe. In the longer term, I have directed my department to review its records to determine whether there are other sites that may potentially require similar remedial works. However, our immediate focus remains firmly on removing any risks to public health and safety at this site.

## Ambulance Service

**Mr BYRNE:** My question is to the Minister for Police and Community Safety. Will the minister guarantee that the Newman government will not privatise any uniform part of the Queensland Ambulance Service during this term?

**Mr DEMPSEY:** The gift that keeps on giving! From a member and shadow minister who last night failed to support laws to protect police officers—

**Opposition members** interjected.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** They do not like it. The shadow minister, who has emergency services as part of his shadow portfolio responsibilities, came into this House when we introduced legislation to increase the penalties in relation to assaulting police—from seven years to 14 years imprisonment—and simply said, 'No, I will not protect you.' Then in relation to the serious offence of evading police we proposed a mandatory minimum penalty of $5,000 and a two-year loss of licence and he said no.

**Mr Byrne:** Read my speech.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** We can read the speech, but it is about how you voted.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr Malone** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! I warn the member for Mirani.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** This is the shadow minister who asks a question in relation to the privatisation of ambulance stations; is that correct?

**Mr Byrne** interjected.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** No. In previous sittings in this House we have had debt, deficit and deceit. Now we are seeing denial—and we are not talking about the river. The member for Rockhampton and the rest of the members of the opposition—the David Copperfields of cash over the last 20 years—have taken no responsibility at the end of their time in government.

**Ms Palaszczuk:** Answer the question.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** I have just said: no.

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! I now warn members on my right as well as my left. It is becoming difficult to hear the minister answer the question. I call the minister to answer the question.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** So in addition to debt, deficit and denial, we have hypocrisy. And we all know how we spell 'hypocrisy', don't we?

**Government members:** A-L-P.

**Mr DEMPSEY:** A-L-P. Let us look at what they did to emergency services and police, even since November last year. There was a reduction of 320 staff in police and approximately 120 in corrective services. If those opposite talked to the three former ministers on the opposition frontbench they would find out how they ripped the departments completely apart. After 20 years of those opposite putting this state into debt, we will paint plenty of pictures in question time. A $65 billion debt means over $100 million in interest. On my department's figures, that equates to an extra 1,000 ambulance officers or an extra 1,000 fire officers. If you want to equate it to carbon credits, it is 38.

## Women, Legal Services

**Mrs OSTAPOVITCH:** My question without notice is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice. What steps has the Newman government recently taken to deliver vital front-line legal assistance to Queensland's vulnerable women, and what steps are being taken to ensure important public input into the future of financial support for legal services throughout Queensland?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I thank the member for Stretton for the question and for the strong interest she has in vulnerable women in Queensland who deserve every access to legal justice. On that note, last week it was an immense pleasure for the Premier and me to attend a function at Gadens lawyers supporting the Women's Legal Service. We recommitted this government to providing $750,000 over three years. The Women's Legal Service gives not only legal advice and referral; it also gives advice to women in domestic violence situations. At that function the Premier and I heard the sad news that on the previous night the Women's Legal Service had to turn away seven women because that vital service was underfunded by the Labor Party. I remember the former minister for women—

**Ms Bates:** How could you forget her?

**Mr BLEIJIE:** I do. I remember what she said when we made this vital announcement of a pledge to provide $750,000 for vulnerable women in Queensland. She said that it was hush money. I said shame on her then, and I say shame on the Labor Party and the seven opposite who support that opinion. I am told that the member for South Brisbane and the former minister for women are good friends—good buddies from the same faction of the Labor Party.

I was very happy to join with the Premier when he announced the additional funding of $750,000. We talk about underfunding for the Women's Legal Service. Justice Margaret McMurdo was referenced in an article in the *Sunday Mail* of 27 November 2011. The article states—

One of the state's most respected legal figures has hit out against funding cuts to the Women's Legal Service.

The president of the Court of Appeal says it would be "unthinkable" if a domestic violence victim became a homicide statistic after being turned away from the WLS—

the Women's Legal Service—

because of cutbacks.

We have righted that wrong. Not only have we done that; we have also engaged the private sector. Gadens lawyers on the night announced $75,000 over three years in sponsorship. The Women's Legal Service is not saying, 'We want a handout;' it is saying, 'We want government help but we also want the private sector to become engaged.'

The government will be conducting a review of legal funding in the LPITAF funding arrangement. It is my pleasure to table a copy of the review of the allocation of funds from the legal practitioners interest fund.

*Tabled paper:* Department of Justice and Attorney-General document, undated, titled 'Review of the allocation of funds from the Legal Practitioner Interest on Trust Accounts Fund, Terms of reference' [788].

We will make sure that community legal centres are sustainable, that they have funding, and that the Law Society and the Bar Association work with us to ensure there is enough money in that fund in the years ahead so we can make these decisions to ensure the Women's Legal Service and groups like it receive the vital funding that women in Queensland deserve.

## Oral Health Services

**Ms TRAD:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the government's mass sackings and cuts to front-line services, and I ask: will the minister confirm that oral health services—

**Government members** interjected.

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! We will hear the question. I will ask the member for South Brisbane to start again.

**Ms TRAD:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the government's mass sackings and cuts to front-line services, and I ask: will the minister confirm that oral health services within Metro North region are now subject to budget cuts and that oral health services at Royal Children's Hospital, including surgery on cleft palates in infants, have also been directed to cut their budget?

**Mr STEVENS:** Madam Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Under standing orders, that question clearly contains an imputation and therefore is out of order.

**Madam SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the Minister for Health to answer that question and determine what aspects are appropriate. I call the Minister for Health.

**Mr SPRINGBORG:** We have opposite a member asking a question who obviously has been stuck in a time warp when it comes to the administration of health in Queensland. On 24 March, not one single person in this state voted for Queensland Health to stay the way it is. Being stuck in that time warp, the honourable member opposite does not understand some of the trials and tribulations that the Queensland budget is going through and some of the difficulties involved with battling with the problems of Labor's failed Health payroll system.

The simple reality is that all of the hospital and health services across this state will have an increase in their budget. That has already been established. The clear indication is that we will be quarantining front-line services from the very necessary process that we are going through at the moment with regard to corporate restructure and the restructuring of middle management. I would love for the utopian notion that exists in the minds of the Labor Party to be attainable—that is, a money tree or a magic pudding. That is the way the Labor Party operated in Queensland.

Going back specifically to the issue of oral health services in this state, we have a greater availability of oral health services for the patients of Queensland than anywhere else in Australia. Some 40 per cent of Queenslanders are eligible to access oral health services through our public health system, and we are currently in negotiations with the Commonwealth about actually increasing those services—not decreasing those services. Here is another contention that the honourable member opposite might like to consider for one moment. Where was the honourable member opposite when from 1 July last year to 24 March this year the Labor Party terminated 4,440 contracts in Queensland? Where was the honourable member opposite? Where was her concern about the workers in Queensland at that stage? Where was the honourable member opposite when from 1 July last year to 31 December last year 690 temporary nurses lost their jobs in Queensland—those people who the honourable member opposite is running around about at the moment pretending through her gushing crocodile tears to have some concerns about? I am asking the honourable member opposite to do the honourable thing: to put pressure on that person in front of her—and she is probably doing that with a knife at the moment—to get her to release the secret legal advice so that I can get that $150 million to enhance services in Queensland Health.

*(Time expired)*

## Biosecurity

**Mr TROUT:** My question without notice is to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. Can the minister please inform the House of the impact of his department's savings on front-line biosecurity in Queensland?

**Madam SPEAKER:** Minister, you have two minutes.

**Mr McVEIGH:** I thank the member for his question. The answer to that is none. None of the savings will impact biosecurity programs. Vital front-line services are being fully maintained. Indeed, they are being enhanced under the Newman LNP government after years of shameful neglect. An additional 15 new biosecurity front-line officers are being provided, including five wild dog officers, three tick officers, three new crop protection officers, two new pest and weeds officers, a horticultural officer

and a fisheries officer. Like every department, we have had to find savings because of the absolute financial mess left by those opposite. We have found savings in head office of approximately 200 staff—mostly admin, corporate, communications and PR roles the Beattie-Bligh Labor regimes were so fond of at the expense of front-line agronomy and livestock officers.

Let us compare this with the massive staff cuts under Labor. When Labor came to power some 20 years ago, DPI had 6,250 staff. When the LNP came to office, we could identify that there were just 2,788 left. In the end, of course, there was no department left. Under Labor, DPI was slashed some 55 per cent. Under Mulherin it was slashed a further 1,113 staff—a further 28 per cent cut by Mulherin. In the end he did not even have a department. Ludwig has been hitting the airwaves peddling fear. In fact, the person putting farm industries at risk is Joe Ludwig himself. The real danger to Queensland farmers and agricultural production given that Ludwig has not bothered to lift a finger for Queensland banana and pineapple growers is Labor itself. It always has been.

**Madam SPEAKER:** The time for questions has expired.

## MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

### Australian Agricultural College Corporation

**Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (3.32 pm), by leave: I rise to advise the House of the absolutely parlous financial and physical state of our once-proud agricultural colleges that were put by the previous Labor regime under the Australian Agricultural College Corporation in 2005. Our agricultural colleges have been shamefully run down and neglected, particularly during the time of the former minister and now deputy opposition leader, Tim Mulherin. On taking over as minister, I toured the colleges and quickly saw the extent of maladministration. My office was inundated with complaints and consequently I instructed my director-general, who is the CEO of the AACC, to instigate an independent review. This review has been undertaken by Ernst & Young and late yesterday afternoon I was presented with its final report—which is absolutely damning—and I table its key findings.

*Tabled paper:* Summary of findings by Ernst & Young relating to agricultural colleges [789].

Proper financial management and reporting has been virtually nonexistent. Indeed, there even appears to be no proper recording of academic records. In short, AACC is heading towards a loss of some $6.8 million this financial year. It would run out of money by the end of this calendar year. The corporation and the colleges cannot be left to continue in their present shameful state. Ernst & Young found management and financial reporting have been appalling. Potential workplace health and safety issues abound. There are possible concerns with overstaffing, poor standards in kitchens and accommodation—generally, maintenance and upgrades have been virtually nonexistent for a decade or more. Mr Mulherin and Labor wrecked our once-proud agricultural colleges. They ran the Burdekin college down into a disgraceful state of repair before mothballing it. They sold off the Dalby Agricultural College assets and lumbered staff and a respected industry advisory board with a simply unworkable and non-viable AACC model.

There will be changes and I am now working very closely with my colleague the Minister for Education to work on options to ensure appropriate and industry-relevant agricultural education in Queensland. I will be consulting widely with industry and local members and local community representatives on the way forward from this mess, and I look forward to working with the member for Gregory, amongst others, in that regard. Agricultural colleges this academic year in particular, given the 100 or so residential students who are now at Emerald and Longreach colleges, will finish their college courses this year with my full support. The LNP supports agriculture as one of the four pillars of the Queensland economy. Make no mistake: I am committed to agricultural skilling and training, but Queensland deserves better than this. Therefore, in order to report back to cabinet in the coming months, the Minister for Education and I will consider all options moving forward and work closely with my agricultural and rural community stakeholders so we can get the agricultural skilling and training outcomes that Queensland deserves.

## SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

### School Group Tours

**Madam SPEAKER:** There will be tours today from school students from Coolum Beach Christian College, represented by the member for Nicklin; Geebung Special School, represented by the member for Nudgee; and Monkland State School, represented by the member for Gympie.

# MINES LEGISLATION (STREAMLINING) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 2 August (see p. 1437).

## Second Reading

**Hon. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (3.36 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for its expeditious consideration of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. I note that the committee tabled its report on Thursday, 16 August 2012. I now table a copy of the Queensland government's response to that report.

*Tabled paper:* Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 7—Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012, government response [790].

The committee's report recommends that the bill be passed. I will now address a number of points of clarification and recommendations for the amendments which have been raised in the committee report. Before I address the specific recommendations of the committee, I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge the consultation that I have had with my colleagues the Minister for Energy and Water Supply in relation to the streamlining amendments contained in this bill that provide for increased flexibility for petroleum leaseholders to adjust production commencement dates. These amendments support the emerging CSG-LNG industry. In making a decision to adjust production commencement dates, the minister will consider a range of issues such as gas market considerations, the public interest and the interests of the state.

I will now address the points of clarification and recommendations contained in the committee report. The committee has sought clarification regarding what additional work the department will undertake to inform landholders and other affected stakeholders about the provisions of the bill should it be passed through the House. This is a valid point of clarification sought by the committee, and obviously effective implementation is key to any policy and legislative process.

In order to inform key stakeholders of the passing of the bill, the department will write to them, industry peak bodies and those individuals who made submissions to the committee informing them that the bill has been passed and highlighting key sections of the bill. The department will also continue to work through implementation of the bill through regular stakeholder meetings that are held with groups such as AgForce, the Queensland Farmers Federation, the Queensland Resources Council and the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association. The committee has also sought an assurance that the department will in future include landholders, environmental groups and peak bodies representing them in consultation processes for industry related bills.

Firstly, I would like to say that this government is listening to the concerns of the community. The provisions of the bill reflect the issues that communities and landholders have expressed not only to me but also to my parliamentary colleague over some time through a broad range of mechanisms. This is particularly relevant to the CSG-LNG related amendments that have been directly informed by community concerns about environment and landholder impacts and directly address these issues. I can assure the committee and the parliament that this government is committed to collaborative policy and legislative development processes as they relate to the resources sector.

A prime example of this commitment is the establishment of the GasFields Commission. The core focus of the GasFields Commission is to assist in promoting co-existence and community acceptance of the gas industry in Queensland. The GasFields Commission will play a key role in representing community and landholder interests in future reform processes.

It is pleasing to note that the first recommendation of the committee is that the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 be passed. The committee has sought further advice as to when MyMinesOnline will be operational once the bill is passed and when it will be possible for members of the public to access permits and lease documents online. I acknowledge that there was broader community concern regarding opportunities for the public to benefit from modernising tenure administration, in particular, public access to online information about resources activities.

I am pleased to draw the attention of the House again to the release last Friday, 17 August 2012, of the local area mining permit report service. This free online service utilises MyMinesOnline technology to provide user-friendly reports about resources activity in a local area. Members of the public will now be able to search for applications and granted permits over and within two kilometres of their land or by local government boundary.

The committee has recommended that the bill be amended to more clearly provide that contractual arrangements between parties that grant interest in parts of mining tenements are not covered by the prohibited dealings provisions of the bill. I understand that a segment of the industry has some concerns about provisions in the bill that regulate postgrant business transactions and changes of

ownership. I acknowledge the committee's recommendation for greater clarity around contractual arrangements and prohibited dealings as well as the submissions made to the inquiry by the Queensland Resources Council and Freehills lawyers. I note that in its submission Freehills refers to case law to support its view. However, it is the opinion of the government that at this point the related provisions of the bill serve the policy intent and reflect the existing frameworks currently in place in the resources legislation. This amendment maintains the status quo.

It is important to note that the matters raised have the potential to have a broader impact than this bill and could potentially require amendments to all of the resource acts. Should further detailed consideration of these issues result in the need for additional legislative changes, I will seek these at a later time, if required. However, I wish to assure all stakeholders that the government will undertake more detailed consideration of the committee's recommendation and the issues raised in the submissions.

The committee has also recommended an amendment to the bill to provide that safety requirements of the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 shall be the safety regime that applies to pipelines for the transport of produced water. I appreciate the concerns raised by stakeholders in regard to clause 114 of the bill about two safety regimes applying to the same area or no regimes applying at all. The potential issues arise from complex definition issues, so careful consideration and discussions with stakeholders will be needed to ensure that the intended outcome is achieved without impacting on other provisions. As such, along with the need to progress the remainder of this important bill expeditiously, I propose that any amendments required be addressed in the next suitable legislative instrument process. However, I want to assure stakeholders that, as drafted, the bill and the current provisions in the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 will pose no risk to safety.

Under the proposed amendments, pipelines that transport produced water that are authorised under a petroleum authority will still be subject to the safety management plan provisions of the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, which defines all authorised activities for a petroleum authority as operating plant. In addition, the vast majority of water pipelines carrying untreated water are constructed out of polyethylene, or PE. The construction and operation of these pipelines is required to meet the standards set out in the Code of Practice for Upstream PE Gathering Networks—CSG Industry. This code is called up as a safety requirement under the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Regulation 2004. Water pipelines under a petroleum authority will also be subject to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011.

In relation to the compulsory acquisition amendments, the committee requested that I clarify what is meant by the words 'extinguish all interests in the land, including native title rights and interests' stated in clauses 21, 42, 48, 73, 79, and 158 of the bill. It is important to note that these provisions in no way change or amend rights or processes under Commonwealth native title legislation.

To explain the effect of the clauses, it is necessary to briefly outline the intent of the abovementioned clauses. A key element of the compulsory acquisition amendments is that resource interests should be extinguished by compulsory acquisition of land only where it is incompatible with the purpose of taking the land. The abovementioned clauses outline a less obvious but important example of where the existence of resource interests is incompatible with the purpose of taking the land. In some instances, it is necessary for the state to extinguish all interest in land, including native title. For example, to convert leasehold land to a freehold title, it is necessary to extinguish the interest of the lessee and that of the native title holder. In order to do this, it is necessary to extinguish any resource interests present, even if resource interests are not physically incompatible with the purpose of taking the land.

To avoid any doubts about the intent of amendments, the abovementioned provisions clarify that resource interests can be extinguished where it is necessary to extinguish all interests in the land, including native title rights and interests. In these instances, the resource interests holder would be required to be served with relevant notices and have access to compensation for any resumed rights. I commend the bill to the House.



**Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (3.48 pm): This legislation is evidence that, when it comes to the 'N' in LNP, the mining industry comes first. The opposition notes with concern the omission of urban restricted areas in this legislation and that they were included in the previous incarnation called the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011. This legislation lapsed at the election.

There are many aspects of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill, particularly around the streamlining of government processes for CSG, that we support. Some of these legislative changes are sensible and will lower costs for both industry and government. However, I must limit my praise in relation to that part of the legislation. It was the previous Labor government that put in the hard yards to bring about a green tape reduction project to streamline government processes for CSG.

I am sure that this government will be trying as hard as it can to take credit for this legislation, just as the LNP try to avoid taking any responsibility for its plan to increase debt and harp on about debt left by Labor. Just as they stood outside the Airport Link tunnel or at the official opening of the Supreme Court building—

**Mr Berry** interjected.

**Mrs MILLER:** And I am hearing the good member for Ipswich, Mr Berry. Oh deary me, how we loved the photo of the member for Ipswich and the member for Mount Coot-tha at the Bremer Institute of TAFE. It was a lovely photo. The day before the member for Ipswich was whingeing and whining about us spending money on good things like the Bremer Institute of TAFE and then he carries on like a lunatic about the so-called debt. We put in all this money in relation to looking after the Bremer Institute of TAFE and you, you hypocrite, member for Ipswich, and member for Mount Coot-tha, have a photo taken of what you criticise. Unbelievable!

**Mr RICKUSS:** I question the relevance of this. This bill is the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Legislation. It has nothing to do with Bundamba TAFE.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! I remind the member to be relevant to the bill, please.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** I rise to a point of order. I would like your ruling as to whether the metaphor 'like a lunatic' is appropriate parliamentary language.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will ask the member for Bundamba to withdraw.

**Mrs MILLER:** I withdraw. Member for Lockyer, I thank you for your advice in relation to the bill. I will not miss you either. That is coming later. There are things that Labor would have done differently, however, in relation to this legislation. Labor in government would have consulted properly with farmers, graziers, landholders, environmental groups and the broader community. The government initially proposed just four working days for landholders, graziers, farmers and other community groups to lodge submissions on over 500 pages of legislation and explanatory notes following a three-year long consultative process with the resources industry. The majority of public submissions received took issue with this lack of consultation. In relation to this lack of consultation, page 4 the committee's report states—

The failure to consult stakeholders during the development of the Bill has created widespread concern. The development of this Bill would have benefited from wide public consultation during its development and discussions with all stakeholders prior to its introduction in the Parliament.

There must be an extended time for public consultation on this legislation for it to have any legitimacy at all. As the member for South Brisbane set out in the opposition statement of reservations, nine working days for the committee to consult, consider and deliberate on more than 500 pages of material as part of this legislation is completely unacceptable in a democracy like Queensland. I note that the member for Dalrymple and Katter's Australian Party, through a statement of reservation, is willing to stand up for regional Queensland landholders and take issue with this. Good on them. It is a pity that, other than the member for Gregory, there are few others in this LNP government willing to do likewise. When the LNP were in opposition, and most members would not even know because they were not here, we also heard the member for Condamine and the member for Warrego stand up for regional landholders. It is now becoming a very bad habit of this LNP government to use the committee system as a rubber stamp. There they go, rubber-stamping the legislation and to consult in name only and not in practice. With such a strong parliamentary majority, Queenslanders should be concerned with this habit. I can tell members I know they are.

I do not take issue with my good friend and neighbour, the member for Lockyer, because we do share a border at Ripley. I do not take issue with the chair of this committee because the chair of this committee sometimes takes personal offence.

**Mr Rickuss:** Very rarely.

**Mrs MILLER:** He takes personal offence so I do not take issue with him, but I do take issue with the government. This government should be concerned by the genuine criticism from stakeholders across the community that they are not consulting adequately. We do not want the LNP telling us that it is not concerned about a lack of consultation, as they seem to do when the community disagree with them. What we ask is that this government starts listening to the community, and listening means opening both ears. One area where the government might benefit from listening is in the removal of the legislation for urban restricted areas. There were public submissions from AgForce, the Friends of the Earth, the Environmental Defenders Office of Northern Queensland, the Environmental Defenders Office, the Queensland Greens and the Mackay Conservation Group. All took issue with the removal of urban restricted areas from this legislation. The earlier iteration of this legislation, that lapsed before the election, was titled the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011.

**Mr Choat** interjected.

**Mrs MILLER:** You wait. I will not miss you. It contained restricted urban areas or an urban buffer zone on mining. The previous government's policy was to restrict mining exploration and development within two kilometres of towns with a population of over 1,000 people or to create an urban buffer.

**Mr Cripps:** Keep digging a hole. Jackie dug the hole for you this morning on the radio. You keep digging.

**Mrs MILLER:** No, you can't dig yourself out. We expected more from the minister. We really did.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**Mrs MILLER:** Have you just warned the minister? I thought you might have there. We expected more of the minister in relation to this legislation. I know a lot about mining exploration and development within two kilometres because Ipswich was a big mining community. We know a lot about the effect of mining exploration and development.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mrs MILLER:** That is right. Over towards your way. I think in the seat of Ipswich West. In my own electorate mining has encroached on urban areas. The suburbs of Swanbank, Bundamba, Ebbw Vale, Dinmore, Riverview, Redbank, Redbank Plains, Collingwood Park, Blackstone and Goodna have all had coalmining. To this day we still have the effects of coalmining in our community. The urban restricted area policy has been implemented by us through a gazette notice, but this legislation would have enshrined it. There is nothing in this legislation that would have prevented the minister changing the population and distance ratios to fit differing circumstances. So here we have in this parliament—

**A government member:** Here we go. Come on.

**Mrs MILLER:** You are going to cop it. Here we have in this parliament the members for Ipswich and Ipswich West who are going to vote for this legislation, which means that, in the case of the member for Ipswich West, he is going to support legislation that is going to allow exploration and development right up in Rosewood, right up in Tivoli—

**Government members** interjected.

**Mrs MILLER:** You are going to allow it. You are going to allow development and exploration.

**Mr CRIPPS:** I rise to a point of order. I really must object to this continuous line of debate from the member opposite, because the member is misleading the House in relation to the effect of the provisions of the bill. I will be happy to outline why that is so when I reply to the second reading debate—

**Ms TRAD:** I rise to a point of order. That is not a point of order.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! Members will take their seats. I call the member for Bundamba.

**Mrs MILLER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you very much. I know what the minister is trying to do. I know that he is trying to look after the members for Ipswich and Ipswich West, because they are going to lose at the next state election. We have the best candidates lined up against them and we are going to wipe the floor with them. They will only be oncers in here. I can tell the House that when the people of Rosewood, Tivoli and Raceview know that they voted for a government that is going to allow exploration and mining right up to their back doors, they are going to absolutely slaughter you. That is what is going to happen.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**A government member:** You're a liar.

**Ms TRAD:** I rise to a point of order. Unparliamentary language was used by the member over there, the member for Ipswich West. Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask you to make a ruling that he withdraw that unparliamentary language. He called the member a liar.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I did not hear the language, I am sorry.

**Mr Choat:** I did not.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Ipswich West!

**Mrs MILLER:** I heard him call me a liar and I am personally offended by that—deeply offended, in fact. Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker, I ask him to withdraw,

**Mr CHOAT:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I will not withdraw because I did not make the comment. Get your facts right, ladies.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member will take his seat.

**Mrs MILLER:** Let us have a look at this. In the last sitting, legislation went through this House in relation to lying to the parliament. One of you called me a liar. Which one is it? Stand up and be counted. Which one was it? The member for Ipswich is on his feet.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Bundamba, I have ruled on this. I did not hear it. You will now move back on to the debate.

**Mrs MILLER:** The member for Ipswich stood up when I asked for the person who said it to stand up and be counted. The LNP government has advised the committee that they are walking away from regional landholders having buffer zones around regional towns. Why? Because they will look to do something similar through their statutory regional planning process. I ask, who in this state would trust the Deputy Premier, Jeff Seeney, with a statutory regional planning process?

**Government members:** I would.

**Mrs MILLER:** No-one else would; no-one else with a brain in their head would. We on this side of the House understand the Deputy Premier to be the most hated man in the bush. God forbid! No-one would accept that.

We do not accept the LNP's hollow excuses for removing urban restricted areas and putting the mining industry ahead of Queensland communities. The rushed nature of this legislation has also resulted in unintended consequences. I note that page 10 of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee report details that the legislation could result in the same geographical locations being subject to two separate pieces of workplace health and safety legislation, that is, some pipelines will not be directly subjected to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 and could instead be subject to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011. This is a little embarrassing for legislation entitled 'Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill'. This issue was brought to the government's attention through a submission from HopgoodGanim Lawyers. This shows the value of consultation. Had government consulted earlier in the process, there would not be a requirement now for legislative amendment.

Another area of concern raised in public submissions to the committee is whether the information in the MyMinesOnline portal will be made publicly available. We encourage the government to make as much information from this web portal available to the public as is practical. I note that the current MyMinesOnline portal allows for public inquiry reports and this is a start. It is also worth mentioning the advice from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines that no landholder rights will be limited by the new section 15A under clause 76 for the movement of produced water and brine as part of the CSG industry. The Queensland Gas Company has advised that these amendments will allow for the construction of pipelines across tenure to central treatment facilities and will mean 68 fewer landholders are impacted. Many of those water pipelines will be underground to minimise the impacts on landholders.

Even with existing landholder protections, the role of the LNG Enforcement Unit, established by the previous Labor government, will continue to be important in managing impacts. This government needs to make sure that its heartless cuts to services and government workers across Queensland do not extend to the LNG Enforcement Unit. I would ask the minister to personally give that commitment in relation to the LNG Enforcement Unit. Last year, the LNG Enforcement Unit inspected 300 groundwater bores to monitor groundwater impacts from CSG development. Most landholders in the Surat Basin would consider the LNG Enforcement Unit's role to be front line.

However, what is front line under this LNP Newman government? The goalposts move around like dancing AFL football players. We never know what it is. They just move around and wave about. There go the front-line lines, because we do not know what they are. I doubt that the inspectors meet the 75 per cent contact with the public that the new definition of front-line officers seems to require. I ask the minister: what is it? Are they front-line people? Are they front-line officers? As I look across, I see that the minister is looking down, down, down. Are they front-line officers or not? Are you going to let us know? Are you going to tell us?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! The member for Bundamba will address her comments through the chair.

**Mr BERRY:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I want to correct the record. The member for Bundamba indicated, when she was looking for somebody when she was called a liar—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I have already ruled on this and I have said I did not hear it. Please take your seat. I call the member for Bundamba.

**Mr BERRY:** I want to correct the record, because—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Take your seat.

**Mrs MILLER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, thank you for your protection. For LNP members, those here at the moment and others out on one of the rosters, to take credit for the work of this bill is yet another attempt at rewriting the history books of this state. As an opposition, we take issue with the fact that, following three years of consultation with industry, the LNP initially granted just four working days for submissions from landholders, graziers, environmental groups and farmers. We also take issue with removing urban restricted areas from the previous version of this bill.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mrs MILLER:** Let me just assure members, including the member for Lockyer—

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lockyer!

**Mrs MILLER:** Thank you so much for your protection, Mr Deputy Speaker. They are getting a bit excited, particularly the member for Lockyer, whom I have some respect for as the chairperson of this committee, and the members for Ipswich and Ipswich West because you will wear this legislation like a crown of thorns around your neck.

**Mr LANGBROEK:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Can I refer you to standing order 244(7), which says that members will only refer to each other by their title or parliamentary district.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I will ask the member to address her comments through the chair. I will ask the member to address members by their correct title. And I will ask the member to please be relevant.

**Mrs MILLER:** Thank you very much, Mr Deputy Speaker. It is a pity that the Minister for Education was not listening. I did in fact refer to the member for Ipswich and the member for Ipswich West and I stated that they will wear this legislation like a crown of thorns around their heads, because by the time we are finished with them they will be out of here.

**Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (4.10 pm): I rise with great glee to respond to the ridiculous statements that have just been put forward by the member for Bundamba. Unfortunately, she has done no research.

**Mrs Miller:** Yes, I have.

**Mr RICKUSS:** If she has been given information, she has been poorly misled. This bill—the Mining Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012—is the sort of bill that politicians come into the House to get passed. This is something which a politician can really get his teeth into, do some hard work and get things done. Who is doing it? The LNP members here. It is to see a wrong and right it; to help a community and fix it.

We heard a lot of banter about the communities that will be disadvantaged. What about communities like Ma Ma Creek in the Lockyer Valley? There are about 15 to 20 people, a few houses, a shop and a hall. You are ignoring those communities with your two-kilometre buffer for a thousand people. There is myriad small communities in my area, in the member for Whitsunday's area, in the member for Dalrymple's area, in the member for Warrego's area and in the member for Gregory's area that do not have a thousand people but still need protection and that is what our statutory planning will do. It is not about ignoring the poor small villages; it is about assisting the poor small villages that you have forgotten. That is why there are only seven of you sitting over there, because you forgot most of the state.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lockyer will address his comments through the chair and refrain from using the word 'you' when addressing a member.

**Mr RICKUSS:** I apologise, Mr Deputy Speaker. I must congratulate Minister Cripps, the Premier and the cabinet for introducing this legislation. It really is something that needed to be fixed. As the member for Bundamba said, the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill did have consultation. You highlighted the fact that there was a lot of consultation on that bill. That is the foundation for this bill. Unfortunately, a lot of the reports that were made did not understand that the statutory regulations were going to assist those small communities that everyone else had ignored. That is why this is such a good report into this legislation. It is absolutely disappointing when members of the opposition cannot grasp the whole concept of what is being done here. This legislation will improve the way the state does business.

The minister announced the MyMinesOnline website yesterday in parliament. That will definitely assist communities. It will assist communities of all sizes because they will be able to find that information out at the click of a few buttons on a computer. This is about saving the state unreasonable costs. Even the Environmental Defenders Office of North Queensland talked about this mining resource that the state owns which they wanted to compensate mining companies for. Let us be realistic: we the Queensland people own the resource. We are talking about the acquisition of land under railway lines and paying people for a resource that we the people own. Let us be realistic: the government is not some airy-fairy notion. The government is us. The government is the people of Queensland. Unfortunately, that is where this delusional ALP has gone wrong. It has forgotten that it is the people of Queensland's money that makes up the government of Queensland's money, and the previous government spent it ridiculously.

We had a rant from the member for Bundamba about how they did the hard yards and we did not do the consultation. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot have done the hard yards but then there has been no consultation. Members on the committee grew up looking down at the Rosewood mine. The Krause family live at Tallegalla and overlook the mines at Rosewood which would be, what? About two or three kilometres away?

**Mr Krause:** About that.

**Mr RICKUSS:** I take that interjection.

**Mrs MILLER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I would just like to place on record—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Bundamba, what is your point of order?

**Mrs MILLER:** My point of order is that it is not only the member for Beaudesert who might have grown up with the Rosewood mine.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! This is not a point of order. Please resume your seat.

**Mrs MILLER:** No, no, but I grew up with a mine under me.

**Mr RICKUSS:** It is a shame it wasn't a bomb.

**Mrs MILLER:** What was that?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Lockyer.

**Mrs MILLER:** No, I rise to a point of order. The member for Lockyer said, 'It's a shame it wasn't a bomb.'

**Mr RICKUSS:** Well, inferring to put a bomb under you.

**Mrs MILLER:** I take personal offence at that and I ask him to withdraw.

**Mr RICKUSS:** I withdraw that remark. Tallegalla is a small village of people and it would have been ignored under your legislation. There are not a thousand people there. Rosewood would have a thousand people in it but Tallegalla—

**Mr Costigan:** Alpha.

**Mr RICKUSS:** Alpha is another classic example. Those towns would have been ignored. That is the sort of thing that members opposite have totally ignored in this whole process. The minister gave a great explanation of how some of the issues raised in the report will be handled. It is important that we speak with industry bodies such as AgForce and QFF so people understand what is happening. But remember that most of this bill is about railway line easements and powerline easements—vital pieces of infrastructure that need to be tidied up. This legislation has gone on for years. How many mining legislation amendment bills have come into this House since I have been in parliament for eight years and since the member for Bundamba has been in here for 14 years that did not pick up this flaw that has now been picked up? Admittedly, probably some issues were picked up in 2009 when the review was done, but it has to be changed and it has to be changed now so there is certainty in these sorts of processes. Certainty is important because we need this sort of infrastructure.

I have seen the Deputy Premier come in here and highlight the fact that the rail corridors that have been put through are definitely important for the state of Queensland. It is important that we have this sort of infrastructure. The Gasfields Commission is another important initiative by this government that will make things better for Queenslanders. It will make things better for landholders. It is important that those sorts of commissions work, and work well. That is what we are talking about doing. The safety requirements of water pipelines have been mentioned. I sat here at a briefing two weeks ago when that issue was raised. Unfortunately, it can be covered under parts of the legislation, but it will still be reviewed further in the legislation. That is the sort of thing that we really need to happen, and I am glad to see the minister has highlighted that fact in his second reading speech. Compulsory acquisition really does need to happen that way. This whole report has been about hard work and getting it done. That is what the members of the LNP and members of the committee have done. We have worked extremely hard to get this done. I must congratulate Rob Hansen and the other members of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee secretariat. They do an excellent job. They highlight issues that are really important to the committee and make sure that we get the appropriate advice when we have inquiries.

The recommendations in this report are soundly based. They support good legislation that is important to Queensland and important to Queenslanders. This legislation needs to be passed so we can have a reasonable operating business in the state. The ranting we heard from the member for Bundamba just goes to show why Labor were so inept in government and why they are still inept in opposition. They just do not have it even at this stage. They have missed the point that this is about getting Queensland back on track. That is what we are about—getting Queensland back on track, making sure the appropriate easements are in place and making sure there is certainty not only for Queenslanders but for landholders, mining resource companies and the legislative process so it works and it works well. That is what this is about. That is what we have done with this report and that is what the minister is doing with this legislation.

**Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (4.19 pm): I stand here today to speak in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. This government has committed to reducing red tape and providing regulatory certainty to investors, with the Mines Legislation (Streamlining)

Amendment Bill 2012 being a clear step in the delivery of this commitment. The bill contains the amendments necessary to transition Queensland from a paper based system to an online delivery system and to modernise Queensland's regulatory approvals process. In addition, the amendments proposed in the bill will increase transparency of the tenure approvals process.

The bill contains amendments that have been categorised under four objectives. These are: to implement part of the Streamlining Approvals Project; to clarify the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resource interests; to confirm and clarify current jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants; and to provide increased regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the state's emerging CSG-LNG industry. The amendments relating to the Streamlining Approvals Project will be the focus of my speech here today.

This government has been working closely with our industry partners since 2009 to develop and deliver the Streamlining Approvals Project. The goal of this project is to modernise Queensland's mining and petroleum regulatory approval system. A key finding in the first report on the streamlining project was that the outdated paper based system blocked the flow of information and restricted innovation in service delivery. The current tenure administration system needlessly wastes considerable government and industry time and resources. Implementing initiatives from the Streamlining Approvals Project will modernise the tenure administration system and reduce the time taken for each tenure decision.

The main recommendation of the report was that an integrated electronic management system was needed to modernise Queensland's process to achieve best practice technologies and to bring Queensland into line with other Australian states. This will be achieved through the introduction of an online service delivery system called MyMinesOnline. Queensland's resources acts require amendments to facilitate the operation of this online service. These amendments will also improve process efficiency and reduce assessment times.

The streamlining related amendments proposed in the bill include: the removal of barriers to online lodgement and the sharing of data between agencies; the transfer of power to grant mining leases under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and petroleum leases under the Petroleum Act 1923 from the Governor in Council to the minister, improving approval times; providing clarity of process for industry around the administration of mineral and coal exploration permits under the Mineral Resources Act 1989; providing a single process common across all of Queensland's resources acts for resource authority holders to deal with business transactions and changes of ownership; providing a consistent process across all resources acts for the department to request additional information about any resource authority application; clarifying that environmental studies are permitted under a mineral and coal exploration permit; allowing the department to give notice to resource authority applicants to progress their application if they are unreasonably delaying its progress; clarifying that applications for mining claims and leases referred to the Land Court can be remitted to the mining registrar if all objections to the application have been withdrawn before the hearing starts; and reducing the term of a mining claim from 10 years to five years.

The streamlining project amendments are about aligning the process across resource legislation, reducing red tape and improving departmental efficiency. Through this, Queensland is actively reforming its regulatory environment for mining which sends a strong message to the world that Queensland is open for business. I commend the bill to the House.

**Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (4.24 pm): As the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, I am pleased to stand here today in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 and to commend the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines for bringing it to this House. I do so because this bill provides benefits not only for the communities of Queensland, for industry and for us as a government but also for the state's environment.

When I travel out into regions that are experiencing the great boom within the coal seam gas industry in particular—and it was a great pleasure to travel with the previous speaker, the member for Pumicestone, as recently as last Thursday and Friday to Roma and Chinchilla where we had an opportunity to talk particularly with landholders and council representatives out at Maranoa and also with QMDC and AgForce—the questions that are raised with me pertain largely to the management and treatment of the water that is related to the coal seam gas industry and subsequently the brine. Apart from wanting to know how the treatment process works, they also raise the impacts of multiple storage ponds, the overdevelopment of certain sites and the impact on vegetation and local habitats. All of those are very important.

Under the current legislative framework, CSG and LNG operators are not able to aggregate field developments or centralise their CSG water and gas gathering networks across tenures. These amendments will allow that to happen which means less impact on landholders and the environment, and that is a win-win situation. The changes introduced by this bill also provide both the community and

industry with rules about how CSG sites can more effectively manage their water and brine. As a result of these amendments, industry will be able to reduce the number of CSG water processing facilities needed. I think the assistant minister and the minister visited one such amalgamated site out at QGC Kenya. It is quite breathtaking to see the scale of the project and to also know that through that they are able to treat a significant amount of CSG water and ultimately, hopefully, look to use that in a beneficial way for the surrounding community.

This amendment will mean that companies will be able to reduce the many storage ponds dotted around the landscape so that we end up with more consolidated situations, like the Kenya arrangement I just mentioned. They will now be allowed to build combined water processing facilities which can service multiple sites. These larger treatment plants provide economies of scale and will also reduce the impacts posed by these multiple smaller facilities. Consolidation of the wastewater processing facilities means that, overall, the infrastructure footprint is reduced. This is a practical, sensible approach that will work. Another benefit will be that fewer landholders will be affected, and ultimately there will be less impact on surrounding vegetation and the local habitat.

Over the past few years as the high-vis army has moved into regional Queensland, communities have begun to want more from the CSG industry to better leverage greater community benefits from their local resources. The introduction of larger storage facilities in regional Queensland means that we are also creating an opportunity for new industries through the commercialisation of salt waste from CSG water treatment. In addition to the attraction of new industries, water pipelines that will be constructed as part of the new arrangements will support regional Queensland's other main resource—the agricultural sector. The water pipelines to be constructed as part of the new arrangements will also allow for greater support of the state's agricultural sector, increasing treated water transportation between processing facilities and agricultural sites, including those that particularly are normally dry.

Another initiative that I welcome under these amendments is the requirement for CSG proponents to lodge infrastructure reports that outline the location and type of gas field infrastructure. This will enable the government to maintain a comprehensive record of activities authorised in the gas fields. All activities authorised will still be required to hold a relevant environmental authority. This will also apply to activities that a proponent conducts off tenure.

Further, the easement provisions will ensure greater transparency for land buyers by creating a public record of easement. All field development and activities will require CSG-LNG proponents to enter into conduct and compensation agreements with landholders and will still be bound by the land access code, providing further protection for landholders' rights. It is important to point out that when we went to the election with the LNP policy around coal seam gas, in particular our focus was on ensuring landholders' rights. Again, I commend the minister for bringing this legislation forward to help continue and increase those rights in legislation.

I am pleased that both the Queensland Resources Council and the four leading CSG-LNG proponents are supportive of these amendments. I, too, commend the bill to the House.

**Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (4.31 pm): I rise to speak on the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. I rise to speak in opposition to the bill primarily due to the nature of the consultation period and also the absence of the restricted urban area clause, which was in the original legislation.

This bill is a very clear example of those opposite once again abusing parliamentary process and refusing to engage in genuine consultation with the Queensland community over significant changes that affect their lives, their livelihoods and their communities.

**Mr Dowling** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** As members present would know, the bill was introduced into parliament on 2 August 2012 and, as the member for Redlands—if he is listening—would know, the bill was then referred to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee of which I am a member. I acknowledge the contribution made by the chair of that committee in this place today. I also want to place on record my appreciation to the secretariat of the committee, namely, Mr Rob Hansen, who has worked within extraordinary time frames and deadlines to meet the requirements of this government to report back to this place on very, very complex pieces of legislation.

The closing date for submissions was 5 pm on 8 August. That was after the bill being referred to the committee on 2 August. This allowed the public less than four full working days to assess, comprehend and prepare written submissions on the proposed bill. To say that this time frame, which was dictated by the government for no apparent reason, has been insufficient is a gross understatement. But more so, it is simply an insulting and offensive gesture to landholders and regional communities right across Queensland. These communities were not given a genuine opportunity to understand the full impact that this bill will have on their lives—three full working days to comprehend,

understand, write a submission and come back to the committee on this bill. This is a shame. This is outrageous. It is the most offensive gesture that the government can make to regional communities across Queensland.

Rebecca Smith from the James Cook University set out in her submission—

... it appears one sector of stakeholders—industry—has had a fair amount of pre-Bill consultation while non-industry stakeholders have been left with minimum time ... This factor needs to be addressed for accountable and transparent government for all Queenslanders.

But are they listening? No, they are not listening to the words 'accountable' or 'transparent'. Ms Smith is not alone. Over half the public submissions—15 out of 27—received on the bill raised lack of consultation or lack of time as a serious issue. In fact, I encourage members to go back to the public transcripts and read all of the oral submissions made and read submission after submission centred around the lack of consultation—three full working days to consult on almost 500 pages of changes to law relating to mining approval processes in this state.

It is true that the previous Labor government initiated consultation with industry in its earlier version of this legislation, which was titled the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011. Even in the title one can see that there is a completely different emphasis on the nature of the bill. In the bill before the House there is no balance. The previous bill had been referred to the relevant parliamentary committee with sufficient time allocated to properly consult, visit communities and report back to the parliament. However, this is not the only significant difference, as we have already heard in this place today.

The government has also removed the requirement for urban restricted areas from the legislation, and this omission goes to the heart of the quality of life for people living in regional communities. I have heard members opposite interject and suggest that it has not been taken out. Let me quote from the submission of the director-general of the minister's department. During the public hearing he stated—

A number of the amendments contained in the bill are reintroductions from the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011—the RLA bill—which was introduced into the Legislative Assembly in November 2011.

...

Also, as the committee may have seen from the comparison provided of the RLA bill and this bill, a major change is the removal of the amendments relating to urban restricted areas.

I will say it again—the removal of the amendments relating to the urban restricted areas. He went on—

An alternative approach is being adopted on this issue and the interface between resource exploration around population centres is now being managed through a comprehensive and consultative statutory regional planning framework.

So what we have is protecting regional communities—urban centres—in law, or deferring them to a planning framework. If the minister had the courage to confront regional communities he would ask them where would they prefer their rights to lie—in law, or in a regional planning framework. Where would they like the protection of their community to be—in law, or in a regional planning framework? I am a betting woman and I reckon that people will back the law each and every time.

Let us not just take my word for it. Let us take AgForce's word for it. What does AgForce have to say on the removal of urban restricted areas? In its submission to the committee, AgForce stated—

AgForce is disappointed to see the removal of the Urban Restricted areas component of development control within the proposed Bill. These frameworks are important for the longevity and continuance of many of the rural and regional areas that support our farming community—to see these developments go unchecked due to the removal of these restrictions would be derelict.

Who is standing up for the bush?

**Mr Stevens:** We are.

**Ms TRAD:** I take that interjection from the member for—

**Mr Stevens:** Mermaid Beach.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you very much, Mr Manager of Government Business in the House. If you are standing up for regional communities, I challenge you to withdraw this bill and take it out to regional communities and consult on it properly.

There is no doubt that many aspects of this legislation will streamline government processes and allow lower cost, delivering wins for both regional communities and the resource industry. This is what the previous Labor government set out to achieve when the last version of the bill was introduced to the House. But I am keen to return to the important issue of consultation—or collaboration, as the minister said in his remarks today.

What did the committee itself have to say about consultation on the bill? I note that the minister was in a rush to alert the House to the fact that the parliamentary committee had recommended that the bill be passed, but the parliamentary committee also suggested that the department should undertake

further work to inform landholders and other groups who may be affected by provisions in the bill that is passed by the Legislative Assembly. So 'let us tell people about the laws that we have changed after we have changed them, not before'!

What else did the committee have to say? Well, the committee acknowledged that it has had limited time to examine the bill in depth. So this report, which the chair of the committee said in this place was a great report, lacks the depth, lacks the examination necessary, to give proper deliberation and recommendation around the full volume of the proposed bill. What else did the committee have to say? The committee said—

> The development of this Bill would have benefited from wide public consultation during its development and discussions with all stakeholders prior to its introduction in the Parliament.

The words 'consultation' and 'collaboration' easily roll off the tongues of those opposite; they are not easily put into practice. If those opposite were genuinely interested in consultation, they would take this bill out of this place today, defer its passage and consult properly, genuinely and meaningfully with those people in regional communities who will be affected by these changes to legislation.

I want to take issue with the poor excuse for a joke that was proffered by the member for Lockyer in this place and suggest to the parliament that the biggest joke in relation to this bill is the consultation process, is the parliamentary committee's report in relation to this bill. Three full working days in which to consult with the public of Queensland around changes to mining laws in this state is an absolute joke.

Of course, we know that the committee was always going to recommend the passage of this bill, don't we? The committee is overwhelmingly stacked with members of the government's caucus—members of the government who are collecting thousands of dollars on top of their base salaries because they sit on a committee, rubber-stamping whatever the government throws their way. Just like good puppy dogs, they tick and flick. I challenge those members to go back to their communities, stand up and say, 'We gave you nothing in terms of protecting your urban area, nothing in terms of protecting your community. To make matters worse—to rub salt into the wound, to add insult to injury—we threw out three full working days for you to consider this bill, have a think about it and come back to us with any proposed changes.' What a joke!

The biggest joke is that landholders were given three full working days to provide feedback on this bill. Graziers were given just three full working days to consider the bill and provide feedback. Farmers were given just three full working days to consider the bill and come back to the parliamentary committee. Environmental groups were given three full working days to consider this legislation in full, deliberate and come back to the parliamentary committee. I contend that that is the joke in this place. That is the joke in terms of the parliamentary committee process and that is the joke in relation to this government.

As AgForce set out in its submission to the committee—

> ... we would like to highlight the ridiculous timing of purported consultation with the community. To provide such a short timeframe is not conducive to appropriate consultation. To further not include the broader land use sector throughout the development of the legislative arrangement, but to include directly the industries that this review will favour, is tantamount to negligence. No landholder, agricultural, environmental or community group appears to have been consulted throughout this process—only the mining and resources sector. This is cause of great concern to AgForce.

During my time on the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee I have diligently participated in numerous investigations, public hearings and briefings. I have sat on this committee and looked into three substantial and complex pieces of legislation that have far-reaching environmental consequences. And each time the consultation period was counted in days—not weeks, not months. The green-tape reduction bill—days. The animal care and protection bill—days.

**Mr Stevens:** Everyone else is handling it.

**Ms TRAD:** Really? Is that right? I take the interjection from the Manager of Government Business. I can take it, but the people of the Torres Strait, who were given less than a week to consult on the animal care and protection bill, said that this process was wanting. On behalf of AgForce I come into this place. They said 'ridiculous timing' and 'negligence'—their own words. It is not conducive to the long-term survival of regional communities, and all of those opposite will wear that stain.

By the time this bill was presented to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee I had had a gutful. I refused to blindly follow along, like the other committee members had—rubber-stamping whatever the government manipulated through the committee system, to push their political agenda through this parliament without scrutiny and without any accountability. The only honourable thing—the only accountable thing, the only transparent thing—that this government can do, that this minister can do, is withdraw the bill for adequate and meaningful consultation with regional communities—with all stakeholders, not just the mining industry. That is the only honourable thing you can do in the House here today.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Mr Watts): Order! The member will address her comments through the chair and refrain from using the word 'you'.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I shall. I take on board your concerns.

The only honourable thing for this government to do is withdraw this bill for adequate, meaningful, transparent, comprehensive consultation with all stakeholders—with farmers, with graziers, with environmental groups, with people living in regional communities, with regional communities that have exploration leases over them.

I contend that the only honourable thing to do is to withdraw this piece of legislation, refer it back to the committee for further consultation and get the committee to stump up to regional communities and let them know that the restricted area provisions in the previous iteration of this bill have now been taken out. That is the only honourable thing to do. I put that challenge to the minister and to this government.

**Mrs MENKENS** (Burdekin—LNP) (4.49 pm): Listening to the diatribe that we have just heard leaves one somewhat breathless. I am very happy to support the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill and commend the work of the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon. Andrew Cripps, because he certainly did not get too many commendations in that last lot of rubbish we heard. I question how the member for South Brisbane would know more about rural Queensland than the member for Hinchinbrook, who happens to be the minister. There has also been much mention of a time frame. Nobody has brought up the fact that there are significant mining projects desperate for this legislation, significant mining projects that are absolutely imperative to our economy waiting for this legislation. No wonder there was a tight time frame to consider this bill, but of course that does not get mentioned. The people in the opposition would not understand anything about the economic needs of Queensland.

This LNP government has recognised the importance of mining to Queensland. It is one of the four pillars that will grow this state once again in an attempt to claw back this massive debt that has been left to Queensland by the ineptitude of Labor. That is what this bill is all about. Instead of taking advantage of the boom times in the mining sector, Queensland sadly went backwards under Labor and this bill is about streamlining the mining process and reducing the red tape—or so-called green tape—that strangled businesses and stifled industry in this resource-rich state. That is what this bill is about. In the *Courier-Mail* of Monday, 20 August 2012 under the headline 'End of the boom nigh as BHP profit tumble tipped', it was reported that BHP-Billiton will this week post its first profit fall in three years in what some will see as perhaps a somewhat symbolic end to the mining boom. The article stated—

Chief executive Marius Kloppers and his mining peers complain that the cost of doing business in Australia is rising, amid speculation BHP will cut jobs at its Queensland coalmines and its Brisbane office.

That is what this bill is about. For too long under Labor Queenslanders have experienced lengthy delays in development approvals. Businesses waited. They jumped through the various departmental hoops. It took years and years while they submitted and resubmitted applications. They made adjustments, new business plans and impact statements, paid more fees, jumped through more hoops and again submitted applications. That has taken an obvious toll, with many businesses that were previously lining up to do business in Queensland sadly pulling out of projects due to the financial constraints and endless red tape.

However, this Newman government is ready to streamline the approval process and provide greater development certainty which will take the industry's short- and long-term needs into consideration. Since being elected there have already been positive steps in the right direction, with the Deputy Premier and the new LNP government throwing their support behind the port of Abbot Point, which is in my electorate of Burdekin. The Premier, the Deputy Premier and indeed all LNP ministers and backbenchers have recognised Abbot Point as an important strategic state asset, with its successful future expansion set to play a key role in Queensland's economic development.

As an example of the stifling of industry under Labor, I use the example of a report which was tabled on 22 March 2005 on the Abbot Point Northern Missing Link. It was laid upon the table of the House over seven years ago now and it stated that the then Labor government was announcing another boost to Queensland's $8 billion coal export industry. The government was—

... fast-tracking planning for over $1 billion worth of infrastructure projects, to ensure the coal industry can meet future export demand.

The government was—

... seeking to expedite two major projects: expanding the Abbot Point coal terminal and the construction of the railway 'Northern Missing Link' between the Goonyella and Newlands coal systems.

**A government member:** How long did that take?

**Mrs MENKENS:** How long did that take? The 2005 report said—

There are strong indications that the world is working up an even more gargantuan appetite for Queensland coal, we need action—not a task force—now.

It further stated—

... in the Smart State we have kept our eye on the ball; we are taking the best available advice on what is needed for north Queensland coal, and we are acting as a catalyst so that the transport infrastructure meets demand.

We have put this infrastructure on the fast track because future coal exports will support thousands of Queensland jobs and fuel our skyrocketing economy.

The former Labor government did not keep its eye on the ball and there was no evidence of fast-tracking in this regard.

The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill is a clear statement to industry that this LNP government is making it easier to do business in Queensland. It is ensuring that our state's resources and energy sector are rightfully recognised as world leaders. This government is committed to reforming mining and resource tenure management and to also reducing red tape. The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 contains amendments which will simply speed up the processes but not overlook the relevant guidelines and necessary framework protections that have been put in place. By implementing initiatives from the streamline approvals project, it will modernise the antiquated and inefficient resource tenure processes which have imposed unnecessary administrative and regulatory burdens on industry and on government. This bill will support online lodgement of documents for assessment and management of all resources permits, a process which is also being adopted by Western Australia and New South Wales. It will streamline the administrative processes and requirements for managing mineral and coal exploration permits under the Mineral Resources Act 1989.

Tenure management will be transformed—transformed from an outdated, manual, paper based system to a much faster and much more modern and more transparent online system—MyMinesOnline—which will provide seamless interaction between the relevant department and the resources industry. This bill will establish a single process for all resources permits and will also provide a clear power to require an applicant to progress their application. It is also supportive of small scale mining, because there are a lot of small scale miners right across Queensland; it is not just the big names that we see out there. So it will be supportive of small scale mining, with the initial term of a mining claim under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 reduced from 10 years to five years to align with the other reforms. The bill will clarify legislation so that resource activities such as exploration and development activities can co-exist with infrastructure development and the environment.

This bill is also about transferring power to grant mining leases from the Governor in Council to the minister which is a process change that will save time in getting projects off the ground. The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 will reduce red tape for investors and at the same time increase security for landholders and industry. The compulsory acquisition amendments contained in this bill will clarify the relationship between the compulsory acquisition of land and resources interests and will ensure the resumption law aligns with government's policy.

Reducing the red tape burden on business—that is what this LNP government is doing. This LNP government has been told that under Labor it had simply become too hard. It had become too costly to do business in Queensland. Unlike Labor—which, as I quoted earlier in its report to the House seven years ago in 2005, was supposedly fast-tracking and keeping its eye on the ball during a time when Queensland was poised to take full advantage of the mining boom—this Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 seeks to support industry. This bill will bring Queensland's legislation into line with the other resource jurisdictions in Australia and once again show the world that Queensland is totally supportive of the mining and resources sector, which is driving economic growth, job creation and prosperity in Queensland. It is time to stop the needless waste which has occurred under Labor and stop the endless reams of paperwork and the run-around experienced by business, industry, stakeholders, government department officers and others who have been attempting to progress industry and development in Queensland.

The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill brings down some of the barriers that have been placed on industry under Labor. It is time to restore the confidence and investment certainty in the resources sector in Queensland. This bill does that. Mining is a very important part of my electorate and I feel very strongly about this legislation.

**Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (4.59 pm): I rise today to speak in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. This bill will bring about much needed change in Queensland's approach to regulation, compulsory acquisition, implementation of the streamlining project, clarifying jurisdictional arrangements in relation to hazardous chemicals and operating facilities and providing regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the emerging coal seam gas to liquefied natural gas industry. The resources industry is a significant employer of Queenslanders. Countless residents of my electorate of Logan are reliant on the growth of this sector. This amendment bill ensures that the continued growth of the mining and resources industry gets the strongest possible legislative support that it deserves.

The need to streamline the resources industry in Queensland can bring about the next evolution in a key economic sector within our state. The need to have an effective, seamless and proactive industry can come about only with the most practical and supportive legislation. After three independent

reports on the resources industry's need to improve efficiency and the regulatory framework for the sector, this amendment bill will see that those targets highlighted in the report are met, which will help to continue the growth of this vital industry.

All industries in today's dynamic and robust resources market need to be readily accessible for their local, regional and global partners. A key recommendation of the streaming approvals project is the establishment of online delivery platforms. Through stringent security checks and balances, this interactive and responsive ability for the sector to engage with consumers, providers and government entities puts the resources sector at the forefront of the global market. Through the modernisation of online services, as I have previously mentioned, we will see Australia, and in particular those elements of the resources industry that call Queensland home, lead this sector for decades to come. This modernisation brings about a more efficient operating procedure, such as designating powers that will allow the department and its respective chief executive to take appropriate steps without the referral of the mining registrar.

This amendment bill will also see the streamlining process improved through the reduction of the initial term of a mining claim from 10 years down to five years in an effort to support small scale mining, improve resource stewardship, consolidate administrative processes and requirements in relation to mineral and coal exploration, clarify access arrangements for exploration, ensure that all applications comply with legislative requirements and reduce the assessment times by streamlining the process of the Land Court referrals. These measures are on track with our government's commitment to reducing red tape, creating smaller government and thus restoring government accountability.

These initiatives, which are key to the streamlining process, will see greater flexibility when dealing with departments and, ultimately, will pave the way for a stronger market and better growth within Queensland, all of which would not be achievable if it were not for the legislative reforms that we speak to today. Queensland can be a vibrant, bustling state for years to come. Our potential to expand our natural resource market is limitless. Over the past several years the growth in the mining industry not only in Queensland but across the country has seen an unprecedented boom since the pioneering years of our nation's birth. With this growth we have seen more jobs and more infrastructure for our citizens. Our ability to be a strong factor in the international market in the natural resources industry has been proven time and time again.

But as the market expands, as the need for our resources expand, both domestically and abroad, we must allow that very industry to expand with it. In allowing this industry to expand, we must facilitate that need by providing support both in the form of legislation and on-the-ground action. For an industry to expand, especially one like the mining industry, we need to construct the very provisions that allow this industry to be a globally connected enterprise. This is not limited to the establishment of a strong transportation network linking Queensland's mining regions to our international ports. In order to accommodate this rapid expansion, we need to provide the right legislation to enable both enterprise and governments to work in conjunction with the community to secure the economic development of our state. To achieve this, we need a responsive and understanding approach to compulsory acquisition. Currently, compulsory acquisition in Queensland lacks the clarity that is required to keep track of the progressive rate at which our state and the mining industry evolves. This bill will see that the laws currently in place that govern resumptions and acquisitions of land and resources align with government policy.

Another key area that this bill seeks to rectify is the approach to regulating the coal seam gas to liquefied natural gas industry. This industry is an emerging sector that has a strong future as part of the economic future of our state and our nation as a whole. The legislation that exists currently was developed in order to facilitate the production and exploration of petroleum. As CSG continues to evolve as an emerging resource, the need to refine the current legislation in order to facilitate that growth should be a priority in supporting the natural resource sector in Queensland. The existing legislation lacks the necessary flexibility to allow the unexpected production of this product. In an industry that is reliant on its very ability to meet deadlines and production levels, this lack in capability must be corrected. The inability to adjust production commencement dates hampers our ability to be a leading state in the production and shipment of the product to markets around the world. This legislative handicap must be rectified and this amendment bill does just that.

A shortcoming with the current legislation is its failure to support the efficient transportation and treatment of CSG water and brine between regions, which leads to the development of common-use water treatment and brine facilities in permitted areas. To address this failure, the amendment bill will generate greater adaption in this sector, which will see the shipment and processing of the CSG water and brine. Furthermore, this amendment will allow for more innovative solutions to be generated when addressing the shortcomings that pertain to the transportation and treatment of CSG water and brine. This solution will bring about the ability for the industry to more easily comply with government policy towards CSG water management.

Proponents of CSG are seeking a way to negate the current easement issues with landowners that are affected by the presence of pipeline routes. It is essential that, with the expansion of the CSG network, an amicable agreement is reached between landowners and proponents of the industry. It is

also essential that security for the pipeline infrastructure is ensured and that there is longevity of the presence of the pipeline when land titles change hands, integrity of the land register and, most importantly, a strong safety record protecting the community, landowners and the future of the CSG sector.

In all industries, the implementation of stringent occupational health and safety guidelines is a must when it comes to protecting the boots on the ground. To quote an occupational health and safety tag of the Royal Australian Air Force, 'We do dangerous things safely.' This quote could be more appropriately styled to the resources industry. Across-the-board, Australia has a proud record in implementing workplace safety. A tribute to that record is the provision in this bill to continue to support the existing regulation following the enactment of the national work safety law. This bill also clarifies the application of workplace chemicals and operating facilities. With this all-round precaution, yet practical approach to workplace safety, the protection of everyday Australian workers and the members of the public surrounding the resources industry will have the best possible legislation behind it.

This amendment bill is quintessential to our state's growth, both domestically and internationally. If our state wishes to continue to be an active party in the global resources market, we need to support that very industry with the right legislation and will not let the countless thousands of Queenslanders who are employed by the resources sector slip behind the eight ball. The benefits that will come from this amendment will have untold value in the future. With jobs and economic growth so strong in the resources sector and the need to build our economy, a strong industry means a strong economy, which means a stronger Queensland for tomorrow. The ripple effect that this amendment bill will have across-the-board will bring about a more robust, skilled and prosperous Queensland, with constituents such as those within my electorate of Logan, who are active partners in our resources industry, to gain the most out of this sector and a strengthening of our local and state economies. It gives me great pleasure to commend this bill to the House.

**Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (5.08 pm): I rise to support the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 which aims to provide legislative changes necessary to clarify the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resource interests; confirm and clarify current jurisdictional arrangements for the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants; and provide increased regulatory certainty for Queensland's emerging CSG-LNG industries.

I will be brief as I wish to talk in particular in relation to the Streamlining Approvals Project section of the bill. As this bill will amend some 17 pieces of legislation, in my role as Assistant Minister for Regulatory Reform, I believe this bill goes a long way to help address the current high level of red tape and regulatory overburden within the mining industry and will allow us as a state to develop and deliver a more modern and efficient regulatory framework that will encourage these organisations to grow within our state.

The mining industry is one of the four pillars identified by our LNP Newman led government to drive economic growth and prosperity in our state. Therefore, it is vitally important that this legislation reflects this agenda and assists rather than hinders the resources sector. This bill will enable the state's paper based tenure administration system to be modernised to an online environment. It is pleasing to see that one of these initiatives is the establishment of MyMinesOnline, a web based system that will do away with the cumbersome paper based systems that were restricting the flow of information to stakeholders. While this system will reduce regulation and red tape, I would like to emphasise that it will not reduce the rigorous assessment system that is necessary for sustainable and appropriate resource management. This brings us in line with other Australian states, such as Western Australia and New South Wales, which are also moving towards online systems. It is about time that a Queensland government did something to encourage resource companies to invest in this state. By retaining and improving the investment attractiveness of our great state, the Queensland community can take full advantage and reap the economic benefits that flow from the current resources demand.

This bill will allow for a four- to six-week saving by transferring the power to grant mining leases from the Governor in Council to the minister. This is a process change that will save time in getting projects started. It will also save months over the Christmas-New Year period when the Executive Council does not meet. This power will provide many benefits to both industry and government as it will allow for faster and more predictable time frames along with a consistent legislative approach for all tenure approvals, both in Queensland and Australia. It also allows for the situation where an applicant is unreasonably delaying the assessment process which can often deter investment from other bona fide parties. It is a good move forward.

The dealing provisions will reduce the assessment burden on transactions that have little or no risk to the state. We can also process transactions for all tenure types, not just for coal or petroleum. The state can also focus its effort on the assessment of high-value projects by reducing the assessment time frames and allowing companies that wish to invest in our state greater certainty and transparency. This bill also reduces the assessment times for mining claims and leases and the burden on the court system will therefore be reduced.

Amendments clarify that an application may be remitted back to a mining registrar if all objections to the application have been withdrawn prior to a Land Court hearing starting. This obviously not only saves time and money for both industry, government and the employees involved but also will allow projects to start sooner if granted.

As I have already mentioned, I believe this bill goes a long way to reducing red tape for our vital investors into this state. It will also increase security for landholders and the industry as a whole. It will encourage more timely decision making by government and provide more certainty. It will allow Queensland to become open for business and drive the vital economic growth that is much needed. I congratulate the minister for his hard work in bringing this bill to the House in this vital time. It is with that I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.14 pm): I rise in the House in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Act 2012. It goes without saying that much has changed in the mining industry in this great state since those founding fathers of Queensland first met in this place when mining for gold, in keeping with the times, was all the rage. In the 1970s my hometown of Mackay was well-known throughout the nation as Australia's sugar capital with eight mills within 90 minutes of the city heart. At the start of that decade we also witnessed the birth of the coal industry in the Brigalow Belt in Mackay's hinterland—a huge patch of real estate better known to Queenslanders today as the Bowen Basin, a coal rich area that has largely powered Queensland's economy ever since. How the Mackay-Whitsunday region has changed. It is now the biggest regional economy of the north. In fact, the growth of the resources industry in this part of the world is one of the great success stories in this state's modern history and we should never forget those embryonic days of the Utah Development Company, coupled with Japanese investment and the proactivity and support of the former Bjelke-Petersen government, that made it happen.

In the early 1990s I actually resided very close to the port of Hay Point. It always gave me a great sense of pride back in those days when I would bring visitors up the hill to the viewing platform overlooking the port showcasing the place exporting our black gold to the world. Of course, looking to the future, we need to facilitate sustainable growth of the entire resources industry, not just coal, although suffice it to say that coal is still king in the eyes of many people, especially those in Central Queensland who work in the industry, whether it is driving those giant dump trucks near Blackwater—just like my sister does—or driving trains towards Bowen and the port of Abbot Point which, when I lived in Bowen, would see just a handful of ships coming and going every week, a far cry from what has happened since with the resources boom.

In keeping with the Newman LNP government's resources and energy strategy, that is exactly what this bill is all about: facilitating sustainable growth of the resources sector. To make this happen legislative amendments to resources legislation are needed to make sure resource projects and infrastructure can be delivered efficiently with minimal risk and at the same time maintaining the integrity of the assessment and approval systems. The bill has amendments that have been categorised under four policy objectives which are: clarification of the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resource interests; implementation of part of the Streamlining Approvals Project; confirmation and clarification of current jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemical, major hazard facilities and operating plants; and provision of increased regulatory certainty for everyone associated in our emerging CSG-LNG industry.

As the name of the bill suggests, the main focus here is the streamlining and harmonisation of government procedures in the application for documentation, such as exploration permits, authorities to prospect, mineral development licences, mining leases and petroleum leases. The bill also provides much needed reforms in relation to matters such as water produced from CSG operations and the compulsory acquisition of land subject to existing resource interests.

I was not a member of the 53rd Parliament, but from my observations it would appear that this bill is not too different from the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011, a piece of legislation that was initiated by the former Bligh Labor government but lapsed with the change of government—a change that has given us a strong mandate to pursue our premier objective: facilitating the sustainable growth of the resources sector.

I turn to the first of our policy objectives, which is compulsory acquisition. A clear compulsory acquisition framework is vital to facilitate timely and fiscally responsible infrastructure developments to support the economic growth of the great state of Queensland. With massive growth in the resources sector—in particular, in the Surat, Galilee and, of course, Bowen basins—the development of road and rail infrastructure is most critical. The compulsory acquisition process will be central to the timely development of those key pieces of infrastructure to support industry growth. Currently, the government is seeking to facilitate the Surat Basin rail project to bring on economic development in that part of Queensland. As part of that process, advice has been received by the government that under the current legislative framework the compulsory acquisition of land extinguishes all resource interests and gives the resource interest holders the right to claim compensation. It is fair to say that for many years resource related activities and infrastructure can and have co-existed in Queensland. For example, exploration for minerals and activities such as CSG production have and will continue to co-exist with

development activities such as the building of road and rail infrastructure. The amendments in the bill will clarify the legislative framework relating to the compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resource interests.

In summary it will, firstly, make it clear the compulsory acquisition of land by a construction authority will not extinguish resource interests, with the exception of instances where a potential or real conflict exists. Secondly, it will give constructing authorities the power to acquire resource interests where there is a conflict with the purpose of the proposed take, for example, a rail corridor—and I will come to more on rail corridors in a moment—that needs to be acquired that would directly impact on the pit of a proposed open-cut coalmine and an alternative arrangement could not be reached with the tenure holder. Thirdly, it will ensure that past compulsory acquisitions of land generally did not extinguish resource interests unless constructing authorities took specific action, such as the issuing of formal notices to intentionally extinguish the interest. Finally, it will provide for a process for the granting of mining tenements over acquired land where the relevant minister is satisfied that the grant of the tenement is compatible with the purpose for which the land was taken.

Without these amendments, projects such as the Surat Basin rail project and other key infrastructure projects could be jeopardised. In fact, they could end up like the Northern Missing Link. I am sure the members for Gregory, Mirani and Burdekin, who have spoken about the Northern Missing Link, would know all about that. The missing link was the section of rail line that, until just a couple of weeks before Christmas last year, did not exist between the Goonyella and Newlands rail systems. For those members not familiar with it, it is the 69-kilometre section of rail that was finally opened by 'Boy Wonder' from Proserpine in his final days in office. Do we remember him?

**A government member:** Where is he these days?

**Mr COSTIGAN:** He is not with me and nor should he be, because he presided over a disaster and he had some mates. Of course, I am referring to the former Deputy Premier—that is right, 'Boy Wonder' from Proserpine—whose government and previous Labor governments had failed to grasp the importance of this vital piece of rail infrastructure in the Mackay-Whitsunday hinterland. This line was talked about in the 1980s, back when I was keeping tabs on those shipping movements at Abbot Point, which in those days was in the Labor electorate of Bowen but nowadays is represented by my good friend and colleague the member for Burdekin. In the early 1990s, I understand that Tim Fischer, the boy from Boree Creek, as some of us like to refer to him, and former leader of the Nationals in the federal parliament—

**Mr Minnikin:** A great man.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I take the interjection from the member for Chatsworth; he is a great man indeed—called on the Prime Minister of the day, Paul Keating, to fund the missing link. In those days its estimated cost was in the vicinity of $70 million. Let us compare that to the price tag last year when 'Boy Wonder' finally cut the ribbon. How much did the Northern Missing Link cost? A whopping $1.1 billion!

**Mr Cox** interjected.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I can tell the member for Thuringowa that there was no streamlining then. That big project could have and should have been delivered many moons ago. Members can go and ask the Regional Economic Development Corporation in Mackay, or maybe Bowen Collinsville Enterprise or Townsville Enterprise. I am sure they would love to weigh into that debate, as would some of the people involved with those organisations in years gone by, because had it been delivered years ago this missing link would have shored up the coal supply chain from the mines in the Bowen Basin to our ports on the coast, providing flexibility in the process. Therefore, in the event of a derailment on the Goonyella to Hay Point line, which has happened from time to time, perhaps on the Connors Range due to monsoonal rain, natural disaster and so forth, those trains could have been diverted to Abbot Point via the Newlands line and, of course, the Northern Missing Link to ensure that our black gold got to our customers around the world.

This government is all about growing the economy. It is no different to when Peter Costello did exactly that after the mess he inherited when he became federal Treasurer upon the election of the Howard government in 1996. Back then, our federal colleagues in Canberra inherited a debt of $96 billion or, if you like, around 19 per cent of GDP. That was a pretty damning and shocking statistic at the time, but Peter Costello's fiscal repair work was launched and he got the job done. I am sure I speak for every government member in the House this evening when I say we have every confidence in our state Treasurer in doing a 'Cosi', in paying back that monster Labor debt of $65 billion, remembering that it could have gone to $100 billion by 2018-19 unless corrective action was taken. As part of our fiscal repair work on the state's finances, we need mining projects to kick in as soon as practical. Our saving grace is the fact that Queensland is blessed with tremendous mineral, gas and petroleum deposits. However, we must do what I said earlier—that is, facilitate sustainable growth and thus help rebuild our state's finances and ensure prosperity for all Queenslanders.

It is obvious there has been some debate in relation to urban restricted area provisions. For the benefit of members, I bring to their attention what was said at the public hearing on 10 August 2012 when Mr John Skinner, the Deputy Director-General of Mining and Petroleum in the Department of

Natural Resources and Mines, explained to the chair the protections afforded by the existing gazette notice and the benefits to smaller communities that would be provided as part of the regional planning framework. Mr Skinner said—

There is an arrangement in place under what is called restricted area 384, which was gazetted in the context that, for any town in Queensland with a population over 1,000 people or more, there be a two-kilometre buffer. That is still in place.

**Mr Cripps:** Exactly.

**Mr COSTIGAN:** I take the interjection from the minister. Mr Skinner continued—

The government has indicated, though, that it sees the statutory regional planning process as a further refinement and development in this space with an emphasis being placed on developing statutory regional plans for the Darling Downs and Central Queensland in terms of the priorities. Work has started on that in terms of using the statutory regional planning process to deal with the issue of interface between the various sectors. That has been a major government priority, as outlined by the Deputy Premier.

The chair responded by saying—

Thanks for that, John. I would imagine that would take in towns of fewer than 1,000 people, too, when they do that planning.

Mr Skinner replied—

That planning takes into account towns of all sizes.

There you go. Under Labor, as far as I am concerned, communities with a population of less than 1,000 people could have been left vulnerable, exposed like a shag on a rock. Communities in Central Queensland such as Alpha and Dingo, and Bluff along the Capricorn corridor—

**Mr Johnson:** In a good electorate, too.

**Mr COSTIGAN:**—represented strongly by the member for Gregory, and I say that because my sister—

**A government member:** Are you after some leave or something?

**Mr COSTIGAN:** No. I say that because my sister might have a problem and I am sure the member for Gregory would be more than happy to see her. He is always fighting for the people of Central Queensland, not just his own electorate.

These are places I am most familiar with thanks to my travels over many years across regional Queensland. Through this government's statutory regional planning framework, it goes without saying that these communities will not be forgotten. I will not speak on all the policy objectives of the bill, but I will say that these amendments will form part of the streamlining approvals project and thereby allow the state's paper based tenure administrative system to be brought into the 21st century by way of an online environment, specifically the MyMinesOnline initiative which allows people, no matter who they are, to see what is actually happening. Online systems that accept lodgement of mining applications will become best practice for resources administration. Other jurisdictions such as Western Australia and New South Wales are also moving to online systems.

In closing, I would like to thank my committee colleagues under the chairmanship of the member for Lockyer as well as the committee staff—in particular, Mr Rob Hansen—for their diligent work and also those people and organisations who provided submissions. These amendments will bring about many positive benefits including making it easier for resource companies to do business in Queensland. Guess what? We are cutting red tape and retaining and improving the investment attractiveness of this state. Queensland under the Newman LNP government is well and truly open for business. I commend the bill to the House.



**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (5.31 pm): I rise to speak to the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill and, in doing so, put on the record the information and advice that the minister has passed on not only today but at other times in relation to other legislation. There is just a small number of issues that I wish to raise because in 10 minutes it is not possible to address the issues that are raised in two very large volumes of legislation, but it is legislation that is incredibly important to rural and resource communities because they are usually one and the same.

The first issue that I want to put on the record is the difficulty in relation to timetabling. The bill was referred to the committee on 2 August, which was a Thursday. On that same day via email subscribers and, I assume, stakeholders were advised that the closing date for submissions was Wednesday of the following week. On Friday the 10th, after the closing date, there was a public briefing in Brisbane, a public hearing and a further public departmental briefing on the same day. The secretariat had to provide the department with FLP concerns for comment.

On Monday the 13th—so we had the weekend in between—the department had to provide its advice back to the committee regarding fundamental legislative principle issues. On Tuesday the 14th the draft report was circulated to committee members. On the 15th they had to be prepared at 10.30 to get together and adopt the report. The 16th was the deadline for lodging a statement of reservations and the reporting deadline set by the House. So to say that public consultation was concertinaed would be an understatement. For a bill of this size and importance, particularly to resource areas where coal seam gas, in particular, is being retrieved, that was insufficient time.

I thank the minister for clarifying that the CSG portions in this legislation were fully included in the previous bill. So in the bill tabled by the Labor government any consultation that occurred in relation to CSG matters would have received public consultation at that time. That in some way is a saving measure.

I am advised that compulsory acquisition issues have been included. There has not been consultation with the community, but from reading the explanatory notes and the report the consultation with industry was intended to protect the state government's and the people of Queensland's exposure in terms of compensation. The minister has advised that, under workplace health and safety, with regard to matters covered in this bill compared with the existing matters under the workplace health and safety legislation there is not an opportunity for unforeseen implications to the community. I thank the minister for that information. However, when you read the contributions by people in this document it is clear that they were aggrieved by the short time frame, and I believe that government needs to not only acknowledge that but also learn from it.

Those who were least consulted were landowners, the agricultural sector and the grazing sector, and they are precisely the ones that are affected greatly by CSG. My electorate is affected in a different way because we are the receiving end of the gas. The use of the land at Curtis Island for that purpose caused some grief amongst landowners, but we do not have pumps and wells on our properties. We have gas lines, but that is all. I think the landowners in rural Queensland who will have gas pipelines, water dams and alkaline storage areas deserve to have a say in their future, because this will have a significant impact on them over a long period of time.

I have been listening to the contributions that speakers have made to this bill, and while most of them have made sense one or two of them were a little nonsensical.

**Mr Cripps:** I wonder which ones they were!

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** I wonder. Many government speakers have talked about the resumption laws being changed in line with government policy but with little detail or little explanation of what that means. It may be that in this legislation aligning with government policy is a good thing, but if that is going to be the justification used in legislation for changing laws—that it will align with government policy—I for one would be concerned because it lacks clarity and transparency. I am assuming the resumption laws that have been referred to are those relating to compulsory acquisition, in particular, to protect the state from cost exposure. But, if there are greater implications to those statements than that, I look forward to the minister's clarification.

Development significantly impacts on community. We have a small community with fewer than a thousand people in the middle of my electorate called Mount Larcom. They are not adjacent to but are the next community to the Aldoga industrial estate that was gazetted many years ago. It was about 7,000 hectares at the time. When that was gazetted it was stated in the documentation that all impacts from industry—and there were 10 industry pads located on those 7,000 hectares—that is, airborne and waterborne odour, would be contained within that 7,000-hectare footprint. Aldoga industrial estate is now close to 30,000 hectares. Mount Larcom is still being constrained from having development in its township because the GEIDB initially objected to development of Mount Larcom because it may impact on the industrial estate. Now this new government still has not given Mount Larcom any confidence that that will change, and they will not build their services unless they can get more people to improve water supply to improve government services—in particular, federal government services but state government services as well. People need more than words.

As I said, the Aldoga industrial estate study that was commissioned by the state Labor government in the early 1990s said that all impacts from industry proposed on the Aldoga industrial estate will be contained within that 7,000-hectare area. It has more than quadrupled, and that community has no confidence that the impacts proposed for that industrial estate—and it is still only 10—will be contained within the estate and will not affect their community and development.

Members here tonight have spoken about the urban restricted areas. I appreciate the member for Whitsunday saying that the two-kilometre restriction around towns greater than 1,000 is retained in the legislation and that further consideration will be given to smaller communities through the statutory regional planning process. Communities that are told they will not be impacted need more than words because from my experience words mean nothing when it comes to trying to grow a community that needs to grow for its future survival.

I look forward to the minister's summing-up because a number of issues of concern have been raised by speakers, particularly the consultation period, the urban restriction and the other matters that were raised by Labor members. Communities must be considered equally. Industry may be one of these four pillars of our economy, but community must be fundamental to all of this because without community we do not have a state.

**Mr COX** (Thuringowa—LNP) (5.40 pm): I wish to comment today on the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. The Legislative Assembly referred the bill to the committee on 2 August for examination and report by 16 August 2012. I would like to thank those who briefed the committee and contributed their views at the briefings and hearing held on 10 August 2012 or who

otherwise contributed to the inquiry. I especially thank the committee staff led by Rob Hansen. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines and the department of state development assisted the committee in its work.

The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 attempts to clarify the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resources interests; implement part of the Streamlining Approvals Project; confirm and clarify current jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants; and provide increased regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the state's emerging coal seam gas to liquefied natural gas industry. These four points were important missing pieces under Labor because Labor gave no security to landholders, industry and investors and only held up projects that regional communities needed to keep them alive. For too long under Labor, the state missed out on revenue because of their go-slow effort.

The committee consulted with likely stakeholders on the bill and received a number of submissions. For example, AgForce highlighted a number of points in its submission. Regarding the binding nature of agreements—and it is a pity the member for South Brisbane is not present to hear me say this—AgForce supports the construct of a framework that allows the landholder some position over the effect that these developments will have on their land. The land is not only important to AgForce members, to those farmers who will play a major role in this state's economy as we try to recover from the Labor mess we inherited. To this end, AgForce supports the inclusion of the proposed clause so that existing landholder provisions and agreements are nonbinding on future landholders, providing a new landholder the opportunity to negotiate a position and agreement that will be more amenable to farming practices they wish to develop across their land.

This has highlighted an important fact—that as properties change ownership so does the farming practice and in some cases the farming systems. The inclusion of this clause will allow greater certainty for the sale and purchase of properties. This gives more security to rural areas. Agriculture, as we know, is one of the Newman government's focuses, and it has played and will continue to play a major role in the state's economy and make us go forward.

The committee invited the minister to clarify what work his department will undertake to inform landholders and other groups who may be affected by the provisions in the bill. I and I am sure other LNP members across the regions will help to do this because we value the regions. They are important when it comes to getting this state back on track.

The bill proposes a number of amendments to Queensland's Acquisition of Land Act 1967 and other acts in relation to policies and practices for the compulsory acquisition of land. The amendments would provide constructing authorities with greater flexibility in relation to compulsory acquisitions of resource interests connected with land, in line with practices in other Australian jurisdictions. Construction is another one of the Newman government's four pillars, and construction in industry stalled under Labor.

The department assured the committee that these amendments will not extinguish resource interests, except in instances where a potential or real conflict exists. For these situations, the amendments would provide constructing authorities with a discretionary power to acquire resource interests where there is a conflict with the purpose of the proposed take—for example, a rail corridor that needs to be acquired that would impact on a proposal for an open-cut coalmine. This is important to assist with the development of infrastructure to help one of the Newman government's four pillars grow in the resources industries, unlike the system which got bogged down under the previous Labor government. The bill also includes transitional provisions to ensure that, for past compulsory acquisitions of land, resource interests were not extinguished unless actions were specifically taken to do so.

A number of submissions commented on the requirements in the bill for holders of exploration permits to periodically relinquish land throughout the life of the exploration tenure. Those opposite might want to point the fingers at the negative as usual. They only mention the negatives because they are not prone to being positive. Again, that is partly why the state is in the position it is.

The Queensland Resources Council highlighted the requirement for proponents to periodically relinquish land throughout the life of the exploration tenure. It seems reasonable that any land compulsorily acquired should be counted towards a proponent's periodic relinquishment. Further, in the circumstances where a large amount of land acquired is in the principal area of the tenement, a relinquishment credit will be available towards the proponent's remaining tenements. This is similar to the concession offered to explorers under the previous government's urban restricted area policy. QRC is happy to work with the government on developing this further. So we now see the resource industry happy to deal with the Newman government, which I imagine differs greatly from the limbo land of Labor governments.

The department's advice included that the relinquishment for an exploration permit occurs by sub-blocks. So if part of exploration tenure is extinguished, then it would count toward relinquishment if the whole sub-block is extinguished or any part of the sub-block not affected by the extinguishment is also

relinquished. However, if the part of a sub-block not affected by the extinguishment is also relinquished, then it would not count towards the relinquishment. To do otherwise would unnecessarily complicate the administration of relinquishment to accommodate a very rare scenario. In other words, the system has been simplified. It needs to be noted that any extinguishment of area in exploration tenure would be very rare.

There were some submissions in relation to the periodic reduction in land covered by exploration permits. A number of submitters questioned whether the minister would retain discretion to relax the land relinquishment requirement for permit holders in exceptional circumstances under the proposed new relinquishment scheme. However, the department has advised that the bill does not change—I repeat, does not change—the discretion provided in the Mineral Resources Act 1989 for the minister to decide an alternate relinquishment requirement.

As part of the Streamline Approvals Project, the decision-making role will transfer from the Governor in Council to the minister. The bill proposes to transfer the power to grant and renew mining leases and petroleum leases under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Petroleum Act 1923 from the Governor in Council to the minister. There were some concerns raised during the inquiry that this power should be left with the Governor in Council. However, the Department of Natural Resources and Mines has advised that this proposed amendment is designed to reduce assessment times and that it is consistent with the legislation operating in other states. So here we have a government helping to make things work, not stopping them. This is a government that realises mining and other such resource industries do not stop at our borders. The committee was satisfied with the advice provided by the department.

The Newman government is committed to cutting red tape by reducing complex and inefficient processes. The proposed amendments in this bill will help achieve this, such as the introduction of an integrated online electronic management system—MyMinesOnline. This web based service delivery system will provide seamless interaction between the relevant department and the resources industry. In the future the public and communities will be able to go online and look, creating transparency—something that was missing in the past under the previous state government.

The committee supports the MyMinesOnline and has noted that the government has made a budget allocation for its introduction. The committee also invites the minister to provide a time frame as to when the system will be operational if the bill is passed and when the public will be able to access permits and lease documents online, which I believe is up and running now. The government has made a budget allocation. That is something new. In the past the previous government would have left that little problem for later on when it would then decide to go and look at borrowing the money.

The bill contains amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 which will reduce red tape while providing greater security for the industry and landholders. The bill inserts a new section into this act which will make it possible to move CSG water and brine off site to a central location for treatment and salt recovery. This is part of the commitment of this government to help all industries take off the shackles and get on with business to create jobs in the private and corporate sector and to not create jobs that that government cannot pay for. In a submission to the committee it was raised that the registering of easements may degrade or decrease the value of rural properties because there would be a reduction in the farm area available to be transferred to third parties. It was also noted that the bill is silent as to where the produced water would be located or how it would be stored.

The department consulted extensively with the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection about the amendments relating to the transportation and treatment of CSG water and brine. CSG companies would still require an environmental authority and a licence to transport CSG water and brine off their lease. Regarding the environmental concerns, the department advised that CSG water could be used for agricultural uses—one of our government's four pillars. It could allow centralised processing facilities. It could be commercialised to saleable product. It does not remove the rights of landholders but actually looks out for them. Pipeline licence holders will still require a conduct and compensation agreement before entering any affected landholder's property. Again, that is giving them some control, not taking it away.

The committee notes the rationale for piping CSG water and brine off properties: the potential for greater efficiencies for treating water from CSG operations. These pipelines will only be constructed with the written permission of the affected landholders. The Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon. Andrew Cripps, noted in his introductory speech that these proposed amendments to the bill will support improved environmental outcomes and increase regulatory certainty for Queensland's coal seam gas and LNG industry.

There were submissions received by the committee which raised concerns about the absence of the urban restricted area provision in the bill, which protects residential areas from mining projects. Those provisions in the 2011 bill stopped the granting of and application for mining and gas tenures within two kilometres of towns with a population over 1,000 if the application did not have consent from

local government. Unlike those in opposition, the current government is about giving our local governments a say. That is done through managing interaction between resource activities and urban areas. That will be dealt with through a statutory regional planning process, currently being progressed as a priority by this government. Let the local community have their say. That is also something new that we would not have seen from the previous Labor government. This will provide more flexibility to communities and new regional plans, which will be restricted by the current two-kilometre zone. The current situation remains until if and when a new one is presented.

In summary, the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 will provide a modern and efficient regulatory framework for the Queensland mining industry with compromising environmental protections. The bill will also reduce red tape for investors while increasing security for landholders. This means getting Queensland back on track, making it attractive again to invest in the industries that bring jobs and real money back into our economy. After considering the views of the participants in the examination of the bill and the advice provided, the committee recommends that the bill be passed with the recommendations of the committee, which I have mentioned today. I thank the honourable minister Andrew Cripps for considering and answering the committee's recommendations but, more importantly, for presenting this bill to the House without delay to assist Queensland to get back on track. Once again, on behalf of the committee I would like to thank those who briefed the committee and contributed their views to the briefing and the hearing. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr GIBSON** (Gympie—LNP) (5.54 pm): I rise to also make a contribution to the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 and in doing so note the contributions that have occurred before mine. I do not intend to go into the detail that many of my colleagues have already presented on this bill. I thank them for their information.

As has been noted, the committee's investigation into this bill was conducted within a tight time frame. Whilst that may not have been ideal, I do wish to thank the committee staff for their great work in being able to pull together all the activities that occur. I particularly want to thank the members of the public as well—those who made submissions and those who presented to the public hearing, both in person and via telephone link. I think it highlights the effectiveness of this committee's arrangements at work within the Queensland parliament that we can, in a truncated time frame, engage with the public in such a way that they are able to be heard. Listening to those opposite who have spoken, one would think that the truncated time frame actually denied them any opportunity to be heard—far from it. Whilst it was not ideal, they did have an opportunity to put forward their views and their submissions were heard.

I also want to thank the departmental officers. I know that they worked particularly hard in responding to the committee's questions and concerns, again, within that tight time frame. That was appreciated by the committee and the parliament, and I thank them for that. I ask the minister to pass that on to his departmental staff.

The electorate of Gympie has a strong mining connection. Indeed, Gympie is a township that was established as a result of the discovery of gold. James Nash, as we know from history, did discover gold in the area next to what is now the town hall of Gympie and, in doing so, saved the state of Queensland as an early colony when it was almost bankrupt in the late 1800s.

**Mr Rickuss** interjected.

**Mr GIBSON:** The member for Lockyer has been reading my notes, because what would have happened had James Nash found gold under the legislative requirements that exist currently? I can tell honourable members this: the state of Queensland would not have been saved. We would have lost this state because we would not have had the opportunities to embrace the mining of gold that was so necessary to bring about the wealth and rewards that this state has gained. What we are seeing with this legislation today—and I want to acknowledge this because I think it is important—which is based upon the previous bill, the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011, is that we are removing that unnecessary regulation and red tape and bringing efficiency back into our operations. That in itself is a critical component. The explanatory notes to the bill highlight—

The purpose of the Bill is to provide the legislative changes necessary to:

- clarify the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resources interests ...
- implement part of the Streamlining Approvals Project ...
- confirm and clarify current jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants ... and
- provide increased regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the State's emerging Coal Seam Gas ... to Liquid Natural Gas ... industry ...

I wish to focus my remarks on two of the bill's purposes: the streamlining component and the state's emerging coal seam gas to LNG industry. In doing so, I point out, as I flagged, that a large part of this bill is based upon the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill, which was introduced in the previous parliament. That is important. Why? Because it blows apart the

falsehood that we have heard from others that there has been no public consultation in relation to this bill. Such a large part of this bill was already in the public domain due to the introduction of the previous bill. Indeed, during the public hearing we heard that consultation on elements of this bill—and the previous bill—started as far back as 2009. However, there is a valid criticism, which is that the consultation was with stakeholders and not broadly with the community. I believe—and it has been reported in the committee's report—that the department could do better.

In fact, if we take anything from this particular piece of legislation it is to understand that, whilst, of course, we must consult with stakeholders, there is an appropriate time to also be consulting with the broader public.

**Mr Cox:** It is better than it would have been, or was.

**Mr GIBSON:** I take that interjection, but it is important that we keep that in mind. I had the misfortune of listening to those opposite, and I have come to one conclusion: they have spiked the Kool-Aid on level 9. The contributions we heard could be nothing more than delusional ramblings because of the Kool-Aid being spiked. Clearly, there is a problem on level 9 and we need to get security up there to check before anything dangerous happens to those members.

Let me take a moment to, in the tradition of that great TV show that my kids love so much, *Mythbusters*, bust a few of the myths we heard from those opposite. I will start with the time frame, because we heard from them that there was no opportunity for public consultation. We have already shown by submissions that, whilst the time was short, there was public consultation and views were heard. My adage in life—it is one that many people subscribe to—is that if you want to get a job done you should give it to a busy person. Well, this committee got on with the job and reviewed this legislation and, I believe, has put forward a good report.

The member for South Brisbane would like us to believe that it was a tick-and-flick exercise, that we rubber-stamped the bill. But then, when the Kool-Aid kicked in, she used this very report to criticise the government. Hold on a minute! Does that mean that this committee actually critically looked at the legislation and was providing advice back to the government? I think so. But how could we rubber-stamp if all we are is a mouthpiece of the government? The member for South Brisbane is exposed for the sham that she put forward in this parliament.

This committee has done its job. This committee has a responsibility to this parliament and to the people of Queensland to examine legislation, to be critical and cast an eye across it to ensure it provides the best outcomes for the people of Queensland. That is exactly what we have done. It is evident in the recommendations within the report. I note that the statement of reservations does not provide anything other than a whinge. That is the calibre of the contribution we have seen from those opposite. Instead of actually being involved in the process, they want to throw stones from the side, failing to recognise that under their government this process started—and, indeed, the lack of consultation is a fault of the department, not of either government.

Let us bust another myth, and that is what we heard from the member for Bundamba when she rattled the tin of fear and tried to make the people of Ipswich believe that there would be mines on their doorsteps as a result of this legislation. As has been mentioned by others but I wish to reinforce, the urban restricted area provisions are not damaged because of this bill. RA 384, which is gazetted, is in force and provides that for any town in Queensland with a population over 1,000 people there is to be a two-kilometre buffer. Myth: busted. The member for Bundamba has been exposed for arousing fear, not for reporting on what is accurate.

**Mr Grimwade:** And not for the first time.

**Mr GIBSON:** I take that interjection. What we have, though, and what this committee was able to determine is that, clearly, RA 384 is not enough. There is concern that there are communities within our great state of Queensland of a smaller size than 1,000 people that need to be protected, and the appropriate opportunity to do that is through the statutory regulatory planning process. Indeed, that is what we are seeing. No fear campaign should be mounted on this legislation. There should be a collective cheer—a cheer that this government understands regional Queensland, a cheer that this government understands smaller communities, a cheer that this government is doing something rather than what we saw from the previous government, which was nothing more than spin.

Another myth I wish to bust is about the lack of consultation. I have alluded to it, but I cannot allow the member for South Brisbane to enter into this House—and I appreciate that she is only new to this parliament. She was not here in the dark days of the Beattie government. Under Peter Beattie, consultation meant flying into an area in a chopper, landing at an airstrip, with the media already gathered, and telling the community, 'This is where I am going to build a megadam.' I direct the member to South Brisbane to the history books that are being written about the Traveston Crossing Dam, because they expose Labor's hypocrisy. When the Labor government wanted to consult about the Traveston Dam, they did not do it with the people of Queensland. They did not even do it with their own

caucus. We know what the then member for Noosa said as she was strongarmed to make sure she toed the line. If ever we saw an example of rubber-stamping, it was the hypocrisy of Labor as they held their members in line.

**A government member:** What did it cost us?

**Mr GIBSON:** The Traveston Crossing Dam debacle has cost the people of Queensland $600 million plus. More than that, it has cost them a community—a community that is resilient, a community that is proud and a community that is holding on by the very skin of its teeth but is doing so now with a future. The community was not offered that under Labor. We saw how Labor treat regional and rural parts of Queensland. They march in, kick them in the guts and then walk out.

**Mr Grimwade:** And never apologise.

**Mr GIBSON:** I take the interjection, because the former member for South Brisbane, despite in this House making a promise that she would visit the Mary Valley, never did so. I imagine that, now she has hightailed it out of this state, she will never visit the Mary Valley to explain her actions. Labor is a party of hypocrites and full of hypocrisy. We only need to look at history to show us those examples.

Returning to the legislation, I wish to touch upon the issue of coal seam gas because it is a topical issue. It is one, indeed, about which many people in Queensland are concerned. During its public hearings the committee was fortunate to have the opportunity to discuss with those organisations and individuals that came forward the issue with regard to the movement of produce water and brine. Coal seam gas is an emerging industry. We have never seen its manner of operation on the scale that it is occurring. Quite rightly, the community has concerns and we as legislators have a responsibility to listen to those concerns and to have discussions about them.

What is evident is that the current methodology with regard to the movement of produce water and brine does not provide the best environmental outcome. This bill ensures that amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act reduce red tape for investors but also provide greater security for landholders and for industry. These amendments are designed to improve the environmental outcome and to increase regulatory certainty for this state's emerging industry. I believe that we should commend that. This is an amendment that will ensure we are able to see processing of that coal seam gas extracted water, rather than have it sitting in large ponds or used for other minor purposes. We will enable this to occur in such a way that there will be a net environmental benefit.

There were issues raised in the submissions which we of course put to the department. I note its responses to those issues. The committee has looked at that. I know that it will be an area of interest for this parliament. I am sure the minister will ensure that, as this rolls out and we start to see the benefits of these particular amendments within the coal seam gas industry, the people of Queensland can have one less concern about coal seam gas. As it is a new industry there will be many concerns, but it is important that we address them, that we do it in an open and transparent way and that we are able to bring the people with us on this journey. I know that the minister is committed to that. I thank him for that and look forward to his further comments.

**Mr Cripps:** The Minister for Environment outlined how impressed and pleased he was with the environmental benefits that will come from the amendments in the bill.

**Mr GIBSON:** I take that interjection from the minister, because it is important. What we have seen from the Minister for Environment is exactly that commitment, and that is what we want to achieve. This is not about an open slather in terms of coal seam gas; it is about a measured, controlled approach to ensure that we achieve both the environmental benefits and the economic and development benefits for this state that are offered by coal seam gas operations.

As I said at the beginning, the time frame we had to deal with this piece of legislation was not ideal. But as a committee we did so, and I believe we did so in a manner that highlights the very effectiveness of the committee structure that this parliament has. We as members of parliament have a responsibility to examine legislation. We have a responsibility to hold the executive to account, and we have demonstrated that we have done so in the report on the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill. It would not have been possible without the efforts of Rob Hansen and our staff, and they deserve credit for that. It would not have been possible without the leadership provided from our chair and from the membership of the committee, for those who were available to be involved. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (6.10 pm): I rise in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. This is an important bill that provides Queenslanders with increased surety in relation to the management of their natural resources and how we maximise our benefit of these resources to ensure that we draw a balance between financial outcomes, environmental sustainability and the impact the developments have upon local construction and infrastructure. Whilst there are no mines within my electorate of Ferny Grove, in the most recent electorate overview it is reported to contain 23 operating mining companies; 22 companies associated with utilities, including

gas; 508 companies providing professional, technical and scientific services; 806 construction companies; and 20 ICT companies. While there is no guarantee that these figures equate to the number of operating businesses within areas specifically impacted by this legislation, I am sure that the companies operating either directly or peripherally to the mining industry and support services will be watching the passage of this bill with great interest.

This bill will ensure that the Newman government takes another huge step towards delivering upon our core election commitments to reduce the time and regulatory burden associated with operations within the mining sector, and to ensure that this is achieved the bill delivers the following policy objectives: clarification of the legislative framework in as much as it relates to the resource industry and compulsory acquisition of land; modernisation of the tenure administration system to reduce the time taken for each decision, that is, streamlining of approvals; clarification of the application of relevant hazardous chemical and hazardous facilities acts; and support for coal seam gas to liquified natural gas projects throughout Queensland.

Businesses throughout the Ferny Grove electorate that are either directly or peripherally associated with this sector are looking forward to their government providing them with this increased surety and stability, mitigating risks and providing a regulatory framework that is unambiguous. They want a framework that ensures that our management of resources and the environment are sustainable and that the beneficial outcomes for one are not necessarily mutually exclusive to the benefit and sustainability of the other. Businesses want to conduct their affairs with a government that empowers operations rather than constricts them, that promotes sustainability rather than ignores it, a government that has a long-term vision for success and co-existence rather than a short-term grab of resource profits.

With collaborative and consultative engagement, this government has prepared this bill to largely align with legislation within other jurisdictions and provide the outcome to align with expectations of all interested parties. One of the most significant interested parties is of course the Queensland government and the people of Queensland. The impact upon the first objective, that of compulsory acquisition and the clear advantage to the Queensland people, is evident when reviewed as follows. Under the current legislation, exploration and mining tenements can be compulsorily acquired; however, the capacity to continue exploration or mining activities is extinguished. So what this bill will address is a capacity to allow co-existence with linear infrastructure projects and resource tenure holders. The benefit this provides to stakeholders and the people of Queensland is that the procurement of easements within existing tenements is usually possible at a fraction of the cost and therefore significant and critical infrastructure will, in time, cost much less and be delivered far quicker than is possible under the existing legislation.

One aspect of this bill that shows a real and tangible example of the Newman government's can-do approach to business within Queensland is the common-sense amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004. The amendments ensure that the age-old economic principle of economies of scale can be applied to the emerging CSG and LNG industries to ensure that a more timely completion of deployment of infrastructure at lower costs will be possible. To analogise, in my last career I worked in the ICT sector. When building new communication networks, for years the ICT sector deployed using a hub-and-spoke type model—that is, where centralised servers can be accessed using routers, switches, hubs et cetera. This ensures that services can be obtained in regional areas with minimum deployment of network infrastructure. Similarly, in the future under the accords of this bill we may well see adjacent mining tenements sharing services such as access roads, network infrastructure, electricity and facilities for treatment of CSG brine and water. This hub-and-spoke model will translate into a shortened time to market for many sites and services that are shared. It also means that regulatory oversight of standards and compliance might well be enhanced by ensuring that smaller, less efficient operators may well outsource the complicated treatment and reporting of environmental compliance to larger centralised mining operations.

Earlier this afternoon we heard typical hysteria and scaremongering from the members for Bundamba and South Brisbane. They clearly do not understand the concepts of negotiation and collaboration with industry and partners. They said that the years of hard yards were undertaken earlier by Labor. However, without a win-win mentality when entering into negotiations—instead having a 'win at all costs' mentality—it is little surprise that very few of the outcomes that they wanted came to fruition and success. This bill presents as a win-win outcome. The stakeholders share in the benefits of a shorter time to market and in the increased likelihood of a high level of compliance to environmental standards through sharing of transportation and treatment facilities. Common sense would dictate that the best standards will be achieved more readily and more cost-effectively.

In fact, I envisage an immerging service industry being provided from those businesses within Ferny Grove being possible with the successful introduction of this bill. The bill provides a capacity for shared infrastructure between existing tenements and there will be a capacity for adjacent operations to share resources and ancillary operations such as those mentioned previously. Another significant modernisation this bill will enable is the introduction of online lodgement of documentation and

management of resource permits. This online lodgement will significantly reduce the time between lodgement approvals, changes of ownership and the issuing of departmental requests. In the current dynamic, stimulated, up-beat and increasingly confident business community, this component of the bill removes many existing impediments to business. The combined efficiencies each aspect of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 will deliver provide this fledgling industry with the leg-up required to ensure that current barriers of entry and burden of red tape are lifted without compromising the stringent environmental safety standards required throughout the industry.

We all know that the current debt position of Queensland is unsustainable and that without these remedial actions this debt would have reached $100 billion in 2018. With all other Australian states with a debt to revenue ratio at or below 100 per cent whilst in Queensland we are overburdened by a debt to revenue ratio approaching 150 per cent, something needed to be done to slow the slide towards this enormous level of debt. With Queensland being singled out in the recent Moody's report as having a high level of dependency on the mining sector, this bill ensures that the much needed revenue can be realised earlier than otherwise possible. Our government has again opened the door to business in Queensland, removed the burden of red tape and streamlined operations throughout the state.

I commend the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines for the introduction of this bill and thank him for the contribution this bill will have in ensuring that the resources sector remains an integral pillar of our growing economy and will ensure that the Newman-led government does get Queensland back on track. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (6.19 pm): In rising to speak to the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Bill 2012, I wish to thank my fellow committee members for their work on this bill. This bill seeks, among other things, to clarify the legislative framework relating to the compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to mining interests, to implement part of the Streamlining Approvals Project and to provide increased regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the state's emerging coal seam gas industry.

I wish to raise a number of issues that were identified during the committee process, but there are aspects of the bill that I welcome, such as the greater transparency through MyMinesOnline and greater negotiating powers for individual landowners affected by mining development. However, a number of issues were raised that I do not think were adequately addressed by the minister in his second reading speech. The most common objection raised in the submissions has been the short time frame that was allowed for public scrutiny of this bill. The result of this short time frame is evident in the lack of submissions that came from those who are most affected by mining development: landowners and the agricultural industry. That sector of the community has the most to lose from the fast-tracking of development applications. Individual landowners living in isolation and working vast tracts of land will find it nearly impossible to go through the material and make submissions before the deadline, which was four days. However, these are the people who are most likely to have mining developments on their land in the near future. The minister has now basically said that landowners will be informed of the passing of the bill, but that is too late. Landowners should have been given more opportunity to comment through the committee process on this bill that is before the House.

I would like to read and also table a submission from AgForce, as I think it sums up very well the thoughts and feelings of rural Queensland about this government's approach to community consultation.

*Tabled paper:* Submission, dated 10 August 2012, from AgForce Queensland Industrial Union of Employers to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee regarding the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 [791].

This is the submission of Mr Drew Wagner, General Manager, Stakeholder Relations, AgForce. It states—

Before we take this opportunity to provide feedback and comment to the committee on this legislative review submission, we would like to highlight the ridiculous timing of purported consultation with the community. To provide such a short timeframe is not conducive to appropriate consultation. To further not include the broader land use sector throughout the development of the legislative arrangement, but to include directly the industries that this review will favour, is tantamount to negligence. No landholder, agricultural, environmental or community group appears to have been consulted throughout this process only the mining and resources sector. This is cause of great concern to AgForce.

This precludes these groups not only from participation in the development of this new framework, it also does not provide an appropriate amount of time to fully unpack and interrogate the contents of the proposed framework, thus hindering organisations like ourselves from making in depth comment. To this end, the principles discussed within this submission will be heavy on questioning, light on preferred or deliverable outcomes, and at times from a position of lack of understanding due to the timeframes of consultation—a process that AgForce, on behalf of landholders across Queensland requests the Government to not undertake again.

Understanding that we are discussing legislative frameworks that will directly impact two of the Government's four pillar election campaign—one perhaps positively, the other potentially negatively—questions the ongoing role of consultation and negotiation leading into the future.

The following outline some of our concerns. Please do not consider this a complete or in depth list, as the timing has not allowed further development of appropriate positions.

...

AgForce is disappointed to see the removal of the Urban Restricted areas component of development control within the proposed Bill. These frameworks are important for the longevity and continuance of many of the rural and regional areas that support our farming community—to see these developments go unchecked due to the removal of these restrictions would be derelict. AgForce is sure that many of the other submissions to this process will include issues pertaining to the exclusion of these details from the proposed Bill.

Further to this is then the way in which the environmental restricted and protected areas are managed under this proposal, or indeed, how they are not addressed. It is difficult to understand how a Government can work with a landholder to provide for an in perpetuity nature conservation covenant over a parcel of land, and provide for its protection in a manner commensurate with that of a National Park, yet legislation such as this does not recognise or include that protection. This legislation should recognise the legislative instruments that are used for the protected areas, and provide for their exclusion of these under this amendment. This should recognise not only the current activities exclusion on these protected areas, but also exclude any further development work under a resource tenure, or progression within, that will impact in any way the conservation values identified within the covenants ... AgForce does not support proposed amendment s290. As the committee is aware, this section gives sole approval for the granting and continuation/renewal of all mining leases to the Minister, and not the current process of the Governor in Council, ie the Cabinet acting on the advice of Ministers. Whilst this is in no way a misguided interpretation or indeed a questioning of the Ministers capacity, surely from a Governance perspective this is a process better undertaken by a greater number for the greater good, not just an individual? AgForce requests that this clause be deleted from the amendments.

These issues above highlight the most concerning that AgForce has developed due to the restricted timeframe for deliberation of this amendment, and should not be considered as an exhaustive list of concerns on behalf of the agricultural sector.

AgForce requests the Government, through this committee, to undertake an appropriate amount of consultation on these proposed amendments, and for the committee to take this proposal back to the community for further comment and opportunity of input.

The government has not done that. The focus of consulting with the developers while neglecting those impacted by development is not consistent with the view that agriculture and mining are to co-exist as the pillars of our economy. The implications of watertable or river system contamination from CSG, the potential impact of mining operations on agricultural industries and property values and the impact of land acquisition and development approvals for mining operations on landowners deserve far greater public scrutiny than the period allowed.

There were also many issues raised about the removal of the urban buffer zone of two kilometres, which was in the original legislation. The government has flagged regional planning changes that it intends to introduce that will vary according to the situation, but I think that that does not provide the certainty that rural communities need. Considering this government's already appalling track record of community consultation, it is interesting to note that the only stakeholders supporting the removal of the urban buffer zones is the mining industry.

The urban buffer zone is very important. I have a number of mining towns located in my electorate. At Moranbah, there was an approval for a coalmine to be constructed within seven kilometres of that township. The people who were the most outspoken opponents of that coalmine were the coalminers themselves who lived in that mining town, because they know what it is like to put up with the hazard of silicon dust and other dust, the lights, the noise and the hazards of mining. Isaac Plains Coal is located within seven kilometres of the township. Every afternoon the people who live in the southern end of that town have to clean their verandas or patios because of all the dust that accumulates there from that coalmine. So it is very important that a buffer zone is in place to mitigate the impacts on people's health that result from mining.

The only sector that is comfortable with the short time frame is the big end of town—the mining companies that stand to benefit from the streamlining approval process so that projects are fast-tracked by the minister without the scrutiny of Governor in Council. The lack of scrutiny allowed for in this bill and the removal of accountability is not consistent with the promises of transparency and community engagement by this government. In fact, it demonstrates the opposite.

Sitting suspended from 6.28 pm to 7.30 pm.

**Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (7.30 pm): I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the contributions from all members today and I must say that I am still a little confused. I am looking for clarification from the minister in his summing-up. The reason for the confusion is that I have had a look at the gazette members have been talking about and which the deputy director-general referred to in his submission to the committee. I note a number of members have referred to page 14 of the committee report which states—

Mr John Skinner, Deputy Director-General, Mining and Petroleum in the Department of Natural Resources and Mines explained to the committee:

*…as the committee may have seen from the comparison provided of the RLA bill and this bill, a major change is the removal of the amendments relating to urban restricted areas. An alternative approach is being adopted on this issue and the interface between resource exploration around population centres is now being managed through a comprehensive and consultative statutory regional planning framework.*

It goes on to say—

In advice on the submissions, DNRM further advised:

*The position of the current Government is that the issue of managing the interaction between resource activities and urban areas will be dealt with through the Statutory Regional Planning processes currently being progressed as a priority by Government.*

In evidence at the hearing, Deputy Director-General John Skinner explained to the Chair the protections afforded by the existing Gazette Notice and the benefits to smaller communities that would be provided as part of the regional planning framework.

That made me go to the gazette notice. It prompted me to ask the question and consider: how easy is it to amend the gazette notice? Member after member has said, 'Listen, you have nothing to worry about. It is in the gazette notice. We are going to have a statutory regional planning scheme to protect everyone else'. If I can take the example of a statutory regional planning scheme, we already have one in South-East Queensland. They are not set in concrete. The South East Queensland Regional Plan is regularly updated and varied. The boundaries are regularly changed. Since the Beattie government introduced the South East Queensland Regional Plan we have seen permitted uses change. We have seen councils have to change their planning schemes to bring them into alignment with what the state government's requirement is. I think members need to be aware that a statutory regional planning process sounds all very well and good but it is not set in concrete. It is available to be varied in the future.

In relation to the gazette notice, my question to the minister is: how easy is it for this gazette notice to be amended? How easy is it for this gazette notice to be varied? What opportunities do members of parliament have to review it? I know in the past in the House some other ministers have not even responded to questions I have asked. I do not know what stance this minister is going to take. I can vividly recall him, when he was in opposition, speaking with passion about issues in relation to the former Labor government allowing no consultation, that it is so disgraceful and deplorable. When the Attorney-General was in opposition he spoke about the disgraceful position of the former Labor government that did not properly consult on a whole range of legislation. The member for Gympie spoke about the consultation not being crash hot but 'we did a good job'. Quite frankly, if we think this is the standard that is acceptable, I shake my head. What happened to the commitments that the Premier gave when he won the election? What happened to the commitments that the Premier gave when we saw him in the media when he opened the Liberal National Party conference and spoke about being open and transparent? I think it is shameful. I actually think it is shameful that the government members are happy to say that the consultation was not good but it is fine. When I go to the recommendations from the committee, the first recommendation is—

> The committee invites the Minister to clarify what work his department will undertake to inform landholders and other groups who may be affected by provisions in the Bill that are passed by the Legislative Assembly. The committee also invites the Minister to provide assurances that his department will in future include landholders, environmentalists and peak bodies representing them, as well as community groups, in its consultation processes for the development of resource industry-related Bills that may affect their interests.

Quite frankly, the horse has bolted. They are saying, 'Sorry, minister, we really don't think you did it well enough but we are not going to tap you over the wrist. Hopefully when you do your next bill you will do it better.' This is a significant piece of legislation. Yes, the previous government started groundwork and this government and minister has refined it. Yes, there was discussion and consultation by the previous government with stakeholders. If this is the standard of consultation this government is happy with I shake my head. I feel so disappointed that so many Queenslanders are not seeing what is happening in this, the 54th Parliament.

When I have raised this before the Manager of Government Business has said, 'But look, we had to get business into the House. We had to rush these bills into the House because we had to debate something.' The Manager of Government Business sets the agenda. I understand the importance of trying to get the mining industry up and running. But, by crikey, I shake my head and feel so sorry for so many Queenslanders who voted for the Liberal National Party. Many who rallied outside yesterday, who simply wanted to meet with the Premier or the minister or speak with a government member, voted for this government.

**Mr Cox:** They voted for change.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** My word, they voted for change, but it is very disappointing to see the process by which this change is happening. That is the comment I want to make. I know the government has a mandate. It will make the change. It will push it through. Maybe next time the minister might come to this House and say, 'We have learnt from our first time and we will have better consultation.' All I can say is that they should have had better consultation this time. It was not going to be that difficult to have another couple of weeks. We do not come back for two weeks.

**A government member:** Twenty years we have waited.

**Mr WELLINGTON:** Let us forget about what happened in the previous government. This is this government's agenda and this government's bill. What would have happened if we had waited a bit longer? I am urging the minister to respond to my question about how easy it is to amend this gazette notice. Quite frankly, I do not believe this gazette notice is anywhere near as powerful and as strong as an act of parliament.

If you have an act of parliament, it means that if there is to be change it has to be debated on the floor of parliament. It means it has to go to a committee, unless the government declares it an urgent bill and pushes it through or guillotines it, as we have already seen this government do. I do not believe the gazette notice is anywhere near as secure. I am not taking interjections from the minister responsible for water resources. He has had his chance and he can speak later.

That is what I wanted to touch on. Hopefully, the minister will clarify this for the benefit of all Queenslanders, especially the landowners who have not had the chance to be consulted. I ask the minister to please explain why this bill was not able to lay on the table for another two weeks and be debated at the next sitting, so that the committee had a reasonable amount of time. That is all we are asking. We are not asking for the impossible. When I discussed this issue with the Attorney-General in relation to another bill, he said, 'We shouldn't have to wait for six months; it's unreasonable.' I am not asking the minister for six months. I am asking for a reasonable amount of time.

In its report, the committee identified a schedule of the time limits. I note the member for Gympie is in the chamber again. I spoke earlier about his contribution and that he said, 'Well, it wasn't good, but we did a pretty good job with what we had.' Just so that the member for Gympie is aware, I say that that is not good enough. I do not think Queenslanders voted for a government that would say that this is good enough. Just for the record, let us look at the schedule of the time frame. I think it is shameful.

*(Time expired)*

**Mr YOUNG** (Keppel—LNP) (7.42 pm): I rise to speak briefly to the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. The mining resources sector provides economic benefits to every postcode in Queensland. In 2010-11 it delivered $1 in every five to the state's economy through spending in Queensland. Mining supports one in eight Queensland jobs and in 2011 it paid $2.7 billion in royalties to the Queensland government. In its first year, coal seam gas will provide royalties to the Queensland government of over $850 million. In 2010-11 in the local Rockhampton area, mining contributed $268 million in wages and salaries—which does not include contractors—to 2,300 direct full-time workers engaged in mining. Across this state, the mining resources sector provides $4.7 billion in wages paid to 40,600 direct resources jobs.

I hope I have painted an accurate picture of how important the mining resources sector is to the economy of Queenslanders. I will share a brief bit of data with fellow members of the House on the sheer magnitude of the LNG project in Gladstone and throughout the Surat and Bowen basins. The project will diversify the Queensland economy, generate new jobs and rejuvenate regional towns and communities. Near the peak of construction, at Gladstone the total workforce now stands at 7,300, which is 1,600 staff and more than 5,700 people engaged with major contractors. It is simply staggering to fly over the project and see its sheer size. In the 10 years to 2021, LNG will boost the Queensland economy by up to $32 billion. The Darling Downs region economy will be boosted by $14 billion and the Fitzroy region, which I am proud to say is in my part of the world, will get $13.4 billion.

In the Gladstone region, LNG projects have been heavily involved in community engagement and financial benefit. The member for Gladstone and I have seen firsthand their contributions to health services, community groups, sporting groups, social infrastructure and housing in her electorate. I might add that they donated two chairs to the dialysis unit, which was very much needed for people who were having to travel to Rockhampton on a daily basis.

This government is committed to cutting red tape and reducing government and industry time and resources in relation to the Streamlining Approvals Project. The Streamlining Approvals Project commenced in 2009 and, to date, has produced three reports. This bill aims to produce an online service, known as MyMinesOnline, which supports reforms made by the Greentape Reduction Project. Authenticated customer access will provide transparency, as well as providing certainty through a platform that allows industry groups to transact with government. The general public can also view proposals online. It is a great asset.

The bill will reduce red tape, remove inefficient processes and, at the same time, maintain rigorous environmental assessment, which is fundamental for appropriate resource development. Another important aspect to facilitate economic development is to obtain a balance in the relationship between the compulsory acquisition of land and mining resource interests, in line with government policy. In order to bring Queensland legislation in line with elsewhere in Australia, these amendments will allow construction authorities flexibility in relation to the compulsory acquisition of land. This bill recognises development activities such as mining, exploration and coal seam gas production can co-exist with necessary infrastructure such as roads and rail corridors.

By amending the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004, the bill will provide regulatory certainty for the emerging coal seam gas to liquid natural gas industry. This amendment has nine fundamental policy changes. It will deliver safe storage, transportation and treatment of coal seam gas water and brine from leases to a centralised water treatment and brine processing plant, thus enabling local landholders, councils and industry to utilise treated water and encourage the commercial disposal of salt recovered from the brine water.

**A government member:** That makes sense.

**Mr YOUNG:** Thank you. The registration of the pipeline easements from coal seam gas proposals to the liquid natural gas proponents on Curtis Island at Gladstone will bring security for pipeline infrastructure investments and adjacent landholders. The Department of Natural Resources and Mines will assess and administer pipeline licence applications and regulate the health and safety of the pipelines and processing and treatment infrastructure. This bill also confirms the state's commitment

to the Council of Australian Government's national harmonisation of general work safety laws. The bill proposes amendments to the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and contains provisions for the transfer of the regulation of hazardous chemicals and major hazard facilities in Queensland's specialised mining legislation.

I compliment the minister, his staff and the committee for their hard work in the development of this bill. One only needs to see the level of development and investment at the LNG plants at Gladstone to see the benefits to the Queensland economy. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mrs MADDERN** (Maryborough—LNP) (7.47 pm): I rise to speak to the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012. In his introductory speech, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon. Andrew Cripps, stated that the purpose of the legislation was to support the government's commitment to reducing red tape for the mining sector by reforming mining and resource tenure management with a modern and more efficient regulatory framework. In order to achieve this goal, there are four components of the bill: clarifying the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resources interests; providing increased regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the emerging coal seam gas and liquid natural gas industry; streamlining the approvals process; and confirming and clarifying the jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants. This bill was referred to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, of which I am a member. There were 27 written submissions and a public hearing in which seven groups, as well as departmental officers, participated. Our thanks go to those who participated in that process for their valuable contributions.

A significant number of submissions levelled criticism at the government for the very short time frame for consultation with various stakeholders, particularly those who were not mining companies, peak bodies or government agencies. I note the submissions raised a significant number of other issues, some of which I will address later. The shortened time frame for consultation is the basis for the statements of reservations by the member for Dalrymple and the member for South Brisbane. The criticism is valid to some degree, but I think it needs to be understood in the context that this government is a new government with a large amount of legislation to process. In these early months of government it would not be feasible to give a six-month consultation period to every single piece of legislation before tabling the legislation for debate.

While acknowledging that there are some changes, much of this legislation has been in the public forum for some time under the previous government. Further, the legislation is primarily technical in nature in that it is dealing with processes rather than policy. Almost all of the comments in the speeches by members of the opposition were a continual repetition about the short consultation time frame. There was very little reference to, or debate of, any of the legislative components of the bill by members opposite.

The committee has noted the concerns of those making submissions, in particular, the lack of consultation with landholders and community groups, and has sought assurance from the minister that these groups will be consulted in any further development of resource industry related bills that may affect their interest. I note that the latest referral by the government to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee has a reporting date of 29 October 2012—a period of some 10 weeks.

Quite a number of those presenting submissions expressed concern at the lack of provision in the current legislation for what has become known as the urban restricted areas policy. This policy provided for an area around population groups such as small towns where mining would not be allowed, thus providing a buffer between communities and mining activities. This was of particular interest to me as there is a proposed mine in my electorate which is in relatively close proximity to a small township. The committee members sought advice from the department in relation to this matter and were advised—

An alternative approach is being adopted on this issue and the interface between resource exploration around population centres is now being managed through a comprehensive and consultative statutory regional planning framework.

Given that there is a timelag in the preparation of these plans and they will not cover all areas in the short term, I am pleased with the further advice that gazettal RA 384 remains in place. This gazettal provides for a two-kilometre buffer around towns of populations over 1,000 people. Unfortunately, my small township has a population of less than a thousand people and does not benefit from this gazettal. I will ask the mining company to respect this urban restricted area—and I have no reason to believe that it will not—until such time as the matter is dealt with under a regional management plan. I am concerned, and will be seeking a regional management plan that takes into account much smaller regional communities, and I would hope that the plan is not as prescriptive as the current regulation. Too bad if your community has 999 people. It does not benefit from the current regulation, which I note was implemented by the Labor government.

An area of particular interest to me as a consequence of my former occupation as a property valuer is the area of compulsory acquisition, and I think the member for Gladstone may be interested in the following comments. Compulsory acquisition for infrastructure purposes is an area of regulation in the law which has the capacity to be complicated, time consuming and costly. Much of the assessment of compensation surrounding compulsory acquisition is dependent on case law and precedent and subject to individual interpretation and testing in the courts. This act proposes to make changes so that

the legislative framework surrounding compulsory acquisition is well understood and responsive. The economic development of Queensland is dependent on the development of supporting infrastructure in a timely and consistent manner.

The government's policy position is that resource tenure can generally co-exist with other forms of tenure and infrastructure development and that the compulsory acquisition of land should not extinguish resource interests. This bill will clarify the relationship between the compulsory acquisition of land and resource interests. It will uphold the government's policy that a compulsory acquisition does not automatically extinguish resource interests unless the acquiring authority can demonstrate that the resource interest is incompatible with the purposes for which the property is being acquired. Recent interpretations of the existing legislation were that a compulsory acquisition does extinguish a resource interest.

This bill will also ensure that past compulsory acquisitions of land have not extinguished resource interests unless constructing authorities took specific steps to ensure that the resource interest was extinguished. While this may raise in the mind of some that constructing authorities may now be responsible for compensation claims, I think it is quite unlikely as most of the existing infrastructure has co-existed with possible mining interests, in some cases for many, many years,

The third component of this part of this bill is to specify the compensation which will be payable on the extinguishment of a resource interest. The bill will specify that, in assessing the compensation payable for the resumption of a resource tenure, no allowance will be made for the value of the mineral resource known to be on or below the surface of the land. All other aspects such as fees incurred, severance, injurious affection and disturbance items will be able to be compensated as per the Acquisition of Land Act and precedents which have been set over many years.

In a submission by HopgoodGanim Lawyers, comment was made that the exclusion of the right to compensation for the resource in the ground made the whole resumption process of little value to resource holders. The Environmental Defenders Office of North Queensland Inc. in its submission suggested 'the proposal to deny compensation to mineral resource holders constitutes a fundamental violation of the principle that the government is obligated to provide just compensation for property interests that it takes for a public purpose'.

The resource in the ground—for example, coal—actually belongs to the Crown and remains the property of the Crown until it is dug out of the ground and a royalty to the Crown paid. Therefore, it would be unreasonable to compensate the holder of a resource tenure for something that does not actually belong to the tenure holder until such time as it is physically mined and a royalty paid to the Crown. Even if there were compensation to be paid for the resource, it would be almost impossible to calculate the amount of compensation payable for a mineral in the ground because it is not known how much mineral is actually there or its quality until it is actually mined.

The drafting of this legislation brings clarity to the factors which will be subject to compensation. The position that there will be no compensation payable for an unknown quantity of mineral of unknown quality will remove the likelihood of drawn-out negotiations or court cases in determining the compensation.

This legislation will also provide certainty in the area relating to infrastructure provision for the emerging coal seam gas and liquid natural gas industry. The current legislative framework does not facilitate the efficient transportation and treatment of CSG water and brine both between permit areas and off-permit areas, nor the development of common user water treatment and brine processing facilities on permit areas. The green paper states that amendments to the relevant acts will allow greater flexibility in transportation and treatment which would allow industry to implement better solutions for CSG water and brine and make it easier to comply with the government's CSG water management policy. Further, the legislation will allow for the registration of these pipeline easements, giving certainty to both the landholder and the tenure holder.

The amendments will also allow for lease holders to seek ministerial consent to change production commencement where a relevant arrangement is in place; allow leaseholders to adapt production schedules to optimise the development; allow for incidental activities such as roads, electricity lines and fibre optic cables to be constructed across adjacent permit areas; require lease holders to submit an annual infrastructure report for incidental activities; and apply existing provisions for environmental approvals, water regulation, land access and health and safety to infrastructure associated with the transport and treatment of CSG water and brine.

While there are additional requirements on the tenure holder, this will be offset by a public benefit with the department holding and maintaining a comprehensive record of the authorised activities and incidental activities undertaken on petroleum lease areas. Pipeline easements will also be registered on title, giving certainty to both the proponents and the landholder.

Some of the submissions to the committee expressed the opinion that the registration of easements over adjoining properties for the purposes of transporting water and brine to treatment plants would further degrade rural properties and values due to the reduction in total farm area available.

The gas pipeline proposal is important in that it will allow some flexibility in dealing with and treating water and brine, and I consider the proposal reduces the risk of environmental contamination as there will no longer need to be water and brine ponds on each tenure, and I note the comments of the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection in his speech. This will in fact result in less land being taken from the landholder.

In the matter of the pipeline easements, in most instances the pipeline will be below the ground and once works have been completed in most cases the landholder will have almost full utility of the land. As with most easements, there will be negotiation between the landholder and the tenure owner to come to an agreement as to the compensation payable to the landholder for the registration of the easement, loss of any utility of his land and any related costs such as valuation and legal fees. At the time of resale, the title will be noted with the registration of the easement, and any potential purchaser will have full understanding of what they are purchasing.

In relation to the resale of the property, assuming that prices have remained constant one would expect that the price achieved for the property would be the same as the price of the property as if unencumbered by an easement less the amount which has already been paid to the vendor for the acquiring of the easement. In my experience, and that I am sure of many other property valuers, there is often no difference between the price paid for a block of land which does not have an easement and one which does, particularly if the easement is for infrastructure purposes which are not intrusive to the utilisation of the land.

Minister Cripps, from my perspective as a former property valuer, I commend the bill for the sensible and practical drafting of legislation in relation to the compensation likely to be payable in the circumstance where a resource interest is acquired for public purposes. It gives fairness to both the holder of the resource interest and the acquiring authority while at the same time limiting the possible complexity and legal costs incurred in assessing the compensation. The bill, in enabling the capacity to register easements for pipeline purposes, gives surety to both landholders and the holder of mineral interests. In my opinion, it will give the same capacity for the sale of the affected property as would happen with any other type of property with an easement registered over the land.

I turn now to the streamlining provisions of the act. The green paper notes that in the interests of improvements to the efficiency of the regulatory framework for the resources sector in Queensland, a key component will be the introduction of an online service delivery platform to be known as MyMinesOnline. This will transfer the tenure administration processes from a paper based system to a system which supports online lodgement of documents for assessment and management for all resources permits. The paper based systems were identified as restricting the flow of information to stakeholders.

An online platform will allow the lodgement of documents at any time of the day or night and from any location where there is Internet access. This will result in a need for a change in determining priority in the lodgement process. Departmental advice has been received that this issue will be relatively easy to resolve. Submissions have expressed the opinion that this platform should also be readily available to the general public. Departmental advice is that existing tools such as public enquiry reports, interactive resources and tenure maps will remain available to the public. However, as a result of public submissions, the committee has requested that the minister advise when the MyMinesOnline system will be operational and when it will be possible for members of the public to be able to access permits and lease documents online. I note the minister's statement in his speech that this facility in an initial format is now available to the public.

The fourth part of the bill relates to amendments in the bill to clarify the existing jurisdictional arrangements for safety and health at mines following the enactment of the national work safety law. These amendments will make it clear that the regulation of hazardous chemicals and major hazard facilities at mines will continue to be regulated by the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and relevant pieces of subordinate legislation.

This bill is quite complex and carries a significant number of changes to current legislation which have raised concerns by those putting in public submissions. Each of the areas of concern raised by each person or organisation making a submission has been identified and a response from the department sought. These are all noted in the tabled committee report along with recommendations and clarifications sought. I commend the report to members.

I thank the chairman of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, the member for Lockyer, Mr Ian Rickuss, my fellow committee members, Mr Rob Hansen and the parliamentary support staff, and the departmental officers for their support and advice in our consideration of this bill. I also extend thanks to those people and organisations who took the time and trouble to put in submissions. I am pleased to commend the bill to the House.

**Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (8.04 pm): I speak tonight in favour of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill. I thank the member for Lockyer, the chairman of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, the member for Logan, the member for Whitsunday, the member for Gympie and the member for Maryborough for their extensive deliberation on the bill and their quite conclusive and comprehensive addresses to the House on the bill.

I commend the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines for bringing this bill to the House. The opposition has raised in the debate today the fact that this bill was introduced in this House in another form in the last parliament. The opposition introduced it on 29 November 2011 but it lapsed when the election was called and parliament was dissolved on 19 February this year. Labor simply got their priorities wrong, choosing instead to pass the waste levy and the civil partnerships legislation into law instead of focusing on reform bills which promote development in this state—like this bill does.

The bill before us deals with four main issues: it clarifies the legislative framework relating to compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resources interests; it implements part of the Streamlining Approvals Project; it confirms and clarifies current jurisdictional arrangements in relation to the regulation of hazardous chemicals, major hazard facilities and operating plants; and it provides a regulatory certainty for all parties involved in the state's coal seam gas to liquid natural gas industry.

The first element of this bill, as I just mentioned, is in relation to compulsory acquisition and a change in view of the government as it relates to the compulsory acquisition of land and its relationship to resource tenements. The amendments introduced in this bill give certainty to the government and resource tenement holders, and they protect the state of Queensland from compensation claims. As I said, they give certainty to all parties concerned.

I wish to respond to concerns raised by the member for Gladstone that the provisions of this bill merely align with government policy. That may be the case but they also align in this case with sound policy decisions. Where there is a resumption of land, where minerals tenements or coal seam gas or other petroleum tenures exist, where the rights of those tenement holders are not incompatible with the rights of the resuming authority—the state of Queensland, the Coordinator-General or whoever it may be—then those rights should not be extinguished. However, where there is a clash, we need to make sure that the fundamental principle that the state is the owner of natural resources underneath our soils is upheld. This bill puts into place provisions to that effect.

The second element that I wish to touch on here is in relation to the coal seam gas industry and provisions in this bill for mechanisms to be put in place for off-site or off-tenure processing facilities for brine and produced water from coal seam gas activities. This is an important reform to the petroleum industry laws in this state. At the moment, produced water needs to be dealt with on tenure sites. This obviously leads to some inefficiencies where there are tenures side by side and each tenure holder needs to deal with the produced water onsite. I welcome the amendments to the act which will allow infrastructure to be put in place for that produced water to be dealt with in common storage facilities. This will create efficiencies of scale and perhaps even give a commercial imperative for operations to be created using brine and produced water from coal seam gas production. It will also lead to efficiencies for coal seam gas tenement holders. I welcome that reform set out in this bill.

Another element in relation to the coal seam gas industry is the provision for the registration of easements in relation to pipelines and other infrastructure for the industry. As one who has worked in finance in a major bank which holds mortgages over land where it is proposed that this infrastructure runs, I can fully understand the conflicts which arise between financiers, landholders and pipeline proponents when it comes to the registration of easements. There are perhaps gaps in the present legislation which do not really provide the certainty which coal seam gas operators would prefer to have. This is a gap in the law and I am glad to see that it is being addressed. I welcome that reform as well.

I also wish to note some of the comments made by members of the opposition and members of non-government parties in relation to the removal of urban restricted areas from this bill compared to that which was introduced by the Labor government last year. RA 384, Restricted Area 384, is still in place. It is a regulatory instrument which prevents the granting or upgrading of new mining tenements within two kilometres of townships holding more than 1,000 people in population. There are many townships in my electorate and in many electorates of LNP members that have fewer than 1,000 people. I think the statutory regional planning process, which has been commenced by the Deputy Premier and his department, will be a much better tool for dealing with the concerns of small communities in terms of where they want mining to occur and where mining should not occur. Under the former government's policy, townships with a population of fewer than 1,000 people were completely forgotten about, and I do not think that is good enough.

I think some of the rage which was illustrated by certain members of the opposition is mainly due to the fact that we are not following the policies of the former government. The policies of the former government are what led us to situations of mining tenements being granted very close to townships—and very close to big townships in some cases. We are not going to follow that policy. We are setting out on a different path which will clearly set out areas where mining can occur. We will also take account of the needs and desires of small communities such as the ones that exist in my electorate and in other electorates as well.

Returning to the issue of CSG water and produced water, this is an issue which was identified by the Beaudesert branch of the LNP quite some time ago. One of the issues with the coal seam gas industry in this state is how do we deal with the issue of produced water, whether it be held in holding

ponds or dealt with otherwise. The amendment to regulations made by this bill certainly provide another option as to how produced water shall be dealt with, and I welcome that. I said that my contribution would be brief. I commend this bill to the House.

**Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—LNP) (8.13 pm): This bill provides the framework for the security of gas supply and its production that will serve our state well into the future. Just as agriculture, then gold and then coal built Queensland's future, managed correctly gas also has that potential.

This is good legislation, firstly, because it reduces red tape. I might correct the opening line of the speech made by the member for Bundamba about the issue of ends and political parties' responsibilities. This bill begins with the end in mind. For those who might not remember what leads to good planning and solutions, this key line is the major one. The second one is the bill's adherence to the 'keep it simple, stupid' process, or KISS. To the delightful member for Bundamba, I would say that I am sure she is a lover rather than a fighter, which is an important principle as well. The third concept addressed in the bill is the combined issues of scope definition and streamlining integration of process. If one was to be fair in its criticism, one might say the only key part of this essential quartet of any best practice in matters of process is that of continuous review and modification of process in response to objective data. They did try hard in this bill because the timing changes that they have used will probably address that point.

That said, the bill addresses the very ugly areas of compulsory acquisition of land as it relates to resource interests, streamlining health and safety arrangements in relation to mines and regulatory certainty of the CSG-LNG industry. It is very much demanded and desired by landowners, resource companies, the staff, the government itself and the broader community. The reason that we are all really concerned is exactly that—and most do not want to admit it—our collective futures hinge to a large extent on the success of the CSG-LNG export industry here in Queensland and the continual growth in shipments of our thermal coal assets. Clearly, mining results in royalties paid to the state, labour employed and knock-on effects to everyone from our banks to our regional towns, the people who work in them, transport companies—I have left out millions in between—ports and, if the local papers are correct, even the ladies of the night. In fact, we pray for happy endings for all because from what was once a completely wasted by-product we now have a ready market for a non-value added product. We should be counting our lucky stars, but we have to be very careful about how we move forward. This legislation does exactly that.

This legislation is about protecting everyone's interests, and that is a very good thing. This bill is really about everyone else and not about us—or maybe just a selected few. That is what good government is all about. Some members may remember that Abraham Lincoln summarised it as 'government of the people, by the people, for the people'. If we follow a little bit of what they are doing in the US, those concepts of equity, integrity and liberty are critical, and that is what is in this bill.

I put it to honourable members that we were probably lucky to have the issues of conflict raised early. I feel very sorry for those landholders affected, those who were threatened and the plain anxious. Labor inaction or, even worse, plain ignorance left them without a champion. No wonder everyone from Drew Hutton to Alan Jones has tried to fill that void. Everyone gets to be anxious about it and the LNP set out to try to be the voice of reason. We were drowned out, certainly by an emotional, polarised and ill informed group of agitators. However, now we have addressed these issues. We have talked more about what the issues are and have not tried to follow this group who believe in media for media's sake, personal enrichment through advertising their shows and, for some, straightforward misinformation. The MyMinesOnline website is a great initiative. One can hope that information other than just the location of one's mine can be added to it.

Here in Queensland we are going to face some really great challenges over the next few years that we might not have foreseen. BHP, our biggest mine operator and mine landholder, has just announced a 21 per cent drop in profit and has announced that nearly all of its mines are under water and those that are not under water are not trading profitably. Steaming coal prices are not quite 50 per cent of their record but are close to it. Mozambique, Indonesia, Mongolia—can you believe it—and Brazil are massively increasing shipments. Gas discovered in massive shale oil deposits in the US has actually taken a bit off global pricing. If we were not locked into good contracts we would be in a difficult position. Certainly in Australia Gorgon 2 and Pluto are very close to being operational. In other words, we have to realise that we are in competition. We need to realise that in the next 10 years there will be a 20 per cent increase in global demand for gas. So we are in a very fortunate position.

Australia is indeed a lucky country but Queensland has been historically, in fits and starts, even luckier. Our locked agreements on gas deliveries to four major groups might just save us all. For my children, my friends, my parliamentary colleagues, the broader community and all my constituents, I certainly hope so. I am sure that is what you want, too.

Basically, the approach of this bill is completely in line with what needs to happen to ensure the success of all of the projects—even Arrow's, particularly on the downs. I know that there have been plenty of complaints about theirs, but it gives certainty to the owners of property, contractors, operators, customers and the broader community. The detail in the bill is so comprehensive that it makes one

wonder what all of the former government staffers were doing with their hopelessly inadequate preceding legislation. I know that we all here will see some difficulties, some deficiencies and probably some failures, but this is a really good start.

I am uncertain what the member for Nicklin was concentrating on, but this is the sort of legislation we need. I would like to reassure him that, while we can make this legislation better, this is a good start. It takes courage to confront the issues of land acquisition, because land and ownership are so close to everyone's hearts. It is in this bill. There is practicality here, and common sense seems to have determined the end result. The minister is to be congratulated. The department is to be congratulated. The party is to be congratulated. All of the people are to be congratulated. This bill is about equity, dignity, reality and hope.

I said that we need to start with the end in mind. In my mind, clearly this bill is about certainty for a large and growing gas industry—it is a massive industry—that we in Queensland need to provide real income for schools, health and police. Do I need to keep listing all of these things? We must never lose sight of what a customer offers in return for certainty of energy supply. Queensland gas will make many lives in Asia better. It will make for a safer world for us all and secure our futures at home. That is a win-win, in my mind. As I said, this bill provides that framework for this to occur.

**Mr DAVIES** (Capalaba—LNP) (8.21 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012.

**Mr Rickuss:** This legislation is a bit like you: streamlined.

**Mr DAVIES:** I take that interjection. First, I would like to commend Minister Cripps on the great bill that he has put forward. As someone who is new to parliament but who has been a political observer for many years, I think it is refreshing to actually see someone well and truly across their brief. It is a great thing. Having seen the previous government and the way it promoted people into particular roles, I thought it was almost a case of 'jobs for the boys'. With the appointment of Mr Cripps to this portfolio, we definitely have a square peg in a square hole. It is a wonderful fit.

This bill goes towards fulfilling the LNP's promises to build a four-pillar economy. This particular pillar is the resources sector. I believe that this bill goes a long way towards fulfilling our promise to cut red tape. This bill will not only promote but also encourage the resources sector in Australia to become the world leader. I think at present, with a whole lot of different things happening in the mining sector—the mining tax, the carbon tax and so on—this sector of the economy needs all the help it can get. I commend this bill to the House for that reason.

This bill does cut red tape. It takes the shackles off the resources sector. I think it is very interesting that the previous speaker mentioned that BHP has downgraded its profit forecast. Not only that, in the last few hours it has announced that it is putting on hold its huge, $30-billion Olympic Dam copper and uranium mine in South Australia. It says a whole lot that the current federal government is putting shackles on business while the government here in Queensland is trying to unshackle it. I call on Labor members here to talk to their colleagues in federal Labor to get rid of the mining tax and the carbon tax, which are affecting business right across the nation.

This particular bill is a result of the three reports that have been widely spoken about today. Those opposite have certainly made much of saying that there was not a lot of consultation on this bill. But there have been three reports over virtually three years. I think there has been plenty of consultation and it is time to get outcomes. That is what this government is all about.

This bill seeks to do a number of things. It seeks to modernise the tenure administration system and reduce the time taken for each tenure decision under the Streamlining Approvals Project. It also looks to clarify legislation so that resource activities, such as exploration, and development activities, such as transport and infrastructure development, can co-exist. It seeks to clarify an application of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 to hazardous chemicals and major hazard facilities. Finally, it looks to support the delivery of coal seam gas to liquefied natural gas projects in Queensland. This is all about investment certainty. It empowers the resources sector. That is exactly what the LNP has been elected to do.

One of the other things this piece of legislation looks to bring in is MyMinesOnline, a program to scrap onerous paperwork and red tape. It gets rid of paperwork and puts in place an electronic process that will be much quicker and cleaner. I think we can contrast this to the opposition's From Mines to Minds proposal, which was a thought bubble that the Bligh government had in its dying moments which had no real outcomes, whereas we have made this happen. I commend the bill and the minister. I think it is a great opportunity to take Queensland forward and let us be the state that we need to be.

**Hon. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (8.26 pm), in reply: First of all, I thank all the members who participated in the second reading debate of this bill for their contributions. I would also like to thank the individuals, the stakeholder groups and the organisations for their interest in this bill and for taking the time and making the effort to lodge submissions and appear at the public hearing and briefing of the parliamentary committee that considered this bill.

The Mines Legislation (Streamlining) Amendment Bill 2012 was introduced into the Legislative Assembly on 2 August 2012. The aim of the bill is to deliver a modernised and more efficient regulatory framework for the state's resource sector. In order to achieve this, the bill will modernise the state's tenure administration system and reduce the time taken for tenure decisions under the Streamlining Approvals Project; clarify the current compulsory acquisition legislative framework to ensure that resource activities can co-exist with development activities; support the delivery of coal seam gas to liquefied natural gas projects in Queensland; and clarify the application of the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 to hazardous chemicals and major hazard facilities in Queensland.

I would like to respond to a local issue raised by the member for Gladstone in relation to planning in Central Queensland. I note that the member for Gladstone is concerned about land-use planning issues at Mount Larcom, particularly regarding industrial land. I am pleased to note that Mount Larcom is within the boundaries of the Central Queensland statutory regional planning area, as designated by the Deputy Premier on 29 June 2012, and, therefore, the types of issues that the member for Gladstone raised will be able to be dealt with in close consultation with affected local communities in that area as part of this process.

I turn now to some of the comments that have been made by the shadow minister for the environment, the member for South Brisbane, during the course of the day in relation to the supposed removal of urban restricted areas and the relationship with the statutory regional planning process proposed by the Newman government. In an ABC interview this morning the member for South Brisbane raised the issue of managing and protecting urban and future urban areas from resource related activities. I also note that the removal of provisions associated with urban restricted areas, or URAs, from the bill has raised concerns with community and other stakeholder representatives, and some of those concerns were raised during the course of the parliamentary committee's hearing and briefing that occurred last Friday.

Unfortunately for the listeners of the ABC program on which the member for South Brisbane appeared, they were treated to a big dose of scaremongering by the member for South Brisbane. I cannot determine from the comments made by the member for South Brisbane whether or not she is simply ignorant of how that policy is currently applied in the state of Queensland or whether she set out to deliberately mislead the people of Queensland in relation to the application of the urban restricted areas policy. I want to make it very clear that the URA was a policy of the former government and this government does not support this approach. It is a prescriptive, 'one size fits all' approach that does not recognise the specific circumstances of individual Queensland communities.

There are many clear examples of towns in Queensland that are built on or next to mining activities in this state. We only have to look at places like the great city of Mount Isa or the great towns of Cloncurry or Weipa to see that towns can grow and they can prosper and be successful and great places to live if they are located close to mining activities. But the government absolutely recognises that this is a real issue for another group of communities and one that needs to be dealt with in a serious but flexible way and in consultation with those affected communities. We recognise that those mining communities will need a different approach to other communities that have genuine concerns that amenity and character may be affected by resource activities.

That is why the government is committed to managing this issue and a range of other critical land use interactions through the statutory regional planning process. We are currently working through the development of regional plans in priority resource regions in Central Queensland and on the Darling Downs, and that process is being led by my colleague the Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, the Deputy Premier. These plans will be developed in close partnership with local and regional communities and key stakeholder groups. They will give communities an opportunity to have their say on how resource activities such as exploration and mining are managed in close proximity to urban areas. The Deputy Premier has made his mark already on the consultation process that will be pursued by the Newman government, and that is in stark contrast to the sham and ridiculous consultation process that was the hallmark of the Bligh and Beattie Labor governments in relation to the statutory regional plans that were developed for South-East Queensland and Far North Queensland.

I want to reiterate the words spoken at the parliamentary committee on Friday, 10 August by Mr John Skinner, the Deputy Director-General of Mining and Petroleum, and they were drawn to the attention of the House during the contribution of the member for Whitsunday. Mr Skinner clearly said when questioned by the Chair on the issue of urban restricted areas, responding on behalf of the department—

> The government has indicated ... that it sees the statutory regional planning process as a further refinement and development in this space with an emphasis being placed on developing statutory regional plans for the Darling Downs and Central Queensland in terms of the priorities. Work has started on that in terms of using the statutory regional planning process to deal with the issue of interface between the various sectors. That has been a major government priority, as outlined by the Deputy Premier.

**Mr Rickuss:** I understand that because I was there.

**Mr CRIPPS:** Correct. Statutory regional plans will provide certainty for all regional Queensland communities, not just those over 1,000 in population, as is the case under the current restricted area policy, and that is why this government does not support the policy that was brought forward by the

previous government. Maybe—just maybe—if the member for South Brisbane had bothered to turn up to the parliamentary committee briefing on this bill the member for South Brisbane would have a firmer grasp of this topic—which she tried and failed to understand and in the course of doing so has misled the people of Queensland. That is right, honourable members: for those of you who were here to be entertained by the outrageous contribution of the member for South Brisbane during the second reading debate, for all of her screeching and squawking and complaints about the lack of consultation, as a member of the parliamentary committee that the bill was referred to for scrutiny, the member for South Brisbane did not turn up!

**Mr Bleijie:** Oh! To the committee?

**Mr CRIPPS:** Did not turn up to the committee hearing. So all of the complaints about the lack of scrutiny and the lack of consultation that we heard from the member for South Brisbane was absolute hypocrisy, because the member for South Brisbane, charged with scrutinising this bill, failed to turn up. She is not the shadow minister for mines and natural resources—that is the member for Bundamba—and yet the member for South Brisbane was on the radio this morning taking liberties with providing commentary.

I understand the obligations and the responsibilities of members of parliament are sometimes such that they are unable to make all of their commitments, but I refer to the standing orders of the Legislative Assembly of Queensland contained in chapter 33 in relation to committees. Standing order 202 provides—

> In the case of illness or inability to attend by a member of a committee, or where a member decides to stand down from a committee for a period of time or for a particular inquiry, where the member is a Government member, the Leader of the House may appoint another member to attend that committee for a period of time or particular inquiry and where the member is a non-Government member, the Leader of the Opposition may appoint another member to attend that committee for a period of time or a particular inquiry.

So just because, for whatever reason, the member for South Brisbane could not attend the parliamentary committee's briefing on this bill does not mean that the Leader of the Opposition did not have the opportunity to appoint another member of the opposition in her place. Similarly, for all of the carrying on and complaints by the member for Dalrymple about the same issue, he similarly did not attend the committee hearing and briefing on this bill. I say that the complaints lodged in this regard by the member for South Brisbane and the member for Dalrymple are hollow, because they had the opportunity to be replaced by other members of the House—the opposition or the crossbenches—should they, for whatever legitimate reason, be unable to fulfil their commitments. For whatever legitimate reason, if they were unable to meet their commitments, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Dalrymple have the opportunity to legitimately replace someone on the committee.

I note also that the member for South Brisbane has been quoted in the media today questioning what protections are in place to act as a safety net for communities. I assure the House that, until an appropriate statutory regional plan has been adopted that addresses the issue, a restricted area, or RA, that is currently in place to prevent lodgement of a new application for exploration permits over towns of more than 1,000 people, plus a two-kilometre buffer, will stay in place. This RA, known as RA 384, covers South-East Queensland in its entirety plus a two-kilometre buffer zone. The RA was given effect by gazettal notice on 19 August 2011. I note that that gazettal notice was put in place by the former government. It is a policy of the former government.

Make no mistake, this government considers the issue of managing urban areas as they relate to resource exploration and development as critical, but we will not do it in a way that is insensitive to and inconsistent with the needs and aspirations of all Queenslanders in all of those communities.

I turn now to respond to some of the issues raised by the member for Bundamba, the shadow minister for mines. I have now been in this House for nearly six years and can I say that I have never heard a more poorly presented or less coherent contribution from a shadow minister to a bill presented to the House. The contribution of the member for Bundamba as the shadow minister was a terrible embarrassment to this House. In her speech to the bill, the member for Bundamba touched briefly—briefly, I must emphasise—on a couple of matters of substance actually related to the bill. The matters that she raised were questions about the future of the LNG Enforcement Unit, and even that was drawing a longbow in relation to the matters pertaining to the bill. I acknowledge that the LNG Enforcement Unit has an extremely important role—a front-line role. The member asked whether it would be impacted by any future budget measures taken by the government. I can reassure the member for Bundamba that the LNG Enforcement Unit will certainly not be impacted by any efficiency programs or initiatives of the government. The LNG Enforcement Unit will continue to play a significant, ongoing role in the enforcement and compliance of the CSG-LNG industry.

As I stated in my second reading speech, I acknowledge and appreciate the concerns raised by stakeholders about clause 114 of the bill, which relates to two safety regimes applying to the same area or no regimes applying at all. That is why I have directed the department to give this matter careful consideration and to undertake discussions with stakeholders. However, we cannot rush this, as we need to be sure that the intended outcome of the amendments is achieved without impacting on other

provisions. For the benefit of the member for Bundamba, who raised this matter, I will go through it again. Currently, there are two regulatory regimes on the same area of land. The Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act applies to matters requiring technical expertise in petroleum and gas. The Work Health and Safety Act 2011 applies to other safety matters. The amendment will mean that the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 will continue to apply to gas pipelines and the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 will apply to water pipelines carrying untreated water, which are laid in the same trench as the gas pipelines. I am confident that proponents of the CSG-LNG industry have the capacity to understand and work within that framework. I want to assure stakeholders again that, as drafted, the bill and the current provisions in the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 pose no risk to safety.

During the course of the second reading debate on a number of occasions the consultation process for this bill was mentioned. Indeed, it was mentioned in the report of the parliamentary committee that considered this bill. Unfortunately, it was referred to in the media and in the debate. I have covered this matter in some detail in my second reading speech, in which I assured the committee and the parliament that this government is committed to a collaborative policy and legislative development process. It is critical that the parliament note that the majority of the amendments contained in this bill are reintroductions from the Resources Legislation (Balance, Certainty and Efficiency) Amendment Bill 2011, which was introduced into the Legislative Assembly by the previous government in November 2011. At the time the bill was referred to the former Industry, Education, Training and Industrial Relations Committee for detailed consideration and a public briefing was held on the RLA bill on 12 December 2011. The RLA bill subsequently lapsed with the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly in February 2012. Therefore, although a number of members may have observed that the parliamentary committee process in this parliament was compressed, this was only on the basis that the majority of the bill had been examined previously and undergone significant community consultation as part of that process. There were no surprises in the vast majority of the provisions in this bill.

I understand that there is some concern about the amendment to transfer the power to approve mining leases from the Governor in Council to the minister. This amendment is about removing a competitive disadvantage for Queensland, where leases are approved by the minister in other Australian states. This amendment will reduce unnecessary processes that delay projects from getting started. It is not about reducing assessment rigour. It is important to note that the minister also grants approvals under other resource acts in Queensland. Therefore, this amendment brings the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Petroleum Act 1923 into line with other resource acts.

The Streamlining Approvals Project amendments are about aligning processes across resource legislation in Queensland, reducing red tape and improving government efficiency. Through this Queensland is actively reforming its regulatory environment for mining, which sends a strong message to the world that we are a place to do business—a theme that has been repeated tonight in many contributions from members, mostly from this side of the House, during the course of the second reading debate.

The amendments in this bill will benefit the communities of Queensland, industry and the government. The amendments relating to the transportation of water and brine will ultimately reduce the amount of CSG water processing facilities required. This will lead to a smaller infrastructure footprint on Queensland's landscape, which means less clearing of land and fewer landholders affected. I thought that would be something that the opposition would be welcoming. This change also provides potential benefits to the broader community. We are establishing the framework that could lead to new industries in the regions through the commercialisation of the salt waste from CSG water treatment. We are setting the framework that will allow the pipeline infrastructure to support the state's agricultural sector by transporting the treated water to places where irrigation opportunities present themselves. In contrast to the contribution by the member for Dalrymple, this proves that in everything that the government does in developing its policies to bring before the House in legislative form, all of our four pillars that we took to the election in relation to rebuilding the state economy are foremost in our minds.

A clear and well understood compulsory acquisition framework is critical to facilitate timely and fiscally responsible infrastructure developments to support Queensland's economic growth. Queensland is currently experiencing unprecedented growth in the resources sector. In 2010-11, the resources industry contributed $38.9 billion, or 15 per cent of Queensland's total gross state product. With such significant growth in the resources sector in Queensland, particularly in the Surat, Galilee and Bowen basins, the development of linear infrastructure such as roads and rail is critical. The compulsory acquisition process will be central to the timely development of these key infrastructure projects to support industry growth.

The interaction between resource interests and compulsory acquisition has been an area of conjecture for some time. This bill provides certainty around the compulsory acquisition process and firms up the government's position that resource interests and linear infrastructure can in the main co-exist. It also provides the government with the discretion to acquire those resource interests when it is

warranted owing to land use or other legitimate conflict. In those cases, it also provides certainty to the resource interest holders that they will be given appropriate notification and able to be compensated in the rare occurrence that resource interests are acquired.

I turn now to make some observations in relation to the individual contributions of members during the second reading debate. I thank the member for Lockyer for his supportive contribution and I thank him for his stewardship of this bill through the committee process. I thank the member for Pumicestone for her contribution to the debate and acknowledge that as the Assistant Minister for Natural Resources and Mines she will appreciate, certainly perhaps more than other members given the contact she has with industry, the benefits that will accrue to industry and the community from the amendments in this bill progressing through the House.

The member for Glass House, my friend the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, made a very positive contribution to the debate and pointed out a number of the environmental benefits of the bill. As I mentioned before, it will deliver a smaller footprint on the CSG industry infrastructure in this state. It will provide better opportunities for using treated CSG water for a beneficial use with potentially significant benefits to agriculture and certainly significant benefits to the environment.

Unfortunately following on from her outrageous contribution on the ABC this morning, the member for South Brisbane came into this House and made what can only be, for the reasons I outlined earlier, a hypocritical and alarmist contribution to the debate. The basic proposition put forward by the member for South Brisbane was that she was opposing the legislation on the basis of the lack of consultation. But as I have already mentioned, the bulk of the amendments were in the House last year. Compulsory acquisition was an issue that came to the attention of the government quite suddenly arising and the health and safety amendments contained in this bill are a matter of clarification only.

Removing the amendments for the restricted area policy in the bill was something that the government has already been quite clear and transparent about. The removal of these clauses in the bill that was introduced by the government last year does not mean that the restricted area policy is being removed. It remains in force through the gazettal notice. The statutory regional planning process that the government has been quite clear and transparent about will eventually replace the restricted area policy that the former government put in place last year. Until such time as the statutory regional planning process is completed, the restricted area policy will stay in place.

Claims by the member for South Brisbane that the committee process is stacked ignores the fact that the government has always maintained a numerical majority on committees of this parliament since they were first established several iterations of committee systems ago. The claims by the member for South Brisbane rang hollow in my ears because she did not even turn up to the committee hearing and therefore contributed nothing to the scrutiny of the bill through the committee hearing process.

The member for Burdekin made a great contribution to the debate and provided great perspective about the importance of this bill from someone who would know. I thank the member for Logan for his positive contribution to the debate and I thank the member for Nanango for making a number of observations about the provisions of the bill which will be of great benefit to industry and the local community. I was particularly grateful for the member for Whitsunday's contribution. He made a number of observations about the practical issues relating to his electorate where the provisions in this bill will assist with the sustainable development of the resources sector and continue to provide a lot of opportunities for families and for businesses in his electorate. I thank the member for Whitsunday for his considered contribution to the debate.

The member for Gladstone made an honest and genuine contribution to the debate in this House as she always does in good faith with her electorate of Gladstone. I have consulted with the member for Gladstone and I want to reiterate to the member for Gladstone that the reintroduction of the provisions in this bill relating to CSG are overwhelmingly replicated from the bill that was introduced by the government last year. So I am satisfied that the public has had visibility of those proposed amendments since the bill was introduced and, indeed, went through a committee process last year. The compulsory acquisition process amendments that are contained in this bill are a matter that has suddenly arisen to the attention of the government. The amendments in this bill are designed to protect the state and the taxpayers of Queensland from any exposure that they may have from the law not being clarified as soon as possible. And as I have mentioned before, the health and safety amendments in this bill are an overlap but there is no hole in the net.

The member for Thuringowa made a very supportive and detailed contribution that dealt with some of the technical issues contained in the bill and it is clear that he has a very competent understanding of the content of this legislation. The member for Gympie made a number of very valid criticisms about the consultation process that were acknowledged by the committee report. I have canvassed those in my second reading speech and again in my speech in reply today. I have already indicated that the department has given an undertaken that we will be communicating with industry stakeholders and everyone who made a submission to the committee about the implications of the

provisions in the bill when it passes the House. I thought it was a very excellent contribution, particularly in relation to the *Mythbusters* segment of his speech. I thank the member for Ferny Grove for making a contribution to the second reading debate.

The member for Dalrymple, similarly to the member for South Brisbane's contribution, smacked of hypocrisy given that he did not even bother to turn up to provide any scrutiny of the bill. I find his criticisms through his statement of reservation to be hollow indeed. The member for Nicklin raised similar issues and he asked for some specific clarifications from the minister in the summing-up. Restricted areas under section 391 of the Mineral Resources Act can be declared or amended by gazette notice by the minister at any time. The reasons why we are moving so quickly to implement this is for the reasons I outlined in my responses to the member for Gladstone—that is, to minimise the exposure of the government and the taxpayers of Queensland in relation to new legal advice about the compulsory acquisition process. It would be irresponsible of me to delay that process given the legal advice that the government has received in that regard. It is also critical to the delivery of the Surat Basin rail joint venture project when it reaches financial closure in November 2012. The government has a contractual obligation to deliver that project on time. The members for Keppel, Maryborough and Beaudesert all made very measured and considered contributions. I thank the member for Gaven for his contribution.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

## Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 to 59, as read, agreed to.

**Mr KNUTH** (8.57 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Division: Question put—That leave be granted.

**AYES, 10—**Byrne, Cunningham, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad, Wellington. Tellers: Miller, Scott

**NOES, 72—**Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

Resolved in the negative.

Clauses 60 to 123, as read, agreed to.

Clause 124—

**Ms TRAD** (9.07 pm): I rise on this clause to speak particularly in relation to the advice given to the parliamentary committee from HopgoodGanim Lawyers, who identified a number of issues in relation to the health and safety regime that will apply in circumstances under this legislation. I note that the minister has referred to them in earlier remarks as well. Because the bill excludes the operation of the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 for pipelines for transporting produced water, this means that there will be two pieces of legislation operating in respect of virtually the same geographical location or, as the minister pointed out previously, the same trench. You have the one trench; you have two pipes that have two acts governing the work health and safety arrangements that preside over them. As HopgoodGanim Lawyers pointed out, that is totally contrary to one of the stated purposes of the act, which is to streamline the approvals process for resource tenements.

Once this was raised, the committee asked about it at the public hearing. Departmental officers agreed to take the matter on notice, look into it and respond. In its report, the committee provided the further advice of the department, which was—

The submission makes a valid point as the intention of the changes was to provide for a clearer, simpler and more appropriate application of the safety regimes commensurate with the risk of the activities and the expertise of the regulators. It is acknowledged that there may have been an unintended consequence because of the wording of the changes and definitions.

The Department will need to fully consider how best to rectify this issue without producing further unintended consequences. It is proposed that any necessary legislation changes will be considered in the next most appropriate legislative instrument.

The department advised that, until the necessary legislative changes can be made, the safety management plan provisions of the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 will apply to water pipelines by virtue of the petroleum authority holder's obligations. We are very lucky that HopgoodGanim Lawyers were able to review the legislation in such a limited time, enabling this anomaly to be picked up. I urge the government to take up the recommendations of the committee, which is for the minister to provide assurances that his department will in future include landholders,

environmentalists and peak bodies representing them, as well as community groups, in genuine consultation processes for the development of resource industry related bills that may affect their interests.

**Mr CRIPPS:** As the member for South Brisbane indicated, I did canvass this issue a number of times during the second reading debate and also in my reply to the second reading debate. At the end of the day, the member for South Brisbane was asking for assurances that in future there will be a consultation process involved. I can assure the member for South Brisbane that that will be the case. The amendments in this bill are a clarification only of the safety and health aspects, because there were concerns raised. They were legitimate concerns recognised—

**Mr Rickuss:** That is what the committee does, isn't it?

**Mr CRIPPS:** That is correct. The committee raised those concerns, they were raised by the member for South Brisbane and the member for Bundamba, and I have recognised that they are legitimate in that regard. Certainly, if there are any complications that are drawn to the attention of the government from a situation where both of the acts apply, there will be full consultation with the industry and relevant stakeholders to address any complications involved in the future.

Clause 124, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 125 to 133, as read, agreed to.

Clause 134—

**Mrs MILLER** (9.12 pm): I rise to speak to clause 134, which amends section 363 of the Geothermal Energy Act to facilitate online lodgement of applications and documents and addresses issues of timing with the submission of paper documents. While I support online lodgement of documents and applications in a sensible process, this legislation would benefit from setting out what information in fact is to be made publicly available. Submissions from Friends of the Earth and the Environmental Defenders Office of Northern Queensland have raised concerns about public access to information on the MyMinesOnline portal. I understand that the government has made some information available and that is a welcome start, but what the opposition opposes most about this legislation is what has been left out of it.

The previous government had a plan to hold public forums and engage in extensive consultation on this legislation. This LNP government has been slammed by stakeholders from the agricultural industry and environmental groups over this lack of consultation. It is completely unacceptable that this government has failed to consult. Instead of failing to listen, the government should put this legislation out to consultation including its omission of urban restricted areas. In case LNP members were not listening the first time, AgForce called this consultation process 'ridiculous'. The member for Gympie calls this 'a tight time frame' and 'not ideal', and I must say he knows what it is to be on an excellent committee because he was the deputy chair of the previous transport, local government and infrastructure committee.

**Mr Gibson:** Those were the days.

**Mrs MILLER:** I take the interjection from the member for Gympie: those were the days. We actually took our role very seriously and made sure that consultation was very well done.

**Mr Hart** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! If the member for Burleigh wishes to interject, he will return to his seat.

**Mrs MILLER:** He is so rude! Those community groups who had to stay up all night rushing in their submissions and reading through over 500 pages relating to legislation have used stronger words than 'not ideal', and there is an answer for the government—to put this legislation back out for consultation.

I would like to talk briefly about the member for Burdekin lecturing us about profit margins. How ridiculous that is! I would also like to talk briefly about mining developments, particularly in relation to issues raised by Mining Communities United, Moranbah Action Group and the Blackwater Community Progress Association. Labor's legislation was aimed at delivering a balance because we wanted to consult with Queenslanders. It is very interesting. I am the only person in this House who has actually worked in the mining industry. I have coalmining blood in my DNA—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member's time has expired.

**Mrs MILLER:**—and I would like to say that I am the only one who stands up for coalmining communities.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Bundamba will respond to the instructions from the chair or I will warn the member and she will have some time out of the chamber.

**Mr CRIPPS:** If any members of the House were lucky enough to miss the earlier contribution from the member for Bundamba, they have just seen episode 2 of one of the most irrelevant diatribes from a shadow minister in relation to the scrutiny of a bill that came through the House for which they had

responsibility. If the member for Bundamba had not already disgraced herself enough with her incoherent response during the second reading debate, she has just confirmed her ineptitude in her portfolio by the scrutiny of clause 134 of the bill.

I have already outlined to the House this afternoon the hypocrisy of the member for Bundamba and the member for South Brisbane in relation to their failure to provide anyone to come to the public hearing and briefing on this bill by the parliamentary committee. Then they turn up here during the clauses and reprosecute arguments that have already been dispatched by so many members of the government during the second reading debate. It is a real concern that all we have to listen to is a reprosecution of issues that have been raised before. Quite frankly, in relation to the consultation process, as I have responded to inquiries during the second reading debate from a number of members, the bulk and overwhelming majority of the amendments in relation to the CSG industry are replicated from the bill that was introduced last year by the former government. The issues in relation to health and safety relate to issues of clarification of the application of those two acts to those issues, and I have acknowledged that the question asked by the member for South Brisbane was a legitimate question and that they were issues also raised by the committee.

In relation to the compulsory acquisition amendments in the bill, they relate to an issue that has come to the attention of the Queensland government in recent times. They involve an exposure of the state, and in due course the taxpayer of Queensland, and it would be irresponsible of the government not to move as quickly as possible to minimise that exposure. That is the reason why we have brought the legislation into the House as soon as possible. That is why I am confident, given the public notice that was involved with the bulk of the amendments coming to the House last year in the former bill of the former government, that there has been enough scrutiny of the bulk of provisions in this bill. The other issues are ones of clarification and ones of extreme importance to minimise the exposure of taxpayers. The question from the member for Bundamba is superfluous because I have already answered these issues during the course of the second reading debate.

Division: Question put—That clause 134, as read, be agreed to.

**AYES, 74—**Barton, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C Davis, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young. Tellers: Menkens, Smith

**NOES, 8—**Byrne, Knuth, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Trad. Tellers: Miller, Scott

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 134, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 135 to 190, as read, agreed to.

Clause 191—

**Mr KNUTH** (9.25 pm): I wish to speak to clause 191, 'Replacement of s 238 (Mining lease over surface of reserve or land near a dwelling house)'. I wish to quote the present Deputy Premier's own words when he moved a motion for debate in this House on 9 March 2011 regarding restrictions on mining in the vicinity of townships and prime agricultural land. He called on the new minister to—

... immediately make whatever legislative changes are necessary to revoke the permit to ensure that, no matter how remote, a mine can never be established in what is an entirely unsuitable area for mining.

I table this extract from *Hansard*.

*Tabled paper:* Extract from Record of Proceedings, dated 9 March 2011, in relation to a motion regarding exploration permits [792].

The Deputy Premier was referring to the township of Toowoomba and the rich farming land of the Darling Downs, but we need to ensure communities across Queensland have what the Deputy Premier called for, which is 'statutory separation distances between all resource industry authorities and urban areas'. The Deputy Premier also said we need—

a regional planning process that ensures proper separation distances between mining industries and urban areas ...

He said—

There is a chance for the new minister to show that he is prepared to take the actions that are long overdue in terms of a regional planning process that should ensure the proper separation distances between what can be competing industries.

The amendment that I was moving was about protecting communities with a standard buffer zone. This is the call from AgForce. It gives a clear-cut definition for mining and communities, and it is what the member for Callide was pushing for when he was in opposition. So why won't the minister enact a buffer zone at a certain distance in this legislation?

**Mr CRIPPS:** Mr Chairman, I just shake my head. I wonder if the member for Dalrymple's sudden interest in clause 191 is as a result of a little visit from the member for South Brisbane to the back of the House—to the north-west branch of the Labor Party—just to make sure that the north-west branch was pulling their weight during the debate.

**Mr KNUTH:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I find that offensive. The minister does not even have a clue what he is talking about.

**Honourable members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Member for Dalrymple, what was the point of order?

**Mr KNUTH:** I find that offensive and I ask the minister to withdraw.

**Government members** interjected.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Members will cease interjecting. Minister, the member somehow finds the comments offensive and he has asked that they be withdrawn.

**Mr CRIPPS:** I am happy to withdraw. I am relieved to know that the member for Dalrymple finds that offensive. Actions speak a hell of a lot louder than words, and the member for Dalrymple ought to reflect on his actions if he does not want members like me referring to him and his colleague as the north-west branch of the Labor Party. It is becoming more and more apparent that they are in league and that they are working together. The Labor Party is even subcontracting out work on the picket line to the north-west branch, as I noticed in recent times. It is becoming embarrassing for the Labor Party. I will turn now to the substance.

**Mrs MILLER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Does the minister really want to take on the CFMEU mining division?

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is not a point of order. The member is now warned under standing order 253A. At the next inappropriate comment, the member will leave the chamber for an hour.

**Mr CRIPPS:** I turn to the substance of the question asked by the member for Dalrymple in relation to the restricted area policy and the erroneous allegation that he made against my colleague, the Deputy Premier, that in some way the position of the Deputy Premier has changed. It has changed in no way whatsoever. Out of the member for Dalrymple's own mouth only seconds ago he said to the House that the Deputy Premier, who at the time was an opposition member, said that in terms of being able to provide a flexible mechanism to reflect the individual circumstances of Queensland communities on a regional basis what was required was a statutory regional planning process. Since the Newman LNP government has come to this side of the chamber, that is precisely and exactly what we have done. We have commenced both on the Darling Downs and in Central Queensland a process to develop a statutory regional planning process that on a regional basis will take into consideration the individual circumstances of communities in the regions and that will reflect their individual and specific needs. We reject the one-size-fits-all inflexible policy of the former government that nominated specifically townships of over 1,000 people and a buffer zone of two kilometres.

In order to protect the amenity and the character of individual communities that the Deputy Premier spoke about when he was in opposition, we will deliver meaningful consultation through the statutory regional planning process. It is something that I am thrilled is happening because at last we have a government that is willing to take on these hard decisions and not just frivolously throw a 'one size fits all' policy or blunt regulatory instrument at a problem that they do not understand. The complaint made by the member for Dalrymple in relation to clause 191 and his allegations against the Deputy Premier are false and I reject the premise of his question.

Clause 191, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 192 to 276, as read, agreed to.

Clause 277—

**Ms TRAD** (9.33 pm): Of course, clause 277 was the point at which the provisions for urban restricted areas were located in the previous legislation. I rise to speak in relation to the urban restricted areas and their exclusion from this iteration of the bill.

I know that there is quite a lot of community consternation about the removal of the urban restricted areas because I did read the transcripts, all of the submissions provided and all of the documentation. Regardless of whether or not I participated in the public hearing, I read all of the documentation. Because the minister has raised this with such gusto, I thought I would refer to my attendance at committee meetings and hearings at this particular point. Given that the committee had nine working days in which to turn around its report on this issue and considering that in relation to bills that had been referred to the AREC for consideration with a truncated time frame I had already on two occasions turned up and participated in public hearings and deferred electoral appointments whilst LNP members did not, I decided on this occasion that I would not defer the very important business of the South Brisbane electorate so that I could come along to another rushed meeting—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): Order! The member for South Brisbane will resume her seat. The member for South Brisbane needs to be relevant to the clause.

**Ms TRAD:** This is relevant to the clause.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am now asking the member to return to the clause immediately.

**Ms TRAD:** Clause 277 was the point where the urban restricted areas provision used to be in the bill. That provision has been deleted, as has been detailed in the track changes document, which is actually up on the parliamentary website.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for South Brisbane is not relevant to the clause. It is about the application process or the documentation. It is about requiring lodgement of a hard copy of the application or document. I fail to see how the member's contribution is relevant.

**Ms TRAD:** The previous provision was omitted and I am talking to the previous provision.

**A government member:** That was in the lapsed bill.

**Ms TRAD:** Yes, I know; it is no longer going to be law. The reason why there were only three full working days—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! I find the member's contribution to be not relevant to the clause and I ask the member to resume her seat.

**Ms TRAD:** Sure.

Clause 277, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 278 to 323, as read, agreed to.

Schedules 1 to 3, as read, agreed to.

### Third Reading

**Hon. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.37 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. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.38 pm): Before moving that the long title of the bill be agreed to, I would like to acknowledge all of those officers in the Department of Natural Resources and Mines who have assisted me in the development of this bill. I recognise also that we have been assisted in this regard by officers from the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning and the Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel as well. 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.

## HEAVY VEHICLE NATIONAL LAW BILL

Resumed from 31 July (see p. 1294).

### Second Reading

**Hon. SA EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.39 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee for its timely consideration of the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012. I note the committee tabled its report on the bill on 13 August 2012. I now table a copy of the Queensland government's response to that report.

*Tabled paper:* Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee—Report No. 4: Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012, government response [793].

In its report the committee made two recommendations about the bill. In recommendation 1, the committee unanimously agreed to recommend the bill be passed. The Queensland government supports this recommendation with no reservations. In recommendation 2, the committee recommended that the Minister for Transport and Main Roads amend clause 638 of the bill to provide that immunity from personal liability is excluded in circumstances where the protected person has acted negligently and/or recklessly. The Queensland government advises that this matter was carefully considered during the development of the clause and there has been firm national support for the clause

as it is currently drafted. The Queensland government proposes not to change the clause at this stage and has asked the national project office to place the issue in the legislative forward work program for review once the reform is implemented.

As I outlined at the time of the introduction of the bill into the Legislative Assembly, this bill supports the Queensland government's pre-election pledge to reduce red tape and grow a four-pillar economy. Queensland businesses will soon benefit from improved productivity and the ability to operate across state borders without the unnecessary burden of dealing with a range of regulators and regulatory interpretations across different states and territories. This bill will at last answer calls from industry for less regulatory burden and simplified regulation. Improved productivity in the transport industry translates to savings for everyone and will help the road freight industry to continue to prosper and continue to grow the Queensland economy.

**Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (9.41 pm): The opposition will be supporting the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012. The bill establishes the new National Heavy Vehicle Regulator here in Queensland and creates the heavy vehicle national law. This reform can be traced back—

**Mr Bleijie** interjected.

**Ms TRAD:** Point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I ask that if the Attorney is going to interject—

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER** (Dr Robinson): The Attorney is Acting Leader of the House while the Leader of the House is absent.

**Ms TRAD:** The Leader of the House is here, Mr Deputy Speaker.

**Mr Stevens:** But I am out of my seat.

**Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am sure that the ministers will resolve which seats they need to be in should they need to interject any further.

**Ms TRAD:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker, for providing a level of order to the place. I will start again.

The opposition will be supporting the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012. The bill establishes the new National Heavy Vehicle Regulator here in Queensland and creates the heavy vehicle national law. This reform can be traced back to 2 July 2009, when COAG agreed to establish the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and a national body of law consistent across all jurisdictions governing the regulation of all vehicles weighing more than 4.5 tonnes. Once approved, the heavy vehicle national law, HVNL, will be the primary source of regulation for heavy vehicles in Australia.

As host jurisdiction for the regulator, Queensland is the first state to pass the model laws. When the national regulator commences operations on 1 January next year and the national model law comes into effect, it will replace dozens of previous model laws governing different aspects of heavy vehicle operations.

The simplified law, coupled with the single national regulator, will bring benefits to Queensland and other jurisdictions. It has been estimated that these reforms could save the heavy vehicle industry as much as $12 billion Australia-wide over a period of 22 years. In Queensland alone, the saving could be as much as $1.47 billion.

The national model law will cover a wide range of matters including heavy vehicle registration, vehicle standards rules regulations, heavy vehicle registration charges, mass and loading regulations, oversize and overmass vehicles regulations, restricted access vehicles regulations, higher mass limits regulations, heavy vehicle driver fatigue and heavy vehicle speeding compliance. I note that there are some matters not covered by the model law, including the transport of dangerous goods, traffic laws or passenger transport regulation. I also note that the national law does not currently include heavy vehicle driver licensing but that is subject to an ongoing body of work and may at some future stage be incorporated into the national law.

In Queensland we have a strong record on heavy vehicle regulation. Compared to other jurisdictions, we have been at the forefront of modernising the law in this area and have kept abreast of the national law reforms in this area. That is one of the reasons Queensland was chosen as the host jurisdiction for the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. Our record of reform in this area means that the new national model law will have only minor impacts in Queensland as we have already implemented the bulk of previous model laws.

At the moment, heavy vehicle operators and drivers must follow different regulations in each state and territory they drive through. Juggling the different requirements of different jurisdictions can be confusing, expensive and time consuming for operators and for drivers. A single regulator implementing a single national law will mean that complying with the regulations will be simpler, cheaper and quicker for the heavy vehicle industry.

The national model law enjoys strong support from industry. The submissions received from stakeholders were broadly supportive of these reforms. I note that the staff from the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator project office have met with many stakeholders and have worked with them to resolve

as many issues as possible. I do note one issue, however, that was raised by the Australian Logistics Council, ALC, regarding the level of staffing for the national regulator. The ALC was concerned to ensure there were sufficient numbers of staff with technical expertise to ensure the regulator could hit the ground running and do the job that was expected of it by industry. I understand that, while there will be a number of staff in the national heavy vehicle office in Brisbane, a large part of the front-line work will likely be undertaken by staff located in other states and territories. Those services will be contracted through service agreements between the national regulator and those other jurisdictions. I am concerned, however, that the flagged job cuts in the Department of Transport and Main Roads may see qualified staff with experience in heavy vehicle regulation lose their jobs. This may give rise to the situation where the new regulator does not have enough qualified staff to do its job. I would ask the minister to advise the House whether the government has terminated the contracts of any temporary staff who were working in the area of heavy vehicle regulation—that is a question to the minister, if he is bothering to listen—or whether any such staff will be at risk of losing their jobs under the minister's plan to cut almost 2,000 jobs from DTMR.

I want to place on record my thanks to all those in Queensland and in other jurisdictions who have worked hard over many years to harmonise Australia's heavy vehicle regulations into this national model law. I particularly want to thank the parliamentary committee that investigated this. I note that there are a number of people in this chamber who sit on that committee and have scrutinised the national model laws. I commend the bill to the House.

**Mr HOBBS** (Warrego—LNP) (9.48 pm): The Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012 was introduced into the Queensland Legislative Assembly on 31 July 2012 and referred to my committee for consideration. The committee was set a reporting date of 13 August 2012. I would like to acknowledge the work of the Transport and Local Government Committee of the previous parliament which commenced examining the earlier versions of the bill. The Transport and Local Government Committee received a total of nine submissions on the previous bill, and a further eight submissions were received by the current committee. Two of these replaced submissions previously made to the former committee.

I want to thank the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator project office for the assistance they have given to the committee. I also want to thank members of the committee who have taken their responsibility to consider the policy outcomes to be achieved by the legislation very seriously. This was a particularly difficult task given the size of the bill and the short time frames available to consider it. The committee unanimously recommends that the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill be passed.

It is important to note the principal objectives of this bill are to reconcile variations in state heavy vehicle laws to a single, unified approach applicable across all states and territories and to establish a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator responsible for the administration of those laws. The new heavy vehicle law will replace eight sets of laws that operate across Australia. In February 2010 Queensland was named the host jurisdiction to lead implementation of the national law and the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator. The National Heavy Vehicle Regulator will be established in Queensland as an independent statutory body responsible for administering the national law. The project office has been established in Brisbane and a governing board of senior transport and road agency officials, the National Heavy Vehicle Project Implementation Board, has been created to oversee the implementation of the reform. Membership of this board includes officials from all jurisdictions and industry representatives. The bill also allows for the establishment of the national vehicle regulator board whose proposed members have been nominated and agreed to by the Standing Committee on Transport and Infrastructure. The Minister for Transport and Main roads will have the power to formally appoint the board members after the bill has been passed in the Queensland parliament.

Due to the complexity of some of the issues involved in consolidating the model laws, the development of the national law is being progressed in two stages, and it is important to understand this. The bill currently being considered by the committee and the regulations to be made under it provide the legislative framework for the establishment of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator as well as the substantive consolidation of model laws into a single body of law. However, some policy and technical matters remain unresolved due either to the complexity or the inability of the particular jurisdictions to reach agreement. An amendment bill—and this is important—is currently being drafted for the consideration of the Standing Committee on Transport and Infrastructure to enable resolution of those outstanding issues. Once approved, the national law will be the primary source of regulation for heavy vehicles in Australia. However, it will not regulate such matters as transport of dangerous goods, traffic laws or public passenger transport regulations. The national law does not currently include heavy vehicle driver licensing, although work is continuing on exploring a national licensing regime and may be included in the national law in the future.

Consolidation and unification of national heavy vehicle laws is necessary to address a longstanding problem of contradictory and inconsistent state laws that stifle productivity and hamper the promotion of safety. The lack of a single administrative body leaves operators to navigate a maze of government bodies for important decisions around registrations, accreditation, vehicle conditions and access. The current cost of compliance is considerable. NatRoad estimates that the typical driver of

heavy trucks receives approximately three days of compliance training per year. With 44,000 interstate drivers, this equates to 132,000 days of compliance training at a total cost of $17-odd million. An operator wishing to cross the state border into Western Australia may be a member of up to three accreditation schemes, all with fees and heavy requirements. Border crossings are a high-stress node in the transport industry and, according to industry sources, drivers who cross borders experience considerable compliance stress with attendant health risks, although this stress is nonquantifiable as it has no direct economic impact. It influences drivers' quality of life and on-road focus and could also conceivably be a risk factor in fatigue management. The current complexity of the system is a natural barrier to expansion.

An independent cost-benefit analysis was commissioned to ascertain the net benefits possible through adoption of the proposed national heavy vehicle law. Two separate methodologies were used. The first based on previous work of the Productivity Commission estimated total net present value gains of around $12.4 billion over 20 years. The second methodology based on new research and direct consultation conservatively estimated gains in the order of $9 billion in reduced regulatory burden on industry through the consistent and coordinated administration of a single, nationally applied heavy vehicle law. As members can see from that, there are going to be significant gains overall across-the-board. We do not really know what the figure is at this stage; all we know is that this will be a significant gain to industry. Those benefits will predominantly be derived through red-tape reduction and reduced regulatory burden to industry through consistent and coordinated administration of a single, nationally applied heavy vehicle law.

As provided for in COAG, the cost of establishing the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator will be funded by the Commonwealth government. These costs will largely comprise the establishment of the basic information technology platform from which the regulator will operate. The Commonwealth provided $15.556 million for the development of the information technology systems for the regulator. There will be costs incurred by individual jurisdictions in implementing transitional arrangements to apply the new national law within their jurisdiction and each jurisdiction will be responsible for funding their own transitional costs. However, costs incurred by individual jurisdictions in moving regulatory responsibility for heavy vehicles to the NHVR will be cost recovered through industry through the heavy vehicle charges determination. These costs will be largely comprised of system changes to facilitate effective information exchange and updated workflow processes for the development of a national service under the national legislation.

On an ongoing basis the NHVR will be self-funded through cost recovery from industry through the heavy vehicle charges determination and through the application of fees for the direct services that it provides. The NHVR project office has advised the committee that it is intended that the NHVR will administer the new regime within the pool of funding that is provided by the current heavy vehicle charges, and it is important to consider that. The committee has also noted that the NHVR will not be responsible for making the annual determinations as pricing and heavy vehicle charging determinations will continue to be the responsibility of the National Transport Commission and the National Transport Commission making recommendations to the Standing Committee on Transport and Infrastructure. So there are significant changes to be made.

The NFF and AgForce have raised the issue of funding for the NHVR in their submissions to the committee. AgForce in particular submits that it would be unacceptable if the industry is asked to fund the NHVR on top of already paying registration and other road charges. The NHVR project office advised the committee at the public hearing on 3 August 2012 that—

> The industry frequently asks me whether heavy vehicle charges will increase as a result of the national heavy vehicle regulator coming into operation. The response to that has been—and I can indicate that again today—is that we are endeavouring to create the national heavy vehicle regulator within the pool of funding that is currently in existence. That underpins the whole concept of having a national reform, because we are going to replace some things that are done eight times individually in every state and territory into the one national body ... It is the National Transport Commission whose responsibility it is to do the annual determinations and the new determinations around the heavy vehicle charges themselves. So I do not have any direct control in that particular process and ultimately those decisions are made by ministers.

The committee notes that it is the intention of the NHVR to administer the new regime within the current funding pool but that the regulator does not have any direct control over the annual heavy vehicle determination charges which are agreed to by the Standing Committee on Transport and Infrastructure on the recommendation of the National Transport Commission. The committee is strongly of the view that funding for road maintenance and upgrades in Queensland should not be reduced as a result of establishing and maintaining the office of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator.

The committee raised the concern about the lack of flexibility within the current driver fatigue provisions, especially in relation to the current requirement to stop for a 24-hour break period, even if the driver is in close proximity to home or a town with rest facilities. At present, the driver can be within 10 minutes of home, or a service station, or restaurant and if the time is up, the time is up; the driver has to stop there and stay. They cannot drive. They cannot even go into town and have a shower. So we need to have some flexibility. Queensland is a large, decentralised state and we need to be able to get drivers home if we can.

The NHVR project office provided the committee with advice that the new advanced fatigue management approach will introduce some flexibility into fatigue management relative to driving hours and rest required. The NHVR project office advised—

The other thing ... is that the law sets up the broad policy objectives. The regulations contain more of the operational aspects of how fatigue will work and mass, dimension and loading, and we are still working on the regulations and they will have to go to ministers and they will be the subject of a lot of discussion with all of the states and territories and industry as well... There are also business rules inside the National Heavy Vehicle Accreditation Scheme that we are looking at as well to complement the overall new approach to advanced fatigue management, which, as I have already indicated, at the end of the day and at the end of the process will need to be approved by ministers before it can come into operation.

The National Road Freighters Association also made a submission about driver fatigue, requesting that Queensland adopt the same system as Western Australia: 14-day cycles requiring drivers to undertake two periods of consecutive 24-hour rest breaks in each cycle. The committee sought clarification from the Department of Transport and Main Roads on this issue and was provided with the following advice—

The National Fatigue Model Laws were approved in August 2008 and have been implemented by Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and South Australia through existing state based laws. All other states and territories, with the exception of Western Australia—

and this is interesting—

will adopt the national fatigue laws when the HVNL is introduced in their jurisdiction.

Unlike other jurisdictions who regulate heavy vehicle driver fatigue through transport laws, Western Australia legislates heavy vehicle driver fatigue under Codes of Practice established under Occupational Health and Safety laws. Western Australia has indicated they will not be adopting the HVNL in so far as it applies to fatigue management of heavy vehicles and will maintain its existing approach.

National fatigue laws have been the subject of extensive fatigue expert advice and industry consultation and are considered to provide an appropriate balance between providing flexibility and productivity opportunities for industry and managing the road safety risks of driver fatigue.

Queensland supports the adoption of national fatigue model laws through the introduction of the HVNL.

The committee is satisfied that it is the intention of the regulator to resolve operational issues relating to driver fatigue through ongoing discussions between the states, the territories and industry. It is most important that we do not lose the benefits we have gained. We want to be able to ensure that we have flexibility across the states. Obviously, Queensland has vast distances compared to, say, Victoria. So we have to ensure that our fatigue laws are not eroded so that our truck drivers and our produce can move around the state without having further restrictions placed upon them. The committee is satisfied that it is the intention of the regulator to provide some flexibility with regard also to logbook requirements.

AgForce has raised concerns around the ability to get the higher efficiency combinations, that is AB triples, approved, particularly for cattle—and this is in relation to volumetric loading—when some of the smaller states may not require the capacity. AgForce's submission outlines the issue as follows—

Queensland is a very large state and therefore the distances and numbers of cattle that are moved are significant, and both producers and transport operators are always looking for more efficient combination to move not only stock but grain as well.

Queensland currently allows larger combinations than in other states, i.e. Victoria, as distances and cattle numbers are not as significant. Therefore when the NHVR comes into being we would like to know how larger combinations will be assessed to ensure Queensland producers are not unfairly disadvantaged.

The NHVR project office provided the following advice on this issue at the public briefing on 3 August 2012—

... at the current time volumetric loading schemes and other forms of primary producer schemes, which are dealing with mass dimension loading requirements, are treated as local productivity initiatives and are preserved. There is no intention to change from an individual state or territory those sorts of schemes from the commencement of the national regulator. I think you have got volumetric loading here in Queensland. That remains for your Queensland operators when the national regulator is in place. Other states have other forms of loading requirements for particularly livestock movement and other forms of primary produce.

What the national regulator would do is consider all of those schemes across Australia and look to see where a particular scheme or features of a particular scheme would have benefit for a greater area than it is currently in place for. Again, the reform intention is not to make anyone any worse off than what they are today.

That is important. The reform intention is not to make anyone any worse off than they are today. The advice provided at the public briefing by the NHVR project office continued as follows—

In fact, the intention is to enhance and make more productive the heavy vehicle sector. So any concerns from the Queensland livestock loading industry that they will lose their volumetric loading are not correct.

The committee is satisfied with the confirmation provided by the NHVR project office that unique primary producer schemes such as volumetric loading schemes will be preserved under the reform arrangements.

Other reforms, such as the reduced registration for primary producers for those vehicles that are used off-road, are also supposed to be continuing. So there is no intention to reduce the reforms that we have already. Let us just hope that, at the end of the day, we have a better system in place, a more equitable system and that Queensland will be allowed to progress with its wonderful trucking industry.

**Mr SHORTEN** (Algester—LNP) (10.06 pm): I rise tonight to speak to the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012. This bill proposes a national law regulating the use of heavy vehicles. As members would know, it is the states and territories that regulate transport operations, safety standards, weights and

dimensions. As a consequence, differences between these regulatory systems mean that interstate road and rail operators face inconsistent road rules, licence categories, registration classifications, charges, vehicle standards and driving hours, creating unnecessary inefficiency and cost.

The heavy vehicle national law will replace eight previous model laws that operated across Australia. As the appointed lead jurisdiction, Queensland has the responsibility of being the first jurisdiction to introduce the new national law. The key policy outcome, which is sought by this bill, is to reconcile variations in state heavy vehicle laws into a single unified approach applicable across all states and territories and to establish a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator, which will be responsible for the administration of those laws.

As there are a lot of new members in this House, I would like to give them some history of the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill. In 2009, COAG agreed, as part of its reforms to deliver a seamless national economy, to establish a National Heavy Vehicle Regulator to oversee a national body of law regulating heavy vehicles. Queensland was appointed the lead jurisdiction and, once passed by this House and signed into law, the law will take effect from 1 January 2013. This means that the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator will be responsible for administering matters such as mass and loading, fatigue management, vehicle standards, registration and compliance and enforcements. A single national heavy vehicle law will create—and I will quote the minister from his introductory speech—

... the same outcome in the same circumstances regardless of the jurisdiction.

This will reduce regulatory and operational costs of compliance. What does this mean for Queensland? It is expected, over a 22-year period, to gain the net benefit of approximately $1.47 billion.

This bill is the first of two bills. This bill contains those policy changes that are required to bring Queensland into line with national legislation. The most important new provisions in this bill are those that set up the regulator as a separate corporate entity. These provisions provide for staffing, financial controls and corporate governance structures. Members may ask at this stage who is picking up the bill for this national policy. I certainly had my concerns that Queenslanders would be left with the bill given the current track record of the Gillard Labor government. The committee was advised that the Commonwealth would fund the establishment of the regulator. The majority of this cost will be in setting up a basic information technology platform from which the regulator will operate. Just over $15 million has been provided by the Commonwealth for the development of the information technology systems for the regulator.

Going forward, the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator will be self-funded through cost recovery from industry through the heavy vehicle charges determination and through the application of fees for the direct services that it provides. The National Heavy Vehicle Regulator project office advised the committee that it is intended that the regulator will administer the new regime within the pool of funding that is provided by the current heavy vehicle charges. As the committee commented, the committee is strongly of the view that funding for road maintenance and upgrades in Queensland should not be reduced as a result of the cost of establishing and maintaining the office of the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator.

The committee received 17 written submissions. One of these was later withdrawn. Submitters represented a vast range of industry groups, including the National Farmers Federation, the Australian Logistics Council and AgForce Queensland. I can put on record the quality of the submissions from all submitters. They were very detailed, yet clear as to what each group was concerned about. Can I add at this point that industry is fully supportive of the national law as the benefits gained will flow to itself and consumers. Can I also thank the witnesses that came before the committee to give us a briefing and answer our many questions: Mr Peter Caprioli, Director, Freight and Vehicle Systems Strategy and Mr Bruce Ollason, General Manager, Road System Management, both from the Department of Transport and Main Roads; and Mr Richard Hancock, Project Director, and Mr Raymond Hassall, Principal Manager, Legislation and Policy, both from the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator project office.

As we all know, committees could not operate effectively without the wonderful secretariat and I would like to put on record my thanks to them. Kate McGuckin, Rachelle Stacey and Susan Moran worked tirelessly not only on this bill but other bills which are flowing through to the committee now. Can I thank the other members of the Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee chaired by the member for Warrego, Mr Howard Hobbs. I look forward to the second part of this bill coming forward to this House and in turn to the committee. I recommend the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012 to the House.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (10.12 pm): I rise to support the Heavy Vehicle National Law Bill 2012. I think everyone in this chamber would agree that there are no borders in the nation of Australia. Heavy vehicles transport not only perishables but goods of all types across state boundaries. I am sure that many heavy truck drivers will welcome this bill because it will simplify their life in terms of permit requirements and in terms of complying with what has in the past been various requirements state by state.

I note that this bill only covers vehicles over 4.5 tonne. It will not cover the transportation of dangerous goods, heavy vehicle driver licensing or bus industry accreditation. That appears to me to be appropriate. Each state has a different type, make-up and regularity of the transportation of dangerous goods. Certainly in this state, because of the mining and the explosives that have to be carted, we would have a significant amount of dangerous goods carted and it is appropriate that we remain responsible for that. It will include, however, registration, mass and loading issues, fatigue management, vehicle standards, compliance and enforcement.

I drove back from Brisbane a week or so ago and, whilst there are hundreds of very responsible heavy vehicle drivers, when you get a feral it is very frightening.

**Mr Gibson:** On so many levels you are right.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** Very right. I was driving an unfamiliar vehicle. It was one of my husband's buckets of bolts—all roadworthy, minister, just in case you are wondering. There was a B-double that came past me, he got just past the cabin and halfway down his first trailer and a vehicle came against him. He should not even have started. He momentarily paused, thinking 'I might get—no, I won't—oh, it doesn't matter, she'll get out of the road.' I had to actually physically stop to let that B-double go past otherwise I would have been creamed on the side of the road. When you get a driver who is not responsible it is problematic. They have such weight and mass that anyone in their way will not win the argument.

We have had a number of heavy vehicle accidents in the region that I represent over the last month or two and it has been saddening. A couple have involved fatalities, not of the truck drivers but of other vehicle occupants. It is a tragedy that it occurs, but it reinforces to me how much drivers of these large vehicles have to take responsibility for the vehicles that they drive and for the safety not only of themselves but others.

I note that this will be a two-stage procedure: this bill and a second bill further on in the year. In some ways, because of the magnitude of these changes, that is a good thing. It will allow some policy refinements and some technical amendments. I am sure that this has been a long time in the planning, getting all the states to agree on a uniform set of rules and regulations, but I do believe it is a step in the right direction given the way that we as a nation travel and carry commodities. I welcome the legislation and commend the minister.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Cunningham, adjourned.

## ADJOURNMENT

**Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Manager of Government Business) (10.16 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

### Skilling Queenslanders for Work

**Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (10.16 pm): The Newman government's cuts to the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program will have more wide ranging social and economic ramifications for Far North Queensland and the rest of the state than the government acknowledges. In the *Courier-Mail*, the Minister for Education, Training and Employment said cuts to Skilling Queenslanders for Work would total $19 million with 144 jobs lost, but this turned into a $53.8 million cut with more than 27,000 job seekers impacted. The Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative ran successful programs helping disadvantaged people currently unemployed, those looking at re-entering the workforce, teenagers at risk of losing contact with education or training, Indigenous jobseekers and people with low literacy skills such as those helped by FNQ Volunteer Tutors' now defunded Community Literacy Program. From Tully to Kurumba, for 18 years this group has worked with a number of other organisations who cannot access other training in their own communities. Program coordinator Melinda Stockwell said outcomes included 94 per cent of participants going on to further education and training and more than 60 per cent finding employment. Letters of support from 15 individuals and organisations urging the funding for FNQ Volunteer Tutors to continue have been provided from organisations like Babinda Task Force, ITEC Employment, Job Find, Kuranda State College, Douglas Shire Community Services and the Ngoonbi Cooperative Society; and people like Shane McQuillan from Mossman who says he has a medical condition and he is trying to retrain himself and to lose this opportunity would be a great disadvantage. For the benefit of the minister, I table these letters.

*Tabled paper:* Correspondence from various parties in relation to Far North Queensland Volunteer Tutors Inc [794].

Then there are benevolent organisations like Choice Australia, which used Breaking the Employment Cycle in 2006 and Skilling Queenslanders for Work in 2011 to deliver two of the largest government funded employment programs ever after cyclones Larry and Yasi respectively. Between these two large scale projects, 700 displaced, unemployed and disadvantaged people were able to undertake accredited training following these natural disasters. In 2006 the team cleared over 1,000 hectares of fallen debris; repaired damage to over approximately 45 schools, community groups,

sporting and recreational clubs; and restored damaged walking tracks and pathways for cassowaries and other wildlife. I have long been a supporter of Choice Australia and I am happy to declare that CEO Todd Hartley, a former Cairns Regional Council Citizen of the Year, supported me during the last election because we share a belief in investing in people for our future. The LNP fails to understand how important jobs programs are and how much it means to regional economies to have more people skilled and ready for work.

The slashing of this program by the Newman government will also affect the future of the community groups running these programs. Every government worker sacked and every group whose program has been axed is paying for the LNP's election promises, not paying down debt. It is that simple. The axing of Skilling Queenslanders for Work is particularly short sighted, considering that a report prepared by Deloitte Access Economics found the $53.8 million program would have generated $1.2 billion in state tax receipts in the years to 2020. In that same period, the contribution to the wider Queensland economy would have totalled $6.5 billion. It is further evidence that the ideologically driven LNP government sees only numbers and not people.

## Rosewood Lions Club

**Mr CHOAT** (Ipswich West—LNP) (10.19 pm): I rise to speak about the Lions Club of Rosewood. Recently, my wife, Nicky, and I had the pleasure of attending the annual changeover lunch at the Royal George Hotel and I know they enjoyed the antics of our little Eloise. Just like our other great Lions clubs in Ipswich West, the Rosewood Lions are dedicated to the selfless service of others and make such a positive difference to the lives of people from across the community. The changeover lunch was a great event for the Rosewood Lions. I know the members are grateful for the tireless efforts put in by Past President Lion Lyall McEwin to keep the club strong and the changeover's huge attendance is a reflection of that.

I am thrilled that the board of directors for 2012-13 is led by hardworking President, Lion Eyris Heit. It was no surprise at the Australia Day Community Awards that Eirys was selected as Rosewood Citizen of the Year. I was very pleased to be present, along with hardworking Ipswich councillor for division 10 Councillor David Pahlke and our ever-popular Mayor Paul Pisasale, when Eirys was recognised in this way.

The 2012-13 Rosewood Lions board of directors is comprised of Past President and Membership Club Care Lion Lyall McKewin, Secretary Lion John Mcrae, Treasurer Lion Dona Waters, Assistant Treasurer Lion Ian Letchford, and Vice President Lions Christine Forrest, Bernie Newell and Ivan Schindler. Other members of the board of directors are one-year directors Lions Clyde Nicoll and Trevor Halter, two-year directors Lions Len Henry and Pat Gil, Tail Twister and Installing Officer Lion Greg Tutt, Lion Tamer Lion Bill Freeman, Bulletin Editor Lion Dale Smith and, of course, the District Governor Lion Merv Ferguson.

Over the past year the Rosewood Lions have worked with the community for the local area and its people in many great endeavours and much fundraising for some very worthy causes. Some of the more notable endeavours from 2011-12 were the Lions Youth of the Year Quest, which was held in February. It was great to see the winner, Madeline Rogers from West Moreton Anglican College, go on to represent Rosewood Lions at the regional finals. Madeline was the overall winner on the night. I congratulate Lion Clyde Nicoll, Youth of the Year Coordinator, for his efforts on behalf of the Rosewood Lions and for this great example of fostering excellence in our young people.

Other projects include ongoing support for the Ipswich Tennis Championships led by Project Coordinator Lion Ivan Schindler, the Driver Reviver Project led by Coordinator Lion Clyde Nicoll and, of course, the fabulous Used Glasses Project led by Coordinator Lion Ron Embrey. Those projects give so much to the community and I am sure we will see the continuation of those great initiatives into the future.

I would like to report to the House that last year the Rosewood Lions donated a total of more than $11,000 to community groups, clubs, schools and needy individuals from across the region. Last week at the Rosewood Golf Club, I joined the Rosewood Lions for dinner where again they donated even more money and support to some great causes and to two little boys in particular, Kevin and Blaise. I know that they are so much better off for that support and I know just how much their families appreciate it. I thank the Rosewood Lions for their magnificent efforts and ongoing support for our community.

## Cervical Cancer, Vaccination

**Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—LNP) (10.22 pm): I am concerned that Gold Coast parents and students—and I should speak about this generally, because the issue applies to many throughout the state—may not understand the huge benefits of the cervical cancer or human papilloma virus vaccination program, with more than 30 per cent of eligible Gold Coast students failing to take advantage of this free program and an alarming number failing to complete the three-dose course. In fact, it is a factor of three of that.

Data from the Gold Coast Public Health Unit indicates only 69 percent of year 8 female students from an eligible group of 3,474 students commenced the three-dose course in 2011. Equally alarming is that only 52 per cent have had the third dose, and that is the problem. According to the latest edition of *General Practice Gold Coast*, the newsletter for the region's GPs, the vaccine is 98 per cent effective if all three doses are given prior to initial infection by the HPV genotypes contained in the vaccine. For those who do not realise, for the majority of people who go on to have cervical cancer and virtually all those who have cervical abnormalities HPV is the cause of their illness.

Figures for the Gold Coast City and Scenic Rim regional councils show that 69 per cent of girls in Year 8 have the first dose and 65 per cent have the second dose, but only 52 per cent have the third dose. That means that 586 or 17 per cent of the female students who started the course failed to complete the three doses required.

Gold Coast data indicates that last year only 2,402 or 69 per cent of students from an eligible cohort of 3,474 commenced the three-dose course. The HPV vaccine is funded for year 8 female students up until the end of the following calendar year, a total of two years. As noted in the newsletter, all efforts should be made to administer any missed doses during this time, after which the vaccine is available by private prescription at around $150 per dose or $450 in total.

My concern—and I think members need to know this—is that when discussions were had about screening programs, and this is a kind of screening program, once the target falls below the critical number of 80 per cent of people covered, the program is ineffective and thereby may not justify its initial cost. We are very close to that number.

Adolescents not attending schools, such as home schooled students, who would normally be in year 8 are also eligible for the SBVP funded vaccine. However, non-permanent Australian residents and a variety of others who exceeded those times are not. We need to approach this seriously. This is a serious problem and I would ask all members to support it.

## Sexual Violence

**Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (10.25 pm): In every suburb, town and city you will find members of our communities, predominantly female, who have been sexually violated at some time in their life. Almost every single one of us will know someone from within our circle of family and friends who has been affected by sexual assault. The crime can often remain hidden for many years.

While some sexual violence takes place within the family structure and falls into the category of domestic violence, there are also some fundamental differences. Sexual violence occurs in a whole range of settings and relationships. The perpetrator could be a work colleague, neighbour, friend or someone in a sporting or social club, or even a professional such as a teacher. Of course, it could be a total stranger. Of great concern are the victims of sex trafficking and slavery, which does occur in Queensland.

It is known that up to 80 per cent of women and 40 per cent of males in the mental health system have experienced sexual violence at some time in their past. There is a strong link between the severity of abuse and the probability of developing a mental illness in adulthood. Whether the victim be male or female, in 98 per cent of cases the perpetrator is male. Research carried out by the Australian National Council on Drugs found that—

> ... Sexual abuse is strongly correlated with substance abuse ... and women who have not adequately addressed these issues in treatment appear to be more likely to relapse to drug use.

This is significant because up to 70 per cent of women with drug and alcohol issues have experienced sexual violence in their life. Research also supports that specialist sexual assault therapeutic intervention can greatly assist in long-term health and wellbeing gains for the survivors and reduce the likelihood of victims re-entering healthcare services for mental health related issues.

It is vital that funding to sexual assault services in Queensland is maintained so that this destructive crime can continue to be addressed at the primary level and not masked by mental health, drug and alcohol and a range of other costly health symptoms and outcomes. If we merely respond to victims of sexual assault without addressing the causes, we will never do anything to actually prevent it or reduce the long-term health effects and diminished life opportunities.

I wish to commend the Centre Against Sexual Violence in Logan. Their six dedicated and caring staff and CEO Deb Aldridge respond to the needs of female sexual assault victims aged 17 and over in the Logan, Beenleigh and Beaudesert regions. They also deliver a range of prevention programs in secondary schools and the community.

*(Time expired)*

## Crime

**Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (10.29 pm): Today I rise in the House to address a concern that for me and my electorate is a pressing issue. Our government is paving the way for more accountability, and I believe it is time to encourage not only government accountability but also personal accountability. It is

time to hold people accountable for their actions and once more instil a sense of respect for their fellow citizens and community to which they belong—something which I believe has been sorely lost on society today.

Several weeks ago in my electorate a local firearm business was ram-raided. Local businesses, private and public property and individual citizens were being targeted by criminals who believe that it is their right to steal, damage and degrade our community. Since then, due to the hard work of our local police, suspects have been arrested for this crime.

With a continued rise in the prevalence of hooning and alcohol related antisocial behaviour, public decency is being lost on some. When faced with the consequences of their actions, the offenders without hesitation pass the buck back to the very community which they have perpetrated against.

I commend the new legislative measures that can tackle these issues such as more police, tighter laws on repeat offenders, tougher laws on crime against police officers and all the steps that our government has either already achieved or is on the way to achieving as part of our action plan to get the state back on track. However, I advocate that we need to be as strongly committed to crime prevention as we are when dealing with the aftermath of the appalling behaviour of those who commit crime. I commend the government's commitment to increase school and community based policing. It is through education and community involvement that we can look to restore the personal accountability and responsibility that is lacking in society.

When an offender sets out to commit a crime, it is not out of desperation. It is not due to a lack of basic entitlements such as clothes and food. It is perpetrated out of a want or need for destruction, their own personal enjoyment and the desire to inflict pain and loss on hardworking people. This lack of respect is holding back not only themselves but also the community at large from achieving our full potential. It is preventing our community from being the next growth region in our vibrant and bustling state. With the current predicament we face, only together as a community can we make positive changes for a brighter future. My electorate of Logan, like so many other electorates across our fair state, has a dilemma.

**A government member:** Is it the truth?

**Mr PUCCI:** It is the truth. It is a dilemma which can be addressed by restoring community pride and accountability, by better education through community policing programs and, most of all, by restoring respect for one another. I have faith that our government and our communities will achieve these goals. I wholeheartedly believe that our policies, whilst working hand in hand with the community to establish more personal accountability, will restore a sense of pride and respect to our great state.

## Gympie Music Muster

**Mr GIBSON** (Gympie—LNP) (10.32 pm): There is a saying that some of the world's greatest feats were accomplished by people not smart enough to know they were impossible. If you were to speak to the organisers of the first Gympie muster over 30 years ago and asked them to go about organising an event that would be Australia's premiere outdoor music festival, that would distribute all profits to worthy charities, both locally and nationally, that would raise more than $14 million for charities over 30 years, that would turn over 50 hectares of the Amamoor Creek State forest, 40 kilometres south-west of Gympie, with no major infrastructure into a community of over 20,000 for four days into what has become a quintessential Aussie event, I am sure they would have looked at you, smiled, cracked open another rum and told you to relax and that this was just going to be a bit of fun.

The Apex Club of Gympie, of which I am a proud member, has established Muster Ltd to provide professional management of this event with a professional board to provide oversight on behalf of the Apex club. The muster is more than just the performers; it is about the patrons. Indeed, the atmosphere on main stage on the hill has become an attraction for performers. Shannon Noll summed it up best when he said recently, 'The Muster crowd is amazing. It gives the festival a really good vibe.' This year the iconic American country music performer Kenny Rogers will get to experience that muster vibe as he takes to main stage on Sunday.

This year's Apex Optus Gympie Music Muster is the most inclusive. It is for all ages and all abilities. It is an all-in muster. It does not matter if you are four or 44 like myself or 94; there is something for everyone. Kid's country is back this year, with a large secure and safe play area supervised by professional blue card holders. This will allow mums and dads to enjoy the muster and keep their children entertained at the same time. For seniors and those who are disabled, the old sound shell has been converted into a wheelchair accessible site, with prime viewing and listening provided for the first time. There is also a special free admission deal for carers accompanying the person they care for.

For the remainder of us, we need to be aware that security has been increased in the licensed area to ensure that responsible service of alcohol requirements are met, but everyone will have a good time. The muster is more than just a spectacular celebration of music; it is a spectacular celebration of

community. There are over 50 community groups and 2,000 volunteers working with the muster team to stage this non-profit community based festival to raise funds for charities Australia-wide. I look forward to doing my part at the muster, as I know many others do.

## Victory in the Pacific Day

**Mr BERRY** (Ipswich—LNP) (10.35 pm): I wish to speak today in honour of Victory in the Pacific Day, which was celebrated on Wednesday, 15 August 2012. VP Day commemorates Japan's acceptance of the allied demand for unconditional surrender in 1945. For Australians, Victory in the Pacific Day, or VP Day, meant that World War II was finally over. History tells us that the day really was a celebration after six long years of war, and Australia woke to find a world at peace. Many recall singing and dancing in the streets across the country and even in Sydney, and shredded paper raining down from office windows. A day later on Thursday, 16 August 1945, a large crowd gathered to watch the march of ex-servicemen and to respect the fallen with a traditional minute's silence. Of course that includes Australians, Americans and other allied forces.

On 11 August I attended a Victory in the Pacific Day commemorative service held at The Monument, Manson Park in Raceview. I would like to recognise and pay my respects to the namesake of the park, Mrs Rose Manson, a local Ipswich resident who cared for the graves in the Ipswich cemetery during the war and wrote to the families of the fallen American soldiers. A war widow herself, Mrs Manson cared for 98 Australian soldiers' graves and 60 American graves every Sunday until the number grew to over 1,400, when she decided to place one bowl of flowers every night at the base of the flag pole as a memory to every mother's son. Mrs Manson also wrote to the mothers of all the fallen American soldiers, and she gives Ipswich great credit for having performed that service.

I am also proud of the wartime service of my family: from the Boer War, where Sergeant RE Berry gave his life in an ambush by the Boers; to my grandfather, Charlie McConachy, a drover from Longreach, who served in the 2nd Light Horse Regiment; and to my father, who served as a 17-year-old on HMAS *Katoomba* in New Guinea.

I thank all Queenslanders who paused on Wednesday for a few moments to remember those Australians and those like me who attended commemoration services to remember those who gave their lives to help achieve the peace that VP Day stands for. We must never forget, nor should their past sacrifice be forgotten. On VP Day it is also important to honour those veterans who returned to enjoy the peace that they had helped deliver to all Australians. According to the annual report of the Department of Veterans' Affairs, there are 121,000 surviving World War II veterans. I thank those Australians for their service to our country and those who are currently serving our country. Their sacrifice and service to our country must not be forgotten.

I pay tribute to our American brothers who helped and assisted us to defeat a force which certainly was formidable in the Pacific. My daughter is American and I know that she attends marine balls and so forth. It is a shame that the member for Logan is not here.

*(Time expired)*

## Labour Day, Public Holiday

**Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (10.38 pm): I would like to bring to the attention of the House an important issue that was brought to my attention. The secretary of Charters Towers Country Music Inc. sent me this email today expressing great concern. Her name is Lyn Verra and she has been the secretary practically since it first started. Her email states—

Yesterday, I received a phone call from the ABC Radio in Townsville, inquiring as to whether I knew about how the committee would handle the decision by the Qld Government to move the Labor Day Holiday from May to October.

I was shocked and disappointed as this was the first time, I had heard about this decision. When the previous Government had decided to change the date at least there was some communication and stories in the newspaper. This sudden decision unannounced has not given any organisation—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Dalrymple, is this referring to a bill before the House?

**Mr KNUTH:** No, Madam Speaker, this has nothing to do with the bill before the House.

**Mr Bleijie:** I think it is.

**Mr KNUTH:** It is nothing to do with the bill before the House, Madam Speaker. It is an email that has been sent to me about concerns—

**Madam SPEAKER:** Member for Dalrymple, there is a bill before the House with regard to that particular matter. I ask that you not refer to that matter as it is anticipating debate and that would be in conflict with the standing orders.

**Mr KNUTH:** Okay. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

## Coomera Electorate, Eagleby

**Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (10.39 pm): I have been heartened by all that is going on in the seat of Coomera and in particular in the area of Eagleby. I opened the local paper this morning, the *Albert and Logan News*, and on page 20 I found a photo of two schoolchildren from Eagleby State School. The article said—

Students at Eagleby State School are competing to be the healthiest of them all with the Healthiest Schools Awards program.

The school was visited by the Boogie Woogies who performed their Eat Smart B Active show to inspire the children to think more about what they eat.

**Mr Bleijie:** Boogie Woogies matches your tie.

**Mr CRANDON:** I am sure it does. These young people never fail to amaze me. These children are aiming to get a five-point lunch every day, and let me tell the House what that means. They get one point for each of the food groups as well as for participating in a skipping challenge. That is what they need to do. The article continued with some words from principal Suzanne Jolley—

'It's a great program because they know about the five groups and they're learning about what's healthy and what's not,' she said. 'They're putting pressure on their parents to bring good foods and so far we've seen a difference, it's become a competition between the kids.

'Good nutrition makes a big difference to their learning too.'

Ms Jolley said the school was likely to continue a similar program after the Education Queensland program finished.

That is the kicker—the bottom line is that they are going to continue with the program. So that is the first thing I wanted to talk about that is happening in the seat of Coomera and in particular Eagleby.

I also visited the TS Walrus, which is the local Navy cadets, for a chat with the young people there. By the way, they are the current Navy League of Australia's most efficient sea cadet unit in Australia for 2011, so you have to hand it to them for that. But, guess what, I was told just the other night that they have been confirmed as one of the seven cadet units right across Australia—out of approximately 100 cadet units—that will be competing for the 2012 award.

We had the Eagleby State School sausage sizzle and car boot sale, which was a great success. We had the Eagleby NAIDOC Family Festival Day—which is the National Aborigines and Islanders Day Observance Committee day—to celebrate NAIDOC Week. We had the Eagleby Festival, and there were thousands there. That was sponsored by the Heritage Bank, and congratulations go to the Eagleby Community Centre for that. Also, the Twin Rivers Community Mallet Sports Club presented a mower to make sure that the Oliver Sports Complex is even better maintained. It is heartwarming to see that so many good things are happening in Eagleby rather than the bad we hear so much about.

## Lions Club, Code of Ethics

**Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (10.42 pm): I rise to speak tonight on my local Lions Club that meets at the Runcorn Tavern twice a month. I am honoured to be involved with an organisation that does so much good work for the community and promotes a healthy and decent philosophy. Each time we meet, we recall our code of ethics and I would like to share some parts of this with the House. I note that some in particular are a challenge in this chamber. They include 'to remember that in building yourself up it is not necessary to tear another down'. Also—

Always to bear in mind my obligations as a citizen to my nation, my state and my community, and to give them my unswerving loyalty in word, act and deed. To give them freely of my time, labour and means.

To aid others by giving my sympathy to those in distress, my aid to the weak and my substance to the needy.

To be careful with my criticism and liberal with my praise; to build up and not destroy.

After my first couple of sittings in this chamber, I did wonder if it was possible to keep parts of this code. I have done my best and, to my recollection, I have not attacked anyone in this chamber on a personal level and I hope I never do. However, I am disappointed that those in the opposition clearly do not share this philosophy. Indeed, over the last three months I have been sworn at by the member for South Brisbane, another opposition member has attempted to intimidate me by telling me that I had better be careful as they were coming after me, and then yesterday there was the personal attack from the member for Bundamba. I have to say that it reminds me of my high school days when I was the victim of schoolyard bullying by girls who thought they were more important than anyone else.

I find it quite extraordinary that such childish behaviour should find its way into the chamber. However, I remind myself of the other pledge of sorts that we hear when we start each day—that is, forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Therefore, I forgive those who attempt to intimidate and hope that they may find wisdom in the Lions code of ethics, even if they are not a Lion. Surely the office of a parliamentarian should have as high a standard as that of a Lion, if not higher.

### Gladstone Goorie Centre Indigenous Corporation

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (10.45 pm): On 11 August I had the privilege of representing Minister Andrew Cripps at the formal handover of approximately three hectares of land on the banks of Police Creek to the local Aboriginal communities. The deed of grant was presented to the Gladstone Goorie Centre Indigenous Corporation, which is chaired by Cedric Williams. The consultant who guided this whole process over a number of years, Lew Opie, was also present, and his position has been funded for several years by Rio Tinto. The three Aboriginal groups in my electorate are the Baiali, the Goreng and the Goreng Goreng. Representatives of those three groups were in attendance.

Concept plans for that site include a business hub, a non-denominational chapel, a sports area, a cultural precinct, a child-care facility and a hospitality area—for instance, a restaurant. All of those things may not end up being there, but it will be a staged development and certainly it will be supportive of not only the Aboriginal community but all members of the community. I have to thank the previous minister in the previous government because all the work started back then. I thank Minister Cripps for the opportunity to represent him at that event. I did tell the attendees that Minister Cripps and I are identical—well, almost identical. There are similarities.

**Mr Johnson:** You're better looking than him.

**Mrs CUNNINGHAM:** Thank you very much—so are you. It was a great day and there was a lot of emotion, particularly from the Aboriginal elders. The Police Creek site holds a lot of history for them. There was an alleged massacre—I say 'alleged' only because historically there are no documents on it—of Aboriginal people in that area along Police Creek, so it was appropriate that if land was to be handed back to them it should be that site. I know that the Aboriginal people there, particularly the older ones, were touched by the handover and the fact that they own this piece of property now. They are determined to make a success of that project and to benefit their Aboriginal community and the broader community through the development of that site. Again, I say thank you to the former government and thank you to the current government for that privilege. I wish the Aboriginal community through the corporation every success.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 10.47 pm.

## ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, Davies, C. Davis, T. Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young