



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 28 October 2014

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	3553
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 27 October 2014, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills.	3553
REPORT	3553
Auditor-General	3553
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 3: 2014-15— Emergency department performance reporting.	3553
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3554
Parliament of Canada.....	3554
PETITIONS	3554
TABLED PAPERS	3554
NOTICE OF MOTION	3557
Queensland Plan.....	3557
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3557
Health System.....	3557
Rural and Regional Queensland, Services.....	3558
<i>Tabled paper:</i> RegionsQ—Issue One.	3558
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Page 10 of the <i>Central Telegraph</i> , dated, 17 October 2014, titled 'Valleys' Voice'.....	3558
Strong Choices Future Investment Program.....	3558
Health Services, Medical Research.....	3559
Public Transport, Passenger Safety.....	3560
Rural Adjustment Authority.....	3560
Crocodile Management.....	3561
Caring for our Community, Grants.....	3561
NOTICE OF MOTION	3562
Mining Industry, Fly-in Fly-out Workforce.....	3562

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 28 October 2014

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3562
School Group Tours	3562
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3562
Queensland Health, Software	3562
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, dated 5 October 2010, titled 'iMDsoft signs state-wide agreement with Queensland Health'.....	3563
Queensland Health, Software	3563
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Brief, dated 2 July 2013, to the Executive Director, RBWH:Meta Vision.....	3563
Metro South Hospital and Health Service	3564
Queensland Health, Software	3564
Auditor-General's Report, Emergency Departments	3565
Queensland Health, Software	3566
Townsville Hospital and Health Service	3567
Strong Choices	3567
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Queensland's Plan for Secure Finances and a Strong Economy, pp 33 and 34.....	3567
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Consolidated Queensland Treasury Holdings Pty Ltd—Financial Statements, p 14.....	3567
Public Hospitals, Waiting Lists	3568
Gladstone Electorate, Police Resources	3569
Health Services	3570
LNP, Fundraising	3570
Queensland Health, Safety of Public Servants	3571
Lease of Public Assets	3571
Metro South Hospital and Health Service	3572
Queensland Health, Software	3573
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media release, undated, titled 'Queensland Health expands the scope of its agreement with iMDsoft to include state-wide enterprise licence for MetaVision'.....	3573
BreastScreen Queensland	3574
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3574
School Group Tours	3574
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3574
Newman Government, Performance	3574
Gold Coast International Marine Expo	3576
Townsville Hospital and Health Service	3577
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from Queensland Audit Office Report No. 3: 2014-15, p 78, 'Appendix D—HHS performance against the four-hour target'.....	3577
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Townsville Bulletin</i> , dated 28 October 2014, by Samantha Healy, titled 'Hospital backlog falls—Waiting times slashed'.....	3578
Sale of Public Assets	3578
Tourism Industry; Hartley's Crocodile Adventures	3579
Newman Government, Performance	3580
Electricity Prices	3581
Grantham, Floods	3582
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Australian</i> , dated 28 October 2014, by Paul Kelly, titled 'Equality at risk in the West: Murdoch'.....	3582
Tourism Industry	3583
Royalties for the Regions; Gladstone Hospital	3584
Regional Queensland, Water Infrastructure	3585
MOTION	3586
Order of Business	3586
MOTION	3586
Revocation of State Forest Areas	3586
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3587
Second Reading	3587
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 49—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response.....	3587
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time.....	3615
Resolved in the affirmative.....	3615
Consideration in Detail	3615
Clause 1, as read, agreed to.....	3615
Clause 2 postponed.....	3615
Clauses 3 to 9, as read, agreed to.....	3615
Insertion of new clause—.....	3616
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Powell's amendments.....	3616
Amendment agreed to.....	3616
Clause 10, as read, agreed to.....	3616
Insertion of new clause—.....	3616
Amendment agreed to.....	3616
Insertion of new clause—.....	3616
Amendment agreed to.....	3616
Clause 11—.....	3616
Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.....	3617

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 28 October 2014

Clause 12—	3617
Clause 12, as amended, agreed to	3617
Clause 13—	3617
Clause 13, as read, negatived	3617
Insertion of new clause—	3618
Amendment agreed to	3618
Insertion of new clause—	3618
Amendment agreed to	3618
Insertion of new clause—	3618
Amendment agreed to	3619
Insertion of new clause—	3620
Amendment agreed to	3620
Insertion of new clause—	3620
Amendment agreed to	3620
Insertion of new clause—	3621
Amendment agreed to	3621
Insertion of new clause—	3621
Amendment agreed to	3621
Insertion of new clause—	3621
Amendment agreed to	3621
Insertion of new clause—	3622
Amendment agreed to	3622
Clause 14—	3622
Clause 14, as amended, agreed to	3623
Clause 15, as read, agreed to	3623
Insertion of new clause—	3623
Amendment agreed to	3624
Clause 16—	3624
Clause 16, as amended, agreed to	3625
Clause 17, as read, agreed to	3625
Insertion of new clause—	3625
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	3627
Resolved in the affirmative	3627
Amendment agreed to	3627
Clauses 18 to 34—	3628
Clauses 18 to 34, as amended, agreed to	3628
Clause 35, as read, agreed to	3628
Clauses 36 to 101—	3628
Clauses 36 to 101, as amended, agreed to	3629
Insertion of new clause—	3629
Amendment agreed to	3630
Clause 102—	3630
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Ms Jackie Trad's amendments	3630
Division: Question put—That the amendments be agreed to	3630
Resolved in the negative	3630
Non-government amendments (Ms Trad) negatived	3630
Message from Governor	3630
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Message, dated 28 October 2014, from His Excellency the Governor recommending amendments to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014	3630
Clause 102, as amended, agreed to	3634
Clauses 103 to 143—	3634
Clauses 103 to 143, as amended, agreed to	3636
Clause 144—	3636
Division: Question put—That clause 144, as read, stand part of the bill	3636
Resolved in the affirmative	3636
Clause 144, as read, agreed to	3636
Insertion of new clause—	3636
Amendment agreed to	3636
Clauses 145 to 174—	3637
Clauses 145 to 174, as amended, agreed to	3639
Clause 2—	3640
Clause 2, as amended, agreed to	3640
Schedule—	3640
Schedule, as amended, agreed to	3640
Third Reading	3641
Long Title	3641
Amendment agreed to	3641
MAJOR EVENTS BILL	3641
Second Reading	3641
<i>Tabled paper:</i> State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 51— Major Events Bill 2014, government response	3641

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 28 October 2014

MOTION	3643
Mining Industry, Fly-in Fly-out Workforce	3643
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Wikipedia document, dated 28 October 2014, regarding neuralisers	3650
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	3653
Resolved in the affirmative	3653
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to.	3653
Resolved in the affirmative	3653
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	3653
Error in Division	3653
MAJOR EVENTS BILL	3653
Second Reading	3653
Consideration in Detail	3672
Clauses 1 to 104—	3672
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Major Events Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jann Stuckey's amendments	3673
Clauses 1 to 104, as amended, agreed to	3673
Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to	3673
Third Reading	3674
Long Title	3674
ADJOURNMENT	3674
Federal-State Relations	3674
Wamuran Men's Shed; Glass House Electorate, Roads	3674
South Burnett Relay for Life; Amaroo Environmental Education Centre	3675
Somerset Hills State School, Groundskeeper	3676
Burleigh Electorate, Events	3676
Gaven Electorate, Events	3677
Abbot Point Port and Wetlands Strategy	3677
Netball Queensland	3678
Mount Ommaney Electorate, Small Business	3679
Coconut, Auntie M	3679
ATTENDANCE	3680

TUESDAY, 28 OCTOBER 2014



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

For the sitting week, Madam Speaker acknowledged the traditional custodians of the land upon which this parliament is assembled.

ASSENT TO BILLS



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

The Honourable F. Simpson MP
Speaker of the Legislative Assembly
Parliament House
George Street
BRISBANE QLD 4000

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

Date of assent: 27 October 2014

“A Bill for An Act authorising the Treasurer to pay an amount from the consolidated fund for the Legislative Assembly and parliamentary service for the financial year starting 1 July 2013”

“A Bill for An Act authorising the Treasurer to pay amounts from the consolidated fund for particular departments for the financial year starting 1 July 2013 and to amend the Wagering Act 1998 for particular purposes”

“A Bill for An Act to amend the Family Responsibilities Commission Act 2008 for particular purposes”

“A Bill for An Act to amend the Child Protection (Offender Prohibition Order) Act 2008 and the Disaster Management Act 2003 and to make a regulation under the Disaster Management Act 2003 for particular purposes”

“A Bill for An Act to amend the Building Act 1975, the Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, the Professional Engineers Act 2002 and the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, and to make minor or consequential amendments of the Acts mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes”

“A Bill for An Act to amend the Housing Act 2003, the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991, the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation Act 2008 and the Residential Tenancies and Rooming Accommodation and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013 for particular purposes, to repeal the Domestic Building Contracts Act 2000, and to make minor and consequential amendments to the legislation mentioned in the schedule”

“A Bill for An Act to provide for the development and implementation of the Queensland Plan and related purposes”

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

Yours sincerely

Governor

27 October 2014

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 27 October 2014, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills [\[6343\]](#).

REPORT

Auditor-General



Madam SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General report No. 3 for 2014-15, *Emergency department performance reporting*. I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 3: 2014-15—Emergency department performance reporting [\[6344\]](#).

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Parliament of Canada

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, on behalf of our parliament, I have conveyed our condolences directly to the Speaker of the national Parliament of Canada and assured them that they remain in our thoughts and prayers. We continue to take advice from security experts and monitor our own security settings so that we can do all that is possible to ensure the safety of the precinct for those who work and visit here, members, their families, staff and the parliamentary media gallery.

I wish to convey my appreciation to the parliamentary security officers, including our Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Queensland Police who support them. I also thank those who work and visit here for their continued cooperation with our security officers and attendants.

PETITIONS

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

Mt Ossa Seaforth Road, Upgrade

Mr Costigan, from 2,183 petitioners, requesting the House to seal the gravel section of the Mt Ossa Seaforth Road, linking the Calen district to the Hibiscus Coast [[6345](#)].

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

Smoking Products, Regulations

Mr Bennett, from 837 petitioners, requesting the House to review the Health Legislation Amendment Bill and not regulate personal vaporisers as smoking products under the Tobacco Act [[6346](#), [6347](#)].

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

Pacific Pines, Police Resources

Dr Douglas, from 666 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a police station in the estate of Pacific Pines to ensure safety and security for the residents in the surrounding area, to improve response time to incidents and relieve pressure on the stations at Coomera and Nerang [[6348](#)].

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

17 October 2014—

- [6300](#) Wide Bay Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6301](#) Select Committee on Ethics—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6302](#) Boondooma Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6303](#) Grevillea Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6304](#) Kelsey Creek Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6305](#) Middle Park Bore Water Supply Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6306](#) Mulgildie Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6307](#) Six Mile Creek Water Supply Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6308](#) Smithfield Drainage Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6309](#) Woodmillar Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6310](#) Benleith Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 29 November 2013
- [6311](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection (Mr Powell) to Berlin, Paris and London, 15-22 September 2014
- [6312](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry (Dr McVeigh)—Official Trade and Investment Mission to Vietnam and China, 13-19 September 2014

20 October 2014—

- [6313](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 51—Major Events Bill 2014
- [6314](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 51—Major Events Bill 2014, submissions received in relation to the inquiry
- [6315](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 57—Subordinate legislation tabled between 7 May 2014 and 26 August 2014
- [6316](#) Dumaresq-Barwon Border Rivers Commission—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6317](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 39—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6318](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 40—Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [6319](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 40—Education and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, submissions received in relation to the inquiry

21 October 2014—

- [6320](#) Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 2: 2014-15—Hospital infrastructure projects
- [6321](#) Response from the Minister for Local Government, Community Recovery and Resilience (Mr Crisafulli) to a paper petition (2310-14) and an ePetition (2303-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and 119(4), from 715 and 151 petitioners respectively requesting the House to allocate funding for Stage 1: North Rockhampton flood mitigation project

22 October 2014—

- [6322](#) Queensland's Category 2 Water Authorities: Summary of Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2013-14
- [6323](#) Queensland's River Improvement Trusts: Summary of Annual Reports and Financial Statements 2013-14
- [6324](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 55—Queensland Heritage and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [6325](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 56—Subordinate legislation tabled on 5 August 2014
- [6326](#) Juandah Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 16 May 2014
- [6327](#) Washpool Water Board—Final Report 1 July 2013 to 16 May 2014
- [6328](#) National Heavy Vehicle Regulator—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6329](#) Transmax Pty Ltd—Financial Statements 2013-14
- [6330](#) Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 49—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

23 October 2014—

- [6331](#) Cape York Hospital and Health Service—Final Report 2013-14
- [6332](#) Torres Strait-Northern Peninsula Hospital and Health Service—Final Report 2013-14
- [6333](#) Gold Coast Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6334](#) Health Quality and Complaints Commission—Final Report 2013-14
- [6335](#) Office of the Health Ombudsman—Annual Report 2013-14

24 October 2014—

- [6336](#) Mackay Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6337](#) Electoral Commission Queensland: Statistical Returns on the Stafford By-Election, 19 July 2014
- [6338](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing (Mr Dickson) pursuant to section 56A of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Forestry Regulation 1998
- [6339](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 52—Liquid Fuel Supply (Ethanol) Amendment Bill 2014
- [6340](#) State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 52—Liquid Fuel Supply (Ethanol) Amendment Bill 2014—submissions received in relation to the inquiry

27 October 2014—

[6341](#) Central West Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2013-14

[6342](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly under section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992 regarding Statutory Instruments Regulation 2014, Associations Incorporation Regulation 1999, Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Regulation 2003, Casino Control Regulation 1999, Charitable and Non-Profit Gaming Regulation 1999, Coroners Regulation 2003, Fair Trading (Code of Practice-Fitness Industry) Regulation 2003, Gaming Machine Regulation 2002, Interactive Gambling (Player Protection) Regulation 1998, Introduction Agents Regulation 2002, Land Sales Regulation 2000, Liquor (Approval of Adult Entertainment Code) Regulation 2002, Liquor Regulation 2002, Pastoral Workers' Accommodation Regulation 2003, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Auctioneering Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Commercial Agency Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Motor Dealing Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Property Developer Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Real Estate Agency Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers Regulation 2001, Property Agents and Motor Dealers (Restricted Letting Agency Practice Code of Conduct) Regulation 2001, Second-hand Dealers and Pawnbrokers Regulation 2004, Tourism Services (Code of Conduct for Inbound Tour Operators) Regulation 2003, Tourism Services Regulation 2003, Trusts Accounts Regulation 1999, Wagering Regulation 1999, Youth Justice Regulation 2003

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act 1982—

[6349](#) Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 234

[6350](#) Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 234, explanatory notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991—

[6351](#) Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 235

[6352](#) Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 235, explanatory notes

Sustainable Planning Act 2009—

[6353](#) Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 236

[6354](#) Sustainable Planning Amendment Regulation (No. 6) 2014, No. 236, explanatory notes

Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014—

[6355](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 237

[6356](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 237, explanatory notes

Work Health and Safety Act 2011—

[6357](#) Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 238

[6358](#) Work Health and Safety Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 238, explanatory notes

Youth Justice Act 1992—

[6359](#) Youth Justice Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 239

[6360](#) Youth Justice Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 239, explanatory notes

Recreation Areas Management Act 2006—

[6361](#) Recreation Areas Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 240

[6362](#) Recreation Areas Management Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 240, explanatory notes

Aboriginal Land Act 1991—

[6363](#) Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 7) 2014, No. 241

[6364](#) Aboriginal Land Amendment Regulation (No. 7) 2014, No. 241, explanatory notes

MINISTERIAL PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following ministerial paper was tabled by the Clerk—

Minister for Health (Mr Springborg)—

[6365](#) South West Hospital and Health Service—Annual Report 2013-14

REPORT TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

[6366](#) Report pursuant to Standing Order 165 (Clerical errors or formal changes to any Bill) detailing amendments to certain Bills, made by the Clerk, prior to assent by His Excellency the Governor, viz—

Disaster Management Amendment Bill 2014

Amendment made to Bill

Clause 20 (Insertion of new pt 14, div 3, sdiv 2)—

Page 14, lines 20 and 21, 'Disaster Management Amendment Act 2014'—

Omit, Insert—

Disaster Management and Another Act Amendment Act 2014

NOTICE OF MOTION**Queensland Plan**

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (9.34 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House—

1. notes the Queensland Plan that was tabled in the Legislative Assembly by the Premier on 26 August 2014; and
2. ratifies the Queensland Plan as required under section 6 of the Queensland Plan Act 2014.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**Health System**

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.34 am): Sadly we live in uncertain times. We currently face a number of domestic and international threats. We have seen significant conflict overseas, the ongoing scourge of terrorism, Australians losing their lives in tragedies like the Ukraine plane disaster, and we are now seeing the global threat of a deadly virus, ebola, killing thousands of people in West Africa. This government is intent on making Queensland a safer more secure place for families to live. We will continue working hard every single day to protect our community.

Despite the current challenges, we are achieving real change in Queensland by cracking down on criminal gangs and terrorism, helping our police with new resources and recruits, acting to address child safety and domestic violence issues and empowering schools to deal locally with issues like discipline and bullying. But more needs to be done. When it comes to protecting the community against the growing ebola threat, we are the best prepared of any Australian state to keep Queenslanders safe. We are the first, and I understand the only, state that has moved to isolate for a period of 21 days people coming in from places where ebola is known to exist. The Chief Health Officer has been proactive in addressing this threat in cooperation with the Minister for Health. Queenslanders can be confident that this is a government that is doing everything necessary to prevent an outbreak of this deadly disease. This is a government that is doing everything that it can to keep Queenslanders safe and secure. We have a strong system in place and we have signalled that we are prepared to do even more if necessary, acting on the advice of the Chief Health Officer who is constantly reassessing the risk and acting to address it.

Queenslanders can feel reassured about their state's health system because this government is more open, more accountable and more about getting results. We are working on restoring Queenslanders' faith in the health system, giving them security not just to know that they will be protected from infectious disease but to know they can get the right help in a timely manner when they are sick or have hurt themselves. We have a record Health budget of \$13.6 billion for the 2014-15 financial year. This is an increase of 6.4 per cent on last year's record budget and an overall increase of 18.6 per cent since we took office. Across Australia no state has come so far so fast to improve its health system. Our hardworking staff are achieving great results in our emergency departments, elective surgery, dental services—and I might just signal I would love to take some questions today on these results.

Less than three short years ago we were elected and we promised that we would fix the health system. We are delivering on that promise, but there is more to do. Mums and dads, grandparents, aunties and uncles—all Queenslanders—can now feel secure about their access to the best health services in the nation and the knowledge that my team and I will continue to work every single day to make Queenslanders safe.

Rural and Regional Queensland, Services

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (9.38 am): Nothing makes me more proud to be a regional member of our LNP government than seeing front-line services revitalised in country towns, especially the reversal of the neglect our regional hospitals suffered under Labor. The great work of the new hospital and health service boards has been featured in the first edition of the RegionsQ magazine. I table a copy of it for the benefit of the House and encourage all members to have a look.

Tabled paper: RegionsQ—Issue One [\[6367\]](#).

The new RegionsQ magazine will be a bi-monthly publication sharing the stories and experiences of regional Queenslanders with a broad audience. RegionsQ focuses on issues that are important to regional Queensland communities such as health, transport, tourism and education. It tells the stories of delivering front-line services to people in country towns. It tells the stories of people like new Roma mum Melissa Green who benefit from the continuity-of-care maternity model now being offered at the Roma Hospital or Scenic Rim resident Amy Cartwright who recently gave birth to her son at Beaudesert Hospital, the 100th baby to be born at the hospital since our LNP government restored birthing services in March. Those are all real-life examples of how we are revitalising front-line services in country towns for the country people who live there.

For example, in my own electorate Central Queensland Hospital and Health Service Board member Bronwyn Christensen said country people are appreciative that no longer are decisions being made from Brisbane by bureaucrats who may never have set foot in a country town. Hospital and health service boards implemented by our government have not only ended years of sustained budget blowouts in regional health administration, but also have reduced duplication and provided better performance. They have also significantly improved services, slashing hospital emergency waiting times and long waits for dental treatment. Last week, my own local paper printed an article about dental visits. It is something new when a dental clinic gets reported in the local paper. The article stated—

MANY Monto locals couldn't believe their eyes when a public dental clinic rolled into town last month.

Only five years ago, the waiting list for dental services in Monto was 62 months, or over five years, and was 12 years at other places in the Wide Bay-Burnett.

I table this cartoon, which is a not-very-flattering likeness of the local member and the dental van. It illustrates a great example of restoring front-line services to country people in country towns.

Tabled paper: Page 10 of the *Central Telegraph*, dated, 17 October 2014, titled 'Valleys' Voice' [\[6368\]](#).

We are building a stronger, more prosperous regional Queensland through better front-line services, putting back the services that Labor took away. We are growing the economy and delivering better infrastructure through programs such as Royalties for the Regions. The Royalties for the Regions program does not just deliver roads, water and sewage plants, as important as they are. Royalties for the Regions has also delivered funding for a new medical centre in the mining community of Dysart. It has funded new child-care centres for Blackall and Barcardine and it has funded a new swimming pool for the kids at Karumba in the gulf. The Newman LNP government is working hard to revitalise front-line services to ensure regional Queenslanders are safer and more secure. We are investing in better technology and providing more support for front-line staff so that Queenslanders living in country towns and regional cities receive better services and the care that they need from our government.

Strong Choices Future Investment Program

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (9.42 am): I have not yet embarked on a TreasuryQ document, but I feel one coming on, and an enlightening and exciting read it will be. The government promised to revitalise front-line services for Queensland families and we are delivering on that promise. When a family member needs medical attention, all Queenslanders deserve to know that they will have access to the best possible care as close to home as possible. Our regional hospitals play a vital role in the healthcare of hundreds of thousands of Queenslanders

and this government has recognised their importance. The Deputy Premier has covered aspects of that in relation to his own area of Callide. When we came to government, we inherited a maintenance backlog in those hospitals. This government has pledged \$327 million over four years to address these issues. Whether it is upgrading the emergency lighting, fixing the air conditioning or repairing the roof, those jobs are now getting done. In fact, there are 2,000 maintenance jobs being carried out in our hospitals.

However, we know there is much more work to do to ensure all Queenslanders, no matter where they live, have access to quality health services. This is all part of a planned and methodical approach to providing the most effective and efficient health services across the state. Our Strong Choices plan to pay down debt and fund future infrastructure includes a \$300 million Community Hospitals Fund. This is an investment in upgrading and redeveloping hospitals in rural and regional areas to cater for the increasing demand for health services. We will not be repeating the mistakes of the past identified by the Auditor-General, who found that the former government's lack of planning in providing three new hospitals cost taxpayers \$2.2 billion more than expected.

This government understands that proper planning and evaluation is needed before embarking on major infrastructure projects. All potential projects identified as part of the Strong Choices Future Investment Program will be subject to rigorous analysis and project evaluation. We want to ensure that when Queenslanders in our regional and rural communities are faced with the uncertainty of illness or injury, they will have the comfort of knowing they have access to a properly planned and well maintained hospital, staffed by dedicated doctors and nurses. Only the LNP government has a plan to deliver those services to Queenslanders wherever they live.

Health Services, Medical Research

 **Hon. IB WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts) (9.44 am): The enormous scope of practical and applied medical research being undertaken in Queensland is achieving better front-line health services for Queenslanders. This government committed to revitalising front-line services for families and we are certainly doing that in the area of scientific technology. Our scientists are bringing about new discoveries that will make our lives safer and better. It is one of the great privileges of my job to go and see those scientists who are being supported by the Queensland taxpayer. Our best and brightest researchers are actually delivering tremendous results for Queenslanders in terms of healthy and happy living. I wish to talk about three that I have had the good fortune to see.

Each year 25,000 Queenslanders are diagnosed with cancer and many will undergo chemotherapy. Chemo attacks healthy cells, as well as cancerous ones. One of the big problems is the side effects of chemotherapy that affect many people and in many cases can be worse than the disease itself. The good news is that researchers at the Translational Research Institute and the Mater Medical Research Institute have discovered a way to provide a six-fold boost to immune recovery after chemotherapy cancer treatments, which is achieved by putting certain types of immune system stem cells to sleep prior to a chemo session to allow them to survive the treatment. There is great patient recovery and hospitalisation is reduced. The research is supported by \$360,000 from the government to transform this opportunity. Discussions are starting with a US biotechnology company to begin human clinical testing of that process.

Another area of research involves chronic fatigue syndrome. I was fortunate to go to Griffith University on the Gold Coast to meet Mrs Christine Hunter, whose daughter Alison died at 16 years of age, having suffered from chronic fatigue. Her foundation, together with government money, have worked towards the dual launch of a specialist Griffith University clinic on the Gold Coast that is looking at chronic fatigue syndrome and a smart phone app that allows patients to immediately report how they are going to their treating doctor, so that their symptoms can be monitored in real time and the doctor can decide what needs to be done to deal with them.

Finally, we live in the skin cancer capital of the world. One in two Queenslanders will develop skin cancers in their lifetime. With Queensland government support, world-first, cutting-edge laser technology has been developed by Dr Yah Leng Lim. I went to see Dr Lim's terahertz machine, which provides laser image that gives a better view of the skin and where the infection is. It allows much more accurate surgery, so that big lumps of skin do not have to be taken out, but less invasive surgery can be done to treat that very prevalent disease. It has huge potential to revolutionise skin cancer treatment. The great work that we are doing with the Queensland taxpayer to support our best and brightest researchers is leading to great outcomes and better front-line health services for Queenslanders, and that is a hallmark of this Newman government.

Public Transport, Passenger Safety

 **Hon. SA EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (Minister for Transport and Main Roads) (9.47 am): The LNP government is working hard to revitalise front-line services to ensure Queenslanders are safer and more secure. We have a strong plan to make this state the safest place to live, travel, work and raise a family. As part of this plan, we are always working to do more to improve the safety of passengers when travelling by bus, train, ferry or tram. We have a proactive approach to target antisocial behaviour. Yesterday, the Premier and I announced a further boost to security. From mid-2015, 18 extra senior network officers will join the team to patrol the network. That follows our promise last year to double the number of officers on the network, which is a commitment that we achieved. The additional 18 officers will provide a significant boost to safety and customer service and will bring the team to a total of 70 officers. Not only do senior network officers help crack down on fare evasion and assist in customer service, but also they are highly trained in de-escalation techniques and have extended powers, including the authority to detain and search people where necessary.

Whether a student is getting to school or a parent travelling home from work, the network is a safer place with these professional officers equipped to handle any situation that arises. Our additional senior network officers will also join the police railway squad, busway safety officers, mobile dog patrols and contracted security guards to deter antisocial behaviour across the public transport network. Our security teams are well resourced with more than 8,000 CCTV cameras and a dedicated 24-hour security monitoring facility.

It was great to meet three active senior network officers yesterday and hear how passionate they are about protecting the travelling public. One officer described the typical reaction she receives when boarding a bus or a train while on duty. She said passengers feel immediately at ease.

This is the kind of network an LNP government is delivering for Queenslanders while those opposite from the Labor Party continue to have no plans and no policies. Under an LNP government the number of bus driver assaults across South-East Queensland has decreased by 23 per cent compared to Labor. We conducted a number of blitzes on the Gold Coast and as a result bus driver assaults are down almost 50 per cent. These results show our proactive approach is working and delivering a safer public transport network.

Rural Adjustment Authority

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (9.50 am): Tomorrow I will be recognising the Queensland Rural Adjustment Authority's 20 years of strong front-line delivery of financial assistance to rural and regional Queensland. While many farmers are doing it tough, given flooding in recent years and now what is for many the most severe drought on record, it is important to acknowledge this anniversary.

QRAA, as it is more widely known, has offered a helping hand to our farmers, in particular, when they need it the most and gets them back on their feet after floods and during drought. Over the past 20 years QRAA has: assessed over 190,000 applications for loans, grants, rebates and subsidies; approved over 156,000 applications involving \$2.8 billion in financial assistance; approved over 1,500 applications and \$270 million to help Queenslanders enter farming; and approved over \$370 million in funding to help 3,500 farmers improve productivity.

The individual statistics are impressive but combined they showcase the truly significant contribution QRAA and its staff have made to rural and regional Queensland. I am grateful for the support QRAA gives our farmers, especially those doing it tough during the current drought—more than three-quarters of the state is drought declared.

The LNP government has committed \$62 million to support drought affected farmers with fodder and water freight subsidies and rebates for emergency water infrastructure. These have certainly proved very popular with graziers. We have also introduced land rental rebates, mental health services, transport concessions and funded community events to help bring people in the bush together.

QRAA has also helped administer the federal government's drought concessional loans and farm finance concessional loans not only in Queensland but also in the Northern Territory. Last year QRAA opened a new office in Emerald, offering further service and support to the Central Highlands, particularly the Fitzroy, Callide and Boyne catchments. All up, QRAA employs eight regional client liaison officers who regularly travel across Queensland to promote the assistance available. They offer personalised help with the application process.

I thank QRAA for its achievements over the past two decades. Our partnership is set to continue well into the future as we look to build agriculture as one of the four pillars of the Queensland economy.

Crocodile Management

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (9.53 am): This morning I rise to speak on how the Newman government is protecting North Queensland communities from the threat of crocodiles. We have listened and responded to the communities and to staunch local members like the member for Barron River, Michael Trout, and the member for Hinchinbrook and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, Andrew Cripps. Communities and members have long complained about Labor's sit and wait approach to crocodile management. We have introduced a proactive removal program that balances community safety with conservation. We have boosted our front-line ranger services to deliver a better outcome for residents of North Queensland.

The policy is modelled on the successful Northern Territory approach and is implemented with the support and local knowledge of the Cairns, Townsville, Hinchinbrook and Cassowary Coast councils. As of this morning, 45 crocodiles have been removed in 2014—more than double the best year under Labor. That was long before they were captured by the Greens and put a halt to their removal program. We are really only now just moving into crocodile season for 2014. The 45 crocodiles are made up of 23 removed by my department and 22 removed by the Dawul Wuru Indigenous Corporation—the contracted organisation operating in and around Cairns.

We are working hard to deliver for Queenslanders, but we know there is more to be done. I am currently in discussions with the member for Barron River and the member for Cook about what we can do in conjunction with Douglas council.

In addition, an important component of the government's crocodile management policy is to educate the community about crocodile management through its Crocwise public education program. Officers have visited over 46 schools and community centres across North Queensland to convey the Crocwise message. Unlike Labor that has no plans to manage problem crocodiles, we are working hard to deliver safe communities for the people of North Queensland.

Caring for our Community, Grants

 **Hon. TE DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (9.55 am): Our government has been working hard to revitalise front-line services in our communities. We know that community and volunteer groups are the backbone of our communities, and that is why we made a promise at the last election to assist these groups with small grants so they can continue their vital work.

The Newman government is delivering on this \$4 million promise and the third round of the Caring for our Community grants closed at the end of September. These grants have been extremely popular. In this round there were almost 1,600 applications received for small grants of \$5,000 or larger grants of \$15,000 for more substantial projects. I look forward to announcing the six successful organisations that will share in the \$1.3 million worth of grants in the new year.

This small grants program did not exist under Labor and so far the Newman government has made a real difference to 715 community and volunteer groups so that they can spend less time fundraising and more time supporting Queenslanders. I have had the privilege of meeting with many of these organisations across the state to see firsthand the benefit these grants are making in local communities.

In July the member for Ferny Grove invited me to present grants to two organisations in his electorate, including the local Scouts association. I was pleased to learn from one of the Scouts Queensland commissioners Des Allen about how they will use their new trailer, which they will purchase with their grant, and also to learn about the wonderful work the Scouts do annually through their special Angooneree camp, which is all about including young people with a disability in a scout camp experience.

The member also invited me to present one of the more substantial grants to the Ferny Grove State High School tuckshop. It was great to meet Sabine and some of the other ladies and to see how their plans for the tuckshop would take shape and how helpful the grant would be for the volunteers so they could have more space and work in more modern conditions with stainless steel benches and purchase a new large freezer.

In September the member for Ipswich invited me to meet the helpful people at the Ipswich Compassions Food Barn that benefited from a \$15,000 grant which they used to purchase a commercial refrigerator and freezer as well as some extra shelving units so that they could continue to assist very vulnerable young people living in Ipswich.

Finally, at the beginning of this month the member for Murrumba and I visited the Deception Bay Neighbourhood Centre that received small grants to purchase equipment to help vulnerable families in that part of Queensland. It was great to meet Jenny and some of the team and discuss the wide range of activities and support they provide to families in Deception Bay.

These groups truly are the backbone of their communities. The Caring for our Community grants provide a fantastic opportunity for community organisations to improve their facilities and upgrade their resources. These grants are another example of how this government is revitalising front-line services so Queenslanders receive better services and the care they need.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Mining Industry, Fly-in Fly-out Workforce

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.59 am): I give notice that I will move—

That this House:

- notes the Labor opposition's recently released policy to end 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations by giving workers a choice near existing resource communities;
- notes the Deputy Premier's statements, reported on 19 June this year, opposing 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mining operations; and
- calls on the Newman government to follow through on the Deputy Premier's promise as soon as possible and end 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations near existing resource communities.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before commencing question time, I wish to acknowledge schools visiting today: St Patrick's Catholic School in the electorate of Bundaberg; St Joseph's Primary School at Woodburn, New South Wales; and Cooloola Christian College in the electorate of Gympie.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Queensland Health, Software

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (10.00 am): My question is to the Premier. I refer to the Queensland Health report into the intensive care unit medication software program. Given that the RBWH executive director was advised of this potentially life-threatening issue in July 2013 in a briefing note, I ask: will the Premier be the most transparent, open and accountable government in history as promised and table today the briefing note that outlines the risks to patient safety?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I note that there has been, for obvious reasons, a fair bit of interest about this issue in the media in the last 36 hours shall I say. I think it is important to look at the background to this piece of software because there is an interesting bit of history here.

Specialised clinical information systems are essential to improve patient care at modern hospitals. So the planning for the introduction of this particular system, the MetaVision system, commenced for six major Queensland hospitals in 2007. The Gold Coast Hospital implemented the system in September 2011. The Prince Charles Hospital followed in December 2011. Townsville, Rockhampton and Logan transitioned in 2012—early 2012, as I understand it—and Cairns and March in 2013. Subsequently, the Royal Children's went to this system in May 2014, the RBWH on 10 September and Princess Alexandra on 13 October.

I table a media release from 5 October 2010 announcing 'that the government of Queensland has signed an agreement to install MetaVision in selected ICUs across the state's network of public hospitals'—that is, the former Labor government. I table the release.

Tabled paper: Media release, dated 5 October 2010, titled 'iMDsoft signs state-wide agreement with Queensland Health' [\[6369\]](#).

Yes, once again we have the truth being told today in this House. Who implemented this system? The Australian Labor Party health administration. That is who did it. So it was rolled out—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr NEWMAN: They ask the questions—

Madam SPEAKER: I will just ask the Premier to pause. The Premier has the call and is answering the question. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: They ask the questions, Madam Speaker, but they do not like the answer. Here is my challenge back to them, because I note that the member for Bundamba last night was saying we cannot afford to make mistakes and was saying all sorts of things about where were the risk assessments and the project evaluations. Well, let us see some openness from the opposition. I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to provide access to all cabinet and Cabinet Budget Review Committee documents for the implementation of this system. Let us see the risk assessments. Let us see the project evaluation. Let us see the documentation that was the basis of the decision to implement this in the first place.

What I say in conclusion is we are dealing with this. It is not clear whether there are such significant problems, but we will get to the bottom of it and we will make sure that Queensland is the safest place for patients in the health system along with the general community. But we know once again that this is another system—another Labor decision—that we are now sorting out.

Queensland Health, Software

Ms PALASZCZUK: My question is to the Minister for Health. I note that senior management at RBWH was first made aware of this potentially life-threatening software failure some 15 months ago in July 2013 and that the minister met with the Metro North HHS chair on 21 July 2013. When was the minister first made aware of this issue and what immediate action did this minister take?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I acknowledge the question from the Leader of the Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition comes from a political party who presided over the greatest debacle in IT implementation in this state's history—\$1.253 billion which they immolated 75 per cent of the Queensland Health workforce in by either not paying them properly, underpaying them or overpaying them, or not paying them at all. That is the legacy of the Labor Party in Queensland.

As the Premier indicated a moment ago, the planning and the implementation and the contract signing around this happened in 2007—probably around the time the honourable member for Bundamba was the assistant minister for health in Queensland. So the real question is: what did she actually know about this? What did the honourable member for Bundamba know about this? That is what the real question is today. What did the honourable Leader of the Opposition know about this when she sat in the Labor Party cabinet and no doubt was making decisions around these particular matters?

This particular matter was first brought to my attention on the weekend—on the weekend. What actually happened is that our people have been implementing this to make sure that the issues which were probably obvious when the Labor Party rolled this out were not going to be a problem for patients in Queensland. Indeed, if I can refer to that particular advice which was made available to the RBWH, as I understand it, as I have asked for some information around this, in May 2013 the implementation team clearly indicated that they would fix all of that before the new software system was implemented—and that is what they did. I table a letter which proves that that was the case.

Tabled paper: Brief, dated 2 July 2013, to the Executive Director, RBWH:Meta Vision [\[6370\]](#).

That is the difference between the implementation under the Newman government and under the Labor government, because under our clinicians when they identified these issues—the risk assessment around this system, which had been ordered by the Labor Party some six years before—they made sure all of those issues were addressed prior to its implementation.

The issue with regard to the cancellation of the medication in this particular ICU module arose only in the last few weeks and as soon as it did it was escalated and addressed by the clinicians. Indeed, those clinicians in May 2013 actually raised the possibility that there could be other emergent issues which would be very, very quickly dealt with if they came about. So this is another example of where the LNP government is picking up and fixing up a decision which was made by the Labor Party some seven years ago in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Metro South Hospital and Health Service

Mr KRAUSE: My question without notice is to the Premier. In relation to the LNP government's strong plans for front-line health care, can the Premier advise how many long-wait patients there were at hospitals throughout the Metro South HHS at the change of government and how many there are today?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question because I know that he is passionate about the health of Queenslanders and people in his electorate and I know that, like me, he is determined to keep the community safe. I know that the member will be pleased with the recently released health statistics which are very good news for Beaudesert and good news for Queenslanders.

In terms of long-wait patients, the number of patients who have waited longer than the clinically recommended time for surgery has fallen from 1,762 in March 2012 under Labor to 262 in the September quarter 2014 under the LNP. It is an impressive result, and I thank the hardworking nurses and doctors at the Metro South Hospital and Health Service. In terms of dental, the number of people in the Metro South Hospital and Health Service waiting two years and over on the general care waiting list has been reduced from 10,859 to zero today.

In terms of emergency departments, in March 2012 under Labor 55 per cent of people were seen within the benchmark four-hour time frame. In the September 2014 quarter under the LNP, 68 per cent of people were seen within the benchmark four-hour time frame. Is there more to be done? Clearly there is, and we will not rest—we will not sleep—until these improvements continue to be driven through the system.

To turn to the one that I know is very dear to the minister's heart and the local member's heart—that is, the return of birthing services to Beaudesert—after an absence of 10 years, birthing services have been returned to that community, the first to be reopened under this government's commitment to returning vital health services to rural and regional Queenslanders.

An opposition member interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I heard some interjections. Was it from the Leader of the Opposition? Why? Because they are embarrassed. They are embarrassed time and time again when they get found out. The birthing services mean that over 800 women a year can have their babies locally.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I take that interjection. It is offensive, particularly to the mums of Beaudesert. This is the truth. These are the facts. They do not like the facts because they were found wanting. Only today they came in here and ran splat into a concrete wall with an own goal: the Health IT system. Another one that they have implemented has been found to have a few issues. Guess who is fixing the problems? Guess who is turning around Health? Guess who is solving the IT problems? Guess who is putting better project management and delivery of infrastructure into Queensland Health? It is the LNP government: a strong team with a strong plan to take Queensland forward and make this a safer place for all families.

Queensland Health, Software

Mrs MILLER: My question is to the Minister for Health. Does the minister know exactly how many patients are suspected of being at risk of an adverse outcome including the potential of death from the use of MetaVision intensive-care software used in Queensland hospitals? Have each of these patients and their families been notified?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I acknowledge the question from the honourable member for Bundamba, who was the loyal assistant to Gordon Nuttall for so many years as she was effectively mentored in her ways by the now notorious former member for Sandgate. If we go back to—

Mrs Miller: This is life and death.

Mr SPRINGBORG: Exactly, Madam Speaker; everything that the honourable member presided over—whether it be the covering up around Dr Patel in Bundaberg; routinely having people bounce around in ambulances in Queensland for up to nine or 10 hours on bypass, dying in the back of ambulances in Queensland; the 6½ thousand Queenslanders who were on the long-term surgical waiting list in this state; the number of Queenslanders having an adverse event because they were not able to have colonoscopies in Queensland and the number of those who tragically lost their lives as a consequence of those members opposite and their incompetence; or the lack of effective administration in Queensland.

As I indicated earlier, the honourable member should have a significant amount of knowledge on this because she was probably the assistant minister for health in Queensland in about 2006 when the Labor government started to plan this. We would like to know what risk assessments were done by them? What risk assessments were done by the honourable member opposite as the assistant minister when she was advising the Labor Party minister of the day?

What we can assure the people of Queensland is that there will be an effective governance review of this particular issue, as there should be, and that is already in place. From the information available to me, there are no SAC 1 events which have arisen as a consequence of the implementation of this system—that is, people who have suffered permanent harm as a consequence of this system—and it relates to a number of SAC 2 or SAC 3 events. So they are not issues of harm or permanent harm to patients in Queensland. The issue is how were those opposite able to sign up a system where they did not do effective implementation processes behind it?

What did happen, as information has become available to me in the last 12 to 24 hours, when our ICU clinicians went through the process of implementation and risk assessments for the implementation of this system at the Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, is they identified a number of issues. All of those issues were fixed prior to its implementation either by manual workaround or by consultation with the software provider. Anything that has arisen subsequent to that has also been identified and addressed.

(Time expired)

Auditor-General's Report, Emergency Departments

Mr GIBSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the Auditor-General's report into emergency departments tabled this morning, and I ask: is it true the report shows Queensland has the most improved emergency department access in the whole of Australia and that it has been achieved without compromising patient safety?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Gympie for his question. I also thank him for his very strong and strident advocacy on behalf of his constituents and for his representation with regard to the need to ultimately improve the circumstances at the Gympie Hospital. Only a year or so ago he was showing me through that hospital and some of the maintenance issues which have been left by our predecessors who did not even bother to do a master plan around what was needed with regard to lift access and better ways to co-locate the CT scanner. So I thank the honourable member very much for his representation. It is true that the Auditor-General's report into emergency department performance reporting tabled in this parliament only a few minutes ago indicates that Queensland has the most improved emergency department performance in all of Australia.

Mrs Miller interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: It is interesting because the honourable member for Bundamba claimed credit in the Labor Party platform document, which I have a copy of here, for the best-performing emergency departments in all of Queensland. It is absolutely amazing how they have achieved so much in health care in opposition in Queensland because they could not achieve it in government. Just imagine what would have happened if they had gone into opposition earlier. We would have had an absolute streeter when it comes to the performance of health care. We would have had a healthcare system that was better than any in the world because it has improved so much in their 2½ years in opposition. Imagine if they had been languishing in opposition for 20 years; it would have improved out of sight.

The honourable member's colleagues in other places around Australia including Tasmania and Western Australia have not been able to achieve as much in opposition as the Labor Party has in this state. If we look at the Queensland emergency department performance and improvement between the 2012 target and the 2013 result, it is 5.6 per cent. In Western Australia it is 1.8. In New South Wales it is 1.8. In Tasmania, where Labor were in power for most of that time and recently in opposition—but maybe it will improve quickly now they are in opposition—it went backwards 4.9 per cent. In South Australia, a Labor government, it went backwards 1.9 per cent. Victoria has struggled, going backwards by 2.7 per cent. The Northern Territory has also gone back against the benchmark. Queensland has improved.

The other thing which is very important in the Auditor-General's reflection is that it has been done without compromising broader patient safety. That is one of the challenges around the world as you move towards ED performance targets—

(Time expired)

Queensland Health, Software

Ms TRAD: My question without notice is to the Premier. I refer to the answer given by the health minister to the question asked by the member for Bundamba, and I ask: given that the health minister has not confirmed that patients who were at risk or who may have suffered an adverse outcome from the use of the MetaVision intensive-care software were informed, will the Premier now commit to informing each patient or their family who may have suffered or been placed at risk of an adverse outcome from the use of the MetaVision intensive-care software today?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for South Brisbane for her question. Clearly she was not listening to the answer that the health minister gave a few short minutes ago. He has answered the question. I ask her to go and look at *Hansard* and do the work. Then maybe she will be able to correct some of the things that her colleague the member for Bundamba has been saying which are untrue and unnecessary. Let me just go and talk about—

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order.

Madam SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mrs MILLER: I find the comments of the Premier, in which he said that my comments were untrue, to be offensive and I ask them to be withdrawn.

Madam SPEAKER: I ask the Premier—under the standing orders the member has taken offence—to please withdraw.

Mr NEWMAN: I withdraw. As I was saying, the minister has answered the question. Let me now talk about where we have come in 2½ years in relation to Health. We had to sort out a lot of problems. What we have seen is a fake Tahitian prince scandal and \$1.2 billion blown on a Health payroll system. Last week we also saw that the Auditor-General, an independent statutory officer, has taken a very long and clear look at the construction of some major hospitals. The Auditor-General found that \$2.2 billion had been blown by the financially irresponsible malcontents in the Australian Labor Party who wasted money that could have built three new Prince Charles Hospitals.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. There are too many interjections on my left and they are not being taken. I warn members on my left. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: Where have we got to today? We have a record budget of \$13.6 billion, over \$2 billion a year more in Health and we are seeing a turnaround in the emergency departments. Again, those opposite need to listen to what the minister is saying in some of the answers he is giving in this place because the EDs have been turned around. We have an Auditor-General's report into that which confirms great improvements and great performance compared to other health services in the nation. We are seeing the elective surgery waiting times slashed. We are seeing the people who need public dental treatment getting seen and getting their teeth fixed. We are continuing to improve the system. Is there more to be done? Yes, there is. What is our objective? To make this the safest place in Australia to raise a family, and that starts with a fantastic, free public health system. That is what we are about.

This morning those opposite have come in here with a question or two about an IT system that was, again, a Labor brainchild. Again I echo my challenge that I gave earlier on: release the documentation, release the cabinet deliberations, release the risk assessments and the project evaluations, release the business case so we may properly evaluate where we are now and how we are going with this important piece of Health software. That is my challenge to them today. They have not been forthcoming in releasing other Health decisions that they made or, indeed, other decisions. But I live in hope.

Townsville Hospital and Health Service

Mr HATHAWAY: My question without notice is to the Premier. Has there been any improvement in the performance of the Townsville Hospital and Health Service emergency department resulting from record levels of investment and better management of Health under the LNP government?

Mr NEWMAN: The short answer to the member's question is yes, there has been a great improvement because day after day, week after week we continue to sort out the mess that we inherited from the Australian Labor Party—people who would not work hard enough for Queenslanders, people who thought that being in elected office or being a minister meant that you put things on autopilot and they just happened. This government is always taking very seriously our role as the head of government to make sure that things are changed for the better across the Queensland government. Health, of course, is one of our paramount, important areas that we are delivering on.

Along with the health minister and the honourable member, I was very pleased to see the stand-alone paediatric intensive care unit opened in Townsville last week. This stand-alone paediatric intensive care unit provides North Queenslanders with five dedicated beds for the kids of the north and the far north. That is something that we promised. That is something that this government has delivered. An additional two beds will be delivered in 2015, taking the total number to seven by the end of next year. That means that we have a full suite of intensive care services for children and adults at that hospital. The families of Townsville can now be reassured by that top quality health service being available in their city. I know that the member is excited about that, too, because he is the one, along with other members in the North Queensland area, who is talking to the mums and dads and knows how important this initiative has been.

I know that the member is also pleased with the latest health service performance statistics for Townsville. In March 2012—that is right, under the Australian Labor Party—62 per cent of people were seen in the emergency department within the four-hour benchmark. Now, as at September 2014, under the LNP government, that has gone to 71 per cent. Again, there is more to be done, but that is a great and significant improvement. In terms of dental services, back in March 2013 there were 2,207 people who had been waiting two years or more. It is great to hear now that that has essentially been reduced to zero. In terms of long-wait patients in Townsville, in March 2012, under Labor, a total of 747 people were waiting longer than the clinically recommended time for surgery. In September 2014, under this government, there were zero.

We get on and we are going to continue to sort out the mess to make this a safer place for families and to have the best free public hospital system in the nation. It also involves getting to the bottom of some of their botched IT projects—

(Time expired)

Strong Choices

Mr PITT: My question without notice is to the Premier. I table the Strong Choices privatisation document and page 14 of the Queensland Treasury Holdings financial report, which states, 'Revenue from finance leases is recognised on commencement of the lease, as a gain or loss on disposal of the assets,' and I ask: if Queensland Treasury says that a finance lease is a sale, or the disposal of the assets, why are millions of taxpayers' dollars being spent on advertising to tell Queenslanders that there are no asset sales?

Tabled paper. Extract from Queensland's Plan for Secure Finances and a Strong Economy, pp 33 and 34 [6371].

Tabled paper. Extract from Consolidated Queensland Treasury Holdings Pty Ltd—Financial Statements, p 14 [6372].

Mr NEWMAN: I commend the honourable member for his question because it was important to leave the other line of questioning. It was clearly leading them into the swamp as we saw more and more that they had their paw prints—may I say grubby paw prints—all over the decision about the

implementation of this intensive-care software. There was embarrassment on their faces this morning and if it were not so important, it would be a joy to behold. However, we are not taking this lightly because it is a serious matter and we will get to the bottom of it.

Madam SPEAKER: Premier, sorry to cause you to pause. I am going to reset the audio system. We have feedback from another mic being on. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: I will now turn to the honourable member's question. I just say to him that at the end of the day there is a very, very clear difference between a lease and a sale. Let me explain so that the honourable member will know how to explain it to his constituents. No doubt when he is out there he often has to answer this question. I am quite confident that people would say, 'But, Curtis, didn't you tell us only three or four years ago that it was a great idea to sell assets?' He would be there in the pub. 'I'll shout the bar,' says Curtis, and they would say, 'Yes. You are shouting the bar today and you are telling us that asset leases are bad today, but asset sales were good four years ago. Let's talk about that before we have those free beers, Curtis.' That is what they must say.

There is a difference. I reflect that the Leader of the Opposition is legally qualified. Am I correct? My understanding is that the Leader of the Opposition is legally qualified. I am sure that when the Leader of the Opposition did her legal training at university she would have clearly understood the difference between a lease and a sale. When you sell something, it is gone; someone else owns it and they have it forever. It is not yours anymore. When you lease something, it comes back and there are many examples. I will give honourable members an example: Hong Kong. Have they heard of Hong Kong? Over a hundred years ago the Chinese government leased Hong Kong to the British. What happened after 99 years? That is right, it came back.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Order members! I have already warned members on my left for interjections that are not being taken and I will start to warn members under the standing orders. Their noise is becoming disruptive and disorderly.

Mr NEWMAN: Hong Kong is back in the hands of the Chinese government today, so there is a difference and they know that there is a difference. They know that they are floundering out there in the electorate because people know that only four years ago those opposite were telling Queenslanders why things needed to be sold and today they are saying that it is a far better and more palatable proposition to lease, and that is just not on.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: They are being found out day after day because they have no plan. Unlike this government which is strong, united and has a plan for the state's future—

(Time expired)

Madam SPEAKER: I warn the Manager of Opposition Business under 253A for persistent interjections. I call the member for Cleveland.

Public Hospitals, Waiting Lists

Dr ROBINSON: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Minister, now that the LNP can-do government regularly publishes hospital waiting list data that the previous Labor government kept hidden, can the minister advise if there are any further plans to ensure the integrity and transparency of waiting list data?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Cleveland for his question and again thank him for his strong advocacy for the people of his electorate, as enunciated through his local Redlands Hospital and the other community health services there. It is very interesting to note that we have a Labor Party that has had a conversion to transparency which aligns to the time that they have been in opposition in Queensland, because if you go back 2½ years they routinely did not publish health performance data in this state. One of the first briefing notes that I received from my department came to me, as was routine, from the director-general saying, 'Minister, would you like to take the outpatient waiting list data to cabinet?' We said, 'No way. We are not going to do that because from now on that information is going to be published for the people of Queensland, as it should be.' Our performance is improving not only against our predecessor's, but also against national benchmarks.

It is also interesting to look at the Labor Party's policy platform. Whilst in opposition they take credit for achieving the shortest elective surgery waiting times and improved emergency department performance in their manifesto launched in June this year. I think the real corker is the one that says, 'Labor's priorities in government will be to restore harmony to the health system.' I am not so sure that if you talk to a Queensland Health nurse who used to ring us up in this place to ask for assistance to get paid, whether they think that would be 'harmony'. If you asked someone who had to go to St Vincent de Paul for emergency relief funding to put bread on their table, is that 'harmony' in the health system? Maybe it was harmony for the fake Tahitian prince and maybe it was harmony for Dr Patel, but it was not harmony for the patients who were left languishing on waiting lists in Queensland or those people who took advantage of the health system in this state under the Labor Party government.

As was quickly and properly enunciated by the Auditor-General today, we have to ensure that we have consistency in the process of reporting our data. As the AMAQ stated in their election manifesto published at the last state election, there should be an independent oversight of health performance data because of the performance of the members opposite. Now in Queensland we have Australia's first truly independent Health Ombudsman who is responsible for making sure that people's health complaints are assessed independently and responded to independently. What the LNP government has announced under Premier Campbell Newman is that from 1 July next year, on the first anniversary of the establishment of the Health Ombudsman in this state, he and his office will take responsibility for independently auditing health performance data in Queensland—the stuff that we have published since we have been in government and the stuff that was never published under the Labor Party when they were in government.

(Time expired)

Gladstone Electorate, Police Resources

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Minister for Police. With increased shipping movements in the Gladstone harbour from LNG coal and other commodities, what has been done to ensure that water police in Gladstone can be an effective presence on the harbour and combat potential terrorism activity while maintaining a regular presence for community safety?

Mr DEMPSEY: I thank the member for the question. It is a really important issue for all Queenslanders to ensure that their loved ones, whether on waterways, harbours or our deepest oceans, have the peace of mind of safety. That is why this government is achieving a great deal in that particular area. As a new government we made the commitment of three new catamarans—a \$12 million commitment to the Queensland Police Service. We increased police numbers by 850, of which 11 new police officers are now stationed in the Gladstone area. What we have seen in the Gladstone area is that reportable proactive policing offences have increased 14 per cent, and that is drugs, thugs and guns that are off streets and waterways.

As a government we work across all departments and not within silos. I work with the department of transport, and I know that you were there for the \$2 million vehicle tracking sensor announcement that was a first for Gladstone. As with other departments I work with marine safety, and we regularly do checks and balances on all other marine vessels as well as conduct safety traffic blitzes on the waterways in the Gladstone area. We have seen crime going down in these areas and we have record budgets in relation to the funding of our Police Service. For the first time new IT is allowing police officers on the water to communicate in a modern way without having to return to base. Our government's wireless network rollout of over half a billion dollars sees Queensland leading the rest of the states and territories right across the nation in relation to not just technology, but ensuring that the community has greater confidence in our police than ever before.

I say to the good member for Gladstone that my commitment and the commitment of all members is that we will continue to keep people on the waterways safe and secure not just now, but into the future. We have done that by revitalising those front-line services with \$12 million for more catamarans, more police officers than ever before and new technology. The legislation that we have introduced into this House, from the hooning legislation to the firearms legislation, has ensured that police are out from behind desks and are on our waterways, byways and highways protecting Queenslanders like never before. The results are there and the proof is in the pudding. Reportable crime rates right throughout the state are down 11 per cent. These are records like never before, and it is Queenslanders and the Police Service who are doing a magnificent job working together—

(Time expired)

Health Services

Mr RUTHENBERG: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the House on how the government's strong plan for improved front-line health services is helping patients waiting for ophthalmology surgery?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question. Like all members of this government, he is a tireless campaigner for the improvement of health services for his electorate and for all Queenslanders. He wants this to be the safest place in Australia to raise one's family, and it starts with great front-line health services. As the House would be aware, the member is also the chair of the Health and Community Services Committee. I know that he was delighted—because he has told me—when the Metro North Hospital and Health Service received a \$101 million budget increase this financial year.

I will just stop for a second, because one thing that I want to reflect on today is the campaign of the Labor Party. We should just reflect for a moment about the way they are going to run their campaign, because it is very clear now. I have seen things already on the streets of Brisbane where they are saying that the Health budget has been cut. They are saying that there have been huge cuts to front-line health services. This is a bit off topic, but they are also saying that teachers are slashed from schools. That is a matter that is with the Ethics Committee at the moment, so I will not go any further into that. We all know the game that is going to be played.

The last campaign of 2012 was a campaign of deceit, deception and quite outrageous porkies. We are going to see the same campaign this time. How do they have the gall? It just blows me away. We know that the Health budget has increased from \$1.987 billion to \$2.088 billion for the hospital and health service in metro north, and that is a 5.1 per cent increase.

We are busy doing everything we can within that budget increase to actually improve the health system, to put the focus back on patients. An example of this, going to the member's question, is the ophthalmology blitz. Last week in Bundaberg we announced \$23.4 million to clear the long wait list of patients—some 8,000 Queenslanders. We are going to see them, they will get a specialist appointment by June 2015 and they will get treated. We are going to make sure we protect them. We will try everything we can to save their sight or arrest the deterioration of their sight. I know that the member will have constituents who will benefit personally from this blitz. I also know that the member is really excited about the improvement in the metro north health service statistics. The long wait list for dental has gone from 14,307 in March 2013 to zero. There have also been improvements in emergency departments.

This government is passionate about having the best free public hospital system in the nation and doing everything we can to make this the safest place in Australia to raise a family.

(Time expired)

LNP, Fundraising

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Premier. I refer to comments made by Queensland's former acting Integrity Commissioner, David Solomon, who likened selling access to ministers through political fundraisers to prostitution, and I ask: will the government make the practice of selling access to ministers through political fundraisers illegal?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I refer him to comments that I made a long time ago, prior to being in government, in terms of how we would undertake fundraising activities in the LNP. They are, of course, a matter for the LNP.

Sadly, I have to reflect today on the breathtaking hypocrisy of those opposite, who have told the community on multiple occasions that they do not charge people money to sit down with Labor Party politicians. They say that they are off busy doing sausage sizzles. We have seen the fraudulence of that. In the next few weeks the Labor Party will be undertaking a fundraiser and charging \$2,500 to attend.

If I may have the undivided attention of honourable members for a moment, I make a really critical point. We on this side of the House attend such events that have been organised by our party, we go and talk to business and other people and we tell them what our policies are. We actually explain to them what we are doing to make this a better state. It is very clear from the Labor Party flyer that I have seen in relation to this event that there is a sad and disturbing difference between us.

The Labor Party are charging people \$2,500 plus GST. The businesspeople get to turn up, and the very clear imputation in the document is that the businesspeople get to say what the policies should be. That is what they are doing. Clearly, those opposite are about policy for sale. These are the people who said that they do not do those fundraisers.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members! There is too much noise in the chamber. I call the Premier.

Mr NEWMAN: When we have an event we talk to people about policies like the Strong Choices campaign, which is a proper plan that we have developed to actually take this state forward, create 25,000 new jobs, provide \$8.6 billion worth of new infrastructure and take the pressure off electricity bills. Those opposite say that they do not do these sorts of fundraising activities anymore. They have said countless times that they do not do it, but they are doing it. People should judge them harshly for again saying one thing and doing another. It is very clear. That is my response to the honourable member's question.

Queensland Health, Safety of Public Servants

Dr FLEGG: My question without notice is for the Minister for Health. Given the can-do LNP government now employs 800 more doctors in Queensland Health than in Labor's last full year in office, can the minister outline new plans to keep our front-line health workforce safe from violent attack?

Mr SPRINGBORG: I thank the honourable member for Moggill for the question. It is highly appropriate that the honourable member for Moggill asks such a question because he has significantly dedicated much of his life to administering care to people who are in need. No doubt many times during his career as a medical practitioner he has faced situations in which he was personally at risk from patients and circumstances in which many of those patients have been in a stupefied state as a consequence of alcohol or drug use.

Over the last five years some 24,500 Queensland front-line health workers, whether they be nurses, doctors or paramedics, have been assaulted in the course of administering assistance to people who are sick and injured in Queensland. Sometimes the assaults are committed by people who are extraneous to the event, but generally they are committed by the person receiving assistance. Whilst in the last year we have had the lowest rate of assault against our health workers in some four years, we are not taking safety for granted. We want to make sure that our health workers are protected, that we have in place appropriate occupational health and safety protections and that training and support are available for health workers in Queensland.

When I go to hospital emergency departments in this state it is not unusual for me to see security and police officers present, assisting front-line healthcare workers as they deliver assistance to those in need. Of course, paramedics, who turn up to a site, do not necessarily always have that security around them. When they turn up they are often the first responders there, and sometimes they find themselves in a very difficult and challenging situation.

Not only will we be raising awareness around this important issue of respect for our front-line healthcare workers in Queensland and guarding and assisting them when they need our support as they administer their support for us; this government has introduced legislation which will see, from 1 December this year, the maximum penalty for assault against healthcare workers increase from seven years to 14 years imprisonment.

We have drawn a line in the sand. We have basically said that it is unacceptable—beyond the pale—to assault healthcare workers in Queensland. In addition to the legislation there will be a major online marketing campaign to make sure people are aware of this. That campaign will be presented in establishments around Queensland that people frequent, warning them of the consequences of assaulting healthcare workers. We value our healthcare workers and these new laws will assist them.

(Time expired)

Lease of Public Assets

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer please advise the parliament of the measures that have been put in place to ensure the proposed lessees of the disposed Queensland assets do not inadvertently become the de facto owners of the assets as a result of their own capital expenditure on those assets during the proposed 50-plus-49-year lease?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the honourable member for his question. He does acknowledge that, in fact, the government's plan is for no asset sales but asset leases—asset leases for a 50-year term with a 49-year option, subject to strict compliance with the terms and conditions of the leases that are put in place. Importantly, as we have said all along, this will not be implemented until the people of Queensland have had an opportunity to consider our plan and, obviously, to consider the alternative. It is a bit hard at the moment: they do not have one. Nonetheless, we live in hope that there will be an alternative plan put forward by the most well resourced state opposition in the country—23 staff members for a very small number of members of parliament—about how they would pay down the \$80 billion worth of debt, how they would fund investment in the infrastructure that a growing state will need, and how, importantly, they would fund electricity price relief for Queenslanders, addressing the cost of living.

As the member for Dalrymple has pointed out, we are talking about leases. I think it is important that we consider what some other people might have said about leases. Mr Daniel Andrews, the Labor opposition leader in Victoria—

Mr Newman: He wants to lease the port.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Andrews wants to lease the Port of Melbourne in order to invest in infrastructure. There are not many things on which I would agree with a Labor Party person, I would have to be frank, but on this I find myself in agreement.

Dr Douglas interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: He was asked by Jon Faine on ABC Radio on 19 November 2013—Jon Faine is a well-regarded commentator—

A sale of a long-term lease. What does that actually mean? Are you selling the port?

Daniel Andrews replied—

No. At the end of that lease the port reverts back to every single Victorian.

That is what the leader of the Labor opposition in Victoria is talking about. What did the former Premier of this state say? She said—

Dr Douglas: Jobs for your mates! Deals for your mates!

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I apologise, Treasurer. I warn the member for Gaven under 253A for constant interjections. Your interjections are not being taken. I call the Treasurer.

Mr NICHOLLS: What did Anna Bligh say in the *Australian* on 9 December 2009? She said—

There's no doubt that Queenslanders would prefer to own as many of these assets as we can. The leasehold arrangement gives us the chance to do just that.

What we are quite clearly talking about is the opportunity to get a return—

(Time expired)

Metro South Hospital and Health Service

Mr DAVIES: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that since the LNP won office there has been an increase in the number of patients getting surgery in hospitals across the Metro South Hospital and Health Service?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for his question. I thank him for an interest in something that really matters to Queenslanders, because it has been a very illuminating question time today. On this side of the House we have people interested in what is going to positively impact on the day-to-day lives of Queenslanders whereas those opposite have run into one of their usual political problems in that they came in here ready for a political attack and they hit the wall, or perhaps that is the wrong analogy. Perhaps they all ran across the cliff and after about four of them went over the cliff they stopped, someone said, 'Quick, go that way,' so they did a quick right and others did not go over the cliff but then they hit another brick wall. It has been an interesting question time but no plan from those opposite and no interest about the turnaround in the health system in Queensland, and there has been a turnaround because we are determined to make this the safest place in Australia to raise a family. That starts with great front-line health services.

I thank the member for the question and I know the member has received thanks from a particular constituent because the man concerned had been waiting for dental treatment for close to nine years. I say to those opposite: shame on you! They are the ones who allowed such a situation to develop. With regard to the statistics from Metro South when it comes to dental waiting lists, in March 2013 there were 10,859 people on the long waitlist. The number waiting now has gone to zero. The same local constituent is also excited because he now knows that his eyes are going to be fixed thanks to our blitz on ophthalmology waiting lists. Some 8,000 Queenslanders who have been waiting longer than the clinically recommended time will be seen and we will do everything to fix their eyes or save their sight by the end of June 2015. In terms of long wait surgery, in March 2012 under Labor a total of 1,762 patients waited longer than the clinically recommended time. In September 2014 with an LNP government in power, it has gone down to 262—from 1,762 to 262. The surgery waiting list percentage of category 1 patients in Metro South treated within the recommended 30 days has increased from 81 per cent under Labor to 99 per cent under this government.

We undertook to fix the health system and we have been doing that. Day after day we have been dealing with the waste, the inefficiency and the ineptitude of the former government. Day after day we have been fixing up the mess that it created—doing better project management to deliver new infrastructure, making sure we sort out things like the Health payroll system and, yes, fixing issues to do with the intensive care unit IT system.

(Time expired)

Queensland Health, Software

Mrs D'ATH: My question is to the Minister for Health. I table a press release from iMDsoft from late 2012 which refers to a new agreement between the Queensland LNP government and iMDsoft and ask: will the minister confirm that he has personally overseen the expansion of the rollout of this software from four hospitals to the network of public hospitals right across the state?

Tabled paper: Media release, undated, titled 'Queensland Health expands the scope of its agreement with iMDsoft to include state-wide enterprise licence for MetaVision' [\[6373\]](#).

Mr SPRINGBORG: Maybe there was a cliff on the right-hand side, too—straight over that one! It is a little bit of a pity that the honourable member for Redcliffe was not in this place when Wayne Swan was ripping some \$22 million out of the Metro North Hospital and Health budget. Where was the honourable member at that time? She was in Canberra supporting Wayne Swan ripping \$22 million out of the Metro North Hospital and Health budget and inflicting great pain on those health workers. Notwithstanding that fact, since this government has been elected there has been a five per cent increase in the budget of the Metro North Hospital and Health Service—over \$100 million. Together with the Labor Party and with the complicity and the support of the honourable member for Redcliffe when she was in another parliament representing the people of that region as ineffectively as she is today, she was joining in ripping \$22 million out of the budget for Metro North. The simple reality of this is the following—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: I call the minister.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I do not know if the honourable member was listening earlier, but the clinicians identified challenges around this in May of last year because the intensive care directors are the ones responsible for the implementation. As I am informed, when they escalated those particular issues, every single one of the identified issues was addressed or there was a strategy to deal with it at the time the new system was implemented only a month or so ago. They said that if there were other emergent issues they would deal with that and it escalated, and that is exactly what happened in the case of the issue of the medication cancellation.

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. There are too many interjections on my left. They are not being taken and they are disorderly. I call the minister.

Mr SPRINGBORG: How does that contrast with the Labor Party? When the payroll system in Queensland was going kaput, those opposite were absolutely nowhere to be seen. In this Labor Party document here we also note that one of the great indicators in their manifesto is that they want to reinstate central coordination. We know what happened with central coordination! Central coordination caused the payroll system to go kaput. Central coordination in Queensland caused our

hospital performance data and statistics to go backwards. Central coordination saw the honourable member for Bundamba inviting a fake Tahitian prince to come and do with Queensland Health as he chose to do with Queensland Health, and we know what the circumstances are with regard to that.

Mrs MILLER: I rise to a point of order. I find the words of the Minister for Health to be untrue and offensive and I ask for them to be withdrawn.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members! While I am taking advice from the Clerk, that is not your excuse to start behaving badly and I will remove members from the chamber under the standing orders if you do that again. I ask for silence.

I was taking advice because I did not hear the comment that the member for Bundamba took offence to, but I understand that she was mentioned. Under the standing orders, she has taken offence and under the standing orders I ask the minister if he could please withdraw.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I withdraw, but there did appear to be some serendipitous coalescence as both of these individuals seemed to be in around about the same place at around about the same time. I will leave it to others to decide what other circumstances may have prevailed as a consequence.

Mrs MILLER: Madam Speaker—

Madam SPEAKER: Minister, I understand that that could be interpreted as a conditional withdrawal. I ask that you withdraw your comment unconditionally

Mr SPRINGBORG: I withdraw.

Madam SPEAKER: Yes, member for Bundamba.

Mrs MILLER: Madam Speaker, I understand that the minister—

Madam SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mrs MILLER: My point of order is that the minister did conditionally—

Madam SPEAKER: Please take your seat. Member for Bundamba, you are now warned under standing order 253A because you were not paying attention to the chair.

BreastScreen Queensland

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. Given that the can-do LNP government is making a record investment into BreastScreen services, can the minister advise of any new BreastScreen support initiatives for women?

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: I wish to acknowledge one more school that is visiting today: Corinda State High School, in the electorate of Mount Ommaney.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Newman Government, Performance

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.00 am): Under the Westminster system of democracy, we have a convention called ministerial responsibility—something that this government knows absolutely nothing about.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Just pause the clock. Sorry, Leader of the Opposition, for interrupting you. I am going to warn the Attorney-General under standing order 253A for interjecting as he was moving across the chamber. I ask other members who are leaving the chamber to please do so quietly.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is called ministerial responsibility—something that this health minister knows absolutely nothing about. What has been revealed today in question time is the complete incompetence of the Minister for Health. What has been revealed in this House today is the truth and that is that, back on 24 October 2012, this LNP government signed a contract to expand the state-wide MetaVision service—something that the minister failed to even know about today. He was completely caught unaware and off guard.

There is a crisis out there and that crisis has happened directly under the watch of the Minister for Health. We now know that it was this government that signed off on the rollout of MetaVision. Then we find out very clearly that problems started to arise in July 2013. In July 2013, a brief was prepared and submitted to the executive director of RBWH about issues presenting risk to patient safety.

That was very clearly my question today to the Premier: what is the risk to patient safety and why will the Premier not release the secret briefing note that was prepared and submitted to the executive director in July 2013 when this issue was first raised? We know that in that same month, July 2013, this health minister met with the chair of the Metro North HHS. What was discussed? Was it ever raised with the minister at this meeting or any subsequent meeting that there was a problem that was identified and that there were concerns to patient safety? That is a fundamental question.

What has been revealed today is that this government will not answer questions put to it by the opposition, questions that the people of Queensland want answers to. So here we are, some 14 months later, in October 2014, and we ask the minister when did he first become aware of this? When did he first become aware of it? There was the signing of the contract in October 2012. Problems were identified in July 2013. There were meetings with the chair of the health board. But when did the minister become aware of it? Over the weekend!

This is a government that is not transparent. This is a government that is not accountable. Otherwise this minister would do his job and he would know the answers to these questions. For him to come in here today and not have the answers and not know the full details does not put any faith that this minister is capable of carrying out any duties given to him by the Premier.

The member for Bundamba and the member for South Brisbane followed up with a series of questions, which were very simple questions about whether the patients have been alerted that there could have been issues. Once again, there was no follow-up. This government is hiding from the truth. This government is not giving the people of Queensland and the patients the due care and consideration that they fundamentally deserve.

What is this government doing now to rectify the situation? Queenslanders are still kept in the dark. Is anyone concerned that this is happening under the minister's watch? All Queenslanders should be concerned that this is happening under the minister's watch because, under the minister's watch, we have seen over 4,700 jobs axed from Queensland Health. Under this incompetent minister's watch, 4,700 people have lost their jobs. What else has happened under this minister's watch? We had the doctors crisis. This minister is incompetent, he should not be holding the title of minister of the Crown and this Premier should be axing him as soon as possible.

Today, during question time we heard the Minister for Health talk about harmony. We know that in the state of Queensland over the past 2½ years there has been nothing to do with harmony. We have seen fight after fight. This government has fought with every known Queenslander possible. From the doctors, to the lawyers, to the judges, to the teachers, to the firefighters, to the ambulance officers, no-one is safe under this government. It has picked fights with many. But now we find out that things are not so harmonious in the LNP. Not content with picking fights with Queenslanders, the LNP members have now turned on themselves and are picking fights with each other. Over the past three weeks the LNP has been tearing itself apart. The preselection battles have become a public spectacle for all Queenslanders to see.

Queenslanders deserve better. They deserve a government that is governing for all of them, not consumed with themselves. It needs to be focused on Queensland now and into the future. Unfortunately, this is a government in turmoil. We have seen the debacle over the member for Moggill. We have seen controversy around the member for Redlands.

Yesterday, I was very pleased to join my colleague the member for Stafford, Dr Anthony Lynham, down at the Redlands for the launch of our Labor candidate, Deb Kellie, for the seat of Redlands. Deb is a candidate who the people of Redlands would be proud of. She is a barrister. She has lived in the area for many years with her husband. She is passionate about the area and fights each and every day to make sure that the people of Redland have their voices heard.

Over the past 2½ years Queenslanders have been let down by this Newman government. Time and time again it has let them down. Now, five months out from the election, we see a massive waste of taxpayers' money going on political advertising. Make no mistake: over the next few months that advertising buy will increase. People from all around the state are stopping me to tell me that they are sick and tired of the waste of taxpayers' funds. They are sick and tired of the full-page ads, the radio ads, the television ads where this government is trying to portray an asset sale as merely a lease. But we know that it is all spin and we know that Queenslanders can see right through this.

Recently in Bundaberg I sat on a back deck with some residents. We talked about political advertising and the asset sales agenda of this government. They said to me, 'Annastacia, we get it. We know exactly what they are on about here. Why is this money going into advertising when the money could be going into flood mitigation works in Bundaberg?' That is how much this government cares about the people of Bundaberg and the horrific floods that they went through. The residents want to make sure that they are safe and secure and can live fulfilling lives in their community. Why is this government wasting money on political advertising when this money could be directed to front-line services? This money could be going towards putting on more nurses, paramedics and ambulance officers. We know some \$20 million has already been spent. How much more will be spent? The ads are coming thick and fast. The latest are ads about the G20 cultural celebrations. We are hearing that those cultural celebrations could be in the vicinity of some \$10 million, when this government has cut arts funding to organisations right across the state.

What we have seen this morning from the Minister for Health is nothing but a sign of disrespect for people in our hospitals right across the state. Queenslanders deserve more. Queenslanders deserve to know why this bungle happened under this health minister's watch. Why did he only know about it on the weekend when the contract was signed in October 2012 and when it was highlighted to him in July 2013? Why did the minister do nothing? If this minister was a competent minister he would be across these issues. This should be a wake-up call for him. He should now understand that this is a central issue, an issue that Queenslanders want answers on. There should be no more putting his head in the sand. Queenslanders deserve answers and they deserve those answers today.

Gold Coast International Marine Expo

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (11.11 am): A couple of weekends ago in the state seat of Coomera there was a fine demonstration of business opportunity on display at the Gold Coast International Marine Expo. I see the smile on the face of Mr Deputy Speaker. He attended the official opening and spent some time at the marine expo, as did a number of my colleagues from this side of the House. It was a pleasure to walk through the 3.2 kilometres of displays. Everything to do with the marine industry was on display at the facility. It is a massive facility. The Coomera marine precinct is, in fact, the biggest marine precinct for the construction and sale of boats in Australia. It is far and away the biggest area for this type of work. We see as a result of this much larger number of displays than last time a demonstration that business is being rebuilt, that the marine industry is on its way back from the lows of 2009 when we saw hundreds—in fact, thousands—of people having to leave the industry because of the effects of the global financial crisis that hit us in 2008. They are coming back.

We are now looking at a further boost to that comeback of the industry by way of the Coomera dredge sediment management facility that is necessary for us to be able to properly dredge the Coomera River. In cases such as the Broadwater the sands can be taken out into the deep and dumped and only come back to shore in front of Surfers Paradise, but unfortunately the material that is in the Coomera River cannot simply be dumped in other areas. It needs to be processed. It is a sediment. People would appreciate it is a river. The sediment does need to be dumped somewhere so therefore this facility had to be put in place. It could have cost us a great deal of growth in the Coomera marine precinct if we were not able to pull this together. I thank the Deputy Premier for his support in facilitating this dredge facility.

Having this facility means that we will be able to bring much bigger boats into the Coomera marine precinct for fit-outs and refits and we can build bigger boats. In fact, one of the local boat builders who does some work for the state government as well was telling me that he employs around 60 people in his boat manufacturing and refit facility and that that number will immediately jump by 30 people. That is a 50 per cent increase in the size of his business and another 30 jobs in the Coomera electorate.

This is about economic development in the largest electorate in Queensland. It is not the largest by land size, nor by the number of high-rise buildings, but the largest electorate in Queensland by elector. In 2009 there were 28,764 electors in the state seat of Coomera. That number has risen to 37,631 as at September—15.68 per cent over the average of 32,500 electors per electorate around the state. It is the fastest growing region in Australia. We have seven new schools coming online by 2015. We also have a TAFE that has been there since 2009. This is an area that is demonstrating confidence in the future, a confidence that is being met by this government in providing the challenging infrastructure that is needed for the state seat of Coomera to move forward in the Northern Gold Coast area.

Townsville Hospital and Health Service

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (11.16 am): I would like to take this opportunity to highlight the significant achievements made by the Townsville Hospital and Health Service Board and, importantly, our wonderful health clinicians and staff. The board presented its second annual report this month. The 2013-14 year was the second year of operation of the Townsville Hospital and Health Service governed by its board. It continues the good work it performed in its first year. Just as a quick snapshot for those in the House who are unaware of just how large an area this service takes in, the Townsville Hospital and Health Service is the major provider of public health services in the Townsville region, which includes as far north as Cardwell, as far south as Home Hill and as far west as Richmond. It is also the tertiary and teaching hospital for the much larger demographic of North Queensland with a catchment of about 650,000 people covering some of the most rural, regional and isolated communities in our state. In 2013-14 there were 67,331 people admitted to its facilities; 116,206 people attended emergency departments; and the number of surgical operations at the Townsville Hospital was 7,364 elective surgeries and 5,327 emergency operations.

Over the past two years there have been significant improvements across all areas of care: an extra \$7 million of care including more than 500 surgeries and 3,000 specialist medical and surgical outpatient appointments; a \$3.5 million investment in a mobile health van and staff accommodation on Palm Island; and more than 2,000 telehealth provider and receiver consultations—which was a 57 per cent increase from the previous year.

There have also been a number of additional services introduced over the past year: outreach cardiology clinics commenced in Charters Towers and Ingham; the North Queensland Persistent Pain Management Service established outreach services to Cairns, Mackay and Mount Isa; the delivery of two additional linear accelerators which treat cancer with high energy X-rays; the Townsville Hospital became the first regional hospital in Australia accredited to offer a neurology training program; and the Hospital in the Home service commenced and treated more than 100 patients, freeing up more than 300 bed days.

The front-line health results speak for themselves. In relation to surgery long waits, in March 2012 there were 747 on the list and now there are none—that is as at the end of the September quarter this year. There are also shorter emergency stays. I note the Auditor-General's Report No. 3 tabled today. In the calendar year 2012, 65 per cent of patients were treated in four hours; in the calendar year 2013 it was almost 80 per cent. I table an extract of the Auditor-General's report No. 3.

Tabled paper. Extract from Queensland Audit Office Report No. 3: 2014-15, p 78, 'Appendix D—HHS performance against the four-hour target' [\[6374\]](#).

There have also been great results in dental long-wait lists. In March 2012, 2,207 people were on that list and that number has been reduced to zero. As we heard earlier this morning, last week Premier Campbell Newman and Minister Lawrence Springborg visited the hospital to officially open the new stand-alone Paediatric Intensive Care Unit. The unit provides North Queenslanders with five dedicated paediatric intensive care beds, which also was an election commitment. I note that an additional two beds will be added in 2015, taking the total number to seven by the end of next year. The Townsville hospital's new 45-bed subacute unit was also officially opened last week. The

\$22.5 million facility includes the hospital's geriatric evaluation and management units and additional rehabilitation beds. The new facility is a home-like environment that helps patients transition to living in their own homes safely and will focus on getting patients back into their homes sooner.

Last week we also announced a new state-wide campaign to slash the eye surgery long-wait list. In Townsville, 251 patients are likely to benefit from that. This new state-wide campaign will improve the quality of life for patients who, for too long, have been queuing for treatment for vision impairment or debilitating eye conditions. I will table an extract from today's *Townsville Bulletin*, which states—

... new figures show that is a substantial improvement on previous years, when more than 22,000 people were floundering on the 'waiting list for the waiting list'.

Figures provided by the hospital show 13,201 patients were waiting for a specialist outpatient appointment on October 23, down from 17,582 in July and 22,617 in July 2012 ...

The THHS is seeing more patients faster for specialist outpatient appointments ... Townsville Hospital receives more than 45,000 referrals and provides more than 120,000 specialist outpatient appointments.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Townsville Bulletin*, dated 28 October 2014, by Samantha Healy, titled 'Hospital backlog falls—Waiting times slashed' [6375].

This financial year, our HHS has a budget of \$758.1 million, which is an increase of 13.6 per cent compared to Labor's last budget. That equates to an extra \$90.9 million each and every year. What is more, the Townsville HHS Board, which is made up of local people, and our fantastic local clinicians, practitioners and staff are providing increasingly efficient and effective health outcomes, uniquely tailored to meet the current and future needs for our North Queensland patient demographic. Well done! We are very proud and extremely grateful—

(Time expired)

Sale of Public Assets

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (11.22 am): Since the last sitting of parliament, our radios and TVs have been saturated with pro-privatisation political propoganda at taxpayers' expense to, quoting the Treasurer, 'perpetuate a con on the people of Queensland' to say that there are 'no asset sales'. To have taxpayers funding advertising that says 'no asset sales' is the height of arrogance and dishonesty. Taxpayers are unwillingly paying for advertising that is undemocratic, untruthful, political and misleading.

As I outlined in the last sitting of parliament, the Premier has called a lease 'selling off the "silverware"'. The Deputy Premier has said a lease is 'a sale', a 'sell-off' and 'sneaky'. The Treasurer has said a lease is 'giving away the farm'. The Treasurer has been saying that the LNP's record \$37 billion privatisation program will occur through finance leases and he has implied that a finance lease is some mystical arrangement where the people keep control over the assets.

What does Queensland Treasury say about a 'finance lease'? The latest Queensland Treasury Holdings annual report under this Newman LNP government states that—

Leases are classified as a finance lease whenever the terms of the lease transfer substantially all the risks and rewards of ownership to the lessee. All other leases are classified as operating leases.

The report also states that—

Revenue from finance leases is recognised on commencement of the lease, as a gain or loss on disposal of the assets.

So the independent Treasury says that a finance lease involves the 'disposal of the assets' and that all risks and rewards of ownership are transferred to the lessee. Despite this being in black and white, in answer to my question this morning the Premier still insists they are not selling assets.

To use taxpayers' money to tell people that a long-term finance lease is not a sale when Treasury calls it a 'disposal of the assets' is plain wrong, just as it is wrong for the LNP to claim it is seeking a mandate while spending, in secret, an estimated \$300 million of taxpayers' money on asset sales consultants. Last week, ads went out for another round of technical, environmental and property advisors to add to the 17 consultant appointments to date. Spending millions more on advertising saying 'no asset sales' and claiming that Queenslanders will keep control over their assets is a 'con', it is 'dishonest' and it is 'sneaky'. The LNP is not seeking a mandate for asset sales as it promised. Instead, it is saturating the airwaves with a political propoganda campaign designed to hide that its record asset sell-off is even happening.

The *Australian Financial Review* has at least provided a point of reality, rightfully reporting that this government is on an 'asset sale binge' and that, 'The Queensland government has sold more than \$10 billion of assets since being elected in 2012, despite claiming that it would wait for a privatisation mandate ...'. It is Orwellian to claim that a lease is not a sale and the people will have 'control' over the assets. The government may as well be running ads saying that black is white and that two plus two is five. Those ads are untruthful, just like the taxpayer funded flier claiming that Labor left \$80 billion of debt. That figure is made up. It is not in any budget paper or financial statement on record anywhere.

The Treasurer is basing his case for asset sales on untruths, because it is all he has. Now, a record asset sell-off via long-term leases is his only plan to retire \$25 billion in debt. The businesses proposed for sale currently have debt of around \$18 billion. Those businesses pay for their interest bills prior to delivering a return to government, so the debt paydown excluding those businesses is likely to be less than \$7 billion. Meanwhile, general government debt excluding government owned businesses has increased by \$12.8 billion since the LNP came to office. Therefore, even after a record asset sell-off, debt excluding government owned businesses is likely to be higher under the Newman government than when the previous government left office. It is no wonder that they are spending taxpayers' money to tell people fibs! I wonder what the interest savings will actually be?

Mr Hart interjected.

Mr PITT: If only \$7 billion of general government debt is retired, the saving will be just \$360 million per annum and not the \$1.3 billion savings figure the Treasurer likes to prattle on about.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr PITT: Those on the crossbenches and those opposite might want to listen to this, as they might learn something. I think it is time for the Treasurer to again get out his crayons. Over the forward estimates, lost revenue is expected to exceed the interest savings by nearly \$8 billion. I repeat: \$8 billion! The Newman government's plan will involve the repayment of \$7 billion in general government debt in exchange for a net loss of \$8 billion over just four years. That does not make fiscal sense, not by a longshot.

This is not a plan for Queensland. It is a plan to tear a structural hole in the budget bottom line to fund election pork-barrelling for all those opposite who do not want to be oncercs. It is a plan for a widening budget black hole that will only place a double tax on future generations, through both higher prices and lost revenue to the state. The only way to stop the LNP's reckless plans for the largest asset sell-off in Queensland's history of \$37 billion worth is to vote Labor at the next election and absolutely positively put the LNP last.

Tourism Industry; Hartley's Crocodile Adventures

 **Mr TROUT** (Barron River—LNP) (11.26 am): Tourism can be a very frustrating business. In over 25 years in the tourism industry, some things never change. Ron Livingston is a director of Pinnacle Marketing in Cairns. In 1988 he commenced his tourism career at the Great Barrier Reef Wonderland, Townsville—maybe in Thuringowa—after 16 successful years in commercial broadcasting. Over the past 20 years, Ron has visited 30 countries on six continents, selling Tropical North Queensland and particular products. He has held the voluntary positions of chairman of Cairns Tourism Association, director of Tourism Tropical North Queensland and director of ATEC. Without a doubt, he is one of Queensland's tourism gurus. Ron tells me the biggest enemy of successful tourism destination marketing has always been parochialism managed by people who have little or no knowledge of this vibrant economic powerhouse. History shows that decisions made by the uninformed have cost various economies millions of dollars in lost revenue.

Last week Ron was telling me how recently he read of the rise, fall and rise of tourism in the US state of Colorado. Dr Bill Siegel of Longwoods International cited this in his paper published in 2009. That paper was based on 20 years of detailed research. For many years, Colorado was the No. 1 summer destination in the United States, ahead of California and Florida. In 1993 the promotional budget for Colorado was cut to zero and this approach continued until the year 2000. Colorado's market share dropped by 30 per cent or US\$2 billion during this period and it fell in the visitation stakes from No. 1 to No. 17. Once funding was reinstated, the state of Colorado recovered and returned to good health. In fact, the Colorado state treasury estimated that its ROI was \$12 for every single dollar invested.

Tourism worldwide is massive and growing. Destination marketing is of supreme importance to countries, cities, regions and events. For many regions it is not possible to compete in dollar terms due to the massive costs involved, so the answer is collaboration. Regions need to work closely with their RTO, which needs to work in a collaborative way with the state tourism office, which, in turn, does exactly the same thing with the national tourism office.

In Tropical North Queensland, the RTO, Tourism Tropical North Queensland, leads the way in an excellent fashion. LTOs in the regions are there to support and collaborate with the goals of the entire destination, not develop different directions and strategies that do not sit well with the regional approach. Councils and the communities in these regions gain enormous financial benefits from a growing, healthy tourism industry which of itself encourages tourism investment and infrastructure development, growing the economic benefits for all.

Specifically, let us look at a local example. Since the deamalgamation of Port Douglas from the Cairns Regional Council and the split between Atherton and Mareeba shires what has happened? Douglas Shire Council has recognised the value of the industry to their economy and has maintained a destination marketing spend in excess of \$400,000 of ratepayers' money per year. Tourism Port Douglas and Daintree uses member marketing companies to represent their region in appropriate markets in the interests of economies of scale and it works hand in glove with Tourism Tropical North Queensland, the RTO for the region. More importantly, Port Douglas is experiencing great results in attracting visitors domestically and internationally.

Since the deamalgamation of councils on the Atherton Tablelands it is a different story. Tourism revenue generated within the boundaries of the combined councils currently stands at approximately \$170 million, or eight or nine per cent of GRP, and provides 1,000 direct jobs in the region, according to Bill Cummings's research of 2014. The local tourism organisation, Tropical Tablelands Tourism, receives in total \$70,000 in the form of council contributions. Some of this funding is tied to individual projects decided on by local councils and their officers.

These same two councils fund 11 visitor information centres which provide ground support to visitors to the region at a ratepayer cost of \$250,000. So almost four times the amount of money invested in tourism post arrival support in that region is spent to support a \$70,000 investment—a classic case of the cart before the horse.

The government will not fill this financial gap and nor do reasonable folk expect it to. It is my view that RTOs around the state will become more and more reliant on revenues raised within their local regions as years go by and much less reliant on direct or competitive funding provided by the state. Regions decide their own future at the end of the day and if the train has left the station by the time they get to the platform, so be it.

I would also like to acknowledge the 80th anniversary of Hartley's Crocodile Adventures—North Queensland's oldest attraction. It is operated by the Freeman family. I thoroughly recommend this great attraction to anyone travelling north for future holidays.

(Time expired)

Newman Government, Performance

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (11.31 am): This time of year is ordinarily filled with joyful anticipation. The end of the school year is close. Christmas is obviously approaching and the holiday season is not too far away. But for those opposite the end of year is filled with fearful anticipation of what activities the chaotic, shambolic LNP leadership will inflict on its LNP backbenchers.

We know this because at the end of 2012 the LNP leadership, through their arrogant, mindless sackings and cuts, saw three LNP backbenchers defect from the party room. Then at the end of 2013 the intemperate and arrogant Premier decided to just sack the entire Parliamentary Crime and Misconduct Committee, including his own backbench members. As we approach the end of 2014, with not too many sitting days left, we know that LNP backbenchers sit and wait in fearful anticipation about what will happen in the LNP's danger zone, particularly considering a state election is not too far away.

Already we have seen the LNP party room and the party executive at odds. They are at war. That war is being played out in the seat of Moggill. We know that this war is known to Queenslanders. It is very familiar. It is the war that has raged between the old Nationals and the old Liberals for many, many decades. It saw divorce and then reunion and then divorce and then reunion. Then there was the classic incident at the beginning of the 2006 state election campaign where the current member

for Moggill, who was the then Leader of the Liberal Party, and the current member for Southern Downs, who was the then Leader of the Opposition, could not determine who would be the leader should the coalition win the state election. That has tainted them ever since.

What we have in Moggill is a microcosm of the larger war that is raging between the parliamentary party and the LNP state executive. What is more, this war is raging around not just dominance but also who will be leader after the next state election. We know this because the member for Moggill said, after he was barred by the state executive from actually throwing his hat in the ring for preselection in Moggill, that the faceless people within the LNP had denied him the opportunity to run for his seat—the seat that he has stood for and represented for over 10 years—because it was ‘a factional battle for who leads the LNP after Campbell Newman is gone, whether or not that is before or after the election’.

The member for Moggill also claimed that the LNP party leadership had lost faith in Campbell Newman’s leadership. What they are doing is moving pieces on the chessboard in order to secure the next leader of the LNP. We know that the member for Southern Downs has done his utmost to have Dr Christian Rowan win preselection in the seat of Moggill, but he was resoundingly rejected by the party members in Moggill after the LNP executive gave him the tick of approval. We know that the member for Southern Downs wants another National Party vote within the LNP party room, but he has not got through the Liberal Party membership of Moggill. We know that the Premier wanted Dr Bruce Flegg, the current member for Moggill, to be given the right to participate. But we also know that the party executive probably will not let him do it a second time round either, as has been clearly articulated by Bruce McIver, the president of the LNP.

Who will be the next leader of the LNP? Currently, Sportsbet has Tim Nicholls at \$2.10—the shortest odd. Then we have Mr Emerson, the transport minister, at \$2.75.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms TRAD: He must be very happy. He must be out of pocket quite a bit. He must be extremely happy that he is No. 2. Then we have the member for Southern Downs and then Langbroek and Seeney. There is no mention of Mr Bleijie.

(Time expired)

Electricity Prices

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (11.37 am): In the Beaudesert electorate and across Queensland, electricity prices are a major concern for households and for business. Electricity prices have risen dramatically over the last decade. This is largely as a result of increased charges for the poles and wires in the network that are owned and operated by Energex, Ergon and Powerlink. Literally billions of dollars have been spent on this network over the last decade. As a result, Queenslanders, by and large, have a very reliable electricity network, but this reliability has come at a huge cost.

The poles-and-wires cost, known as network charges, make up approximately 50 per cent of electricity prices. So when the Labor Party in 2010 oversaw Energex, Ergon and Powerlink put in place a five-year spending plan in the network that has seen electricity prices continue to rise over the last 4½ years, they really were asleep at the wheel. This government is setting about doing all that it can to bring downward pressure to electricity prices.

Firstly, back in 2012 we froze tariff 11, the household tariff, for a year. Secondly, the government has worked to take out around \$2 billion worth of expenditure from Energex, Ergon and Powerlink. That is \$2 billion less in costs to be passed on—\$2 billion less to be taken from Queenslanders’ pockets through their electricity bills. Thirdly, we have reviewed the strict reliability standards put in place over the last 10 years—standards that have led to the gold-plating of networks. This gold-plating is a major contributor to higher power prices for consumers. Ironically, the effect of this gold-plating is higher prices, lower demand and conditions where the electricity grid simply will not utilise assets that have been built because of the lower demand for electricity.

The government has also looked at the underlying cost factors for electricity prices. The cost-of-living fund announced recently will see \$3.4 billion set aside from the lease of some state assets to remove the cost of the solar feed-in tariff from electricity bills. People receiving the 44c feed-in tariff will continue to receive these payments from the government, but this cost will be removed from the cost of electricity borne by all Queenslanders. Average households will save, under this plan, \$577 over the next five years.

For small businesses on tariff 20 or 22, the savings are on average \$1,400 over five years based on annual consumption of 15,250 kilowatt hours. I know some small business irrigators in my electorate that use tariff 22 and consume significantly more than 15,250 kilowatt hours of electricity per year will save several thousand dollars over the next five years. The cost-of-living fund, and savings for all Queenslanders on electricity bills, can only be implemented through the lease of some state assets after obtaining a mandate from the people of Queensland.

Finally, looking at network charges, Energex and Ergon have recently come out and said that they expect network charges over the next five years to increase by a rate that is below the rate of inflation. Now, if that eventuates, it would bring some stability and relief for electricity consumers—because that 50 per cent portion of electricity bills that is network charges would be largely stable for five years. I say to the government, to Energex, to Ergon, to Powerlink and to the Australian Energy Regulator that ultimately signs off on these charges: our households, our businesses, our irrigators need a break and some stability over the next five years, and keeping network charges stable is essential to achieving this.

All of these things are a step in the right direction to rein in electricity prices. I also want to see the threshold for what constitutes a large user of electricity increased, especially in the primary producer space. At the moment it is at 100 megawatts, and I say that this threshold for irrigators and primary producers is too low. When it is dry—and we are in the grip of a crippling drought right now—irrigators stay on, day in and day out—24 hours a day in some cases—to get crops out of the ground. When primary producers become a large user and the additional network demand charges are applied, thousands of dollars are added to the cost of doing business for our primary producers and farmers. We need to see that threshold raised. I believe it is higher for farmers in Victoria, allowing greater use of electricity before demand charges are applied.

This government is dealing with the cost of the poles and wires, dealing with gold-plating, dealing with onerous reliability standards and dealing with the cost of the solar feed-in tariff. The carbon tax is gone—no thanks to the Australian Labor Party for that—and I urge the government to continue all the work it has been doing to put downward pressure on electricity prices to bring relief for households, certainty for business and a brighter future for Queensland's economy.

Grantham, Floods

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (11.41 am): 'Equality at risk in the west,' says Rupert Murdoch in today's *Australian* newspaper as the headline story in a deeply concerning series of comments made by that newspaper's founder and owner. He has warned that government policies have caused a 'massive shift' in societies around the Western world to benefit the super-rich which is leaving a massive legacy of social polarisation between rich and poor, the haves and have-nots, with the middle classes—once the great powerhouse of the Western world—being crushed in the middle. I put it to members today that Rupert Murdoch is absolutely right and is timely in what he has said. Nowhere is this more clear than in our state of Queensland. I table the article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Australian*, dated 28 October 2014, by Paul Kelly, titled 'Equality at risk in the West: Murdoch' [\[6376\]](#).

If this is the mining state, if this is meant to be where fortunes are made, if this is meant to be the energy powerhouse of the nation, then it is also the place where social polarisation is happening, where we have created a rich superclass that get everything they want and the poor can do as they please. And it is a shame upon us all, because there are clear examples where their blood has been left on our hands because their voices have been crushed and their voices ignored.

The unresolved tragedy of the flood of 10 January 2011 in Grantham that took the lives of 13 innocent Queenslanders must not go down in history as a disaster without answers for such a major loss of life. The victims and their families were mostly poor, not well educated, being battlers living on the fringe of major urban societies. They had no influence then and since the disaster they have even less influence. They have been ignored, chastised, silenced and in some cases even punished. Those who demanded fairness were treated as mentally ill or publicly criticised. The Premier in his letter in response to the request by the Lockyer Valley mayor, Councillor Steve Jones, refused to investigate the matter correctly. I have tabled this letter previously. The Premier refused to investigate and address the serious inconsistencies raised in the only day of hearings devoted to Grantham during the wider flood inquiry.

Queenslanders must know that at 4 pm on the day of the flood the sun was shining. Water from heavy rain to the west and north-west of Helidon rapidly filled Lockyer Creek but was blocked by a dam and bund wall at Wagner's quarry. The dam and bund wall burst. A tidal wave 2.5 metres high crossed the flood plain eastward at 15 kilometres, taking a course other than the Lockyer Creek tracking along the railway line. This smashed into Grantham two kilometres downstream from the quarry dam. Thirteen people lost their lives and many houses in Grantham were destroyed. Yet not one person from the Floods Commission of Inquiry physically set foot in Grantham. Furthermore, conclusions as to what occurred in Grantham were based on a flawed engineer's hydrology report which was done at the peak of the flood using computer modelling alone.

Inexplicably, critical eye witnesses were refused the right to give specific testimony, which would have clarified what caused the flood and why it caused so much damage. It is not unreasonable to say this appears to be a cover-up. It is not acceptable for members here today to sit comfortably on parliamentary leather when these totally unprepared families of victims at Grantham, affected communities and surviving victims suffer in silence. It brings great shame on Queensland and this 54th Parliament that as members we have not risen to this challenge facing us to get those victims at Grantham and all Queenslanders much needed answers. In Queensland we have had droughts, cyclones, fires and floods. There have been times of great prosperity and tremendous hardship which led us from being divided to positions of unity. We have always treated fellow Queenslanders equally and delivered fair justice to all. Why are those in Grantham less deserving?

Today I am demanding a royal commission of inquiry into all matters relating to what occurred in Grantham before, during and after this so-called flood event. We should not just fill in the gaps from the flawed flood inquiry but also delve deeply into discovering what went wrong at Grantham. It must identify what and who were at fault. It should clarify what further steps need to be taken including taking full evidence from witnesses to verify what has occurred. It should then detail a path for prosecutions for those who were responsible. Those actions that led to this must be held to account. God forbid, we must ensure this never, ever happens in Queensland again. And remember: there are great things that have been said in the past. Even the meek have their story to tell and they must be allowed to do so. The stories of those who were affected by the flood in Grantham must be heard. We need to hear them. We need to have their problem addressed. They need acquittal from the process and this should be part of the steps this parliament should deliver for those people.

Tourism Industry

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (11.46 am): Let me enlighten honourable members of a few of this government's activities during the last 2½ years—all achieved by working closely in partnership with industry and local governments to refresh and reinvigorate iconic tourism branding after years of neglect from successive years of Labor. Our \$23 billion tourism industry is recognised by the Newman government as one of the four economic pillars of our great state. At the heart of our approach has been collaboration through partnerships, backing our strengths, clearly identifying our challenges and developing innovative solutions to strategic issues. By pooling our efforts across the industry we are 'growing the pie' so each region can benefit from a much larger slice of the action.

Our annual DestinationQ forums have, in a short space of time, become recognised as Queensland's premier industry and government event. We gather to discuss key issues and seek joint commitment—challenging delegates to throw out their preconceptions, consider the game changers and think outside the square. Destination Success, a landmark 20-year plan for tourism and a shared long-term vision, was fashioned from forum discussions. Action plans for government agencies and industry partners will be measured and there for all to see in our annual state-of-the-industry report. All 13 regional tourism organisations' destination tourism plans are completed or in their final stages, highlighting the uniqueness of our destinations and charting future needs. From the awe-inspiring Great Barrier Reef to our sparkling beaches, to the untouched silent beauty of the outback, our natural assets are a major drawcard.

Through our Ecotourism Plan 2012-2020, developed in partnership with Minister Dickson, we aim to reclaim Queensland's title as a world leader in this sphere and ensure that the delivery of ecotourism experiences contributes to the conservation of our natural resources and our cultural heritage. We are making our national parks more accessible for families and we are also seeing significant interest in new, innovative ecotourism ventures.

Drive tourism is a growing market for Queensland. Our size and climate make it a perfect choice for those wanting to hit the open road and explore our natural beauty at their own pace. Coordination across all levels of government in partnership with QTIC, RTOs and industry associations resulted in the release of our Drive Tourism Strategy 2013-2015 back in January 2013.

We want tourists to be safe and comfortable while exploring our great state. This means maintaining our commitment to quality roads, appropriate rest areas, accommodation options and user-friendly information to enable visitors to plan their journey. As part of the strategy, the government is committed to a three-year program of investment in tourism signage. I commend the minister and the Department of Transport and Main Roads for installing more than 300 of these attractive new signs across our strategic tourism drive routes. Off the back of the Drive Tourism Strategy, in March 2014 we released the camping options tool kit, providing local governments with a range of best-practice solutions to manage camping options in their neck of the woods. There is no one-size-fits-all solution to managing free versus paid camping. Every region and town is different, and managing this local problem requires local solutions.

Well-managed rest areas are important to managing fatigue during the drive holiday. Recently in Mackay I released the *Best Practice Guide for Roadside Rest Areas in Queensland*—another fantastic tool with advice for local councils and community groups on our state's 730 recognised roadside rest areas. From shelter, to destination information to dump sites, this guide identifies factors that make an exceptional rest area to exceed visitor expectations. A huge body of work was undertaken via research and consultation spanning two years. I commend all those involved, particularly the team in my department which drove—pardon the pun—these initiatives that will draw more people to our regions.

While in Mackay, the member for Whitsunday, Jason Costigan, joined me to launch the Mackay-Isaac-Whitsunday Food and Agritourism Strategic Action Plan to foster the development of a vibrant regional food culture. It is a culmination of collaboration between tourism operators, producers, restaurants and cafes, and a model that other regions would be wise to consider.

Just last weekend I had the pleasure of joining Minister Dickson in Bargara for the launch of the 2014 turtle season and the unveiling of seven new visitor information touch screens—an Australian-first innovation. I am immensely proud of what has been achieved through the Newman government's partnership with industry. We have a plan for the long-term prosperity of tourism.

Royalties for the Regions; Gladstone Hospital

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (11.51 am): I am blessed to represent a community that is incredibly positive. They see a problem and, yes, they will recognise it but they also see potential solutions. It is therefore very concerning when the Gladstone Regional Council speaks to me on a regular basis expressing its concern about a lack of success in the Royalties for the Regions rounds. In all of the funding that has been made available, Gladstone has succeeded only once in receiving Royalties for the Regions funding: a very worthwhile project, the Kin Kora roundabout. The council has put up many conforming applications and proposals but without success. Certainly the community is pleased that the Kin Kora roundabout is being fixed but is frustrated with a lack of success for other infrastructure given that it has faced and continues to face the pressure of development, particularly of LNG, which has been recognised by this government and the former government as a significant boost for the future of this state's economy.

An additional area of frustration is the services that are available out of the Gladstone Hospital. We now have two very proactive people who are in charge of health services in Gladstone—Nicki Murdock, who is a practitioner and leader of the hospital services in Gladstone; and Len Richards, who is the regional director, both of whom are working tirelessly to improve services. Therefore, it is concerning to a number of our community members when, because of a lack of services at the hospital over a number of years, they continue to be referred to Rockhampton Hospital. Rockhampton does not cope well with the influx of additional work. Indeed, some members of the community have reported that frustrated and tired staff at Rockhampton even articulate their frustration with 'not another Gladstone resident up here for service'. True to form, I believe Gladstone, rather than being the problem in this situation, is the solution. The solution, while expensive, is simple: rebuild the Gladstone Hospital. In the face of the additional and significant income from LNG in the state budget, it is, I believe, a reasonable response of government to the community to do exactly that. Rockhampton cannot cope and Gladstone is the solution.

The opportunity is there to build for the future. We have a young population, so build maternity and prenaternity into the future. Looking at scans and an ICU service—we currently have a HDU—our hospital can work in partnership with Rocky instead of this tension where it is felt that Gladstone is constantly a poor cousin. Recently Rockhampton Hospital received a permanent scan licence so the mobile service into Gladstone has stopped. If people want a free scan they have to go to Rockhampton—again, more travelling. People can get scans at private providers like CQMI, but it is my advice that even pensioners have to pay \$150 for a scan which previously they were able to get if they waited for the mobile service, which was reasonably regular.

As the government and future governments look to the future, I again reiterate that Gladstone is not a problem in the health sector; Gladstone is the solution. Build a hospital for the future—a growing population that will equal and exceed Rockhampton in the not-too-distant future. We have a demographic that is young by average. The people of Gladstone are proactive in their support for this state and the state's economy. They have accepted the challenges of development with courage—not always happily but with courage. Let us see this government and the next government express its support for the people of Gladstone by building a hospital that meets its needs now and that reasonably and effectively will meet its needs in the future. Again I reiterate: Gladstone is not the problem; Gladstone is the solution.

Regional Queensland, Water Infrastructure

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (11.56 am): I again rise to speak about the growing importance of building new dams and water infrastructure projects in regional Queensland, in particular, throughout Central, North and Far North Queensland. New dams are vital to the future economic development of our state, especially those places north of the Tropic of Capricorn. Something I am most passionate about is building a stronger regional Queensland which I consider to be the promised land of the 21st century. Think about how many people have come here to Queensland since European settlement and then think about those hardy, brave souls who ventured into our regional areas in search of opportunity, looking to farm the land, to start a business, to start a family, despite all sorts of hardships. I have no doubt that more and more opportunities beckon in the future, but much of that will depend on secure water supplies for agricultural and mining projects and for urban use. That is why I am encouraged by the federal government's push into this important area of public policy, in particular, the recently released green paper on dams, and looking ahead a round table discussion in Canberra this week in relation to various water infrastructure projects.

One of those projects is the Urannah Dam—something I have touched on before, something that fires me up, something that I continue to strongly lobby for and something that I know has the support of other regional MPs, in particular, the members for Burdekin and Gregory who also understand the benefits of this project. Last week was National Water Week. 'Big deal' some might say. But it may well be a big deal if we run out of water, if we have no water for new farming projects or new mining projects. These job-creating projects can happen and will happen if we build dams like Urannah. If Urannah were built as was envisaged back in the sixties when Eungella Dam was built further upstream along the Broken River in the Burdekin catchment, we would have had a massive water storage facility west of Mackay—something like 1.5 million megalitres. That makes it bigger than Fairbairn Dam on the Nogoia River near Emerald in Central Queensland, three times bigger than the Peter Faust Dam in my electorate of Whitsunday, 12 times bigger than the Eungella Dam, which partly borders my electorate, and comparable to the dam well known to the member for Burdekin, the 1.86 million megalitre Burdekin Falls Dam.

To gain a better understanding of the Urannah project, I actually visited the upper Broken River last week on Cloverly Station thanks to an invitation from Mick and Judy Cook, the owners of the property, who I accept would be seriously impacted by the construction of a dam in their own backyard. However, they are well aware of the many opportunities that would be afforded to people from all walks of life and all backgrounds on the back of the construction of Urannah, which has been talked about since the sixties. Back then, there was no Bowen Basin as we know it today. For us long-time locals, of course it was the Brigalow Belt. We have seen many mines pop up here and there over the years. More can come on line, in particular, in the northern Bowen Basin so long as water is available. The same water from Urannah could potentially be gravity fed to mines in the neighbouring Galilee Basin. In terms of agriculture, the water could be used for up to 30,000 hectares of irrigated farmland on the Bowen River. Not only that, we would have water for a new baseload power station back in Collinsville, smack bang between the two biggest regional economies of the north.

It is not just Urannah that needs to be built; the Nathan Dam on the Dawson has been talked about for decades as well as projects on the Flinders-Gilbert, the Connors River Dam and the Nullinga on the Walsh River in the far north. It goes on and on. It is my hope that we can start building some of these dams, starting with Urannah, which was always part of the Burdekin plan. If members are not sure about that, they should check out the map next time they go to the Burdekin Falls Dam overlooking Lake Dalrymple and they can see it themselves.

Last Monday, I had a refreshing swim in Massey Creek, which is in a remote part of my electorate, about 4½ hours from my office in Proserpine. It is one of the tributaries of the Broken River, which leads into the Burdekin. It gets about 22 inches of rain a year, enough to fill Urannah pretty damn quickly. Afterwards, we lunched back at the station house and then headed to the coast but not before stopping off at Eungella Dam. I looked at the plaque on the dam wall, unveiled 45 years ago by Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the most legendary of all Queensland premiers, the man who opened up Queensland, the man who certainly transformed regional Queensland. We now need a new wave of projects to build our regions, build our state and help build our nation. Looking forward, the LNP government's \$8.6 billion Strong Choices investment program can certainly help deliver much-needed water infrastructure projects in partnership with the Commonwealth, industry and community. It is my hope that Urannah will happen sooner rather than later for the sake of jobs and regional development and, in particular, for the benefit of the Mackay-Whitsunday region.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The time for matters of public interest has expired.

MOTION

Order of Business

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (12.01 pm): I move—

That government business orders of the day Nos 1 to 4 be postponed.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION

Revocation of State Forest Areas

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (12.02 pm): I move—

- (1) That this House requests the Governor in Council to revoke by regulation under section 70E of the *Nature Conservation Act 1992* the dedication of forest reserve as set out in the Proposal tabled by me in the House today, viz

Description of area to be revoked

Baldy Mountain Forest Reserve	An area of 0.6923 hectares, described as lot 10 on SP254827, as illustrated on the attached sketch marked "A".
-------------------------------	--

- (2) That Madam Speaker and the Clerk of the Parliament forward a copy of this resolution to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection for submission to the Governor in Council.

With such a large and dispersed protected area of state, there is occasional need to revoke the dedication of small areas to correct boundary inconsistencies or achieve more effective management boundaries through land exchanges or to allow for the upgrade or expansion of public infrastructure such as roads and railways. The proposed amendment demonstrates this principle and represents the most appropriate course of action to resolve an outstanding issue.

Roads are not a prescribed purpose of forest reserves under the Nature Conservation Act 1992 and, as such, the road needs to be revoked from the forest reserve. The proposed revocation from Baldy Mountain Forest Reserve will allow for the alignment of the gazetted boundary of Carrington Road with the physical boundary of the road. This will improve the accuracy of the gazetted road records, enable local council to take ownership of this road in whole and will also remove a non-prescribed activity from the forest area.

The proposal is for the revocation of an area of approximately 0.692 hectares from Baldy Mountain Forest Reserve. This will allow for the gazetted Carrington Road boundary to be ratified with the physical location of Carrington Road, about seven kilometres west of Atherton. I recommend that the House support the revocation of part of the protected area and forest reserve specified in the proposal.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

d from 28 August (see p. 2869).

Second Reading

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (12.04 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to stand in the House today offering sensible, workable legislation that cuts green tape, cuts cost to government and business while fundamentally strengthening Queensland's environmental law. This is a positive bill aimed at delivering positive outcomes. I trust those opposite support these sensible reforms, support the bill and do not just oppose it because they feel they have to.

This bill puts to bed once and for all the tired, old line from those opposite that we are slashing environmental protections. The bill amends several pieces of legislation to offer clearer and simpler processes to Queensland's businesses and stronger protection for Queensland's environment. The bill amends the Biological Control Act 1987, the Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993.

The bill introduces enforceable undertakings to strengthen the Queensland environmental regulator's ability to respond to matters of noncompliance. Enforceable undertakings will be used as an alternative compliance tool to improve environmental protection, and I note the committee's support for this new measure. Enforceable undertakings will provide a quicker resolution in some instances without the need for costly and time-consuming court proceedings. Importantly, it is worth noting that this does not represent an easy option. Deliberate offenders will not be able to enter into an undertaking and will feel the full force of the law. For those who are doing the right thing by the environment, we continue to demonstrate our commitment to reduce approval delays and green tape.

However, the bill also increases maximum penalties under the Environmental Protection Act 1994 for those doing the wrong thing in line with similar offences in other jurisdictions. We believe in firm but fair environmental regulation and strong penalties are necessary to emphasise the seriousness of offences and deter environmental wrongdoers.

I thank the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for its constructive comments and recommendations on the bill. The committee tabled its report on 22 October 2014, putting forward 10 recommendations and two requests for clarification. I table the government's response to the committee's report, which addresses each of the recommendations and requests for clarification.

Tabled paper: Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 49—Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response [\[6377\]](#).

As a result of the committee's report, I will be moving six amendments during consideration in detail of the bill. The amendments to be made are to the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011. In addition, amendments are to be made to the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 to support the offsets framework.

Regarding the streamlining and simplification of environmental offsets requirements under the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the committee made three recommendations in relation to providing guidance on the operation of the act, defining matters of local environmental significance and allowing local government to charge less than the maximum set by the financial settlement offset calculator. I

support the committee's recommendation that my department develop further guidance on how the act operates, especially in relation to the meaning of 'same or substantially the same prescribed environmental matters'. These are difficult concepts which reflect the innovative nature of the legislation and our objective to remove the duplication of offsets between the Commonwealth, the state and local governments. My department will produce easy to understand guides to assist the community to have greater confidence that we will deliver on our commitment that there will not be duplication.

The Environmental Offsets Act 2014 also allows offsets for matters of local environmental significance. A number of submissions to the committee called for greater clarity around what values this might cover. The regulation allows local government to identify locally important values in a local planning instrument in consultation with the community. While I agree with the committee that greater clarity is required, in the interests of minimising duplication, I believe that local planning instruments are still the best place to define those values that are not already listed as matters of state and national environmental significance.

The state will use existing planning powers available under the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 to ensure that duplication does not occur. On the topic of duplication, I am pleased to also announce that, as part of the amendments to be moved during consideration in detail, I will be introducing for the first time a mechanism to remove duplication that may arise between offset conditions imposed by state departments. Again, this is about focusing on outcomes ahead of processes, measuring our success in tangible environmental benefits and not in pages of green tape. As requested by industry, these will legislatively ensure that only one offset requirement for each matter of state environmental significance is imposed.

I support the committee's recommendation to allow local governments to determine a financial settlement offset amount up to the maximum currently required under the offset calculator. This will also be supported by amendments to the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, which allow local governments to top up their offset accounts using other funds in order to ensure conservation outcomes can be delivered for their environmental offsets. Local governments will be in control of this decision, as they should be.

In relation to the amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994, during its deliberation the committee suggested that the department develop a guideline on how 'prescribed environmentally relevant activities' should be described and conditioned in an environmental authority. This is a sensible suggestion, and I am pleased to advise that this guideline will supplement the department's regulatory strategy in support of outcome based conditioning.

The committee generally supported amendments to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 which introduce a new end-of-waste framework; however, the committee recommended that the government consider amendments to the bill that would clarify the point at which waste ceases to be waste and becomes a resource. The government does not support this recommendation because the point when waste becomes a resource will be different for different types of waste and therefore cannot be made clearer in the bill. Consequently, each end-of-waste code will define the point at which that particular waste ceases to be waste and becomes a resource for that particular waste.

This government is committed to removing market impediments associated with the management of waste. End-of-waste codes will minimise ambiguity and provide certainty to industry about the delineation between waste and resource. To assist with this I support the committee's recommendation to amend the bill to differentiate between an end-of-waste user and a resource user and I will move amendments during consideration of the bill in detail to make these changes.

The committee also made recommendations in relation to the drafting of provisions that establish a chain-of-responsibility principle for persons acting under end-of-waste approvals. While the government does not support the amendments recommended by the committee, the government does support the policy intent of the recommendation. I agree that there should be a chain-of-responsibility principle reflected in the end-of-waste framework so that there is sufficient incentive for end-of-waste approval holders to manage waste appropriately through to the final point where the waste meets the standard required for it to be considered a resource. To ensure the legislation appropriately reflects this policy intent, I will move amendments during consideration in detail to clarify that conditions of an end-of-waste approval can only impose obligations on the holder of the approval and that those people who are acting under the approval, for example, an employee or subcontractor, must also comply with the conditions of the approval.

The committee made a recommendation that the bill be amended to preserve the general principle that the legal onus or burden of proof lies with the party which brings an action and the approved holder is innocent until proven guilty. This government is committed to ensuring that sufficient regard is had to the rights and liberties of individuals and will address the committee's recommendation by deleting the sections referred to in the committee's report.

Other issues raised by the committee did not require legislative amendment but are important points to clarify. For instance, the committee sought clarification regarding the amendments to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and when the regulations and end-of-waste guidelines to support these amendments will be finalised and made available for industry stakeholders. I can advise that my department is aiming to make the regulation and guidelines in the first half of 2015. During that period my department will engage with stakeholders to allow an opportunity for interested parties to contribute to the development of the draft documents.

As part of implementation planning, the committee also invited my department to consider support tools that would enable the effective monitoring, auditing and evaluation of the implementation of enforceable undertakings. I am pleased to advise that my department already has a process in place to review and improve its approach and business system requirements to facilitate the effective monitoring, auditing and evaluation of the full range of approvals under the Environmental Protection Act 1994.

Another important point for clarification is with regard to the duty to notify in relation to contaminated land. During its consideration of the bill the committee requested that I write to the Local Government Association of Queensland on the changes to the duty-to-notify requirements. I can confirm that, since the general environmental duty and the specific duty to notify for contaminated land could apply in the same circumstances, they have been amalgamated to ensure that there is no overlap or duplication of requirements. I will be clarifying this in writing to the Local Government Association of Queensland.

Before I conclude, I would like to note that last week I visited farmers in Cairns and graziers west of Bowen at Mount Aberdeen to see for myself what a huge effort they are making to help protect the Great Barrier Reef. I visited the Norman Reef off Port Douglas and took part in the Reef Blitz activities in Airlie Beach, and I know that the people of Bowen, Townsville, Cairns, Airlie Beach and graziers as far inland as Charters Towers are passionate about looking after our reef today and for future generations. There are already significant amounts of time, money, effort and resources dedicated to the protection of the Great Barrier Reef. Together with our federal colleagues we contribute almost \$180 million each and every year to improve the health of the reef. This government alone has committed \$35 million per year to water quality initiatives. It is for this reason we take equally seriously any wilful or deliberate attempt to undo that great work or cause wilful harm to the reef.

Consistent with the consideration in this bill of penalties and sentences pertaining to environmental harm, I propose to move amendments to the bill which support the enhanced protection of one of our greatest natural wonders. These amendments recognise the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area as an area of special significance and define environmental harm to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area to be serious environmental harm under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. The amendments also ensure that a court considers the damage to the Great Barrier Reef when imposing a penalty for an offence against the act. The maximum penalty for the offence of unlawfully causing serious environmental harm will be a serious deterrent to potential offenders. After amendments included in this bill, these penalties will be unapologetically some of the toughest in environmental regulation. For an individual committing a wilful offence the penalty will be \$711,562—or 6,250 penalties units—or five years imprisonment. For a corporation the maximum financial penalty is five times that of an individual and is currently \$3.56 million for each offence or contravention.

This bill retains strong environmental protections while also encouraging economic growth in Queensland. These amendments are further proof that this government takes our role as protectors of the reef and the broader Queensland environment seriously and should give every Queenslanders confidence that the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area is being effectively managed and protected. In summary, this government remains committed to balancing environmental protection with economic development, and I believe this bill delivers both in equal measure. We are simplifying processes and strengthening protections. We are delivering innovative solutions to complex problems, and we are working with Queenslanders to transform today's challenges into future opportunities. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (12.19 pm): I rise to make a contribution on behalf of the Labor opposition in relation to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Let me start my contribution by acknowledging the excellent work of the secretariat of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee of the parliament. I particularly single out the work of Heather Crighton, the acting research director, and Megan Johns, the principal research officer. They have done an excellent job in relation to the inquiry on this bill and also in pulling together the report. I commend their efforts in the House here today.

Let me start by doing something very unusual. Let me start by praising the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. This is actually not the worst piece of legislation he has introduced into the parliament so I congratulate him for that. It even contains some elements which the Labor opposition approves of, most notably the increases to penalties for environmental offences. It is better than the Environmental Offsets Bill, which we debated here a few months ago. It is also better than the Nature Conservation (Protected Plants) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2013, which we debated this time last year. And it is certainly better than the Waste Reduction and Recycling and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2012. If the minister keeps this up, one day he may actually bring into the House a bill which the Queensland Labor opposition will support. Unfortunately, today is not that day.

I take this opportunity to refer to the minister's opening remarks in relation to putting paid—I think they were his words; I am happy to stand corrected—to the criticism of the Labor opposition about the Newman LNP government being the worst environmental vandals Queensland has ever seen. It must be such a raw nerve that the Labor opposition has hit for the environment and heritage minister to come into this place and refer to it quite regularly, as he does. I think history will record him as the worst environment minister Queensland has ever seen.

Mr Trout: That was Kate Jones with the—

Mr Berry: The sandmining on Straddie?

Ms TRAD: I take the half interjection from the member for Barron River. It is perhaps one of the most articulate contributions he has made in the House because it was only half formed! I thank the member for Barron River.

As I said, the Labor opposition will not be supporting the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 for a number of reasons, which I will outline for the benefit of the House. First of all, this bill represents a legislative line for a number of policy decisions this government has taken which Labor opposed and continues to oppose. First amongst these is the introduction of a provision which allows the minister to compel local governments to produce a statement of management intent for dispersing flying fox roosts within their jurisdiction. This is not an unreasonable provision in the context of the flying fox management regime this government has instituted, but it is the culmination of a policy Labor has opposed every step of the way.

It also makes a mockery of the government's claims that it wants to do away with red tape and make it easier for local governments to do their job. Labor has long opposed the decision of the Newman government to devolve responsibility for managing flying fox colonies to councils. We recognise the difficulty colonies present to nearby residents, and in government Labor took active steps to alleviate this issue, but we acted in full regard to our environmental and humanitarian responsibilities. The LNP government, however, has not concerned itself with its responsibilities to protect the Queensland environment and treat native fauna humanely. In fact the Newman government and, in particular, the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection have completely ignored their responsibilities by devolving this power to local governments. As Logan City Council stated in its submission to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee—

Logan City Council restates its disappointment in the State Government for putting Council in an untenable position by creating the expectation to the community that we are solely responsible for flying-foxes. Council remains concerned about the cost burden this move has placed on Council and the policy shift from the State has clearly resulted in the community holding an expectation that local governments are the "flying-fox roost managers" with no budgetary support.

Queensland Labor will not support any actions this government takes that further abrogate its responsibility to manage flying fox colonies in a humane and environmentally sustainable way.

This bill also makes a number of changes to the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 that we debated in this chamber just a few months ago. We opposed that legislation then and we oppose it still. I said at the time that Labor had one clear proviso if we were to support that legislation—that is,

that it did not weaken the environmental offsets framework that currently exists. Unfortunately, the act as it now stands requires fewer projects to offset their impact on the environment and caps the offset at an arbitrary one to four ratio. The bill we are considering today does nothing to address these shortcomings. In fact, I note the minister's contribution in his speech in relation to the Great Barrier Reef. I note that he has tabled last-minute amendments to the bill that go to the issue of protecting the Great Barrier Reef.

Taking all of this on board, I do want to note the statement made by the country's leading scientific academy in relation to the Great Barrier Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan. I will go into their comments a bit more later on, but I do want to note that it was reported in a media article published on the *Brisbane Times* that, in analysing the Reef 2050 sustainability plan—

The academy also noted the report focused on offsetting damage caused by development rather than mitigating it, and ignored the potential conflicts of interest between the regulators and developers.

In relation to the offsets bill, these are exactly the criticisms that we raised at the time, and I note that even the scientific community is making these concerns known through the media as well.

All this bill does, in essence, is tidy up a few sections of the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 which are not working as intended. At least that is the aim of the bill, but it is not clear that it actually does this. The Property Council and the Urban Development Institute made note of this and suggested that the amendments will not actually do the work as has been envisaged by the explanatory notes.

In relation to enforceable undertakings, which are contained in this bill, it is obviously a new provision that is being included in the Environmental Protection Act. Labor in principle has no objection to enforceable undertakings. In fact, they are a Labor invention. They were first legislated federally under the Keating government and first introduced in Queensland legislation under the former Labor government. They were first used in Commonwealth environmental legislation by former environment minister Peter Garrett.

Queensland Labor does not oppose the introduction of enforceable undertakings into the Environmental Protection Act. However, we do think it is worthwhile pointing out that in legislation which increases the maximum penalties for a range of environmental offences the minister is also setting up a system which will allow offenders to avoid penalties. The Environmental Defenders Office made the following contribution to the committee examination—

We recommend that proposed section 510(1) be broadened to allow third parties standing to apply for an order if a person contravenes an enforceable undertaking. This will alleviate pressure on the administering authorities to monitor and enforce all enforceable undertakings and better ensure compliance. As recent audits of the Queensland and Federal Governments have stated, adequate monitoring and enforcement of activities is essential to limit environmental harm and these activities have reportedly not been undertaken adequately by the Queensland Government to date. It is advisable to allow open standing to third parties to ensure that potential environmental harm is limited.

I support that recommendation and I give notice that I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail which give effect to it. The real test, I think, is whether or not the LNP government will support those amendments. Given that the LNP government has rescinded the rights of third parties to be notified and to actually have standing to object to mining development applications in this state, I doubt they will support it, even though I think their conscience should dictate it.

Nowhere is the Newman government's disregard for proper environmental management and public policy development more evident than in its disastrous waste policies. These policies are the most telling in a litany of examples of the minister's impotence and incompetence. Since this government came to power there has been an increase of 7.5 per cent, or 90,000 tonnes, in the amount of domestic waste being sent to landfill—a 7.5 per cent or 90,000-tonne increase in domestic waste being sent to landfill. Since this government came to power there has been a seven per cent decrease in the recycling rate of household waste. Households are generating more waste but recycling less. The amount of paper recycled per person has fallen by 4.5 kilograms and the amount of glass recycled per person has fallen by 3.1 kilograms. This is before we even get to the minister's greatest failure—opening up a lucrative industry in cross-border dumping. The amount of construction and demolition waste dumped in Queensland landfills has increased by 273,000 tonnes, including 101,000 tonnes trucked in from interstate. Queensland has unfortunately become New South Wales's dumping ground solely because of the policy decisions of this inept government. The minister is so embarrassed by his wholesale failure that he even refused to put his name to the *State of waste and*

recycling in Queensland report of 2013, leaving instead his director-general to sign it off. This is in stark contrast to the 2012 report which showed improvements in waste management brought about by Labor's successful policies that this government chose to scrap. Given this track record, any policy changes this government pursues in waste management should be treated with appropriate scepticism.

This bill will replace chapter 8 relating to approval of resource for beneficial use of the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 with a new chapter titled 'Provisions for end of waste'. First of all, Labor thinks it is irresponsible to progress major changes to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 before the government has even released the final version of its waste strategy. While the beneficial use framework was separately reviewed by Sinclair Knight Merz, this report has disappeared from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection website. The justification provided for this change in the explanatory notes is insulting in its paucity. If the government is determined to progress a complete revision of an entire chapter in an act which is only three years old, it is incumbent on the minister to properly justify that change. Unfortunately, he has chosen not to do so and not to make a genuine attempt. It is also incumbent on the minister to provide a clear idea of how the new regime will operate. Unfortunately, he has again been unable or unwilling to do so.

The new framework relies on the development of end-of-waste codes. However, it is not evident exactly how such a code will be developed or how long the government will continue to rely on the existing beneficial use approvals. Unfortunately, the suggested framework for this process is amorphous and cannot be properly assessed with the limited information provided by the government. Queensland Labor cannot in good conscience lend our support to a major change when the government cannot provide us with any idea of the new regime and how it will operate. We cannot lend our support when the government cannot provide a clear example of what an end-of-waste code will look like or exactly how one will be developed. We are willing to be a reasonable opposition and we are willing to support well-founded regulatory changes which reduce costs for businesses, but in order for us to do so we require a responsible government which represents well-founded regulatory changes. The changes to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 are not well founded and we cannot support them.

While the changes to the assessment process for the material change of use on either of Queensland's two contaminated land registers is relatively noncontroversial, the government has again given no clear idea of the costs involved under the current process. The decision regulatory impact statement states that departmental assessment costs some \$600,000 annually. The minister should clarify for the benefit of the House why the decision has been made to move to a private auditor framework instead of a cost-recovery basis. Queensland Labor understands the intent behind the decision to remove the requirement for a soil disposal permit to transport contaminated soil to a waste facility. However, we believe that it is a significant lost opportunity to reintroduce some rigour into waste management. It was clear from departmental briefings to the committee that contaminated soil can and will potentially be able to be transported from another state and disposed of in our state.

Mr Powell: It already is.

Ms TRAD: I know, and increasingly. I take that interjection from the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. It already is and it is being trucked more so now—101,000 more tonnes annually because of this government's ridiculous decisions and mindless axing based on no evidence and based on no research. Here we have the evidence. Your policy failures have led to Queensland becoming the waste dump—contaminated waste dump—of other states in Australia. That is the failure of your policy and you should hang your head in shame.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member will direct her comments through the chair.

Ms TRAD: Thank you; of course I will, Mr Deputy Speaker. I apologise for my oversight. In relation to the Great Barrier Reef, the minister has come in and furnished some amendments—another suite of 44 pages of amendments—that purport to increase the protections of the Great Barrier Reef. If these amendments are based on the Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan, then I do not think one single Queenslander can have confidence that these amendments will do anything more to protect the Great Barrier Reef, because certainly the reef 2050 plan does not. It has been resoundingly rejected by Australia's top marine scientists today. It is a sham. It is a simple reorganisation—administrative reorganisation—of the things that are currently being conducted. When I read the report I was very interested in whether or not the report would tackle one of the

greatest threats to the Great Barrier Reef—climate change. Guess what? No, it does not address anything in relation to climate change, and why would it? Why would it when the leader of the federal government thinks that climate change is ‘complete crap’? Why would it when the Queensland environment minister is yet to be convinced of the science behind—

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order. I seek a ruling. Whilst I acknowledge the member for South Brisbane was quoting, I do believe the word she used was unparliamentary and I ask you to make a ruling.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a precedent with the use of that word as unparliamentary and I do ask that the member withdraw.

Ms TRAD: I withdraw categorically. I only wish that we could withdraw Tony Abbott as quickly as I withdraw that comment, but unfortunately I cannot do that. I go back to my main point, and the main point is the reef 2050 plan and its ability to chart a way forward for the long-term sustainability, protection and care of Australia’s greatest natural asset—the Great Barrier Reef. It has been assessed by Australia’s leading marine scientists as a complete and utter failure. Primarily, it is a complete and utter failure because this government and the federal coalition government refuse to accept that climate change is real and they refuse to accept that anything should be done about it at all. They have this attitude—this approach—not only in relation to climate change and how this country should be progressing in terms of the uptake of renewable energy but also in terms of the reality confronting the health and the long-term viability of the Great Barrier Reef. We know that this government and the current coalition government have constantly buried their heads in the sand about the real decline of the Great Barrier Reef.

In my short look at these last-minute amendments, I can say that I do not believe that these amendments will do anything to increase the protection of the Great Barrier Reef. They will do nothing to show that Australia is tackling climate change. They will do nothing to re-introduce vegetation management laws in this state that lead to the reduction in run-off into the Great Barrier Reef. These amendments will do nothing to ensure that riparian vegetation is managed effectively to reduce the amount of run-off into the Great Barrier Reef catchment. These amendments will do absolutely nothing to mitigate the outrageous changes being advanced by this government in relation to above-ground and below-ground water management in this state through the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which is currently before the House. That is all I will say about it.

Mr Powell interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will take that interjection from the minister. I understand that I cannot talk about the actual bill, but let me talk about water reform in this state. Let me talk about how this state government has completely abrogated its responsibility in terms of making sure that water takes and water management in this state is managed appropriately. It has completely and utterly abrogated its responsibility. We heard the member for Whitsunday—the champion for dams—get up and say, ‘Let’s change watercourses. Let’s build megadams and the effect on the Great Barrier Reef and the Great Barrier Reef catchments be damned because, quite frankly, what we want to do in terms of major water harvesting is far more important than the health of the Great Barrier Reef.’ I think that is an utter disgrace coming from someone whose electorate relies upon tourism and the health of the Great Barrier Reef to maintain the tourism economy in his area.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Ms TRAD: I will take interjection from the member for Whitsunday. I am not sure whether that was a preselection pitch but, quite frankly, judging from the things that I have heard I do not think that anything can save the member for Whitsunday from the preselection woes that he is about to encounter.

In conclusion, if the environment minister ever wants to be taken seriously he should start by properly understanding that his role is to protect the Queensland natural environment. Unfortunately, he seems to believe that his role is to cut corners and make it easier for unscrupulous operators to pollute and dump in our state. We will not be conned into supporting the minister’s ill-considered, poorly defined and underdeveloped legislative changes and Queenslanders will not be fooled by them either.

 **Mrs MADDERN** (Maryborough—LNP) (12.42 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I wish to thank my fellow committee members, the secretariat staff, the departmental staff and those who made either written or oral submissions for their contributions to the development of the final committee report on this legislation.

There are four main components to this bill, being an amendment to the Environmental Offsets Act to clarify the process for ensuring that there is no duplication from different levels of government in the imposition of environmental offsets, a reduction in red tape for the process of removing and disposing contaminated soil, the implementation of enforceable undertakings in the management of breaches of the Environmental Protection Act and an amendment to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011, which amends the processes for categorising one man's waste into another man's treasure and which implements an external auditing process.

The state government recently introduced the Environmental Offsets Bill 2014 to simplify and standardise the environmental offsets framework for Queensland and, in the process, consolidate five inconsistent environmental offset policies into one streamlined policy that gives greater choice in offset options to proponents of proposed developments. This greater choice includes the financial settlements option, using a simple and transparent online calculator; direct benefit management plans; and strategic offset corridors to further simplify the selection of suitable offset sites.

This government has continued to work with industry groups such as the Property Council of Australia, the Urban Development Institute of Australia and the Queensland Resources Council to discuss and test the new environmental offsets framework. As part of this process, industry has raised concerns that the act did not go far enough to remove duplication between Commonwealth, state and local government offsets. The proposed amendments to the Environmental Offsets Act are being made in order to clarify the tiered nature of the imposition of environmental offsets for a particular matter. In effect, each level of government—local, state and Commonwealth—has the capacity to impose environmental offsets for a development for matters of particular interest for each level of government. These matters of interest may or may not be of the same or similar nature. Should two levels of government impose an environmental offset for matters of the same or similar nature, the amendment sets out that there cannot be two offsets imposed for that matter for a single development and that the offset imposed by the highest level of government will be the offset to be provided and that an offset imposed by a lower level of government for the same or similar matter will fall away. Offsets imposed by the Commonwealth will take precedence over the state or local government and, similarly, state government offsets will take precedence over local government offsets. The essence of this amendment is simply to ensure that the proponent of a development is not required to provide two or three offsets for matter of the same or similar nature.

The bill incorporates amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to introduce enforceable undertakings as an alternative compliance tool—an alternative that will substantially improve environmental protection in Queensland. Although enforceable undertakings are a compliance tool, they can also become a long-term educational tool in the appropriate management and protection of the environment. An enforceable undertaking is a voluntary negotiated written agreement in which a person undertakes to perform particular tasks as part of a settlement for an alleged contravention of the act. This mechanism can be used in appropriate situations in lieu of the costly and time-consuming court process. Enforceable undertakings can achieve good environmental outcomes without the government having to incur these court costs. This new mechanism does not stand to benefit just the government; it also represents a win for Queensland's businesses, as it provides an opportunity for a company or an individual to make changes to prevent future breaches of the act. An undertaking to increase staff training or implement an environmental management system can lead to an improvement in business operations and, therefore, reduced risk to future illegal activity. This could lead to avoiding future penalties, damage to reputation and loss of profits caused by community backlash.

Although the process of an enforceable undertaking is often more expensive than the option of a fine, the business experience of enforceable undertakings under the Office of Fair and Safe Work Queensland is that it is money well spent rather than just 'wasted' in a fine. As an example of this extra expenditure that can be incurred under the enforceable undertakings process, the Office of Fair and Safe Work Queensland has been using enforceable undertakings for approximately 10 years. In that time, around 120 undertakings have been accepted, resulting in \$25 million being expended in safety processes. In comparison, the possible fines that could have been imposed would have been around \$7 million—a significant lesser amount than the \$25 million.

These amendments demonstrate the proactive approach that this government takes towards enhancing the protection of Queensland's environment. Enforceable undertakings will be an important new addition to the range of compliance remedies available to the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to influence behaviour and encourage responsible management of Queensland's living environment and precious ecosystems. Environmental officers will now be provided with a wider array of options to use in response to a breach of the act. However, although enforceable undertakings are voluntary, they are not a soft option as opposed to litigation. The experience of enforceable undertakings under the Office of Fair and Safe Work Queensland is that they are more expensive than a fine and can take up to two years to complete—a significant imposition on the party that committed the breach. In the event that conditions of an enforceable undertaking are breached, environmental officers have the capacity to seek court intervention. It is worth noting that voluntary enforceable undertakings are not appropriate to use in all cases of breaches of the act. In cases where there is an element of wilfulness in the commission of the offence—in other words, when the offender intended to commit the illegal act—then the offender will be dealt with by the courts.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the minister, the Hon. Andrew Powell, for the work undertaken in the formulation of this bill to reduce red tape in the area of waste management and contamination, to clarify processes in relation to duplication of environmental offsets and for the implementation of enforceable undertakings as a management tool for breaches of the Environmental Protection Act. It is this type of work that ensures that this government creates circumstances in which business can proceed to grow and invest while at the same ensuring that our living environment and ecosystems are protected. I am pleased to recommend the passage of this bill through the House.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (12.50 pm): I never really know what to say about what is coming out of this department other than that they seem to be incredibly capable of repeatedly shooting themselves in the proverbial foot. The critical part of this legislation is the revision of the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011. It is the key to understanding what a bumbling set of clods this minister and his departmental adviser are. In fact, this legislation ensures that the minister will probably be the worst performing minister of the whole lot of the cabinet—fresh from achieving the perfect zero out of 10 when he ensured that Queensland became the dumping ground of all Australia's waste when he removed fees from waste collection, including those from interstate operators, and did not put a fee on those interstate operators, the net effect of this being to near guarantee that New South Wales and even Victorian waste operators transported their garbage and their toxic waste to Queensland. In fact, as the member for South Brisbane, who is the shadow opposition minister, has stated, it was over 100,000 tonnes in the last reportable period in the last 12 months. As if Queensland landfill, especially in South-East Queensland, is not under huge pressure already, the minister executed this perfect disaster with aplomb and within record time. That requires a real feat of trickery, but he did it. This revision is even more hilarious—although the public will not be laughing and no-one really should laugh—because rather than blaming southern operators in this revision, this legislation removes significant market impediments associated with the management of waste and thereby increases their capacity to dump waste here. That requires a lot of skill, minister, and you did it. The minister is allowing greater self-regulation in the industry to define when waste is waste and when it is not. You know what: you have just got to say if it comes from New South Wales and Victoria—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Dr Robinson): Order! The member will speak through the chair, please.

Dr DOUGLAS: Through you, Mr Deputy Speaker. The minister has just got to say that waste coming from over the border has a fee on it. We do not want their garbage. We do not want the garbage of New South Wales, Victoria or even that of South Australia. Heaven forbid if it was put on ships and we got it from everywhere else too. What the legislation is doing does not make a lot of sense. The legislation wants to encourage research into waste with production of a paper trail from where it has come from. The government, whilst deregulating claims to better define where that waste has come from, including organic and hazardous waste, is not significantly reducing what is coming from outside. It claims to be doing this when it has effectively removed all the barriers to becoming basically the tip of Australia. Heaven forbid if we become the tip of the world.

The evidence is in the behaviour of people. The shadow minister was clearly right when she stated that domestic dumpers have increased by seven per cent in the last 12 months. Recycling has reduced by a comparative amount of seven per cent at the same time. The industrial waste dumping amount has gone up by 200,000 tonnes. Has the minister just for a moment thought about this? Is he

pretending he is providing solutions when the burden of the problem grossly overwhelms any minor solution that anyone could provide to handle the problem? It gets worse, because the type of waste we are getting from down south alone is so dreadful that our best systems can barely cope with it before they can handle their own systems. We know this from what is happening on the Gold Coast. We on the Gold Coast wanted to avoid another huge landfill site. We have a massive desalination plant which was theoretically going to run on green power; not purchased with credits, but in fact it was supposed to originally run on waste so we avoided the landfill. The member for Currumbin supported it. That is what was supposed to happen, but it did not happen. Now we have this dreadful waste that is accumulating close to a major tourism destination. We have 12 million tourists a year. And we have this whopping great landfill with all of this southern waste coming into our sites. Why do they dump it there? Because it is just over the border and there is no charge for it. That is what is most ridiculous. If you are going to have policies, link them together. Get this hand to talk to this one, to talk to that one. That is not what happens in this department.

At a time when we needed to make positive steps in waste management, with the small step of demanding these interstate waste operators were at least charged a base rate of \$550, this near-sighted Campbell Newman government, by trying to be smart, guaranteed we became a dumping ground. It did not correct it in this legislation and it should have. Despite this the Treasurer did not react, the minister of course did not react and no-one else seems to have reacted; they just let it go through. What does that tell you? They are asleep at the wheel. We will never be able to get the New South Wales people to take their waste back. The Victorians will not take theirs back either. All this because the government wanted to be smart and to save all this money. This bill is being sold as green-tape reduction and simplifying the management of everything from contaminated land. There are some things in this bill that I do not disagree with. Despite what was said by the shadow minister, I think you need to clear streams and trees in certain cases. I want to talk about the issue of dams which was mentioned earlier. I want to link what has been said by you, minister, and your department and what you have not done in regard to linking policies together.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I ask you again to speak through—

Dr DOUGLAS: I will speak through you.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member, you do not have the call. Take your seat. I will give the guidance in the chair, thank you, and you need to speak through the chair. The member for Gaven has the call.

Dr DOUGLAS: Thank you. I would like to talk about this idea of sensible water storage. Sensible water storage means exactly that and it does mean dams. I reject the Labor view of water storage. The problem I have with the government position—

Mr POWELL: I rise to a point of order. Whilst this House could definitely benefit from a discussion on dams, I do not seem to recall that being part of the bill. I would ask that you rule on relevance.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: When we are finished helping me with my ruling, I am listening carefully to the member's speech and I am noting that what the member has just begun to talk about is not in the bill and I would ask the member to stay focused on the bill.

Dr DOUGLAS: Thank you for your guidance. I was going to make a point that was covered earlier. It does not matter. I will leave that. I will get back to other issues contained in the bill. There are minor amendments which have been mentioned. I do not want to raise a contrary view on them. However, I do not want to let the moment go by without referring to a comment that was made about the flying fox management policy. The member for Dalrymple will speak in the debate, as will a number of other members. The revision of the Nature Conservation Act 1992 introduces an as-of-right authority for councils to manage urban roosts by non-lethal means. It comes after a nine-year campaign by the member for Dalrymple whose electorate has been affected, particularly the towns of Yungaburra, which seems to have cleared up its problem, and Charters Towers, which has suffered the scourge of it. It has been a problem in my electorate, even though my electorate has changed significantly over the years I have been a member. It was a significant problem for the horse people on the back side of Nerang, those people in Mount Nathan and part of what is now in the electorate of Beaudesert at Canungra. There were significant roosts of flying foxes in those areas. The flying foxes are native and protected, but there is the problem of lyssavirus and hendra virus, which have knock-on effects in the general community. Having said that, there has to be a level of accountability. I understand that. Councils have to have some control and the legislation appears to be giving them

some control, as difficult as it seems. We have to balance the rights of flying foxes against the rights of humans and that balance has to be maintained. I would like to hear what the member for Dalrymple says.

In conclusion, this legislation was flawed because of what it failed to do to address the movement of interstate waste over the border into rapidly declining and expensive landfills, particularly in South-East Queensland and especially on the Gold Coast, for no net benefit. The minister really needs to ask himself why. Here is a tip: while the election result is unlikely to affect what has happened here today, the minister can do a lot for all Queenslanders by doing something about the interstate waste coming over the border. If nothing else, address that issue. A big fat fee for interstate dumpers would be a great start.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Dr DOUGLAS: I will get into that later on, member for Lockyer. Having said that, that would be a good start. Why not charge per tonne with a small fee charged by the councils that have to manage these things? We have to do more about preparing those landfills. There is a significant amount of waste that is coming—

(Time expired)

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, member! The House will now break for lunch and resume at 2.30.

Sitting suspended from 1.01 pm to 2.30 pm.

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (2.30 pm): I rise to make a statement about the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I acknowledge the committee members and staff who assisted me with this bill. The committee staff always do a great job and work extremely hard, understanding the legislation and pulling everything together. I congratulate my colleagues on the committee: the member for Barron River and the member for Maryborough, who are in the chamber, and the other members who are not in the chamber. We work extremely hard on these bills to ensure that some common sense comes out of the legislation. This is the second tranche of the red-tape-reduction legislation that the minister introduced earlier in the year. We are seeing some legislative reforms in the environmental protection area that will improve the way that business will work and that the whole process will operate. The enforceable undertakings that the department is bringing into play will also bring some efficiencies. I note that the enforceable undertakings are not a get-out-of-jail-free card. I know some people who have had to do them and they are quite extensive.

It is important that we modernise this area. Unfortunately, for 20 years the previous government had its head in the sand, just like the ostrich. It did not understand what was really going on in the environmental area, but made rash decisions to get the green vote. The member for Gaven and the opposition have been using Russell Coight, the great Australian TV personality, as one of their environmental advisers, such is the level of intelligence coming from the Labor Party and others in opposition. As part of his *All Aussie Adventures*, Russell Coight is now advising the Labor Party and the member for Gaven on how to do things. They want to run with the foxes and hunt with the hounds. However, this legislation is really about common sense.

I take issue with some of the statements made by members who have already spoken in this debate on councils' statement of management intent for flying foxes. Of course that is what we need. This government has given the councils the ability to move on flying foxes as soon as they arrive in an area. Do we want the flying foxes shot? Do we want them blown away? Of course we do not, but we do need to manage them. In my area, near an aged-care facility, council let quite a large flying fox roost meander on for five or six years. Now they have pruned the trees and the flying foxes have moved on. It is that sort of management that needs to be undertaken. Flying foxes are a native animal and they pollinate a lot of trees such as gums. While they can be a bit of a pest, let us face it: no-one wants to see them destroyed simply because of that. No-one wants to see flying foxes shot. Imagine if a half blown away flying fox is found on a school oval or in hospital grounds. That is not what we want in the management of flying foxes. In my area, a lot of people use tank water. No-one would want a shot flying fox landing on their roof during a rain event. It is those sorts of things that we have to think about. The culling of flying foxes is impractical. I am sure other members of the House will support my comments.

The bill introduces the next tranche of offsets. As he advised in his speech on the previous bill, there would be a second tranche to come and this bill introduces that tranche and that is the way it will be worked. I am glad to see that the minister has picked up most of the recommendations from

the committee. The committee works very hard to make practical recommendations that will improve the legislation and that is where some of the offset amendments come in. Some of the councils did not seem to understand the offset amendments. I am glad that the minister will liaise more with the Local Government Association to make sure there is a full understanding around that and, also, the fact that the charge does not have to be the maximum. It can be a lesser amount if that can be done, which is what we really want.

I have already touched on the enforceable undertakings. Labor supports them and we support them. They are not a soft option. It is quite an expensive option to have to put in place whole processes and have information go back to the industry that you are involved with. That is quite an interesting amendment.

I was quite bemused by both the Labor spokesperson and the member for Gaven who spoke about the increase in waste and how there will be 160,000 tonnes more waste from Queensland businesses. There is more waste from Queensland businesses because more business is actually happening. That highlights the lack of understanding of those on the other side of the House. The 'Russell Coight' environmentalists opposite do not understand that waste does not just appear. No-one wants waste and no-one wants to have to deal with it if they do not have to. There will be 160,000 tonnes more demolition waste because more is actually happening. Look at the buildings outside: there is more actually happening.

Ms Trad: Through the chair.

Mr RICKUSS: I am speaking through the chair. I am sure that the member for Gladstone understands what I am talking about. Coming from an industrial area, she understands that business creates things and, unfortunately, some of that is waste. As for stopping waste coming from New South Wales, they seem to forget that we have an Australian Constitution that says you cannot stop something because you do not want it. Northern New South Wales will always use some of Queensland's facilities because we are closer, particularly the large area in South-East Queensland.

I turn to contaminated soil and the issue about more regulations and taxes. All the Labor opposition wants to do is put in more regulations and more taxes. It is going back to its old habits of advocating for more regulations and taxes and how we manage those sorts of things. Let us talk about the Great Barrier Reef. The member for Barron River raised Abbot Point as a classic example of this. What a disaster that would have been under Labor. We have come up with a viable alternative solution because this government thinks about how to manage issues, which is what this bill is about. For example, with sandmining on and the rehabilitation of Stradbroke, Anna Bligh and Kate Jones stood on a rehabilitated sandmining area and said, 'This will be a disaster for the area,' yet they knew that it was a great result because the rehabilitation had been done really well.

This bill is about the common-sense protection of the environment. It is about being more workable. It is about allowing legislation to become more user friendly, which will give the government better results. The enforceable undertakings will be good for business, good for the state and good for the whole process. I congratulate the minister and his staff for working through this process. They understand these difficult issues and I realise that those on the other side are really struggling to understand some of those issues. All I can do is recommend the bill to the House and congratulate the minister on a great job.

 **Mr TROUT** (Barron River—LNP) (2.39 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This bill includes amendments to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2014 that signal fantastic opportunities for the Queensland waste industry to improve resource productivity in Queensland. These amendments will remove any doubt about when waste is no longer classified as waste and instead becomes a resource. This is something that Labor does not grasp and has no knowledge of. This means that businesses can get on with business, while at the same time divert waste from landfill by deriving a valued resource—a win-win for business and the environment.

Once a waste material meets the required outcomes contained in an end-of-waste code, the material is then classified as a resource. A number of regulatory requirements that apply to the management of waste will cease to apply, such as waste tracking requirements and waste management conditions. Here is a perfect example of where a seemingly simple administrative change can have a ripple effect, resulting in improved confidence and certainty for industry. The ripple has the potential to turn into a wave of innovation for anyone dealing with waste. Members of the House, the surf is up for the waste and resource recovery industry.

The amendments introduce opportunities to strengthen commercial relationships, bringing industry partners together to find new uses for waste materials. To facilitate this, the bill will incorporate industry involvement in the development of end-of-waste codes through the establishment of technical advisory panels. The process of developing end-of-waste codes is collaborative, bringing together waste generators and resource receivers and other experts to determine when waste can safely cease to be waste.

The bill also invites the Queensland public to identify waste which might benefit from the development of an end-of-waste code. For example, codes might be developed for producing gypsum from waste plasterboard or producing diesel from waste cooking oil and rendered animal fat. Opportunities are limitless and will be guided by industry.

Needless to say, these amendments are well supported by the waste industry. The Queensland business community is strongly committed to balancing environmental sustainability with economic prosperity. The amendments contained in this bill send exactly the right signals to develop market opportunities.

It may be of interest to members of the House to know that a recent Australian government report found that the value of the materials in commercial and industrial waste is estimated at more than \$26 billion per year. This equates to around \$5.5 billion of potential lost value to the Queensland economy.

The bill is instrumental in lowering costs to the resource recovery industry and keeping waste out of landfills by removing barriers to recovery. The amendments are a major step forward in promoting resource productivity in Queensland. I am pleased to support this innovative approach.

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 also includes amendments to the Biological Control Act 1987 to streamline the process for declaring organisms as agents for biological control. It will allow for the declaration process for the release of an agent to control, for example, the mother of millions weed to be completed.

Mother of millions is a significant environmental weed and was recently ranked as the third most important environmental weed in South-East Queensland. Mother of millions is poisonous to stock and humans and is commonly responsible for cattle deaths where they have ingested the plant. Treating cattle that have been poisoned by this weed is expensive, with treatments costing up to \$70 per beast. Cattle can die in a short time or take up to five days to die. This is extremely distressing for the animal and the owner.

In times of drought, as the majority of Queensland is currently experiencing, it is not uncommon for cattle to consume sources of food they do not normally eat. The likelihood of cattle deaths can sometimes increase during these times when cattle are destocked and moved to other regions. This plant pest has the potential to spread to other areas of Queensland and inland Australia where it can invade rangelands and native pastures and compete with native grasses to significantly reduce the productivity of pastoral areas. There is no single, effective control method for mother of millions. A number of practices are currently being employed.

It is vital for a fully functional biosecurity system to employ as many methods as practicable to counter invasive weeds such as mother of millions. Mechanical and chemical methods and fire are currently employed but biological control can complement existing methods and are used when situations or environmental conditions make the other methods impractical.

The biological control of pests is therefore a necessary element in the protection of the economy and the environment. This is why all states and territories enacted mirror biological control legislation. This legislation ensures the uniform administration and consideration of applications for the employment of biological control methods to combat pests.

The amendments to the Queensland Biological Control Act are necessary to ensure that the next steps in declaring mother of millions a target organism can be progressed. These legislative amendments therefore represent critical progress in minimising the impact of this serious, invasive pest in Queensland agriculture. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (2.45 pm): In speaking to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, I commend the minister for adopting more than half a dozen of the recommendations of the committee. I acknowledge the great job of the committee staff. It is good to

see the recommendations of the committee accepted. The committee process is a big undertaking. There are a lot of public hearings and a lot of submissions. It is very important that the people of Queensland and the different interest groups are represented. The committee report states—

The policy objectives of the Bill, as set out in the Explanatory Notes are to:

- deliver greentape reduction reforms to reduce costs to business and government while maintaining environmental standards
- support firm but fair environmental regulation, and
- promote the recovery and use of waste within the economy.

...

Environmental Offsets Act 2014, to clarify and strengthen legislative clauses to reinforce the intent of nil duplication of offsets across and within jurisdictions, and other minor amendments in response to issues raised since the Act's commencement on 1 July 2014

...

Nature Conservation Act 1992, to require councils to prepare a Statement of Management Intent for flying-fox roost management, as the final component of that management framework for defined urban areas

In terms of that objective, I am not quite sure but it is my understanding that the amendments give more responsibility to the councils for the management of flying foxes. I believe that is very important. Over many years we have had arguments between councils and governments.

We see in a report in the *Australian* newspaper that flying foxes were the host of the ebola virus. Flying foxes around the Congo River carried the ebola virus. It then spread through monkeys. The outbreak occurred on the banks of the Ebola River, which is why it is called the ebola virus. The flying foxes move from Africa through South-East Asia and Australia and back to Africa. Flying foxes are the hosts for many diseases. We have lost about 90 horses and think there have been about seven human deaths.

The government has removed about 25 per cent of funding to the councils that could be used to disperse flying foxes. We are getting the councils to take on this responsibility but they do not necessarily have the funds to remove the flying foxes. It costs a lot of money and requires a lot of workers to remove flying foxes. We need a pool of money for this purpose and then councils could apply for funding out of that pool. It does not mean that every council in Queensland would apply for that funding, but if they have a flying fox problem they could apply. If we give the councils the responsibility to move the flying foxes on and we have taken away 25 per cent of their funding it is going to be very difficult to deal with the flying foxes unless there is the option to cull them—and I know the member for Barron River disagrees with me. That option is questionable.

Mr Trout interjected.

Mr KNUTH: We cannot chop down every tree. I know that the New South Wales government is taking a strong position. I say to the minister that councils are playing their role but at the same time there is a lack of funding available. We definitely support the policy objective of this bill but we also need funding for those councils to do that. Likewise, if the councils are given the opportunity to access funding to remove the flying foxes and the councils do not use that funding to do so and the people feel that the flying foxes are a serious health risk to their community, I believe that legislation and measures should be put in place so that the state government can step in as an overarching power to ensure that councils do move those flying foxes. I believe that this would be a step in the right direction. Such a motion might be brought up at the Local Government Association conference this week. But we need those resources to be able to remove those flying foxes. Likewise, to reiterate, we want to ensure that the councils do move those flying foxes. As I was saying, they are a serious health risk and they should not be living and roosting amongst people. I wanted to bring that to the attention of the House.

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (2.50 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. Firstly, I commend the minister on the measures contained within this bill. This bill continues a positive theme that has been evident throughout our term of government thus far—ensuring strong environmental protection and maintaining high environmental standards, whilst at the same time offering Queensland businesses clearer and simpler processes with less red and green tape. The measures contained within this bill provide further examples of this balance being effectively maintained.

The objectives of the bill are very clearly outlined and demonstrate this commitment our government has to growing our economy and strengthening businesses, whilst also ensuring we preserve our cherished natural environment. The objectives of the bill are outlined as delivering green-tape-reduction reforms to reduce costs to business and government whilst maintaining environmental standards, supporting firm but fair environmental regulation, and promoting the recovery and use of waste within the economy.

This sensible, balanced approach to environmental regulation in Queensland is an approach that is warmly welcomed by Pine Rivers businesses. As I said in commencing this contribution, it builds on a constant theme of enabling businesses and freeing them from unnecessary administrative burden and expense. We have seen this in action in previous legislation—and I particularly think of legislation where Labor's waste tax on businesses was abolished by our government and where ERAs were abolished and simplified.

Back in 2012 I spoke in this House on another green-tape-reduction bill in the Environment and Heritage Protection portfolio. At that time I said—

If there is one complaint I hear from Pine Rivers businesses almost more than any other it is that governments seem to make a sport out of inventing new administrative processes for businesses to follow. Too many owners of small and medium sized businesses that I talk to spend an exorbitant amount of time and money completing paperwork and meeting ever-expanding government requirements. So instead of getting on with running their business, making a profit and employing more staff, they find themselves sidetracked in an administrative nightmare.

Thankfully, the message I now hear from many of those same businesses has changed. There are many businesses who are seeing the benefits of red and green-tape reductions implemented by Minister Powell and also by our government in general. They are still maintaining and are able to maintain the same standards of environmental protection and conservation as they once did, but they are able to do it in a more efficient manner and get on with running their business and get on with what they are there to do. These businesses reap the financial benefits from the scrapping of the waste tax. They are spending less time in unnecessary administration. Our government is here to enable Queensland businesses, as well as to protect our environment. But, again, importantly with legislation relating to environmental protection, these benefits are being achieved for businesses, whilst ensuring that our environment is being protected and that enforcement action is taking place.

Some of the contributions so far have outlined some of the benefits to government of reducing green tape. One of those benefits is that it frees up resources within the minister's department to better enforce noncompliance which helps to ensure that non-complying businesses are adequately dealt with. I note that in the amendment put forward by the member for South Brisbane—and again it seems to be the only line of thought on many things that come out of the opposition—she talks about staffing numbers in departments being cut as if that is some sort of measure of less productivity. It is great to see that with the green tape that has been abolished and the time that is being saved for departmental staff they are actually now able to do more of the things that matter. They are able to ensure compliance, they are able to enforce penalties when there is noncompliance and they are not tied up in doing things that do not matter.

In relation to compliance, we see in this bill the introduction of enforceable undertakings for individuals or firms who breach the law. Enforceable undertakings is a concept that is already in place across a range of Queensland legislation and in this circumstance provides another option to ensure compliance to environmental laws and standards, and I commend the minister on implementing this particular option.

I also want to speak briefly to the amendments introduced by the minister today which are designed to provide greater protection to one of Queensland's most iconic assets, the Great Barrier Reef. Our government is taking the preservation of Queensland's reef very seriously, and these amendments are further evidence of our commitment to the reef.

Last weekend I had the opportunity to travel up to Cannonvale Beach in the beautiful Whitsundays, along with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and the member for Whitsunday. We were there for the inaugural Reef Blitz, which is an initiative of the Great Barrier Reef Foundation—an initiative that is designed to engage the community in the collection and communication of reef data that is relevant to reef managers, users and policymakers to assist in ensuring that we continue to manage our reef in the best manner possible. Reef Blitz saw organisations including Reef Catchments, National Parks, local Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority staff, local schools, the local council, community groups and citizen science organisations, as well as local residents, tourists and even a few backpackers, cataloguing observations around Cannonvale Beach and undertaking clean-up activities along the foreshore.

The Department of Natural Resources and Mines was very pleased to be a sponsor of this inaugural event—an event that is promoting awareness of the need to preserve our reef and an event that is getting local communities practically involved in monitoring the reef. I look forward to seeing events such as Reef Blitz going from strength to strength in years to come and expanding along the Queensland coast.

Our government will continue to promote the protection of our reef and will continue to legislate and put policies in place to ensure that noncompliance and breaches are severely dealt with. Personally, I want to ensure that my children still have a thriving Great Barrier Reef to visit as they grow up and indeed for their children as well, but equally I want to ensure that my children have jobs to get them through their adult life. It does not have to be one or the other, and in this legislation we are proving again that you can actually have both: you can protect the environment and you can also allow growth in the economy.

The compliance measures relating to the Great Barrier Reef in this bill, whilst only expected to be utilised infrequently and as a result of potential major environmental incidents, underline our government's commitment to enhancing protection of the Great Barrier Reef. This bill will benefit Queensland's natural environment including the Great Barrier Reef, it will benefit Queensland businesses and it will help government to become even more efficient. It is sensible legislation and I am pleased to support the bill.

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (2.58 pm): I rise to participate in the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I note that in the minister's opening comments he said how the bill will offer clearer and simpler processes for business entities to do business in Queensland. Yet when I looked at the minister's response to the committee report that he tabled, on numerous occasions he refers to further significant work that the department and the government will have to do. I will go through a few of those that I noted. In relation to recommendation 2, the minister states—

A guideline will be prepared to clarify the intent and interpretation of key aspects in the *Environmental Offsets Act* ...

So a guideline will be prepared. Why isn't that material tabled with this document? Perhaps the minister can clarify that when he responds to the various members' contributions. So, again, we see more work that has to be done.

In relation to the government's response to recommendation 6, the government says that it supports the recommendation and will commence the enforceable undertakings amendments by proclamation to ensure that the statutory guideline can be developed in consultation with key stakeholders prior to gazettal. Again, we need to know from the minister what resources are necessary for this additional work and when it is anticipated that the gazettal is scheduled to happen.

I turn to a further comment in relation to a point of clarification. The minister states—

The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is already considering its approach and business system requirements for effective monitoring, auditing and evaluating the full range of approvals under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* as part of its Compliance Renewal Program. For example, the Compliance Renewal Program includes the Compliance Framework Project which will redesign the department's compliance framework to ensure state-wide consistency in compliance activities and enable the effective and efficient utilisation of compliance resources.

The minister goes on to state—

In the longer term, the Compliance Framework Project will also be increasing the department's interactions with the community through the provision of real time information about the environmental performance of customers and the outcomes of our compliance and enforcement activities.

Again, I ask the minister to please clarify what resources are required for this work and how much time is anticipated to be taken and is needed for the work to be completed. In relation to recommendation 7, the minister says that the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection is aiming to make the regulation and guidelines in the first half of 2015 and that industry will be directly engaged to contribute to the development of the draft document during this period. In my time I have heard a lot of comments from previous ministers saying how they will be doing all this in the first half of the year. What I am looking for is not only more particulars to the parliament around this assurance that the minister is providing but also more particulars for the benefit of all Queenslanders. What assurance can the minister provide to us that in the first half of next year this work will be done? I would hate it to be the case that on another day at another time someone might stand up and say the minister was misleading the parliament because not enough information was put forward about the resources, the staffing needs and the pressures the department was under. We just heard from a

previous government member that the departmental staff are so efficient and they can do so much more work now. What I am looking for from the minister are some nuts and bolts to go with the assurance that he is providing to the parliament which will be in *Hansard* so we can see there is some basis to his assurances, because without those assurances I think it is just motherhood statements.

I turn to recommendation 10. I note the committee recommendation was that the bill be amended to remove sections 173Q(3) and 173Q(4) specifically to preserve the general principle that the legal onus or burden of proof lies with the party that brings on the action and the approved holder is innocent until proven guilty. The approved holder, if accused, must still satisfy the evidential onus of proof for any defence or excuse they raise. I say thank you to the committee for raising this issue. This comes back to an issue I have been talking about for some time now, which is the need for a bill of rights in Queensland. We have to legislate certain fundamental rights that cannot be lightly ignored by a government or a minister of the day. It reflects volumes of the government and the minister that, in the drafting and all the work the government and the cabinet put into the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, which goes to 157 pages, they were so keen to reverse the onus of proof. It is time this no longer happens. I am looking forward to seeing a debate in the future about the rights and liberties of individuals being protected under a bill of rights.

I also note that members have spoken about passing the buck to local councils in relation to the management of flying foxes. Again I say to the government and to the minister: if you are genuine in trying to empower local councils, match the dollars with the passing of the responsibility. If they are really genuine, support the recognition of local government in our Constitution in Australia so they are an entity in their own right so they do not have to do the bidding the government wants them to do on the day.

I also note that just over five hours ago the minister introduced significant amendments to protect the Great Barrier Reef. I note that the amendments go to some 40-odd pages. Again, if this government were fair dinkum in trying to give all members the chance to properly consider amendments which are dropped on the table on the same day the key legislation is debated, these amendments should go to the committee for consideration so we can have a committee report as to whether there is any significance in these amendments or whether they are only relevant in supporting the intent of the bill. I simply have not had time to study the bill in detail because I have other matters that affect Queenslanders and the affairs of my electorate.

I say again: if this government were fair dinkum in being transparent and accountable about the proposed changes to the law in Queensland, these amendments should be referred to the parliamentary committee that tabled this report so it has the capacity to comment on these significant amendments and inform us all—every one of us 89 members—whether there is anything hidden in the amendments or not. I do not know if there is anything hidden in the amendments. I listened to the shadow minister speak about issues relating to the Great Barrier Reef. She raised a number of issues. I wonder what the committee would have thought about those issues.

I also note the issue of enforceable undertakings. I was reassured when I heard a government member stand up and say that if there is evidence the offender intended to commit the offending act the offender will be dealt with by the courts. I think that is really good because it is setting the framework so that in future we will all understand when someone will be able to access an enforceable undertaking and when they will be brought before the courts to answer for their actions.

In summary, my challenge to the minister is to give a commitment that in the future if he is going to introduce significant amendments—pages and pages of amendments—he will offer those to the committee to consider and table a report to the parliament. If they are fair dinkum and want to be open and transparent, what are they hiding? I do not know. Who do I believe? I like to read the committee reports. I am very pleased that the reversal of the onus of proof which this Campbell Newman government was wanting to implement has been overturned by the committee and I understand has been supported by all members of the committee because I did not see a dissenting report.

I look forward to the minister responding to some of the brief matters I have raised. I look forward to participating in the debate during the consideration in detail stage. I also look forward to the shadow minister for the environment speaking to her amendment, which I thought made a lot of sense, about giving third parties some rights because I think it is high time. We know that the department is racing against the clock. There is significant pressure. Let us share the load. Let us give some third parties who are interested the capacity to monitor, observe and inform the department about what is going on.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (3.08 pm): Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to speak to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and thank you for giving me this opportunity. There are a number of issues of obvious importance in relation to environmental management given the nature of my electorate. The first issue that I wish to comment on is the offsets matter. Only some months ago the minister was in my electorate celebrating the signing off of an offset on Curtis Island that related directly to LNG. Previous to that there had been offsets that had been required on the Gladstone Ports Corporation, and those offsets were 100 kilometres north of Gladstone.

The ability of that community, which lost access to or the benefit of that property that they were offsetting, to practically get value from the offset was fairly limited given its location which was quite some distance from the community. The great benefit of the Curtis Island offset was that it was contiguous with the community that had also been affected by the loss of access to this other property. I remember at the time thanking the minister and commenting about the wisdom and the soundness of that sort of offset policy. I certainly hope that it can continue. Those people who lost access to quite a significant part of Curtis Island now have another quite significant area set aside on Curtis Island which will allow for public access. It has diversity in terms of its environmental biodiversity and people will get to enjoy that same geographical area.

In relation to the flying fox issue, I do note that there is an obligation on local councils to prepare a statement of management intent for as-of-right activities involving protected wildlife to ensure councils remain accountable for their management actions. I have a number of flying fox roosts in my electorate, several of which are very close to the community in terms of where they live. One is near a caravan park. The gentleman who raised concerns with me does not have the physical ability to organise a team of people to start, with council's cooperation, a mitigation program. However, I would have to say that he is directly affected by it; he lives almost under the roost. Council has shown some interest in it. Getting that community involvement to actually undertake the mitigation work has been difficult for Bernie. I have appreciated, as I know others have, this government's changed attitude in relation to flying fox colony management.

The bill also streamlines the process for declaring organisms for biological control. This is an area that in some ways is fraught but is also historical in nature. We can still see the benefit of the biological control for cactus. There have been several other very successful biological control mechanisms for different pests and plant pests. There are a couple that were spectacular failures, perhaps 50 years ago. Certainly in my mind these current biological controls are much more advantageous in terms of the impact on the community.

I also commend the government for ensuring that the onus of proof remains with the accuser, as is a tenet of our democracy and our justice system; I think that is important. In a number of instances the former government also reversed the onus of proof as has this government on a couple of occasions during its time in government. I believe that that action has to be taken with the greatest of care and consideration because, as I said, it is a tenet of our justice system that a person is innocent until proven guilty. So the circumstances in which that is reversed have to be specific, very specialised and recognise the gravity of the action in relation to the reverse onus of proof.

In my electorate we have a number of environmental officers, park rangers et cetera. Over the years the numbers have been reduced. I believe we do not have sufficient to do the work and carry the responsibilities that they do, both in overt and less overt monitoring of industry. I would put to the minister—and I know people have talked about the fact that maybe there are fewer officers but they are more efficient—that there is nothing like having a set of legs and a set of eyes out looking and monitoring. It is a bit like the difference between a speed camera and a police car with police livery. When people see a police car or a police person they take their foot off the accelerator, but if they do not see a speed camera they do not immediately modify their behaviour. It is the same principle with environmental matters.

I commend those who work in the environmental area in my electorate. They do an amazing job in what, at times, are very difficult circumstances, particularly in the commissioning phases of major industry. In many instances they are the interface between industry and the community in terms of community confidence.

I have seen the amendment that has been circulated by the member for South Brisbane. As the previous speaker said, I will be interested in the minister's comments on it because I do believe there is wisdom in sharing the responsibility in terms of monitoring the behaviour of companies. Many companies are excellent—do not get me wrong—but if you get a feral one, they are very difficult to

manage. We have had at least one in my electorate. They are not there now. In the early days they managed the SPP shale oil plant. QER, who are managing that plant now, are an excellent company to deal with. There were former managers of that plant who were dishonest—that is the kindest thing that I can say—and the department did not have the personnel to do the work that was necessary. Certainly having the eyes and ears of others was important.

I commend the minister for his work. I look forward to his response to the issues and concerns that have been raised in this debate to date. Again, I reinforce that the community's confidence and their quiet enjoyment of their property, their home and their community are contingent on health—not just in terms of hospitals but also environmental health. I commend the minister.

 **Mrs MENKENS** (Burdekin—LNP) (3.15 pm): I am very happy to support and provide a short contribution to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I certainly commend Minister Powell for his work on this bill because it is a very important piece of legislation. As we know, this bill delivers green-tape-reduction reforms that will reduce costs. They will reduce costs to business and also to government while maintaining environmental standards. Environmental standards are extremely important to this Newman government. This legislation will also support firm but fair environmental regulation and will promote the recovery and the use of waste within the economy.

This bill is another green-tape-reduction success story. It delivers on the government's strong regulatory reform and improvement agenda. The bill carries quite a few innovative changes such as changes to the contaminated land provisions in the Environmental Protection Act 1994. This actually introduces auditor certification for contaminated land reports. This removes the need for the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to actually assess reports and it will halve the decision-making time frames. It will thus reduce the delay costs and will provide a much more agile service delivery model.

This initiative will save the government over half a million dollars per year, and that is saving the people of Queensland half a million dollars a year. It will strengthen market signals for the growth of private sector auditor services. This in turn will drive more efficient delivery of these technical services. What we are seeing here is yet another example of this government embracing a renewal and contestability agenda that supports Queensland businesses. This government is making an important shift from doer to enabler. It recognises that business has the expertise in how best to meet the required standards for environmental management.

These amendments that we see to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 will also remove barriers to business by removing ambiguity and legislative impediments to the recovery of waste. The bill replaces the existing beneficial use approval approach in the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 with end-of-waste codes and approvals. The amendments are designed to increase certainty for waste generators, for waste processors and for businesses receiving recovered materials in Queensland by clarifying when a waste ceases to be regarded as a waste and can, therefore, be managed as a resource. It is important to look at what can be recycled and managed as a resource, because this is where we are heading in the future. I know this is also an area on which the minister is focused and has a vision.

Once a waste is classified as a resource, a number of regulatory requirements and associated costs that apply to waste management, such as waste tracking requirements, will no longer apply. This amendment will help generators of waste to find new markets, and it will also assist receivers of waste to gain valuable resources. Importantly, we will see less waste going to landfill. Essentially this is a win-win scenario. It is definitely better for the environment and as such it is also better for the Queensland economy.

The green-tape benefits do not stop here. The bill also contains a range of other more minor amendments to the Environmental Protection Agency to improve the operation of the act. This will further contribute to the government's regulatory reform and improvement agenda. I am pleased to support a bill that makes sensible changes to a wide variety of legislation across portfolios and makes a significant contribution to reducing red tape.

I am particularly interested to note the amendment to the Nature Conservation Act 1992, which delivers on the final component of the wider revised flying fox roost management framework introduced into the parliament in November 2013. I have been in this parliament for over 10 years, and all I have heard during that time is about the need to remove flying foxes. We know they are a

protected animal and they are very much part of the ecology, but they carry disease. There are many areas that you can visit and see the problems these animals create, but at long last we have a sensible government that has brought in sensible legislation to remove these creatures.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mrs MENKENS: Thank you, member for Whitsunday. We live in an area where we see a lot of them, and certainly over the years we have heard a lot about the flying foxes in Charters Towers. I have seen them firsthand, and to give councils the right to put in place humane removal processes to remove these animals is a totally sensible move.

Mr Krause: It is common sense.

Mrs MENKENS: Absolutely common sense, as the gentleman behind me just said. It should have been introduced five years ago but it was a different government then, wasn't it?

A key element of that framework is an as-of-right authority for councils to manage urban roosts by nonlethal means. In Home Hill there is a quite heavily wooded park which is regularly frequented by flying foxes. The council quietly moved in, trimmed the trees, sorted out a few things and there are no flying foxes there now. Without any hassle or fuss they are gone, and it is as simple as that. Under this particular framework, councils no longer require a permit for the management of those roosts provided this is done in a manner that is consistent with the standards that are established within a statutory code of practice.

The bill provides ministerial authority to require councils to prepare a statement of management intent for as-of-right activities involving protected wildlife to ensure that councils remain accountable for their management actions, and one of the real moves of this government is to empower councils. They are the people who understand what is happening in their community and who truly understand the issues, and now we have a government in Queensland that recognises their authority.

I am really pleased to be able to support this bill, because it does make such sensible changes to a wide variety of legislation. I particularly thank the minister for bringing this bill to the House. I commend the committee for their report and for their hard work, and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (3.25 pm): It is a pleasure to contribute to the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This is a common-sense bill that streamlines and reduces red and green tape in this important area. The member for Burdekin concluded her speech by reference to the amendments to the Nature Conservation Act and the regime that was implemented in November 2013 to give local governments an as-of-right authority to manage flying fox roosts in urban areas. I thank the minister and the government for implementing this regime, because I represent an area where this has been a very big issue. The people who live in Boonah would know what I am talking about, because at Bicentennial Park in Boonah there was a very large flying fox roost that had been established there for three or four years. That flying fox roost has now been dispersed through action taken by the council in accordance with the authority given to it in November 2013 by this government. I thank the minister on behalf of the people of Boonah for improving the lifestyle of residents around that area. It is great to have this regime in place so that we do not have to hear from the member for Dalrymple speaking about the flying foxes in Charters Towers at almost every sitting. I do not know whether they have been dispersed or not, but there is a mechanism there now for the local government in Charters Towers to be able to take action in relation to dispersing that roost as well.

It was a long road to get to this point because, as I said, the roost in Boonah was established three or four years ago. For the people who lived near to that roost, it really created a very difficult situation for them and their lifestyle. I know that the health risks associated with flying foxes are limited in that unless you get very close to a flying fox, or are scratched by them, or come into contact with the bodily fluids of a flying fox, the risk of catching diseases from them is very low; however, there are other impacts caused by flying fox roosts being in close proximity to urban areas and houses. In this case it was less than 100 metres from the roost to the nearest house, and on a hot summer afternoon like we had on 3 January this year the impact of that roost on local residents was quite horrific because of the wind and associated smell which caused disruption to the mental health and wellbeing of those residents. There was a nauseating feeling that came from the smell and also a large amount of noise was generated by that roost. When this regime came into effect last year the Scenic Rim Regional Council put in place a program for the removal of that roost. I am happy to

inform the House that between the months of around April to June this year they undertook a vegetation removal process which has to this point successfully dispersed the entire roost of flying foxes in Boonah. I can say that the people who live nearby are very, very grateful for the actions of this government in dealing with that issue. The health and wellbeing of residents and people must always take precedence—

Mr Costigan: Paramount importance.

Mr KRAUSE:—paramount consideration—over other factors. This government has implemented that regime. It is a shame the former government was not able to see to it that a similar regime was put in place.

Removing this roost from the urban area was a very important step to take. As I said, on 3 January this year it was very hot. I think it was over 42 degrees in Boonah. At that stage there was a massive colony of little red flying foxes situated in Boonah and a lot of them died because of heat. The effect on the neighbours to that roost in that period was completely devastating. I know a lady whose husband was facing some very serious health issues at that time. On top of all of that, they had flying foxes falling out of the sky, dying due to heat exhaustion. Having these roosts in urban areas and the effect on health and wellbeing—mental and physical—was terrible.

I commend the minister for bringing this further amendment to the Nature Conservation Act to the House. It finalises the dispersal mechanism for local governments but also gives ministerial authority to require councils to prepare a statement of management intent for all as-of-right activities involving protected wildlife to ensure they are accountable for their management actions. They will be publicly available documents. When Scenic Rim council entered into the actions they took in relation to this flying fox roost, they prepared one of these statements. It was, as is mentioned in the explanatory notes, a way of engaging and educating the community about the management of flying foxes. That will be the case for other wildlife as well. There are about 30 kangaroos that live in my back paddock. Perhaps we could do with some management activity in relation to them.

Mr Costigan: Have some stew!

Mr KRAUSE: I take that. It is lovely to see them there, but kangaroos are a serious issue in some parts of the state—the way they pick at the properties. They are really competing with cattle for vegetation in some parts of the state. It is not so bad in the Scenic Rim, but I know that in other western parts of the state it is an issue. There is not much feed on the ground because of drought conditions and kangaroos are getting in there first in some cases.

This bill also increases maximum penalties for the most serious offences in the Environmental Protection Act. That brings it into line with other Queensland legislation and with other state and territory jurisdictions. It is sensible reform.

It is mentioned also that this bill follows on from the first round of green-tape reduction, which was undertaken in 2012. That was involving the removal of the annual requirement to fill out an environmental licensing form and pay the associated fee. I know that local government areas had differing fees for that, but in my part of the world it was around \$400. The saving for those businesses that now operate under standard conditions has been welcomed. Every little bit helps.

Ms Trad: That was a Labor bill.

Mr KRAUSE: I take that interjection from the member for South Brisbane. It may have been introduced by Labor, but it was not passed because the parliament ran out of time. They were too busy introducing things like the waste levy and putting other taxes onto Queenslanders that they do not really need. It may have been introduced, but it was not passed. They obviously had more important priorities to undertake.

I thank the minister for bringing this bill to the House and look forward to its implementation in the future.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (3.34 pm): This afternoon I rise in the House to speak in support of the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I acknowledge the work of my colleagues, both government and non-government, on the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee. I thank them for their contribution in relation to the bill. As I always say, we worked under the stewardship of our good friend the member for Lockyer. It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the professionalism, dedication, commitment and advice of the wonderful team on the secretariat. I know that the member for Beaudesert, having served on this committee previously, knows full well the work that they do for the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee.

It was very interesting to hear the acknowledgement by the member for Beaudesert of the amendments to the Nature Conservation Act, particularly in relation to flying fox roosts and so forth. About 18 months ago in my electorate an eight-year-old boy came into contact with a flying fox. Tragically, as a result his life was taken. I am sure there are many people who remember that incident. Our thoughts and prayers continue to be with the family of that little boy who lost his life. Nothing we do will bring him back, but I have no doubt that we are making our community a better place.

As the member for Beaudesert has rightly said, community health and public safety and wellbeing should be of paramount importance. That is not lost on this government. I am proud to be part of a government that is delivering in that respect. The empowerment of our local governments is central to that. I am sure that is not lost on our local government colleagues, who are gathering as we speak in the city that I represent in this place—the city of Mackay—for the Local Government Association of Queensland conference.

This bill supports firm but fair environmental regulation. It amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to increase the maximum penalties for the most serious offences against Queensland's environment to the same maximum penalties introduced by the Regional Planning Interests Act 2014. As the member for Beaudesert just touched on, the penalties for serious environmental offences will come into line with the penalties for similar offences in other jurisdictions, most notably New South Wales and Victoria. The amendments will also increase the maximum custodial sentence from two years imprisonment to five years imprisonment. The increase in severity of the penalties is necessary to act as a deterrent against environmental crime and to encourage good environmental management so as to prevent environmental harm.

The penalty increases help strengthen the Queensland government's commitment to being firm but fair when it comes to being a regulator. We cannot afford to have offenders seemingly getting off lightly for actions that cause environmental harm, and the proposed legislation aims to change this, essentially meaning that, as the old saying goes, if you do the crime you'll pay the fine.

These new penalties more accurately reflect the seriousness of the offence and also work as an effective deterrent to operators from causing significant and potentially irreparable damage. For example, Madam Deputy Speaker Cunningham, these changes will greatly benefit our Great Barrier Reef, something you can relate to in your role as the member for Gladstone, as can other members of parliament representing the Queensland coast. Madam Deputy Speaker, I am sure I do not have to remind you that the Great Barrier Reef is a World Heritage listed site because of its outstanding universal value. Currently, if a company were to wilfully cause serious environmental harm to the reef the maximum fine would be just over \$2.3 million. Under the proposed amendments this fine will increase to over \$3.7 million.

While speaking about the Great Barrier Reef, the minister's genuine care for the environment again shone through last Saturday. As has been touched on by the member for Pine Rivers and Assistant Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, he, along with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and my good self, attended the launch of ReefBlitz which is supported by a lot of good people in the community. It was a very successful day. On a classic dry-season morning in the place that I call paradise, the minister rightfully talked up our government's passion for delivering good environmental outcomes and our government's support of ReefBlitz which will result in increased data collection so that we get to know even more about our marine life, which of course is so precious in coastal communities such as the Whitsundays. I want to thank the minister and the assistant minister for coming to Cannonvale for this important occasion. I know that the minister had been in other parts of the north prior to coming to Cannonvale—in fact, at Mount Aberdeen in the neighbouring electorate of Burdekin only perhaps hours beforehand with graziers who are delivering good outcomes for the environment.

I also acknowledge the Great Barrier Reef Foundation represented by Claire Hanratty and her team and Professor David McInnes from Earthwatch who, contrary to the contribution earlier today from the member for South Brisbane, seemed more than pleased, more than comfortable and more than happy in how Minister Powell and this LNP government are playing their part in caring for the environment. I also commend all of the other key stakeholders who came along: the Mackay-Whitsunday regional NRM group, Reef Catchments and the amazing and incredible Libby Edge, who is no stranger to the minister. Right on queue his ears have pricked up, because she is an amazing lady and environmental crusader with her Eco Barge service. She was there with bells on; she would not have missed it for quids. I also commend people like Damien Head and note the Minister for National Parks smiling like a cheshire cat, and so he should because I was about to touch

on Damien Head, who is basically the big kahuna when it comes to national parks in our part of the world. I want to thank Damien and his colleague Brett Turnbull for taking us out to the islands only a few months ago to look at some of the great work that has been achieved by our park rangers throughout the Whitsunday islands.

Coming back to the bill specifically, a \$3.7 million penalty or five years imprisonment will go a long way towards decreasing the pay-off a business may see in illegally and wilfully harming our environment. Furthermore, increases in the penalties for environmental harm by individuals means that people will obviously think twice now before acting recklessly in ways that damage their surroundings. Let us take the example of a ship that tries to cut through the Great Barrier Reef and instead of going through Hydrographers Passage to the north-east of Mackay it thinks it can take another route perhaps and take a short cut. If a ship does that negligently or otherwise and runs aground on a reef island and causes an oil spill which causes irreversible damage to the unique marine life of the reef, look out. No longer will people be attracted by the idea of harming the environment to save money, because these proposed increased penalties will certainly far outweigh the benefits gained by causing environmental harm.

I also want to acknowledge the leadership of Minister Powell on a previous visit to our part of the world only a few weeks ago in relation to the Healthy Rivers to Reef Partnership. I thought it was a terrifically successful day as the minister launched that partnership for our region. Some 20 community groups and organisations came together to sign on the dotted line as we all work together towards a report card for our local waterways. I look forward to seeing the first of those report cards on our waterways—rivers such as the Don, the Proserpine, the O'Connell, the Andromache and the Pioneer in our part of the world and see how they are faring as our government maintains the rage in delivering good environmental outcomes whilst at the same time ensuring that the Queensland economy grows for the benefit of all Queenslanders.

As I am conscious of the time, in wrapping up I again make the point that these increased penalties will act as a significant deterrent for those people who think that they can cut corners and think that they can damage our precious environmental sites. I conclude by acknowledging the work of the minister, who is very busy in his portfolio. He makes plenty of visits to not just my electorate in North Queensland but right across the regions and I am sure that that is very much appreciated by people like Libby Edge and many others right across this great state of ours. I acknowledge the work of the minister and also the work of his ministerial team and his departmental team. As members would appreciate, I love the idea of taking a cane knife to green tape, red tape, whatever sort of tape. This legislation is music to my ears and, needless to say, I certainly wholeheartedly support the bill.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (3.44 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. There are a couple of points of the bill that I want to focus on. The first is in relation to flying fox risk management. It is always pleasing to see some progress being made in terms of dealing with flying foxes. It was an issue that was paramount when I was on the Mount Isa City Council, so I am acutely aware of many of the issues council face in dealing with it. There has been progress in developing that, but unfortunately when I was on council there was so much misinformation provided in terms of how we deal with that. For instance, the comment was made when I was on the council that culling or reducing the numbers was not an issue because we could not compromise the number of flying foxes in any particular colony, but then a comment was made further in that discussion that nature has a wonderful way of replenishing itself and building up strong numbers in a very fast period. That to me was fairly contradictory to the first point made.

The other point that gets lost with flying fox management in those remote areas is the fact that Mount Isa has only been there since the 1920s and it is a completely unnatural environment and the only other similar type environment for roosting of that size is about 500 kilometres away on the coast. It is certainly a very unnatural environment and habitat that has been created for them there. It has created a big problem and these are small steps towards managing it, but they do help. I give credit to the minister for improving that situation. This issue has come to the fore again with the debate on ebola in that we have become acutely aware of these diseases and the threat that they pose. We just heard from the member for Whitsunday about the deaths that have occurred from this issue, so it is very serious and needs to be dealt with. This is only the start of the journey. There is a lot more to be done with regard to the management of them, but I do appreciate that at least there have been small steps made in that regard. I commend the minister for that.

The other issue I want to address in this bill relates to Great Barrier Reef protection. I am all for it given that I have the port of Karumba in my electorate. Karumba is a little place that bats well above its weight in terms of the local economy. Compared to other western towns in my electorate in terms of economic output, it leaves them for dead. It has a massive fishing industry and a large portion of the mining industry. Century Zinc, one of the world's largest zinc mines, sends all of its concentrate through to Karumba. It has a live cattle export facility. It has huge tourism capacity in that the population swells from 600 people to about 3,500 in the tourist season during the winter months. It is also a fishing mecca for everyone who lives in North Queensland, so it is a great place.

At the moment the port requires dredging. It is a very shallow port. It is not a big port, but it is of enormous strategic value because boats can go straight through to Asia, bypassing the Great Barrier Reef. It is a very important point to recognise that Karumba is an access port for produce out of North-West Queensland and the gulf that can go direct to Asia, bypassing the reef. I am told that Panamax ships are the class of ship that seafarers like to use now in those industries. Panamax ships can get into that port, but we do not like those ships going across the reef.

There is great potential, and that has been acknowledged in the bill. We need to protect the reef and that lends a large focus on the port in Karumba. Mayor Fred Pascoe does a great job in promoting that. I also acknowledge the efforts the Premier made in dealing with Fred Pascoe to get control of Karumba port, and they have been doing some work towards that end. Once Century Zinc reduces its operations and all but shuts down next year, they will not be feeding a lot of money into that port for dredging so it will need some work. If we want to protect the Great Barrier Reef, we have to look at the Karumba port. It can offer a lot of benefit to the development of North-West Queensland.

I appreciate those aspects of the bill. I think both of them have benefits to my electorate. I am very supportive of those aspects of the bill and I thank the minister.



Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (3.49 pm), in reply: First of all, I thank all honourable members for their participation in the debate on the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill this afternoon. I also reiterate my thanks to the members, the chair and the research staff involved in the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for their very thorough consideration of the bill.

Today, members of this House have stood up and spoken in support of this bill as another green-tape-reduction success story. This bill is good for business and industry but also, very importantly, it is good for regulators such as the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection and, most importantly, good for the environment. So I again thank all members for their contributions to the debate. I also acknowledge that that includes the member for South Brisbane. It has taken a long time, but we have finally been able to extract some praise out of the member for South Brisbane for an environmental bill brought forward by this side of the House. However, I must admit that there is some concern in what I heard subsequently from the member for South Brisbane—concern around the fact that, again, we are hearing from those opposite a significant reluctance, if not an outright denial, to devolve things to councils; more centralisation; create green tape rather than cut it; and certainly, again, a return to the good old solution of, 'If you can't solve it any other way, let's whack on a tax.' To me, when it comes to the environment we are starting to hear the election policy commitments from the Australian Labor Party. They may as well sum it up in one word, 'Let's bring back DERM.' That is not something that this side of the House—this government—supports. We have worked very hard as an agency, we have worked very hard as a portfolio to get the balance right to ensure that we work with business and industry to create the economic growth and the jobs that this state requires. I think the member for Pine Rivers summed it up perfectly when he said that he wants his children to have a job but he also wants them to have an environment that they can be proud of and enjoy. The two can go hand in hand and this bill is a contribution to achieving that.

I was pleased to hear from the member for Maryborough, who spoke about the enforceable undertakings, a new compliance tool that will substantially improve environmental protection in Queensland as well as create significant savings for both the government and businesses involved in those undertakings. In contrast to what is really the very coercive nature of litigation, enforceable undertakings are voluntary. They bring about positive results for the environment by encouraging businesses and individuals to take active responsibility for their offence and for the impacts that that offence has caused.

I again note that the member for South Brisbane also approves in principle the introduction of the enforceable undertakings. However, I note that the member for South Brisbane will be seeking to move amendments during consideration in detail to broaden the enforcement powers for these documents to allow third parties to bring court action if they believe that the undertaking has been contravened. I might add that this suggestion comes straight from the Environmental Defenders Office's submission to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee—a submission that my department has already responded to in considerable detail. As the response noted, this would be contrary to the intent of the undertaking in the first place.

An enforceable undertaking is effectively a contract between the regulator—in this case the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection—and the proponent of the undertaking. It is not the role of a third party to be able to come in to say whether that contract is being met. That is the role of my department. That is the role of the regulator. My department is already on the record saying that it is redesigning our compliance framework to ensure state-wide consistency in compliance activities and to enable the effective and efficient utilisation of compliance resources. In the longer term, that framework will also be increasing the department's interactions with the community through the provision of real-time information about the environmental performance of customers and the outcomes of our compliance and enforcement activities. We are very much getting that information out to the community in a very open and transparent way. That will be achieved through an enhanced, contemporary online presence and communication strategy. As a government, we have taken the step of being very open and transparent with the community. We very much take that on board as the environmental regulator. We want to be open and transparent with the community, particularly around issues such as enforceable undertakings.

Madam Deputy Speaker, in your speech you also raised this issue about how we further engage with the community. We have every intention of doing that. But at the end of the day the parties to the enforceable undertaking are the proponent that has the project and regulator. There is no room for a third party to be involved.

That brings me back to the amendment that I understand the member for South Brisbane will be moving in consideration in detail. I come back to that comment I made that this amendment is literally lifted from the EDO playbook in terms of what it provided the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee. I draw the attention of the members of the chamber to the fact that the head of the Environmental Defenders Office in Queensland, and in Brisbane in particular, is a lady by the name of Jo-Anne Bragg. Members may not be aware that Jo-Anne Bragg stood for the Greens in the seat of South Brisbane.

Members may also recall that we debated a bill in this House to which we moved an amendment called the Monto amendment. I think the bill was introduced by the Attorney-General. That amendment was named the Monto amendment in recognition of the member for Callide, the Deputy Premier, who was very adamant that some changes be made to the bill to benefit the Monto show. Clearly, the amendment the member for South Brisbane will move this afternoon is to benefit her political career and her political career alone.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, that is outrageous, offensive—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! Do you have a point of order?

Ms TRAD: I am taking personal offence to it and I ask that the minister withdraw.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I seek your withdrawal.

Mr POWELL: I withdraw. The amendment that the member will move this afternoon is straight from the Environmental Defenders Organisation, headed by Jo-Anne Bragg. Jo-Anne Bragg was the Greens candidate who secured nearly 20 per cent of the vote of the electorate of South Brisbane when Jackie Trad, the member for South Brisbane, achieved 32 per cent and the LNP candidate achieved 38 per cent. Clearly, the member for South Brisbane required the Greens candidate's preferences to win the seat of South Brisbane at the by-election. This afternoon, we are seeing payback. This is a pat on the back for those preferences.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: The minister has repeated his slur.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do you have a point of order?

Ms TRAD: My point of order is that he is being personally offensive and I ask him to withdraw his comments.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member has found your comments offensive and I seek your withdrawal.

Mr POWELL: I withdraw. If I may move on and discuss the contaminated land reports component of the bill. In relation to the new requirement for contaminated land reports to be certified by an independent auditor who is approved by the department as having the extensive experience and skills required for the task, the member for South Brisbane said that this government has no clear idea of the real costs involved. The regulatory impact statement notes quite clearly that the costs to the government are estimated to be about \$600,000 per annum. I acknowledge that that is an estimate, because the actual costs are dependent on the number and the complexity of the assessments that are required in any one year. The member would be well aware that the number of applications or assessments required on contaminated land would fluctuate from any one given year. So the RIS—the regulatory impact statement—has clearly enunciated that it is estimated that that will save the government in the order of \$600,000 per year.

A number of members raised concerns about the amendments in this bill to the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act. The member for South Brisbane questioned the fact that the 2013 *State of waste and recycling in Queensland* report was not released under my name. The reason for that is pretty unexciting. Under the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act, it is the chief executive's responsibility to release the report, which the director-general ably did. But then I guess the member for South Brisbane might ask why did I release the 2012 report. That was because I was pretty proud to be releasing the first state of waste report since 2008. I was proud that I was bringing an end to the lack of transparency of the former Labor government and publishing some real data for the people of Queensland on waste and recycling—again, testimony to the fact that this side of the chamber, the Newman government, is committed to being open and transparent and sharing information with the people of Queensland.

I will also mention that the Newman government is supporting some great projects in partnership with the National Packaging Covenant Industry Association. For the 2014-15 financial year I can report that we are in negotiations in relation to funding agreements for five exciting new projects spread across Queensland. I am particularly excited by the new glass-crushing plant that will be situated in Rockhampton. The constituents of the member for Yeppoon will benefit from that. There will be another plant established in Mackay. The member for Whitsunday spoke about his passion for his patch. I think he calls it paradise ad nauseam. He is wrong. Paradise is in the Sunshine Coast hinterland. That glass-crushing plant in Mackay will go a long way to protecting his part of the world. It will enable locally collected glass to be treated locally and turned into a valuable resource, including construction aggregate for use in civil construction works.

Another great project that the Queensland Newman government has supported is the new Replas facility due to be opened later this year on the Gold Coast. I am sure, Madam Deputy Speaker, you would also be very appreciative of seeing that facility open on the Gold Coast. This is a state-of-the-art plastics-recycling facility turning mixed plastic waste, including soft plastics like bags and cling film, into timber replacement products like bollards for use in landscaping applications. This is the real face of turning waste into resources and demonstrates the kind of practical on-the-ground solutions that this government supports. We do not support a tax. Whenever Labor was confronted with a problem under the previous regime what did it run to? A tax: a carbon tax, a waste tax. Everything was a tax and everything was a slug on the mums and dads of Queensland and the businesses that created the economic growth and jobs in this state. We have undone both of those at a federal and state level and do not shy away from the fact that we will continue to ensure that the cost of living for Queenslanders is managed in a far more responsible way.

The member for South Brisbane raised some criticisms of undertaking a review of the beneficial use approval system before a waste strategy was released and after only three years of operation. Let me correct some assumptions here. Firstly, reviewing regulation and reducing green tape for business is a core commitment of this government. This is not reliant on the delivery of a strategy. This is work that we are running in parallel with the development of the strategy in close consultation—something that the other side could never achieve—with industry and which will deliver appreciable benefits to keeping valuable resources in our economy rather than ending up in landfill like under the previous government.

Secondly, this is not three-year-old legislation. It was included in the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 but was transferred largely unreviewed from the Environmental Protection (Waste Management) Regulation. It is well and truly overdue for a review. It was a review supported by both the waste and the waste generation sectors and it is one of the big improvements that this bill sees.

I now move to the contribution from the member for Gaven, who seemed completely and utterly confused on this issue. End-of-waste codes have nothing to do with interstate waste transport. It is a technical process to work out when a particular type of waste can safely be used in other processes as a resource. A good example—and I see in the chamber the member for Nanango and others from the Darling Downs area—is coal seam gas water which, if treated to appropriate standards, can be used as any other water and is a vital resource for our drought affected farmers.

That brings me to the issue of interstate waste transport that both the member for South Brisbane and the member for Gaven raised in their contributions. Let me make a couple of points about this: firstly, where waste is ultimately disposed of is a business decision. If the waste is going to an appropriately licensed landfill then the environmental issues are adequately managed. Our data shows that most interstate general waste is actually going to private landfills outside of Ipswich, not to council landfills on the Gold Coast as suggested by the member for Gaven. The need for a new landfill on the Gold Coast has a lot more to do with population growth than an increase in interstate waste movements.

Secondly, the increase in waste movements has been caused not so much by the removal of the levy in Queensland but by the massive increases in the levy in New South Wales. I note that my counterparts in New South Wales are concerned by the movement of waste through their state, not because of environmental matters but because of the loss of revenue. They have recently released a regulatory impact statement on these matters noting that there is a saving of \$80 to \$90 per tonne to transport from the Sydney region to Queensland. Even the former Labor government's beloved \$35 per tonne waste tax would not have stopped the increase in movements across the border.

Ms Trad: Says you! Where's the evidence?

Mr POWELL: I take that interjection. The evidence is in the regulatory impact statement released by New South Wales that shows that there is a saving of between \$80 and \$90 per tonne to transport from the Sydney region to Queensland. The flawed waste tax of the previous government was not going to stop that increase in movement.

Thirdly, the New South Wales government is introducing new legislation on 1 November to slow down interstate waste movement, including introducing a proximity principle which prevents the transport of waste a distance of more than 150 kilometres where a suitable facility exists within that radius. This will certainly slow down transport of waste into Queensland which will have impacts on the private businesses which have contracted to transport and take this waste.

I might also raise at this point that the transfer of goods, and that includes waste, across borders has been permitted under the federation of this nation since federation itself. The proposal by the member for Gaven to specifically tax interstate trade is inconsistent with everything that is contained in our Constitution, inconsistent with the practices of the federation and the state since that time, and unless he wants to rewrite the Constitution what he proposes is illegal.

The member for Barron River spoke about the important amendments to the Biological Control Act 1987 that are critical in the battle against the poisonous and problematic weed mother of millions. I am pleased that the declaration of mother of millions as a target organism can now get underway and the impact of this serious invasive pest on Queensland agriculture can be minimised.

The member for South Brisbane referred to the Environmental Offsets Act 2014 and complained that it was an easy way for developers to avoid scrutiny of their impacts, suggesting that it was easier to offset than it was to mitigate. If the member cared to look, she would see that section 14 of the Environmental Offsets Act is very clear: an offset condition can only be imposed if all reasonable onsite mitigation measures have been or will be taken. Let me repeat that: they can only be imposed if all reasonable onsite mitigation measures have been or will be taken. The Environmental Offsets Act is a clear demonstration of how we can maintain environmental protection whilst streamlining processes and removing unreasonable red tape and duplication.

The member also claimed that the UDIA and the PCA do not support the changes. The UDIA and the PCA do support the majority of the changes. They support the removal of duplication of offset requirements and they support streamlining of assessment and administration to ensure greater certainty for developers. However, this government does disagree with the position of the UDIA and the PCA that the decision on whether an activity is a controlled action under the Commonwealth's Environment and Biodiversity Protection and Conservation Act 1999 is a decision about whether an offset is required or not. The government believes that an offset decision requires a rigorous consideration of all mitigation activities and of any offset proposal. It is only through this thorough assessment that the viability and feasibility of the offset proposal can be fully undertaken.

The member for Maryborough spoke about how this government is responding to concerns about the unnecessary complexity associated with provisions in the Environmental Offsets Act 2014. This bill has tackled the very difficult job of removing offset duplication between the different levels of government. The Newman government has not backed away from this challenging task and I am pleased to note that my department has been working very closely with concerned stakeholders to resolve their concerns. The amendments in this bill are the proof that this government is listening to feedback and prepared to finetune innovative legislation.

The member for Nicklin raised a number of matters, although not many of them were consistent with the bill. I guess that is of no surprise really. He made a statement about there being pages and pages of amendments that we are making. I am happy to report to the member for Nicklin that, of the 44 pages of amendments that we are moving, only one was introduced today and only one page has been introduced inconsistently with the suggestions or the recommendations of the committee. The other 43 pages contain amendments to address the concerns of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee. That is one out of 44 pages. That one page is around enhancing the penalties and sentences for damage or wilful and serious environmental harm to the Great Barrier Reef. I do not think that anyone in this House would oppose that amendment.

Mr Costigan: Not in their right mind.

Mr POWELL: Not anyone in their right mind. I acknowledge the member for Whitsunday and I thank him and the member for Pine Rivers for their contributions around these specific amendments. I thank them for what they have demonstrated through the work that they did on Saturday at ReefBlitz. I acknowledge the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, who provided funding to the Great Barrier Reef Foundation for the inaugural ReefBlitz. As the members for Pine Rivers and Whitsunday said, it was great to be there with a whole stack of kids from the local schools and the PCYC, I understand, as well as scientists from a range of universities and a whole lot of community organisations such as Eco Barge. Libby from Eco Barge is always happy to give you a hug every time she sees you; isn't that right, member for Whitsunday? Then very quickly she will get you out on the beach to collect rubbish. What the member for Pine Rivers, the member for Whitsunday and I saw on Saturday morning was a commitment from that community to put the reef first and to do everything we can to protect it. In 2½ years the Newman government has done more to protect the Great Barrier Reef than any government before it.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr POWELL: I hear the interjection from the member for South Brisbane. It is a shame that the member for South Brisbane was not in this chamber when the former member for South Brisbane spruiked the credentials of a massive project at Abbot Point that would have seen 38 million cubic metres of dredge spoil removed from adjacent to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and disposed of at sea. Clearly, any interjection from the member for South Brisbane is not based on fact, because she has a short-term memory when it comes to the actions of the previous Bligh and Beattie governments.

We have heard from the member for Lockyer that the bill carries practical and pragmatic changes to the contaminated land provisions, which I have also touched on. The member for Lockyer, the member for Dalrymple, the member for Burdekin, the member for Beaudesert, the member for Whitsunday and the member for Mount Isa spoke about the clauses in the bill pertaining to flying foxes. I thank all members for their contributions in that regard. Through this bill we have seen the delivery of an election commitment. We gave two commitments around flying foxes: one was to reintroduce lethal damage mitigation permits for farmers, particularly horticulturalists, who have demonstrated that they have pursued a range of non-lethal means but still have issues with flying foxes; and the second was to make it easier for councils, that is, local governments, to get on with the job of getting the balance right between community health and safety and flying fox conservation. That election commitment is working exceptionally well. A number of members talked about—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr POWELL: Madam Speaker, the interjection from the member for South Brisbane about shooting them all is completely and utterly false. Our amendments to the Nature Conservation Act are about giving councils the power to make roost modifications very early on in the piece, before roosts establish, so that colonies do not establish in close proximity to urban populations and so that the people of Queensland, particularly those in our urban areas, do not have to suffer the smell, the noise and all the other lack of comforts that come from having a flying fox community on their doorstep.

The member for Barron River spoke of the changes to penalties in the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to bring penalties for serious environmental offences into line with the penalties for similar offences in other jurisdictions such as New South Wales and Victoria. The penalty increases help strengthen the Queensland government's commitment to being a firm but fair regulator. I am confident that the increase in severity will act as a significant deterrent against environmental crime and will encourage good environmental management to prevent environmental harm. That is another commitment that will be delivered this afternoon by the Newman government that shows you can get the balance right between strong environmental protection and sustainable economic growth.

Before I conclude, I take a moment to thank the many departmental staff who have worked very hard on the amendments in this bill and who have also appeared before the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee. I acknowledge, in no particular order, my thanks to Lawrie Wade, Kate Watkins, Sarah Hindmarsh, Scarlett Stephan, Laurie Hodgman, Tamara Miller, Elisa Nicholls, Scott Buchanan, Vanessa Coverdale, Anne Lenz, Andrew Mullens and Nick Weinert, all under the capable leadership of a number of deputy directors-general, in particular, Tamara O'Shea, Tony Roberts and Dean Ellwood and, of course, Director-General John Black. This bill strikes a balance with sensible reductions in green tape. It encourages investment in the Queensland economy while strengthening environmental protection for Queensland's environment, particularly the Great Barrier Reef. I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 63:

LNP, 61—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

KAP, 1—Knuth.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Cunningham.

NOES, 11:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

INDEPENDENTS, 3—Douglas, Judge, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail



Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): I note that the minister's amendment No. 1 proposes to amend clause 2, which relates to proposed new clauses in other amendments. Therefore, consideration of clause 2 is postponed until after all other clauses and amendments have been considered.

Clause 2 postponed.

Clauses 3 to 9, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.22 pm): I move the following amendment and table the explanatory notes to my amendments—

2 After clause 9

Page 19, after line 12—

insert—

9A Amendment of s 5 (Relationship with particular Acts)

Section 5(3), note, fourth dot point, 'section 972'—

omit, insert—

section 346B

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Powell's amendments [\[6378\]](#).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.23 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 After clause 10

Page 19, after line 23—

insert—

10A Amendment of s 13 (Content of environmental offsets policy)

Section 13(e), 'calculating'—

omit, insert—

determining

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.23 pm): I move the following amendment—

4 After clause 10

Page 19, after line 23—

insert—

10B Insertion of new s 13B

Part 5—

insert—

13B What this part is about

- (1) This part applies if an administering agency may impose an offset condition on an authority, under another Act, for an impact on a prescribed environmental matter.
- (2) This part applies despite anything to the contrary in the other Act, other than as mentioned in—
 - (a) section 5; or
 - (b) the Planning Act, section 325(1).

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11—

Mr POWELL (4.23 pm): I move the following amendment—

5 Clause 11 (Amendment of s 14 (Imposing offset condition))

Page 20, lines 1 to 7—

omit, insert—

11 Replacement of s 14 (Imposing offset condition)

Section 14—

omit, insert—

14 Imposing offset condition

- (1) The administering agency may impose the offset condition only if satisfied—
 - (a) the prescribed activity will, or is likely to, have a significant residual impact on a prescribed environmental matter; and
 - (b) all reasonable on-site mitigation measures for the prescribed activity have been, or will be, undertaken.
- (2) When making a decision under the other Act about whether to impose an offset condition, the administering agency must consider any offset condition that has been imposed on an authority under another Act for—
 - (a) the same, or substantially the same, impact; and
 - (b) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—

Mr POWELL (4.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

6 Clause 12 (Amendment of s 15 (Restriction on imposition of offset condition))

Page 20, lines 8 to 29, page 21, lines 1 to 35, and page 22, lines 1 to 4—

omit, insert—

12 Replacement of s 15 (Restriction on imposition of offset condition)

Section 15—

omit, insert—

15 Restriction on imposition of offset condition

- (1) An administering agency may impose an offset condition on an authority only if—
 - (a) the same, or substantially the same, impact has not been assessed under a relevant Commonwealth Act; and
 - (b) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter has not been assessed under a relevant Commonwealth Act.
- (2) Subsection (1) applies whether or not the assessment resulted in the imposition of an offset condition.
- (3) However, subsection (1) does not apply if the prescribed environmental matter to which the condition relates is a protected area.
- (4) An administering agency that is a local government may impose an offset condition on an authority only for the following—
 - (a) a matter of local environmental significance;
 - (b) another prescribed environmental matter that is further prescribed by regulation as relevant for this subsection.
- (5) In this section—

relevant Commonwealth Act means—

 - (a) the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (Cwlth) as a controlled action; or
 - (b) the *Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Act 1975* (Cwlth); or
 - (c) another Commonwealth Act prescribed by regulation.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister has circulated amendment No. 7 that proposes to omit clause 13. The correct procedure is to vote against the clause. The question is that clause 13, as read, stand part of bill.

Clause 13, as read, negatived.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.24 pm): I move the following amendment—

8 **After clause 13**

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13 Amendment of pt 6 hdg (Requirements about offset conditions)

Part 6, heading, 'offset conditions'—

omit, insert—

environmental offsets

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.25 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 **After clause 13**

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13A Amendment of s 16 (Conditions that apply under this Act to authority)

Section 16(1) to (3)—

omit, insert—

- (1) This section applies if an offset condition is imposed on an authority, under another Act, for a significant residual impact of a prescribed activity on a prescribed environmental matter.
- (2) Sections 19B, 22, 24 and 25 state further conditions that, under this Act, are imposed on the authority.
- (3) A further condition mentioned in subsection (2) is a **deemed condition** of the authority.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.25 pm): I move the following amendment—

10 **After clause 13**

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13B Replacement of ss 18 and 19

Sections 18 and 19—

omit, insert—

18 Electing how to deliver environmental offset

- (1) This section applies if an administering agency may impose or has imposed on an authority, under another Act, an offset condition for the significant residual impact of a prescribed activity on a prescribed environmental matter.
- (2) An entity may, by notice in the approved form given to the administering agency, elect to deliver an environmental offset for the prescribed activity, or for a stage of the prescribed activity, by—
 - (a) a proponent-driven offset; or
 - (b) a financial settlement offset; or
 - (c) a combination of a proponent-driven offset and a financial settlement offset.
- (3) A notice of election that involves a proponent-driven offset must be accompanied by a plan (an **offset delivery plan**) about how the entity will undertake the offset.
- (4) The offset delivery plan must—
 - (a) describe how an environmental offset will be undertaken and the conservation outcome will be achieved; and
 - (b) state that the entity, and any other entity that owns land on which the environmental offset will be undertaken, agree to the offset being undertaken; and
 - (c) be signed by the entities mentioned in paragraph (b); and
 - (d) satisfy each other requirement prescribed by regulation for this section.

- (5) For subsection (4)(a), the offset delivery plan must—
- (a) effectively account for and manage the risks of the environmental offset failing to achieve the conservation outcome; and
 - (b) ensure the environmental offset provides benefits in relation to the prescribed environmental matter in addition to any other benefit provided under a requirement of, or of an authority under, an Act; and

Example for paragraph (b)—

Ensuring an environmental offset in relation to the management of a pest provides benefits in addition to a landowner's obligation under the *Land Protection (Pest and Stock Route Management) Act 2002*, section 77 to take reasonable steps to keep land free of particular pests.

- (c) have transparent governance arrangements that can be readily measured, monitored, audited and enforced; and
- (d) ensure the environmental offset is of a size and scale proportionate to the significant residual impact on the prescribed environmental matter.

19 Agreed delivery arrangements

- (1) After receiving a notice of election, the administering agency must consider the election and any offset delivery plan, including by considering—
 - (a) each relevant environmental offsets policy; and
 - (b) any other matter prescribed by regulation for this section.
- (2) The administering agency must decide whether it is appropriate to deliver the environmental offset in the way stated in the notice of election, and any offset delivery plan, or whether the offset should be delivered in a different way.
- (3) The administering agency must give the entity a notice that states—
 - (a) the way in which the environmental offset is required to be delivered; and
 - (b) the entity is required to enter into an agreed delivery arrangement within a stated reasonable period; and
 - (c) that the entity may apply for a review of the decision; and
 - (d) how and when the entity may apply for a review of the decision.
- (4) An **agreed delivery arrangement** is an agreement between an entity and the administering agency about the entity's delivery of an environmental offset, with reference to any offset delivery plan.
- (5) An agreed delivery arrangement may be entered into before or after the authority is granted.

Note—

However, see section 19A for when an agreed delivery arrangement is entered into before the authority is granted.

- (6) If the administering agency fails to give notice under subsection (3) within 40 business days after receiving the notice of election, the entity may apply for a review of the failure to give the notice, in the way provided for under subsection (8).
- (7) The entity and administering agency may amend either or both of the following—
 - (a) the agreed delivery arrangement;
 - (b) an offset delivery plan;
 by entering into another agreed delivery arrangement before the entity starts the relevant prescribed activity, or the relevant stage of a prescribed activity.
- (8) A regulation may provide for—
 - (a) a review of a decision to require an environmental offset to be delivered in a way that differs from the way stated in a notice of election; or
 - (b) a review of a failure to give a notice under subsection (3) within 40 business days after the administering agency receives the notice of election; or
 - (c) what happens if the entity and administering agency do not enter into an agreed delivery arrangement within the stated reasonable period; or
 - (d) a dispute resolution process.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.25 pm): I move the following amendment—

11 **After clause 13**

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13C Insertion of new s 19A

Part 6, division 2—

insert—

19A Agreed delivery arrangement before authority granted

- (1) This section applies if an entity enters into an agreed delivery arrangement (the **early arrangement**) under section 19 before an authority is granted.
- (2) The entity—
 - (a) may start to deliver a proponent-driven offset before the authority is granted; but
 - (b) must not pay any amount under a financial settlement offset until after the authority is granted.
- (3) If, after the early arrangement is entered into, but not more than 10 business days after the authority for the prescribed activity is granted—
 - (a) there is a change in the way the prescribed activity is proposed to be carried out that will result in a change to the impact; and
 - (b) the administering agency decides that the impact that is counterbalanced under the early arrangement differs from the impact likely to arise from the prescribed activity;

the administering agency must give the entity a notice under subsection (4).
- (4) The administering agency's notice must state—
 - (a) the environmental offset is required to be delivered in a way that differs from the way stated in the early arrangement; and
 - (b) the entity is required to enter into another agreed delivery arrangement to that effect, within a stated reasonable period; and
 - (c) the reasons for the decision; and
 - (d) that the entity may apply for a review of the decision; and
 - (e) how and when the entity may apply for a review of the decision.
- (5) A regulation may provide for a review of the decision to require the environmental offset to be delivered in a way that differs from the way stated in the early arrangement.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.25 pm): I move the following amendment—

12 **After clause 13**

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13D Insertion of new s 19B

Part 6, division 2—

insert—

19B Deemed condition for agreed delivery arrangement

- (1) This section applies to an authority, granted by an administering agency under another Act, to carry out a prescribed activity to which an offset condition relates.
- (2) It is a condition of the authority that the authority holder must have entered into an agreed delivery arrangement with the administering agency, before starting—
 - (a) any works that impact on the prescribed environmental matter to which the offset condition relates; or
 - (b) if the authority allows the prescribed activity to be carried out in stages—any works for the stage that impact on the prescribed environmental matter to which the offset condition relates.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

13 After clause 13

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13E Replacement of s 20 (Amending agreement after prescribed activity starts)

Section 20—

omit, insert—

20 Amending agreement after prescribed activity starts

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) an administering agency and an authority holder have entered into an agreed delivery arrangement that involves a proponent-driven offset; and
 - (b) the authority holder has started the prescribed activity to which the authority relates.
- (2) The authority holder and administering agency may, by entering into another agreed delivery arrangement, amend either or both of the following—
 - (a) the agreed delivery arrangement;
 - (b) an offset delivery plan about the delivery of the proponent-driven offset.
- (3) In considering whether to enter into a further agreed delivery arrangement, the administering agency must consider the matters mentioned in section 19(1)(a) and (b).
- (4) An offset delivery plan amended under this section must comply with section 18(4) and (5).

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

14 After clause 13

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13F Replacement of s 21 (What is a *proponent-driven offset*)

Section 21—

omit, insert—

21 What is a *proponent-driven offset*

A ***proponent-driven offset*** is an environmental offset that an entity undertakes directly or indirectly.

Example of an entity indirectly undertaking an environmental offset—

An entity may deliver an environmental offset by contracting with a broker to carry out activities on the entity's behalf.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

15 After clause 13

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13G Amendment of s 23 (What is a *financial settlement offset*)

Section 23—

insert—

- (2) The amount of the payment is—
 - (a) if the administering agency is a local government—an amount up to the amount determined by the local government in accordance with the environmental offsets policy; or
 - (b) for any other administering agency—an amount determined by the administering agency in accordance with the environmental offsets policy.

Amendment agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

16 After clause 13

Page 23, after line 19—

insert—

13H Amendment of s 24 (Requirements for financial settlement offsets)

Section 24(3)—

omit, insert—

- (3) The authority holder may pay the amount required by the agreed delivery arrangement for a stage of the prescribed activity only if the authority allows the prescribed activity to be carried out in stages.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14—

Mr POWELL (4.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

17 Clause 14 (Insertion of new pt 6A)

Page 23, lines 25 to 30, page 24, lines 1 to 33, and page 25, lines 1 to 6—

omit, insert—

25A Removing duplicate conditions

- (1) This section applies if, after an offset condition is imposed, any of the following offset conditions is imposed—
- (a) a Commonwealth condition for an area that is not a protected area;
 - (b) a State condition;
 - (c) a local government condition.
- (2) The authority holder may, at any time and free of charge, apply for an amendment of the authority to remove one of the conditions on the basis that the conditions are duplicate conditions.
- (3) The authority holder must apply, in the approved form, to—
- (a) if one of the offset conditions is a Commonwealth condition mentioned in subsection (1)(a)—the administering agency that imposed the offset condition that is not a Commonwealth condition, to remove the offset condition imposed by that agency; or
 - (b) otherwise—
 - (i) the administering agency prescribed by regulation, to remove the condition imposed by that agency; or
 - (ii) if an administering agency is not prescribed by regulation—either administering agency that imposed an offset condition, to remove the offset condition imposed by that agency.
- (4) The administering agency must decide the application within 10 business days after receiving the application.
- (5) The administering agency may decide to amend the authority if satisfied that the conditions are duplicate conditions.
- (6) If the administering agency decides to amend the authority by removing the condition, the agency may also make any other amendments that the agency considers—
- (a) relate to the removal of the condition; and
 - (b) are necessary or desirable.
- (7) If the administering agency decides to amend the authority, the agency must, within 10 days after making the decision—
- (a) give the amended authority to the authority holder; and
 - (b) include a copy of the amended authority in the register kept under section 90.
- (8) If the administering agency decides not to amend the authority, the administering agency must give the authority holder a notice that states—
- (a) the decision and the reasons for the decision; and
 - (b) that the holder may apply for a review of the decision; and
 - (c) how and when the holder may apply for a review of the decision.

- (9) A regulation may provide for a review of the decision.
- (10) Any provisions in the Act under which the offset condition was imposed about amending conditions of an authority, other than a provision mentioned in section 5, do not apply to an offset condition that is amended under this section.
- (11) In this section—
 - duplicate conditions** are offset conditions that relate to—
 - (a) the same, or substantially the same, impact; and
 - (b) the same, or substantially the same, prescribed environmental matter.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 14, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (4.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

18 After clause 15

Page 25, after line 10—

insert—

15A Insertion of new ss 95A and 95B

Part 13—

insert—

95A Undecided applications for authorities

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) an application for an authority was made under an existing Act, but not dealt with, before the commencement; and
 - (b) that Act allowed for an offset condition to be imposed on the authority; and
 - (c) the administering agency is deciding whether to impose on the authority a condition in relation to an environmental offset.
- (2) The administering agency may, at the request of or with the agreement of the applicant, consider all or part of the environmental offsets policy under this Act instead of all or part of any policy about environmental offsets (however described) under the existing Act.
- (3) This section applies despite section 95.

95B Amendment of existing authorities

- (1) This section applies to the following authorities granted under an existing Act if that Act allowed for an offset condition to be imposed on the authority—
 - (a) an existing authority;
 - (b) an authority granted, on or after the commencement, as the result of an application that was made, but not dealt with, before the commencement.
- (2) The authority holder may, at any time and free of charge, apply for an amendment of the authority—
 - (a) to allow the selection and delivery of an environmental offset in accordance with the environmental offsets policy; or
 - (b) to allow a financial settlement offset (however described) determined in accordance with the environmental offsets policy; or
 - (c) to remove a requirement to provide an environmental offset for—
 - (i) an environmental value that is not a prescribed environmental matter under this Act; or
 - (ii) an impact on a prescribed environmental matter that is not a significant residual impact.
- (3) The authority holder must apply, in the approved form, to the administering agency that issued the authority.
- (4) The administering agency must decide the application within 20 business days after receiving the application.
- (5) The administering agency may decide to make the amendment only if satisfied that the environmental values for which the environmental offset was required have not yet been impacted by the activity that is authorised by the authority.

- (6) If the administering agency decides to make the amendment, the agency may also make any other amendments that the agency considers—
 - (a) relate to the amendment; and
 - (b) are necessary or desirable.
- (7) If the administering agency decides to amend the authority, the agency must, within 10 business days after making the decision—
 - (a) give the amended authority to the authority holder; and
 - (b) include a copy of the amended authority in the register kept under section 90.
- (8) If the administering agency decides not to amend the authority, the administering agency must give the authority holder a notice that states—
 - (a) the decision and the reasons for the decision; and
 - (b) that the holder may apply for a review of the decision; and
 - (c) how and when the holder may apply for a review of the decision.
- (9) A regulation may provide for a review of the decision.
- (10) Any provisions in the Act under which the offset condition was imposed about amending conditions of an authority, other than a provision mentioned in section 5, do not apply to an offset condition that is amended under this section.
- (11) This section applies despite section 95.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 16—

Mr POWELL (4.27 pm): I move the following amendments—

19 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 25, lines 12 to 26—

omit, insert—

- (1) Schedule 2, definitions *administering agency* and *impose—omit.*
- (2) Schedule 2—
insert—

administering agency—

- (a) for an authority under the Planning Act, means—
 - (i) for an offset condition to which section 255D(3) of that Act applies—the entity nominated under that subsection; or
 - (ii) for an offset condition for which a concurrence agency has the power to tell, or has told, an assessment manager to impose—the concurrence agency; or
 - (iii) for any other offset condition—the assessment manager; or
- (b) for an authority under any other Act, means an entity that, under another Act, performs a function in relation to—
 - (i) the grant of an authority for a prescribed activity; or
 - (ii) enforcing compliance with the conditions of an authority for a prescribed activity, or otherwise administering the authority; or
- (c) for part 7, see section 26.

20 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 25, after line 26—

insert—

agreed delivery arrangement see section 19(4).

21 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 26, after line 3—

insert—

impose, in relation to an offset condition—

- (a) for an authority under another Act—means apply the offset condition (however the application is described in the other Act); and

- (b) for an authority under the Planning Act—includes tell an assessment manager under that Act to impose an offset condition; and
- (c) for an agreement entered into under another Act—means include the offset condition in the agreement.

22 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 26, after line 3—

insert—

local government condition means an offset condition that may be imposed on an authority by a local government.

23 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 26, after line 3—

insert—

Planning Act means the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*.

24 Clause 16 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 26, after line 13—

insert—

- (3) Schedule 2, definition *matter of local environmental significance*, 'see section 10(4)'—
omit, insert—

means a matter prescribed to be a prescribed environmental matter under section 10(1)(c)

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 16, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 17, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Mr POWELL (4.28 pm): I move the following amendment—

25 Before clause 18

Page 27, before line 3—

insert—

17A Amendment of s 17 (Serious environmental harm)

Section 17(1)(b)—

omit, insert—

- (b) caused to—
 - (i) an area of high conservation value; or
 - (ii) an area of special significance, such as the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area; or

Ms TRAD: I know that the minister is on a roll there. I think it is illustrative of the minister's sloppy legislative work that we have to sit through all of this. Let me speak to amendment No. 25. Amendment No. 25 represents a lost opportunity. This does nothing to address the major issues confronting the Great Barrier Reef.

The Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is an omnibus bill. We can introduce legislative changes that will protect the environment and will do something that is not being done to further enhance the protection of the environment. This actually does not address any of the major concerns confronting the Great Barrier Reef. It does not even go to any of the issues that have been outlined in the reef 2050 plan, which has been resoundingly rejected by Australia's leading scientists today as a nothing document.

It is a nothing document. It is a nothing plan that will do nothing to halt the decline of the health of the Great Barrier Reef and it will certainly do nothing to repair the damage that is being done. These amendments introduced by the minister at the very last minute, not referred to the committee, as the member for Nicklin has articulated—the abuse and disrespect shown to the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee is just astounding—do nothing. They do nothing to address the major concerns confronting the Great Barrier Reef. This represents a lost opportunity.

During the debate the minister had the hide to get up and say that he and the government, led by Campbell Newman, have done more in the past two years to protect the Great Barrier Reef than has ever been done before. Do they seriously believe that? Do they seriously believe that this represents a continued strong performance in relation to the protection of the Great Barrier Reef? If

the minister believes that, if the government believes that, then they are in for a very big hiding come the next state election. I take this opportunity to actually refer to the tweet from Shane Doherty from Channel 9 today where he says that the most recent Roy Morgan poll has the Queensland election 'too close to call'—'too close to call'—because quite frankly Queenslanders do not swallow your spin. They do not swallow your untruths. Quite frankly, I think that is why the Leader of the Opposition is the preferred Premier of Queensland above Campbell Newman.

Government members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order, members! Order!

Mr POWELL: If the member for South Brisbane wants to turn this amendment, amendment No. 25—let me read what it is actually about. It inserts a new clause 17A into the bill to amend section 17 of the Environmental Protection Act. This amendment includes the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage as an area of special significance so that unlawfully causing harm in this area falls within the definition of 'serious environmental harm'. This amendment supports the Australian and Queensland government's Reef 2050 Long-Term Sustainability Plan for protecting the reef, providing confidence that the reef is being effectively managed and protected.

If the member for South Brisbane wants to turn the Great Barrier Reef into an election issue, let the people of Queensland be aware of what they will be getting should the Labor opposition be re-elected to government. They will be getting an Abbot Point development that would see 38 million cubic metres of dredge involved—38 million cubic metres. They will be getting a return to the inconsistent with UNESCO practice of building a mine here, a railway line across the state and a new port. Every time the Labor government previously approved a new mine it also approved a new railway line and it approved a new port. Consistent with UNESCO's recommendation, the Newman government has consolidated growth and expansion around four ports within the Great Barrier Reef catchment—something those opposite never achieved. But it goes further.

If the people of Queensland want Labor to look after the reef, what they will also get is their cane growers and their graziers tied up in knots as they fill in page after page after page after page of green tape—green tape that achieves what?

Mr Cripps: Nothing!

Mr POWELL: Absolutely nothing—nothing other than stress and concern and worry for the farmers in our Great Barrier Reef catchment. It does not achieve the outcome it suggests. If those opposite want to make the reef an election issue and if Labor were elected to government, what the people of Queensland would also get is reams and reams and reams of legislation, of green tape, of assessment processes that would tie the officers in the environment and heritage protection department to their desks as they trawl through thousands and thousands of pages. And guess what? They would never be out from behind their desks on the ground checking to see that what they have approved is actually occurring.

What has happened under the Newman government? Why I can confidently stand here and say that the Newman government has done more to protect the Great Barrier Reef than any state government before it is as simple as this: we have, consistent with UNESCO's requirements, consolidated growth in ports around four existing ports. We have taken the decision to not dispose of the dredge spoil within the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority but put it on shore—a decision that took 2½ years of unscrambling the legal and technical and commercial mess that the previous government left us at Abbot Point by its poor decision making. Consistent with UNESCO, we have worked with a range of partners, whether they be non-government organisations, like WWF or the Queensland Conservation Council or the ACIUCN, or the marine tourism operators, the agricultural industry, the resource industry, the federal government. All of those organisations have worked on developing a long-term sustainability plan that will see the reef protected and managed for the next 3½ decades.

We have spent time, money, energy and passion working with our vital cane growers and our graziers. Just last week I had the opportunity of getting out on-farm in the member for Barron River's electorate. I met a fantastic guy—Mark, I think, wasn't it, member for Barron River?

Mr Trout: Savina.

Mr POWELL: Savina—he is putting in a fantastic effort to ensuring that he remains an incredibly productive cane farmer whilst protecting the reef adjacent to his property. I visited Steve and Dell Norman at Mount Aberdeen Station, west of Bowen, and they are one of 11 graziers who have gone through the entire grazing BMP process to be independently accredited. These are

farmers making real change on the ground to increase their productivity but more importantly to increase the benefits to the environmental flows and the Great Barrier Reef. That is what you get from the Newman government—that is, the protection of the reef. I am pleased today to stand here and add another element to that by ensuring that any wilful or serious harm to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area will be met with the toughest penalties that this state can provide.

Mr JUDGE: I rise to speak on the proposed new clause. What we have seen here is the government unprepared yet again, introducing amendments on the run. It is typical of the Newman government. It rushes legislation.

The Great Barrier Reef means a lot to me. It means a lot to my children's future. It means a lot to the good people in the Yeerongpilly electorate. There are a lot of people in the Yeerongpilly electorate—I would say all of them—who care a great deal about the Great Barrier Reef. But what we are seeing from the Newman government is its inability to develop evidence based legislation in an informed way. We are seeing time and time again amendments being introduced at the last minute. Committees are not being provided an opportunity to consider the proposed amendments to the legislation.

We are seeing members of the LNP sitting there just nodding it through. They are not actually thinking about what is coming before the parliament. They are not really representing their electorates. They are simply backing an inept Premier and they are backing ministers who are willing to just endorse what the Premier is imposing upon Queenslanders. Queenslanders have had enough of the Premier. Queenslanders have had enough of the Newman government with its ill-informed, ill-prepared legislation.

I agree with the member for South Brisbane, who has correctly pointed out that scientists have condemned what the Newman government is proposing. The Great Barrier Reef is a World Heritage area. It is not just the property of Australia. It is a World Heritage area that should be protected for the entire globe.

The future of the Great Barrier Reef rests largely in the hands of the Newman government and the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. It is my view that the minister's title should be amended to be 'Minister for the Great Barrier Reef, Environment and Heritage Protection' to place significance on the importance of preserving our Great Barrier Reef. It is my view that it is so important that the title of the minister should include 'Great Barrier Reef'. The environmental significance of it cannot be overstated. We have—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! The member's time has expired.

Mr Judge interjected.

(Time expired)

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member's time has expired. Resume your seat!

The member's time had expired. I had the call, not you. Do not continue to speak over me, please. I call the member for Gladstone.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: In relation to amendment No. 35—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, we are dealing with amendment No. 25.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I beg your pardon. I want to deal with 35.

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

AYES, 65:

LNP, 59—Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trout, Walker, Watts, Young.

KAP, 2—Hopper, Knuth.

INDEPENDENTS, 4—Cunningham, Douglas, Judge, Wellington.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 34—

Mr POWELL (4.45 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendments—

26 Clause 20 (Insertion of new s 19A)

Page 28, lines 20 to 22—

omit, insert—

- (a) the power to impose conditions on the environmental authority under chapter 5, part 5, division 6;

27 Clause 22 (Amendment of s 49 (Decision on whether EIS may proceed))

Page 29, lines 5 to 20—

omit, insert—

- (1A) The decision period may be extended if, at any time before the decision is made, the proponent agrees in writing to the extension.
- (2) Section 49(6)—
insert—
- (d) that the proponent may, under section 49A, resubmit the EIS.
- (3) Section 49(1A) to (6)—
renumber as section 49(2) to (7).

28 Clause 27 (Amendment of s 56A (Assessment of adequacy of response to submission and submitted EIS))

Page 31, lines 11 to 26—

omit, insert—

- (2A) The period may be extended if, at any time before the decision is made, the proponent has agreed in writing to the extension.
- (2) Section 56A(5)—
insert—
- (d) that the proponent may, under section 56AA, resubmit the EIS and the proponent's response to the submissions.
- (3) Section 56A(2A) to (5)—
renumber as section 56A(3) to (6).

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 34, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 35—

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (4.46 pm): In amendment No. 35 it is proposed to allow the administering authority to amend an enforceable undertaking with the written agreement of the person who made the undertaking. I seek clarification of what opportunity there will be for the community to perhaps comment on the proposed changes, particularly if the proposed change decreases accountability or decreases what the community sees as a fair and reasonable commitment by, in the case of my own electorate, heavy industry. I wonder how the community is going to know whether the amendments to the enforceable undertaking are what they would agree with.

Mr POWELL: Madam Chair, I need to address the fact that this is actually referring to amendment No. 35, not clause 35. With your permission, can I address it now? I am happy to—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Gladstone, I will call you again when we get to amendment No. 35. My apologies.

Clause 35, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 36 to 101—

Mr POWELL (4.48 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendments—

29 Clause 47 (Amendment of s 243 (Definitions for pt 8))

Page 39, line 13, '250A(1)(iii)'—

omit, insert—

250A(1)(b)(iii)

30 Clause 61 (Replacement of ch 5A, pts 1 and 2)

Page 47, line 10, 'execute'—

omit, insert—

executive

31 Clause 71 (Amendment of s 358 (When order may be issued))

Page 51, lines 19 to 22—

omit, insert—

Section 358(e)(iv)—

32 Clause 100 (Amendment of s 497 (Limitation on time for starting summary proceedings))

Page 60, line 22, 'administering authority'—

omit, insert—

complainant

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 36 to 101, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

**Mr POWELL** (4.48 pm): I move the following amendment—**33 After clause 101**

Page 61, after line 2—

*insert—***101A Insertion of new s 504**

Chapter 10, part 3—

*insert—***504 Offences relating to Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area**

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) a person is convicted of an offence against this Act; and
 - (b) the commission of the offence caused, or was likely to cause, environmental harm to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.
- (2) In sentencing the person for the offence, the court must consider the environmental harm caused, or likely to have been caused, to the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area.

Ms TRAD: This amendment does nothing to address the major and significant issues affecting the Great Barrier Reef. I want to make clear something about the minister's earlier contribution in relation to the minister's amendments to clause 25. It is really important to put on the record that, despite the slurs that the minister has cast upon the raft of environmental regulations that were pursued by former governments in this state and also former federal governments in relation to water quality, they have produced improvements in water quality running off into the Great Barrier Reef. The minister talks about wrapping up landowners and land users in green tape, forms and regulation after regulation. He comes into this place and he says that. However, when it comes to UNESCO making assessments about what is actually working, it says that reef water quality plans that are based on environmental regulation, that are based on proper assessment and approvals and follow-through, are working in relation to improving the quality of the water running off into the reef.

I think it is important that in this place we debunk the statements made by the minister in this debate here today. As I said previously, this is an omnibus bill. Anything could have been introduced to improve the state's stewardship of the Great Barrier Reef and its stewardship of environmental protections and regulations which have a direct effect on the Great Barrier Reef—maybe terrestrial issues like vegetation management—but what we have seen from this government is a complete winding back on the whole suite of environmental protection that has a direct impact on the Great Barrier Reef. Instead of environmental regulation we have best management practices, so people can say 'We are complying' and the government gives them a tick. There is no assessment, no monitoring

and no reporting. When the minister stands in this place and talks about green-tape reduction, it is actually about environmental destruction and winding back protection. To be very clear, he could have addressed that in this omnibus bill but he chose not to, instead putting up fig leaf amendments to make it look like they are getting tough and protecting the Great Barrier Reef when they are not.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 102—



Ms TRAD (4.52 pm): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, line 11, 'The administering authority'—
omit, insert—

Any person

2 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, line 12, 'a person'—
omit, insert—

another person

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Ms Jackie Trad's amendments [\[6379\]](#).

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

AYES, 12:

ALP, 6—Byrne, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Scott, Trad.

KAP, 2—Hopper, Knuth.

INDEPENDENTS, 4—Cunningham, Douglas, Judge, Wellington.

NOES, 50:

LNP, 50—Bates, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Langbroek, Latter, Mander, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Young.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Ms Trad) negatived.

Message from Governor

Mr POWELL: I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

The Deputy Speaker read the following message—

MESSAGE

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL 2014

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, PAUL de JERSEY AC, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly that—

An appropriation be made for the purposes of the attached amendment, to be moved by the Minister, to a Bill for an Act to amend the Biological Control Act 1987, the Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the Acts mentioned in schedule 1.

(sgd)

GOVERNOR

Date: 28 OCT 2014

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I table the message for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Message, dated 28 October 2014, from His Excellency the Governor recommending amendments to the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. [\[6380\]](#)

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendments—

34 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 62, lines 6 to 14—

omit, insert—

- (6) The administering authority may accept an enforceable undertaking in relation to a contravention or alleged contravention at any time before any proceedings in relation to the contravention end.
- (7) If the administering authority accepts an enforceable undertaking after proceedings in relation to the contravention have started, the administering authority must take all reasonable steps to have the proceedings discontinued as soon as practicable.

35 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, lines 10 to 33—

omit, insert—

510 Amending enforceable undertaking—with agreement

The administering authority may amend an enforceable undertaking with the written agreement of the person who made the undertaking.

36 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, after line 33—

insert—

511 Amending enforceable undertaking—clerical or formal errors

The administering authority may amend an enforceable undertaking to correct a clerical or formal error if—

- (a) the amendment does not adversely affect the interests of the person who made the undertaking or anyone else; and
- (b) the person has been given written notice of the amendment.

37 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, after line 33—

insert—

512 Amending or suspending enforceable undertaking—after show cause process

- (1) The administering authority may amend or suspend an enforceable undertaking if the administering authority is satisfied—
 - (a) the undertaking was accepted relying on a representation or declaration, made either orally or in writing, that was false or misleading in a material particular; or
 - (b) the undertaking was accepted on the basis of a miscalculation of—
 - (i) the environmental values affected or likely to be affected by the relevant activity; or
 - (ii) the quantity or quality of contaminant permitted to be released into the environment; or
 - (iii) the effects of the release of a quantity or the quality of contaminant permitted to be released into the environment; or
 - (c) the amendment or suspension is necessary or desirable because of an environmental audit, investigation or report under chapter 7, part 2; or
 - (d) the amendment or suspension is necessary or desirable because of a significant change in the way in which, or the extent to which, the relevant activity is being carried out that affects the likelihood of the undertaking—
 - (i) securing compliance with this Act; or
 - (ii) enhancing the protection of the environment.
- (2) The administering authority must give the person who made the undertaking a notice that states—
 - (a) the action that the administering authority proposes to take; and
 - (b) if the action is an amendment of the undertaking—the amendment; and
 - (c) if the action is a suspension of the undertaking—the period of the suspension; and
 - (d) the grounds for taking the action; and

- (e) the facts and circumstances that are the basis for the grounds; and
 - (f) that the person may make written representations to show why the action should not be taken: and
 - (g) the period, of at least 20 business days after the person is given the notice, within which the person may make the representations.
- (3) If the administering authority proposes to amend the enforceable undertaking, the notice must be accompanied by a copy of the undertaking that shows the amendment.
 - (4) The administering authority must consider any written representation the person makes within the period stated in the notice.
 - (5) If the administering authority still believes a ground exists to take the action, the authority may decide to take the action.
 - (6) Within 10 business days after making that decision, the administering authority must give the person an information notice about the decision.
 - (7) If the administering authority, at any time, decides not to take the action, the administering authority must promptly give the person written notice of the decision.

38 Clause 102 (Insertion of new ch 10, pt 5)

Page 63, after line 33—

insert—

513 Contravention of enforceable undertaking

- (1) A person must not contravene an enforceable undertaking made by that person that is in effect.
Maximum penalty—
 - (a) if the offence is committed wilfully—6250 penalty units or 5 years imprisonment; or
 - (b) otherwise—4500 penalty units.
- (2) Regardless of whether the person is prosecuted for an offence against subsection (1), the administering authority may apply to a Magistrates Court for an order if the person contravenes the enforceable undertaking.
- (3) If the court is satisfied that the person contravened the undertaking, the court, in addition to imposing any penalty, may make 1 or both of the following orders—
 - (a) an order directing the person to comply with the undertaking;
 - (b) an order discharging the undertaking.
- (4) Also, the court may make any other order that the court considers appropriate in the circumstances, including an order directing the person to pay to the administering authority—
 - (a) the costs of the proceedings; and
 - (b) the reasonable costs of the administering authority in monitoring compliance with the enforceable undertaking in the future.

I wish to correct a typographical error in amendment 37 as circulated. The error is on page 28 of the amendments and relates to subsection (2). After paragraph (d), the next paragraph should read (e), not (c).

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I have several questions in relation to these amendments. The first relates to amendment 34, which states—

- (6) The administering authority may accept an enforceable undertaking in relation to a contravention or alleged contravention at any time before any proceedings in relation to the contravention end.
- (7) If the administering authority accepts an enforceable undertaking ... must take all reasonable steps to have the proceedings discontinued as soon as practicable.

What protection will there be that—and I use the generic word—‘companies’ will not see what they can get away with and only when they are caught will they negotiate another undertaking? How can the community be confident that there will not be ‘sweetheart deals’ between the government and these companies to keep the industry percolating?

My second question is about amendment 35, where it says ‘the administering authority may amend an enforceable undertaking with the written agreement of the person who made the undertaking’. Where does the community have a say in it? In my electorate we have the cement company. They are good people—do not get me wrong—but there is a longstanding and ongoing concern about their environmental undertakings. Those in the community who are concerned would

be completely unhappy—I use that word advisedly—if suddenly they found that, without any opportunity to consult, some environmental undertaking had been changed by consent between the government of the day and the proponent without anyone else getting an opportunity to speak about the validity or otherwise of those undertakings.

Mr POWELL: I thank the member for Gladstone for her very sensible and rational questions around this new addition to our enforcement and compliance tools, being an enforceable undertaking. I guess that is where I would like to start. This is just an addition to the existing opportunities the regulator has to challenge a company on poor environmental behaviour and ensure that behaviour is corrected and not repeated. We start at a low level through a thing called a penalty infringement notice, similar to what Transport and police can offer. It is literally a financial fine: 'You have done a small thing. We are going to slap you on the wrist.' We have increased those PINs, by the way, in terms of their monetary value, so they are fairly significant. There are then a range of other actions we can take, through to full court proceedings.

What we are saying, though, is that in some instances we may come across a company that is willing to admit their guilt, admit that they have done the wrong thing and acknowledge what they need to do to correct what they have done wrong, so we enter into a binding agreement with that company to ensure that outcome is achieved. If they do not achieve it, we go back to the court proceedings and we continue through that process.

The second question the member raised related to how the community would know, under amendment No. 35, that there was an amendment to an enforceable undertaking. Any amendments to enforceable undertakings must be published, so they are publicly available. That would be the opportunity for the community to raise any concerns they had around that enforceable undertaking changing.

Ms TRAD: Earlier this year the Auditor-General released report No. 15, *Environmental regulation of the resources and waste industries*. One of the conclusions the Office of the Auditor-General made was that the environment and heritage protection department is not fully effective in its supervision, monitoring and enforcement of environmental conditions and is exposing the state to liability and environmental harm unnecessarily.

It is a very good question that the member for Gladstone raises. If this government were interested in making sure the community had a say in terms of enforceable undertakings and did have standing in relation to when companies were failing to comply with enforceable undertakings, they would have supported the previous amendment. But they did not, and that is consistent with their approach generally in terms of the Queensland community. I think the question asked by the member for Gladstone did not receive an appropriate response from the minister.

What is clear is that this government can now basically shuffle off major proponents where they have conducted major damage, consistent with their offset pay-and-go scheme: 'So you can damage, pay us a bit of money and go on your way.' Essentially, I have very limited faith that this government will use enforceable undertakings to actually deliver better outcomes for the environment and to ensure that proponents are meeting their basic requirements under the enforceable undertakings.

The community and the public have a right to participate in this process. They have a right to ensure that those undertakings that are made, that are published, are being kept. And when they are not being kept—because they know that the department is not effective, as the Auditor-General found, in monitoring, supervising and enforcing environmental conditions—they, as citizens in this state, should have a right to pursue changes or pursue charges under the enforceable undertakings contract. It is that simple. If this government was fair, if it was fair dinkum, it would give the community standing in this respect. Instead, it is sewing up secret agreements between proponents, polluters and the government, just to continue its pay-and-go scheme. For that it will stand condemned.

Mr POWELL: I reject outright the aspersions cast by the member for South Brisbane. Again, I want to reassure the member for Gladstone and other members in this House that enforceable undertakings have been used by a range of regulators across a range of sectors within Australia and other jurisdictions for at least the last decade. Some of the bodies that use enforceable undertakings include ASIC, the ACCC and—lo and behold—the federal Department of the Environment.

I again reiterate that enforceable undertakings are yet another tool we are adding to our kit bag when it comes to compliance, monitoring and enforcement—alongside warning letters, alongside penalty infringement notices, alongside prosecutions and alongside licence suspensions. We will ensure, as the committee asked us to, that enforcement guidelines provide a consistent platform. But, again, to suggest that this is a pay-and-go option does not give credit to the actual change we are

making here. This is not simply 'pay and go'; this is 'pay, correct your behaviour and demonstrate that you have corrected your behaviour' or we will end up back in the courts and back prosecuting the matter.

As for how community members can have input into whether the company is actually achieving this, it is in the same way a community member would have input in concerns around an operator already. If a community member sees an operator doing something that they believe to be inconsistent with their environmental approval or their environmentally relevant activity licence, they should contact my offices.

This is where we really differ from what the previous Labor government was doing. Yes, the Queensland Audit Office put out that report, but it was judging the decade of operations under the previous Labor government. For the past 2½ years we have been undoing that legacy left to us by Labor. We have been getting our officers out from behind their desks—out on the ground, visiting both those operators who have environmental licences in this state and those who do not have environmental licences at all. That is something those opposite never achieved. Why? All of their officers were tied to their desks in Brisbane, Mackay and Rockhampton doing nothing but paperwork. We, for the first time, have set up all of our regional offices with a compliance focus, which means that for the first time Environment and Heritage Protection officers—the regulators—are out doing what they are meant to be doing.

Mr Cripps: They know what the ERA looks like, rather than what the form looks like.

Mr POWELL: Exactly. They know what is actually happening under that ERA, not just the pretty certificate that they send the business at the start of the year to say that they have their ERA. I thank the member for Hinchinbrook for his contribution. I can reassure Queenslanders, I can reassure the member for Gladstone and I can reassure members in this House that we take very seriously our responsibilities as the environmental regulator. That is why our officers are out on the ground. That is why we are adding to our kitbag when it comes to enforcement, compliance monitoring and prosecution. That is why we are adding this amendment around enforceable undertaking.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 102, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 103 to 143—

Mr POWELL (5.10 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendments—

39 After clause 106

Page 66, after line 3—

insert—

106A Amendment of s 713 (Continued effect to make payment)

Section 713—

insert—

- (3) However, the payment is to be made to the offset account under that Act instead of to an environmental offset trust.

40 Clause 107 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 23)

Page 67, line 3, 'by'—

omit, insert—

on

41 Clause 108 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 69, line 25, after 'definitions'—

insert—

amalgamated environmental authority,

42 Clause 108 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary))

Page 70, after line 13—

insert—

Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area means the area listed as the Great Barrier Reef on the World Heritage List kept under the Convention for the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage done at Paris on 23 November 1972, as amended and in force for Australia from time to time.

43 Clause 123 (Amendment of s 320A (Application of div 2))

Page 79, lines 5 to 23—

*omit.***44 Clause 123 (Amendment of s 320A (Application of div 2))**

Page 79, line 24, '(3)'—

omit, insert—

(1)

45 Clause 123 (Amendment of s 320A (Application of div 2))

Page 80, lines 1 to 4—

omit, insert—

(b) becomes aware of—

- (i) the happening of an event involving a hazardous contaminant on the contaminated land; or
- (ii) a change in the condition of the contaminated land; or
- (iii) a notifiable activity having been carried out, or being carried out, on the contaminated land;

46 Clause 123 (Amendment of s 320A (Application of div 2))

Page 80, lines 17 and 18—

omit, insert—

- (i) the happening of an event involving a hazardous contaminant in the local government area; or

47 Clause 123 (Amendment of s 320A (Application of div 2))

Page 80, line 28, '(4)'—

omit, insert—

(2)

48 Clause 125 (Insertion of new ch 7, pt 1, div 2, sdivs 3A and 3B)

Page 81, lines 18 to 30—

omit, insert—

- (1) A person mentioned in section 320A(2)(a) must, within 24 hours after becoming aware of the event or change mentioned in section 320A(2)(b)(i) or (ii), give the administering authority written notice of the matters stated in subsection (2), unless the person has a reasonable excuse.
Maximum penalty—500 penalty units.
- (2) The notice must state—
 - (a) the nature of the event or change in condition; and
 - (b) the circumstances in which the event or change happened.
- (3) A person mentioned in section 320A(2)(a) must, within 20 business days after becoming aware of an activity mentioned in section 320A(2)(b)(iii), give the administering authority written notice of the activity, unless the person has a reasonable excuse.
Maximum penalty—500 penalty units.

49 Clause 135 (Replacement of ch 7, pt 8 (Contaminated land))

Page 104, line 17, after 'Maximum penalty'—

insert—

for subsection (5)

50 Clause 140 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 23, div 3)

Page 121, lines 2 to 4—

omit, insert—

former section 407.

51 Clause 140 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 23, div 3)

Page 121, line 22, before 'has'—

insert—

the seller

52 Clause 140 (Insertion of new ch 13, pt 23, div 3)

Page 121, after line 27—

*insert—***739 Disposal permits**

Sections 424 and 425, as in force immediately before this section commences, continue to apply until the day prescribed by regulation.

53 Clause 141 (Amendment of sch 2 (Original decisions))

Page 123, before line 1—

*insert—***(5) Schedule 2, part 2—***insert—***Division 6A Decision under chapter 10****Section****Description of decision**

512(5) decision to amend or suspend an enforceable undertaking

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 103 to 143, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 144—



Ms TRAD (5.10 pm): This clause relates to the issue of flying foxes. As discussed previously, I stand by my comments made during the second reading debate. This government is endeavouring to shift on to councils all of the management for flying fox roosts and councils are clearly saying that they need assistance and this government is vacating the space. It is vacating the space and taking a very inhumane approach to the management of flying foxes throughout the state. Labor will not be supporting this clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 144, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 55:

LNP, 52—Bates, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seenedy, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Walker, Watts, Young.

INDEPENDENTS, 3—Cunningham, Douglas, Wellington.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 144, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Mr POWELL (5.17 pm): I seek leave to move an amendment outside the long title of the bill.

Leave granted.

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendment—

54 After clause 144

Page 128, after line 8—

*insert—***Part 6A Amendment of Sustainable Planning Act 2009****144A Act amended**This part amends the *Sustainable Planning Act 2009*.**144B Amendment of s 970 (Continued effect to make payment)**

Section 970—

insert—

- (3) However, a payment made in relation to an offset condition imposed by a department is to be made to the offset account under that Act instead of to an environmental offset trust.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 145 to 174—

Mr POWELL (5.18 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr POWELL: I move the following amendments—

55 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 137, line 11, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

56 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 138, line 1, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

57 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 138, lines 10 to 28—

omit, insert—

- (1) This section applies if—
 - (a) a person sells or gives away a resource under an end of waste code; and
 - (b) the person is not a registered resource producer for the code.
- (2) The resource is taken to be waste until the person becomes a registered resource producer for the code.

158 Compliance with end of waste code

A registered resource producer for an end of waste code must not sell or give away the resource for the code unless the registered resource producer complies with the requirements of the end of waste code relating to the resource.

Maximum penalty—1665 penalty units.

159 Chief executive may make end of waste codes and grant end of waste approvals

- (1) The chief executive may make a code (an **end of waste code**) for registered resource producers that states when a particular waste stops being a waste and becomes a resource.

58 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 139, line 8, 'may, by notice'—

omit, insert—

must, by notice given at least once every year

59 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 145, lines 3 to 6—

omit, insert—

- (b) the end of waste code was made on the basis of a miscalculation of—
 - (i) the characteristics of the resource; and
 - (ii) the potential of the resource to cause serious environmental harm, or material environmental harm, because of those characteristics; or

60 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 145, line 19, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

61 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 146, lines 6 to 22—

omit, insert—

- (f) for a notice given to a registered resource producer—that the registered resource producer may, within a stated period, make a written submission to the chief executive about the proposed action;
- (g) for a notice published under subsection (2)(b)—that any person may, within a stated period, make a written submission to the chief executive about the proposed action.

- (4) The stated period must not end before 28 days after whichever of the following happens last—
 - (a) the day the notice is given to the registered resource producer under subsection (2)(a);
 - (b) the day the notice is published under subsection (2)(b).

62 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 147, lines 5 to 15—

omit, insert—

- (iv) any advice, information or comment provided by any technical advisory panel; and
- (c) another matter prescribed by regulation.
- (6) If the chief executive decides to take the proposed action, the chief executive must give each registered resource producer for the end of waste code an information notice for the decision within 10 business days after making the decision.
- (7) The decision takes effect for a registered resource producer on the later of the following days—
 - (a) the day the information notice is given to the registered resource producer;

63 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 148, lines 13 to 24—

omit, insert—

- (b) to make another change that is not a change of substance and does not adversely affect the interests of a registered resource producer or a person who is likely to receive a resource from the registered resource producer.

Division 4 Registration of end of waste resource producers

173B Registration of end of waste resource producers

- (1) A person becomes a registered resource producer for an end of waste code by giving the chief executive a notice that the person intends to become a registered resource producer for the code.

64 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 149, lines 2 to 16—

omit, insert—

- (1) The chief executive may cancel or suspend a registered resource producer's registration if the chief executive reasonably believes the registered resource producer has failed to comply with a requirement of an end of waste code.
- (2) The chief executive may act under subsection (1) regardless of whether the chief executive has given the registered resource producer a show cause notice under chapter 11.

173D Procedure for cancelling or suspending registration

- (1) Before cancelling or suspending a registered resource producer's registration under section 173C, the chief executive must give the person a notice stating the following—

65 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 149, lines 29 and 30, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

66 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 150, lines 1 to 17—

omit, insert—

- (4) If the chief executive decides to take the proposed action, the chief executive must, within 5 business days after making the decision, give the registered resource producer an information notice for the decision.
- (5) The decision takes effect the day the information notice is given to the registered resource producer.

173E Particular circumstances when end of waste approval lapses

- (1) This section applies if the holder of an end of waste approval relating to a particular waste or resource becomes a registered resource producer for an end of waste code for the same waste or resource.
- (2) The person's end of waste approval lapses.

173F Register of registered resource producers

- (1) The chief executive must maintain a register of registered resource producers for each end of waste code.

67 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 153, line 5, after 'applicant'—

insert—

to

68 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 155, line 14—

omit, insert—

- (2) However, the conditions may only impose an obligation on the holder of the approval and must not impose an obligation on a user of the resource.

- (3) A regulation may prescribe the types of

69 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 156, lines 5 to 30—

omit, insert—

173Q Extending end of waste approval

- (1) A person may apply to the chief executive, on one occasion, to extend an end of waste approval.

- (2) The application must be made in the approved form, not less than 1 month before the approval ends.

- (3) In deciding whether to grant or refuse to grant the application, the chief executive must consider—

(a) the matters mentioned in section 173L(1); and

(b) whether the waste, and resource, to which the approval relates would be more appropriately managed as a waste management ERA.

70 Clause 167 (Replacement of ch 8 (Approval of resource for beneficial use))

Page 161, lines 12 to 18—

omit, insert—

(a) there is no longer a use, or likely to be a future use, for a particular resource under the approval; or

(b) the management of a particular waste or the use of a particular resource under the approval has caused, or is likely to cause, serious or material environmental harm that is unlawful under the Environmental Protection Act, section 493A; or

71 Clause 170 (Replacement of ch 16 (Repeal and amendment of other legislation))

Page 168, after line 17—

insert—

- (6) A person who is registered under a general approval that ends is taken to be a registered resource producer from the day on which the approval ends.

- (7) Section 158 does not apply to a person who was carrying out an activity in accordance with a general approval that ends until 1 year after the general approval ends.

- (8) However, subsection (3) continues to apply as if the general approval has not ended under subsection (5).

72 Clause 170 (Replacement of ch 16 (Repeal and amendment of other legislation))

Page 168, lines 22 to 25—

omit, insert—

- (2) Despite the replacement of chapter 8 under the amending Act, chapter 8, part 5 of the former Act continues to apply to the specific approval.

- (3) From the commencement, the specific approval is taken to be an end of waste approval for the particular resource or waste to which the specific approval relates.

73 Clause 171 (Amendment of schedule (Dictionary))

Page 170, line 6, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 145 to 174, as amended, agreed to.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! The House will now consider the postponed clause.

Clause 2—

Mr POWELL (5.18 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 16, lines 9 and 10—

omit, insert—

- (aa) part 4, other than the following provisions—
 - (i) section 9A;
 - (ii) section 15A;
 - (iii) section 16(2), to the extent it inserts the definitions *administering agency*, *impose* and *Planning Act*;
 - (iv) section 16(3);
- (ab) the following provisions of part 5—
 - (i) section 62(1);
 - (ii) section 63;
 - (iii) section 99;
 - (iv) section 100;
 - (v) section 102;
 - (vi) section 103(5);
 - (vii) section 104;
- (a) part 5, division 3;
- (b) part 6;
- (ba) part 6A;

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule—

Mr POWELL (5.19 pm): I move the following amendments—

74 Schedule 1 (Consequential and minor amendments)

Page 172, line 8, '1987'—

omit, insert—

1994

75 Schedule 1 (Consequential and minor amendments)

Page 172, line 13, before '*insert*'—

insert—

omit,

76 Schedule 1 (Consequential and minor amendments)

Page 173, line 2, before '*insert*'—

insert—

omit,

77 Schedule 1 (Consequential and minor amendments)

Page 173, line 11, 'code user'—

omit, insert—

resource producer

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (5.20 pm): I move—

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. AC POWELL (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (5.20 pm): I move the following amendment—

78 Long title

After '1992,'—

insert—

the Sustainable Planning Act 2009,

Amendment agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

MAJOR EVENTS BILL

Resumed from 26 August (see p. 2654).

Second Reading

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (5.20 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

May I start by thanking the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee for its consideration of the bill. The government has carefully considered the committee's report, which was tabled in this House on 20 October 2014, and I am now pleased to table the government's response to the report, which I note has been approved by the Premier.

Tabled paper: State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee: Report No. 51—Major Events Bill 2014, government response [\[6381\]](#).

As I said in my introductory speech on 26 August, the purpose of the Major Events Bill is to provide a generic legislative framework that may be used for major events held in Queensland. By 'major events' I mean events of international or national significance—mega events such as the Commonwealth Games. Currently, legislation for major events is scattered across the Queensland statute book. We have the Motor Racing Events Act 1990, the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998 and chapter 19, part 2 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, all of which may be triggered by separate regulations. We are bringing together this legislation into one framework, making it more efficient and reducing regulatory duplication.

The bill also includes some new aspects that will meet commitments that the government has made in relation to hosting the 2015 Asian Cup and the 2018 Commonwealth Games. This legislation will bring Queensland into line with other states that already have in place similar legislation. It will send a clear message that Queensland recognises the value of major events and that we are the pre-eminent destination for hosting major events.

Under the bill, a regulation will prescribe a major event and which particular provisions are to apply. Not all events will be prescribed as major events. As I said earlier, it will be limited to large state, national or international sporting or cultural events of the magnitude of the 2018 Commonwealth Games, or the Gold Coast and Townsville V8 Supercar events. It is not intended to be used for concerts, fun runs, regular stadium events and the like that happen every weekend across Queensland. The decision to activate the legislation will be based on factors in the bill such as the size of the event, the number of spectators likely to attend and the contribution that the event will make to the economy. In most cases, events are under negotiation or in the bidding process several years prior, as was the case with the Commonwealth Games and for more than 12 months in the case of the Asian Cup.

I would now like to talk briefly about some of the existing and new provisions of the bill in a bit more detail. Firstly, I will discuss the powers for authorised persons which, as the committee noted, has caused some discussion. These powers are based on chapter 19, part 2 titled, 'Preserving safety for special events' in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the Motor Racing Events Act, which this bill will repeal. They are not new. They were used for the Sydney 2000 Olympics football matches that were held at the Gabba, the 2001 Goodwill Games and the 2003 Rugby World Cup.

Appointing authorised persons to assist police with directing persons in a major event area and checking bags helps free up valuable police resources where they are needed most. On any given weekend, contract security staff provide support to venue staff and the Queensland Police Service at Queensland stadiums. Anyone in this House who has attended an event at Suncorp Stadium or at the Gabba would be familiar with those arrangements. But for those members who are not, let me take them through what happens at Suncorp Stadium.

The stadium's terms and conditions of entry are published on its website and the ticket agent's website as part of the conditions of sale and displayed at the stadium's entry points. These terms and conditions allow the venue's private security to refuse entry to a patron with a prohibited item, such as a loudhailer or a laser pointer. Private security officers are located at entrance points. They are allowed to ask a person to open a bag for inspection. The terms and conditions also allow these officers to evict a patron who does not comply with the terms of conditions of entry—for example, where a patron engages in behaviour inside the venue that could cause injury to another patron. Police are present at Suncorp Stadium events to help venue staff and security officers and to intervene if required.

Recently, one of my staff members attended an event at Suncorp Stadium and witnessed firsthand the eviction of a patron. In that case, the patron alerted a security officer to an incident. The security officer undertook an initial assessment. She then sought support from another security officer. The patron was asked to leave and refused. The security officers then sought assistance from a police officer and the person was removed from the venue. As members can see from this example, security officers perform their role with police oversight at events currently held at our stadiums.

However, the security arrangements at major events are more complex. There are a significant number of spectators and there are challenges in enforcing multiple areas. Certainly, what I experienced in Glasgow for the Commonwealth Games was a substantial and broad security response. That included airport style security screening at all venues as well as the live sites. The impact on police resources was considerable and 7,000 private security guards were contracted to assist police. No-one seemed offended or anxious with that level of scrutiny.

For the Commonwealth Games in 2018, similar support will be required for police as it was in Melbourne in 2006. This bill allows for the appointment of appropriately trained authorised persons to assist police officers with a range of tasks. We are talking about here asking people to go through screening devices, inspecting bags and the like. It does not include frisking a person. This is necessary to ensure the safety of persons within an event area and reduce the risk of people bringing in prohibited items. Again, I emphasise that these provisions are not creating new powers. They exist in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the Motor Racing Events Act. The powers under the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act were used for the Sydney 200 Olympics football matches held at the Gabba, the 2001 Goodwill Games and the 2003 Rugby World Cup.

I note that the bill was drafted in a less prescriptive style and accept the committee's recommendation that search powers be made clearer. That is why I will be moving an amendment in consideration in detail to clarify the intent of clause 18. The amendment will be based on the current wording of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and it will make it clear that an authorised person can only make a request to undertake a search where it is reasonable to do so, can inspect a person's belongings, can touch a garment a person is wearing only if they are of the same sex as the entrant and only a police officer may undertake a frisk search. I stress that people will only be appointed as authorised persons if they have the necessary experience, training and expertise and that police will be present should issues arise.

Other provisions in the bill which already exist include exemptions for visiting health practitioners from registration under state law for a prescribed major event. These laws are currently in the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998. They were originally put in place so that foreign Olympic teams could complete their pre-event training in Queensland and bring in their own health staff prior to the Sydney Olympics.

Debate, on motion of Mrs Stuckey, adjourned.

MOTION

Mining Industry, Fly-in Fly-out Workforce



Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

- notes the Labor opposition's recently released policy to end 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations by giving workers a choice near existing resource communities;
- notes the Deputy Premier's statements, reported on 19 June this year, opposing 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mining operations; and
- calls on the Newman government to follow through on the Deputy Premier's promise as soon as possible and end 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations near existing resource communities.

The Labor opposition has been forced to move this motion in response to another broken election promise from the Newman LNP government. In July 2011 the now Premier was categorical in his commitment when he said that 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, or FIFO, workforces were 'just simply something we would not tolerate if we get into government. That's our rule, our policy, it won't be tolerated.' The LNP's resources and energy election commitment further committed that 'The LNP has made clear its policy of not supporting 100% FIFO mining operation workforces.' This is another broken election promise from the Newman LNP government.

Late last year the Coordinator-General approved 900 permanent FIFO accommodation units at the Buffel Park Accommodation Village. The previous government made two approvals that did not prohibit the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces, but did require that 80 per cent of the total workforces for these operations reside in the Bowen Basin. Conditions were also put in place for the proponent to provide 400 permanent houses. These conditions were never intended to allow companies to exclude local workers and were in response to the economic conditions at that time. Even the Deputy Premier acknowledges this, saying at estimates hearings this year—

I agreed with them at the time and I supported his government at the time in addressing a particular problem. That problem no longer exists.

The Deputy Premier was referring to the fact that the occupancy rate for hotel and motel accommodation was just two per cent in the Bowen Basin in 2011. At the height of the mining investment boom there was a critical housing shortage in the Bowen Basin. However, in the latest available figures from last year the vacancy rate for hotel and motel accommodation is now at the opposite extreme of 37 per cent. Over 8,000 jobs have been lost across the Bowen Basin over the last few years. Just last week when I was in Moranbah I was told that there are some 75 disconnections of electricity happening in that town. Our mining resource towns are suffering under this incompetent LNP government. I have to disagree with the Deputy Premier. Those decisions were a mistake. They did not anticipate the current downturn and if elected Labor will fix it up.

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Those opposite can laugh. This is no laughing matter. This is the arrogance and hypocrisy of this government.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order!

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Deputy Premier and the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines are laughing at these mining resource companies that are suffering. It is no laughing matter. Last week I was in Moranbah speaking to the mayor, Anne Baker, who is passionate about her community. She is passionate about her town and the families who live there. This is a community that is suffering. We can see that if this policy is not fixed up these communities will die. This LNP government has done nothing to ease the burden on these communities. Whilst I was there I spoke to mums Kelly and Leanne. They are passionate about their community. Why is it that their husbands and their children cannot get a job down the road? They cannot get a job because the 100 per cent fly-in fly-out policy prohibits people living in that town working down the road. It is a policy of discrimination.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Deputy Premier, go and talk to Mayor Anne Baker, talk to Leanne and Peter and the people up there because they are upset. I was more than happy to go along to the Moranbah Workers Club and sit down and speak to the families about this issue. Let me tell members who crystallised this issue in my mind the most. The person who crystallised this issue the most was Linda, who worked at the workers club. She came up and said to me, 'Excuse me, Ms Palaszczuk, can I have a word?' This is what listening is all about. Linda said to me, 'Ms Palaszczuk, I am raising

my son in this town. I am raising my son here in Moranbah. My husband has had to leave this town to get a job. His mates have had to leave this town to get a job. I want my son to go to high school in this town and get a job in this town. Is this too much to ask?' Linda was the person who clearly crystallised the issue for me: why can't people living in their local regional communities get jobs in their regional communities?

I then went to Moranbah State High School. I visited the shed they have which facilitates apprenticeships and getting jobs in the mining sector. These people are prohibited from working in some mines because of the discriminatory policy. I want these young people to have opportunities. I want these young people to have jobs. The Deputy Premier can sit there and laugh his head off at this, but this is no laughing matter.

Mr Seeney: You're the joke.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Go and speak to Mayor Anne Baker.

Mr Seeney: You are a joke.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Keep going. Keep coming. Go on. I don't care. You are incapable of listening. Your arrogance knows no bounds.

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

Ms PALASZCZUK: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I would like to commend the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for mines, the member for Bundamba, who have been visiting these regional towns at length and developing this policy with the communities. This is a policy that is reflective of the needs of the community. It would not be tolerated in Brisbane to be told you cannot get a job down the road because you have a particular postcode. Why is it being tolerated in Moranbah?

Our policy also encompasses another serious issue in relation to fly-in fly-out workers and that is the issue of mental health. In my local electorate I have people who come to talk to me about the effects of fly-in fly-out work on their families. They are passionate about this. They say to me that if they had a choice to go and live closer it would be better for their family. It is hard to be away from your family for up to three weeks at a time. It is emotionally draining on many of these families.

This is about giving workers a very clear choice, which is something that this government is incapable of doing. I commend the *Daily Mercury* for running a very clear campaign on this issue, because it has impacts in Mackay and Rockhampton. People living in Mackay and Rockhampton are prohibited from working in those mines, which is only a 2½-hour drive away. Now we will hear what the Deputy Premier has to say. He was more than happy to smile for the cameras of the *Daily Mercury*, which stated, 'Seeney says no to 100 per cent FIFO.' Deputy Premier, we are looking forward to your words of wisdom tonight. I ask honourable members: isn't it right that we are looking forward to hearing words of wisdom from the Deputy Premier? What will the Premier Deputy Premier tell the *Daily Mercury*? Did he tell the truth? I challenge the Deputy Premier to go out there, sit down, have a cup of tea with Linda and hear it from her directly, because those families are hurting and this policy is discriminatory. The government has had 2½ years to change it and it has done nothing. They should hang their heads in shame. It is a disgrace—

(Time expired)

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (5.40 pm): I stand to support the motion put forward by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr Seeney: Where's Moranbah?

Dr LYNHAM: My son worked at Moranbah.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Order!

Dr LYNHAM: My son worked at Moranbah. My son was a paramedic at Moranbah.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Stafford—

Dr LYNHAM: My family—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Stafford!

Dr LYNHAM:—has a proud tradition at the Moura mines.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Stafford, please wait. That is the third time I have asked. Deputy opposition leader, I know that they are winding you up, but please keep the tone down so that we can hear the speakers.

Dr LYNHAM: My family has a proud tradition in the mining industry at Moura. I am proud of my family with their mining heritage. I am proud of my son who worked as a paramedic at Dysart and Moranbah. I take offence at what the Deputy Premier has just said.

The Labor Party has a proud tradition of standing up for the rights of workers in this state, including the rights of workers to have a choice about whether they fly in and fly out or whether they live in local communities. We stand for creating and supporting jobs, whether they be FIFO, drive-in drive-out or local jobs. There are honourable members on the government benches who, at various times, according to newspaper reports, have described 100 per cent FIFO as evil, toxic and unjust. Given their freely given comments on this issue, it will be very interesting to see if this evening the members for Mirani, Gregory and Whitsunday vote with their conscience and in accord with their stated convictions. Will they stand up for their electorates, like Chris Davis tried to do, or will this arrogant Premier force them to toe the party line? Let us be very clear: those members know very well that their party's stubborn refusal to honour an election commitment is causing harm and distress in the Bowen Basin coalfields. They know that there is no justification, given the current state of the resources sector, for the current unfair system to continue, that is, the system that the Newman government continues to sanction. They know that their government could end that misery and harm simply with a stroke of a pen.

It has been convenient for the Deputy Premier and other apologists for 100 per cent FIFO to blame the previous Labor administration for approving the practice at Caval Ridge, which we did. It is convenient but disingenuous, especially given the cast-iron pre-election vow by the LNP not to allow 100 per cent FIFO anywhere in Queensland. The Deputy Premier understands full well the historical context of the original agreement, which was made at a time when there was near-full employment in the coalfields, when demand for staff was unprecedented, when house prices and rental costs in places such as Moranbah were at ridiculous highs and when it was impossible for mining companies to source a workforce exclusively from the local community. Even so, the previous Labor government's intentions and actions were clearly to encourage workers and their families to move to the Moranbah area and support the sustainability of that community. However, ludicrous or not, that is not what has happened today under the Newman government, which is why the issue has become poisonous for the LNP and why the aforementioned LNP members should think very carefully about how they vote on the motion before the House this evening.

A future Labor government will not let mining communities down in the way they have been let down by the LNP. We simply will not permit the use of 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces at mines located near a regional centre or existing mining community. As I and my colleagues have pointed out, this is all about choice: choice to get a job, choice where to live, choice how to structure family/life balance. There are fly-in fly-out workers and their families who live in my electorate on the north side of Brisbane. They are good people who are working hard to make a living for their families. I recognise that some families do choose to have a fly-in fly-out lifestyle, where it is their choice to maintain the family home in Brisbane where support networks exist. The point is that this should be the deliberate choice of the family, not the sole prerogative of large employers.

In this debate, as my colleagues have already pointed out in some detail and to which I have alluded this evening, the irony is that many members have clearly and repeatedly confirmed that they actually agree with the position of the opposition. The family is the first economy. That is the economy we need to support. Why should we artificially restrict the lifestyle choices of families from this segment of our workforce? I support families, Labor supports families and I wholeheartedly support this motion. Not all families have a Cessna and a pilot to get them home at any time they want.

(Time expired)

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (5.46 pm): I move—

That all words after 'House' be deleted and the following words inserted:

- notes the Labor Party is the only government in Queensland that has ever approved 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations;
- notes the LNP government, unlike the Labor Party, has always supported a balance between growing resource communities and providing opportunities for Queenslanders, no matter where they live, to participate in the resources sector; and
- commends the LNP government for their commitment to regional Queensland through programs like Royalties for the Regions.

I struggle to remember a more hypocritical contribution to this parliament than what we have heard tonight. There is the only government in Queensland's history that has ever introduced 100 per cent fly-in fly-out and—I repeat the commitment that I gave—the only government that is likely, in the foreseeable future at least, to approve 100 per cent fly-in fly-out. Tonight they come in here and try to suggest that this single issue is the solution to the economic problems that are affecting our resources industry and the communities across regional Queensland. More than anything else, that illustrates to me the extent to which these people are captive of the CFMEU, because it is only the CFMEU that sees this as a major problem. They are captive of the CFMEU, because this issue is important to the CFMEU. It is all about control: control of mine sites, control of miners, control of their communities.

This work practice was introduced in two mines out of about 60. I will say that again: two out of 60. According to the people over there, changing the work practices in two mines is, all of a sudden, going to make Moranbah boom again and it is going to make Central Queensland's resources industry boom again. Of course that is nonsense and even the members opposite know that. Tonight they have been sent in here by the CFMEU with a job to do. The CFMEU is fighting a losing battle. I remember that when those mines advertised for staff to take the jobs that have been described as all sorts of horrendous things by members opposite, some 950 jobs were advertised and they received 34,000 applications—that is, 34,000 applications for 950 jobs because people wanted that lifestyle and people wanted that opportunity.

Our position has always been that people in Queensland, irrespective of where they live, deserve the opportunity to work in the resources industry. These practices were put in place so that people in Cairns, especially, could take the opportunity. At that particular time the economy in Cairns was not good. There were a large number of applications from Cairns. The reason it had 100 per cent fly-in fly-out was to make the charter flights work—that is, so we could put in place four charter flights a week. That amounted to 250 jobs out of Cairns.

So while they bemoan the fact that they suddenly want us to uproot those 250 people from Cairns and forcibly shift them to Moranbah, they do not care at all about the effect that that would have not just on those people themselves but on the economy of Cairns. The fly-in fly-out policies that are in place allow Queenslanders, wherever they live, to work in the resources sector.

What it does not allow is for the CFMEU to control the lives of every one of those people. That is the issue. When somebody goes to work at Moranbah and flies home to Cairns they can be their own person. They are not persecuted and hassled by the CFMEU down the pub or at the school or subjected to the old practices of the union thugs in those towns. That is what this is about.

It is not about two mines. It is not about a small percentage of the jobs in the Bowen Basin concentrated in two mines. It is about the jobs of CFMEU thugs who want to dominate the lives of people who want to live somewhere else.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (5.51 pm): I rise to support the Deputy Premier's amendment to the motion moved in the House. I support the amendment because it is quite incredible that we have to listen to the sheer hypocrisy coming from the little corner opposite. It is incredible given, as the Deputy Premier said, that the only government in Queensland to fully approve 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces was the previous Labor government. They have the nerve to walk in here today and say, 'We are going to fix it all. We are not going to worry about the workers and their families who are already set up and have their kids in local schools in areas like Cairns. We are not going to worry about them. We are going to kick them out of their houses in Cairns. We are going to get rid of them.' That is what the opposition is all about. Who knows how they intend to fix up their mistakes. This is just another ridiculous piece of Labor hypocrisy at its best.

In the Wide Bay-Burnett region, which the Deputy Premier and I come from, over 3,000 workers go in and out of not just these two mines but over 60 mines in Queensland. It is their choice. Do members know what those opposite seem to believe? They seem to think that everyone involved in fly-in fly-out work lives in either Cairns or Brisbane. That is simply not true.

We have hundreds of such people in Kingaroy and surrounding areas. There are amazing related businesses that can set up in areas like Kingaroy. We have the Perrys from Global Engineering and Construction who fly people in and out of the Cooper Basin which is 15,000 kilometres away. Those people and their workers actually choose to live in a regional community. The economic benefit to our local community is simply incredible. We even have a local pilot who flies them in and out. It is his business. It is really quite incredible what feeds back into our local economy.

I wanted to touch on what the previous government did with the mining royalties. They did absolutely nothing. They squandered them away and did not give a cent of them back to any of our regions. That is unlike our government which has already invested over \$300 million in our regions.

Those opposite did not even think about the regions when it came to squandering all of the royalties that they received. It is absolutely disgraceful. The rivers of gold were absolutely squandered. This government has done amazing things when it comes to critical infrastructure. The Royalties for the Regions program has seen funding go to practical things like the Barcaldine and Blackall child-care centres.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Absolutely. It is fantastic that Royalties for the Regions funding of \$10 million went to the South Burnett Regional Council for the wastewater treatment plant. When the Labor Party were in government it gave absolutely nothing back to those in the bush.

Our government has allowed Queenslanders the right to choose where they want to work and live. The 250-odd workers and their families who are already settled—their kids are in day care and in the local schools and they are being well looked after by members like the member for Cairns—should not have to be forced out of their homes. I think it is embarrassing and typical Labor hypocrisy to come into this House and demand that.

Those opposite are consistently flip-flopping. It is all about chasing the polls. I was interested to hear the Deputy Premier talk about what the CFMEU's role is in this. It is incredible. Obviously they are their masters and that is who they listen to. They do not listen to the people of Queensland unlike those on this side of the House.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (5.56 pm): I rise to support the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition. The motion certainly brings to the forefront this issue of fly-in fly-out workforces in the mining sector. Last week the Leader of the Opposition launched Labor's policy position regarding this issue. Of course, unlike the LNP, the policy was developed in consultation with the varied communities that are directly impacted.

I want to reflect on some of the history regarding fly-in fly-out at this point in time. Before doing so, just remember that at least 9,000 jobs have been lost in the Bowen Basin since the peak of the mining boom in 2010. I note that many conservative MPs, both in the federal and state domain, are making a meaningless and ineffectual racket about this issue of fly-in fly-out. I will come back to that if there is time.

Before we sit here and hear members of the government blaming Labor for 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, particularly to two 100 per cent mines in Central Queensland, here are the facts. The former Labor government did not support 100 per cent fly-in fly-out and in fact stipulated a 70-30 split. The mine proponents appealed that decision to the Coordinator-General. In the circumstances as presented, an extraordinary combination of low unemployment, unprecedented demand for workers, skyrocketing property prices and all sorts of accommodation problems, the mining proponent's appeal was successful. However, that revised approval was with serious conditions, those being that BMA source 80 per cent of its entire workforce locally, as the Deputy Premier has pointed out, and build 400 new dwellings in the region—160 of them in Moranbah.

Obviously, Labor intended to encourage more workers to move to Moranbah to support the sustainability of that local community. It was never Labor's intention to allow BMA to expressly exclude local residents from jobs at those new mines. The opposition has been on the record as highly critical of this unjustifiable postcode apartheid. I am very proud of our policy to address this issue announced by the Leader of the Opposition. Labor has had the courage to set a timetable for ending 100 per cent fly-in fly-out in the Queensland resources sector and not just mouth the mealy-mouthed nonsense that we have heard from government backbenchers.

I get back to the history of this issue. The LNP has been all over the shop. This starts leading up to the last election when the now Premier clearly ruled out the possibility of this practice when he was visiting Central Queensland. I, like other Central Queenslanders, thought that this was an unequivocal position. How wrong I was.

This issue really highlights the desperation in conservative ranks. There are state and federal MPs—like Michelle Landry, George Christensen and Ken O'Dowd—and at least three LNP members of this backbench who have been very vocal in their local media expressing their ardent opposition to

fly-in fly-out. What have they actually done? They are not going to speak in this debate. Where are they tonight? This is the perfect opportunity, the perfect platform, to express their views and say what they are going to do about it, instead of these vainglorious attempts to position themselves in the best light possible given their complete failure to influence conservative leadership at both a federal and state level. So rather than these members swanning around their communities pretending that they have some influence, it is a stark reminder that these members constitute nothing more than electoral cannon fodder for the LNP machine. In truth, their representations have no effect—zero, zip.

I can say that with some confidence given the recent visit to Central Queensland by the Prime Minister. What did he have to say? He said things like, 'Coal is good for humanity.' Of all the things you could say on one side of the argument or the other about coal, 'Coal is good for humanity,' comes from the Prime Minister. On the back of his comments about shirt-fronting the Russians, this bloke is becoming a national embarrassment. But importantly to this debate he said, '... the economics of this mine worked with fly-in fly-out, they weren't going to work on a different basis.'

So clearly he is parroting the brief given to him by the mining company and why wouldn't he? After all, we know about the close relationship that exists between that side of politics and the big end of the mining industry. It is nothing short of embarrassing commentary from backbenchers and embarrassing comments from the Prime Minister, and the Deputy Premier and the Premier are completely at odds with their own backbench. Really they have done nothing in three years except talk.



Mr HOLSWICH (Pine Rivers—LNP) (6.01 pm): I rise to support the amendment put forward by the Deputy Premier to this ridiculous motion. The hypocrisy of Labor members in putting forward this motion is absolutely astounding, as is their inability to remember anything they did prior to 2012. It must be such a happy place for members opposite when they can sit there with a smile on their face and deny that they have stuffed up, because that seems to be the place they are in at the moment.

We are talking here in this motion this evening about a 100 per cent fly-in fly-out policy that was implemented lock, stock and barrel by the former Labor government. There are two mines in Queensland where this 100 per cent fly-in fly-out policy is in force and both of those approvals were granted by Labor. The Leader of the Opposition or the member for Rockhampton can sit there and tut-tut, but our government's record speaks for itself. We have not approved any 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mines under our government.

The position put forward by Labor in saying they will review existing FIFO locations if they were elected to government is an interesting position and certainly a concerning one. Labor's position on this issue is effectively saying to the 900 mine workers at the two existing 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mines, 'We don't care about your jobs. We don't care about your job security.' Labor are willing to put the jobs of 900 or so Queenslanders at these two mines in jeopardy so they can backflip on a policy that they implemented in the first place.

In fact, the opposition leader said herself in her recent media release when she announced Labor's latest backflip—and interesting reading that media release was—'The Labor Party stands for safe, secure jobs for every Queensland, regardless of where you live.' If this is actually true—and I think it is a really long bow to suggest that that is actually what they stand for—why would the Leader of the Opposition want to create instability and uncertainty at existing mines for their current employees? It does not make sense. At its best it is illogical and ignorant; at worst it has the potential to be a disaster for the workers at those mines and their families. I know that there are people from my electorate who travel to these mines and there are undoubtedly people from the Leader of the Opposition's electorate as well who travel to these mines, so it is astounding that Labor would want to put those jobs at risk in this way.

As the Deputy Premier has made very clear in this House today and in recent media commentary, our government will not shift the goalposts for the existing approvals that were granted. We will maintain investment certainty and we will not be party to this ridiculous uncertainty that Labor want to bring to these mines. Our government, as outlined in the Deputy Premier's amendment to this motion, has always supported a balance between growing resource communities and providing opportunities for Queenslanders, no matter where they live, to participate in the resources sector. We also support the right for regional communities to benefit from the resources sector through sharing the benefits of improved regional infrastructure.

Royalties for the Regions is undoubtedly one of the greatest achievements of this government for regional Queensland. Whilst I am not from regional Queensland myself, I have said before in this place that one of the reasons I wanted to serve in this parliament was that through travelling regional Queensland extensively in former employment I was appalled to continually see and hear stories of the state of neglect of regional roads, schools, hospitals and community infrastructure. The Labor opposition has the gall to claim now that they want to see vibrant, thriving communities across Queensland's regions when for years they were happy to sit idly by and let regional Queensland communities fend for themselves while they were in government. In stark contrast to Labor's record, to date we have seen 39 councils across Queensland receive over \$300 million in Royalties for the Regions funding, which is delivering greatly needed and long-overdue infrastructure projects across all of Queensland.

By the time we get to the next election there will have been the best part of half a billion dollars in royalties pumped back into the regions—the regions that deserve to benefit from the royalties generated in those places in the first place. The motion put forward by Labor continues a theme of Labor hokey-pokey where they do not know if their left foot is in or out or shaking all about. Their attempt at a policy on this issue is ludicrous, and I am sure regional Queensland would agree that this LNP government is the only party in Queensland showing a demonstrable long-term commitment to developing a strong resources industry in Queensland and growing strong Queensland regions. Our government supports the continued growth of the resources sector as one of the key pillars of the Queensland economy. I support the amendment to this motion.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (6.06 pm): This motion was an opportunity for the Newman government to clear up finally its policy contradictions, its U-turns and internal squabbling that has been the hallmark of this government that is tearing the LNP asunder on the issue of 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workers. We know that before the last election the Premier told voters in the Bowen Basin that an LNP government would not allow 100 per cent fly-in-fly-out workforces. His exact words were '... just simply something we would not tolerate if we get into government.' That was a clear election commitment—an election commitment that has just as clearly been broken.

We know that there are a growing number of LNP MPs from constituencies where that broken promise is causing so much distress who have dared to be outspoken on the issue. On 26 May this year, the member for Whitsunday told APN newspapers—

Voters have made it very clear to me that it is having a detrimental effect on the Mackay and Whitsunday region. I don't believe in 100% FIFO arrangements and I won't budge on that.

That was very well said, member for Whitsunday. We will see if he speaks up for his community later tonight, and we will see how he actually votes on this motion. But that is not all. The member for Whitsunday went on to say that 100 per cent FIFO was absolutely despised by voters and, 'If it's not discrimination against our local people, what is it?' That is indeed the question.

The member for Mirani, always to be relied upon to be a calm voice of reason, made his opposition to 100 per cent FIFO crystal clear. He even went as far as lodging a petition against it, with 3,317 names, and said he totally rejected its imposition. Also in May this year my old mate the member for Gregory described 100 per cent FIFO as '100 per cent evil', and went further to say, 'We have vacant shops and vacant houses.' He made some pertinent points, saying that mining towns such as Springsure, Tieri, Clermont and Blackwater were reeling from a market slide made worse by mines using only out-of-town commuters.

Sadly, there are senior members of the Newman government whose views have been less clear cut—for example, the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. He seems confused. In late 2012 he said the government had made clear its policy of not supporting 100 per cent FIFO mining operation workforces. But by May this year, along with the Deputy Premier, he had changed his mind, and sought instead to blame the mining unions for his change of heart. The Deputy Premier angrily told APN the debate was more about union power and union domination than it was about country towns or mining towns. Then, on 19 June, the Deputy Premier tried to clear up the confusion. He attempted to articulate a new position, insisting the LNP had never changed its policy or had never reneged on its election commitment at all.

He claimed that the government did not support further fly-in fly-out workforces and could not foresee any further approvals being made other than the two already in place. Crucially, however, the Deputy Premier failed to rule them out. Despite being told repeatedly by the opposition, his own LNP colleagues and federal members from his own side of politics of the harm being caused by the existing 100 per cent fly-in fly-out arrangements, he refused to take any action to end the practice in

order to ensure resource communities were not damaged in the process. Correct me if I am wrong, but that is the Deputy Premier's position, is it not? The Deputy Premier clearly is content to not listen to the cries of people who say their local communities are dying. He simply refuses to acknowledge that some businesses are folding because the hundreds of people who work at local mines do not spend any of their income locally.

If the Deputy Premier would like, I can offer one more quote to help him understand. It comes from Moranbah resident Peter Finlay who, on 19 September this year, told the *Daily Mercury*—

"The number of businesses that have shut here in the last six months is just phenomenal," he said.

...

"The closest mine to Moranbah, which is Caval Ridge, is 6km away from the post office ...

"But you have to live in Cairns or Brisbane to get a job there."

Let me be very clear. Despite the assertions of the member for Nanango—and no doubt what the member for Cairns will assert as well—the opposition's FIFO policy is not about demonising people who are currently FIFO workers from various regions in other parts of Queensland like the southern suburbs of Cairns or the workforce that comes from Innisfail. It is about redressing the balance like the LNP said they would but have not done. Labor is about facilitating and creating jobs: FIFO jobs, DIDO jobs and jobs for local workers. We are not saying that FIFO is a bad thing—it is a commercial reality—we are saying that people should have a right to decide what living arrangements are best for their family and their circumstances. If the Newman government's so-called Royalties for the Regions policy was what it purported to be, those regions may have gotten more support from the LNP government. However, given that Royalties for the Regions is (a) not actually directly linked to royalty regimes in terms of funding source, (b) is essentially a rebadged version of the old local government grant scheme, and (c) ludicrously allows Queensland government departments to actually apply for grants designed for local authorities, one could be forgiven for thinking that it is yet another example of the LNP leading Queenslanders up the garden path.

In conclusion, in that article I quoted from a little earlier, Mr Finlay said that the Deputy Premier's response to his petition was 'total and utter garbage'.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KING** (Cairns—LNP) (6.11 pm): What an interesting debate we have had so far. I rise to support the amendment to the motion moved by the Deputy Premier. I particularly note his amendment highlighting the government's strong focus on regional Queensland. Before I speak to that point, which is a very important point, and I reflect on the benefits for my electorate of Cairns, particularly the 250 FIFO workers in Cairns and surrounding areas, can I touch on the rank hypocrisy of the Labor Party? I have to start by giving sincere apologies to Hollywood actors Will Smith and Tommy Lee Jones because the Labor Party are the men and women in black. If members recall the *Men in Black* movies, they may remember a little machine called the neuraliser. I table information on the neuraliser for the benefit particularly of the opposition.

Tabled paper: Wikipedia document, dated 28 October 2014, regarding neuralisers [\[6382\]](#).

The little machine with the red laser beam called the neuraliser was used to wipe the memory of anyone who saw an alien. The men in black could hold up the neuraliser and they would wipe away all memory of what people had just seen. In its original motion today, the Labor Party have yet again tried to use a neuraliser on the good people of Queensland. This latest flip-flopping, backflipping, neuralising stunt by the Labor opposition is just the latest in a very long line of attempts to rewrite history. Let me count the ways. The Labor Party want to use a neuraliser so that everyone will forget about the debt that they created. They want everyone to forget about selling assets without telling anyone they were going to sell assets. The member for Mulgrave wants everyone to forget his *Mythbusters* series, which he deleted from his website after he was caught out still promoting the benefits of selling assets after nearly two years in opposition. But the Labor opposition especially want to neuralise and neutralise the memories of Queenslanders about their incompetence and recklessness when it comes to managing the health system with the scandals, debacles, waste and complete lack of front-line outcomes. Today the Labor Party want to use the old neuraliser and hope that everyone forgets who approved the 100 per cent FIFO arrangements that operate at the Daunia and Caval Ridge mines. Who approved the 100 per cent FIFO arrangements? The Labor Party did! I commend the Deputy Premier for resisting Labor's neuralising tendencies and reminding Queenslanders of the rank hypocrisy of the Labor opposition.

When the BMA plan was announced to source 250 workers from Cairns and no doubt surrounding electorates like those of Mulgrave, the mayor of Cairns, Bob Manning, said—

We'll find the mining industry, because of the wages they pay, will attract people away but when men and women go to work on the mines they don't intend to stay there for the rest of their lives.

...

"They go away, they're away for a while, they learn new skills, they come back and settle back into life on the coast, so I don't see it as a great problem.

Indeed, the benefit in terms of salaries for Cairns and the surrounding areas is estimated to be \$40 million circulating in our local economy. This is just one demonstration of how regions right across the state are sharing in the wealth created by mining. It also demonstrates that resource workers want flexibility to live and work where they choose, a simple fact of choice that the Labor opposition is choosing to ignore. We are not in the business of shifting the goalposts on the approvals for 100 per cent FIFO that were granted by Labor to the mining company BMA. Unlike Labor, our government is incredibly focused on providing investment certainty. You cannot move the goalposts once they are established. It is a fact that the Labor Party, with members who have rarely—if ever—worked in the private sector, do not understand.

Regional Queensland has benefited enormously under this government from things like Royalties for the Regions, the RegionsQ initiative and important local decision-making reforms. I commend the Deputy Premier and support his amendment to the motion.

 **Mrs MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (6.16 pm): It gives me great pleasure to speak in support of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition today. I would like to say that I am very amused by the contribution of people who purport to be representatives of the LNP. I would like to ask why these people in this House have not got on their foreheads 'LNP proudly supported by BMA', 'LNP proudly supported by Glencore', 'LNP proudly supported by Rio' and the others. I can tell honourable members that it is the mining companies in Queensland who have got their puppet strings out. That is what they are doing. Members opposite are just toadies to the mining companies of Queensland.

This Deputy Premier can say as much as he likes about the CFMEU being union thugs, but I would like to say that I am very proud to stand here as a friend of the CFMEU, as a friend of the ETU, as a friend of the AMWU and a friend of all of those who look after the mineworkers on the mine sites in Queensland. I can tell honourable members that I also worked in Blackwater for four years. If it were not for the CFMEU, the ETU and the AMWU and what was going on in those mining towns at the time, those mining towns would not be in existence today even though they are going backwards.

I would also like to say that I have been to Moura on several occasions. The last couple of times I went to Moura, which this Deputy Premier purports to represent, one of the great jokes was, 'Has anyone ever seen Seeney?' That is what they say. I just say, 'Well, I see him in parliament,' and they say to me, 'Well, you see more of him than we do.'

I would also like to point out in this House tonight that we have Jason Costigan, the so-called representative for Whitsunday, who talks and talks and talks; he gabbers on, but let us see how he votes tonight. There is also Vaughan Johnson, the member for Gregory. I am really upset that Vaughan did not get a speaking gig tonight because Vaughan has spoken in this House many times about the respect that he has for Andrew Vickers and the CFMEU. Vaughan is nodding. He knows what I mean. He knows that it is very important that these mining towns, including Blackwater which Vaughan represents, survive.

Vaughan and I have gone around Blackwater and we have seen what has happened because a lot of the houses in Blackwater are now not occupied by families. Of course we know that Ted Malone is retiring, but I understand that he would know what is happening in these mining towns. The member for Cairns trying to make a joke about what is happening in mining towns is a disgrace, because what is happening in the mining towns is a very serious matter. I have been to Moura, Dysart, Middlemount, Blackwater—where I was for four years—Moranbah and Collinsville. When you have a look at Collinsville, Glencore has ripped the guts out of it. That is only one way to describe it. The men and women who are living in Collinsville cannot get a job in Collinsville.

Mrs Menkens interjected.

Mrs MILLER: All that the member who is supposed to represent Collinsville can talk about is the fact that there are fewer so-called 'communists' in Collinsville than there were. That is just shocking!

I would like to talk about what is happening in these mining towns, because I have gone around and spoken to them. The miners want choice, and we all support choice. People in Mackay should have the choice to drive in and drive out of Moranbah; the people of Rockhampton should have the choice to drive in and drive out of Blackwater. We support choice, but what we do not support is the businesses in these towns going bankrupt. We have seen that in Moranbah. We know that the motels in Moranbah are going bankrupt. We also know about the postcode of apartheid where, if you want to apply for a job, you have to have a Brisbane address to get a job in Moranbah even though you live in Moranbah. That is a disgrace!

(Time expired)



Hon. AP CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (6.22 pm): I rise tonight to oppose the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition and to support the amended motion as moved by the Deputy Premier. Mr Deputy Speaker, the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition this evening comes in three parts, and it effectively represents the written confession of the Queensland parliamentary Labor Party about this issue. In the first part it reads—

- notes the Labor Opposition's recently released policy to end 100% fly-in fly-out operations by giving workers a choice near existing resource communities

This policy confirms that, up until the point in time that the Leader of the Opposition moved and spoke to this motion, their policy has been something other than this position. It confirms in writing that the Labor opposition and the previous Labor government fully supported 100 per cent FIFO arrangements in Caval Ridge and Daunia mines in Central Queensland. You are condemned by your own motion in moving it effectively tonight, and the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the opposition should hang their heads in shame because they have written it down themselves, moved it and spoken to it in this parliament. The position of the Leader of the Opposition has, up until this point in time, been one of support for 100 per cent FIFO arrangements in the resources sector in Queensland.

Do members know why they have had to move this motion tonight? You can just envisage the meeting. They have had to go up there and talk to the bosses of the CFMEU and they have had to stand in front of them and do the 'mea culpa'—'Mea maxima culpa.' They have had to go before the bosses and say, 'We were wrong. We did the wrong thing. We wrote the conditions in. They were not effective.' Notwithstanding the point that the member for Rockhampton tried to make tonight and the weasel words around all of the conditions in the previous approval, they effectively provided for 100 per cent FIFO positions in Caval Ridge and Daunia. No matter how the member for Rockhampton tries to squirm in his chair, that is the fact. The second point in the motion states—

- notes the Deputy Premier's statements, reported on 19 June this year, opposing 100% fly-in fly-out mining operations

In relation to the second point, I think the points that have been made by the Deputy Premier earlier and some of the other members from the government dwell on the fact that prior to the Newman government coming to power not a single dollar of royalties were dedicated to the rural and regional communities in Queensland, and we have done that. The LNP believes that resource workers should have a choice of where they live and work, and we are planning to grow the resources sector in Queensland to create more jobs for people in Queensland, whether they live in those resource communities or whether they choose to travel to those resource communities to get those jobs.

The Newman government is injecting more than \$495 million through the Royalties for the Regions program to improve infrastructure and develop community projects in resource communities to improve their lifestyle, welfare and circumstances and will continue to work with local communities and councils to ensure that these communities are attractive places to live and work so that all Queenslanders benefit from the royalties that come from the resources sector. The LNP has never changed its policy on 100 per cent FIFO workers. We have always supported a mix of local and commuting workers to support those projects in the resources sector. The last point of the Leader of the Opposition's motion says—

- calls on the Newman government to follow through on the Deputy Premier's promise as soon as possible and end 100% fly-in fly-out operations near existing resource communities.

Let us be very clear about what the third point means. The Leader of the Opposition has tonight called on this parliament to effectively retrospectively repeal decisions made by the previous Labor government. This motion is an effective call to this parliament to repeal decisions made by the previous Labor government, and those decisions were made when the Leader of the Opposition was in government, when the member for Mulgrave was in government, when the member for Mackay was in government, when the member for Bundamba—who is embarrassed tonight—and the member

for Woodridge were in government. Let us have a score card: number of mines approved by the Labor Party with 100 per cent FIFO, two; number of mines approved by the LNP with 100 per cent FIFO, zero.

(Time expired)

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

AYES, 49:

LNP, 49—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Choat, Costigan, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Flegg, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Watts, Young.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

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

AYES, 49:

LNP, 49—Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Choat, Costigan, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Flegg, Frecklington, Grant, Grimwade, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Malone, Mander, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Nicholls, Powell, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Seeney, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trout, Watts, Young.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 8—Byrne, D'Ath, Lynham, Miller, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House:

- notes the Labor Party is the only government in Queensland that has ever approved 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operations;
- notes the LNP government, unlike the Labor Party, has always supported a balance between growing resource communities and providing opportunities for Queenslanders, no matter where they live, to participate in the resources sector; and
- commends the LNP government for their commitment to regional Queensland through programs like Royalties for the Regions.

Sitting suspended from 6.36 pm to 7.36 pm.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Error in Division

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): I have been advised by the government whip that there was an error in calculating the government votes in the last two divisions prior to the dinner break. The error does not affect the outcome of the vote, however the record needs to be corrected. The result of both divisions was in fact ayes 49, noes 8. In accordance with standing order 106(11), I have instructed the Clerk to amend the *Record of Proceedings*.

MAJOR EVENTS BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 3642, on motion of Mrs Stuckey—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (7.36 pm), continuing: It is nice to be welcomed back after dinner. Before the dinner break I had completed some nine minutes of my speech and I had just discussed the changes in this bill relating to health practitioners. Following on from the Health Practitioners Act 1998, I make the comment that these laws have been used for a number of other events since this time. The Major Events Bill repeals and replaces these provisions. There are some very subtle changes. Instead of the chief executive having to keep track of scripts that are written by health

professionals from overseas, it is now the Chief Health Officer who needs to do that. They will continue to apply, as they do now, but the health minister will not need to make a separate regulation to bring them into force. Again, this is part of the main driver of the bill, which is to cut red tape and reduce regulatory duplication for major events.

The ticket-scalping provisions in the bill, although not new, will be broadened. Ticket-scalping provisions are currently contained in the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001 and the Motor Racing Events Act. However, these provisions only apply to declared motor-racing events and events which are held in Stadiums Queensland facilities such as Suncorp Stadium, the Brisbane cricket ground and the Brisbane Entertainment Centre. I understand that the Rolling Stones will be at the Brisbane Entertainment Centre in a couple of weeks. The bill will allow ticket-scalping protections to apply to other events including, for example, all the events at the Gold Coast Aquatic Centre, which would not be protected under existing legislation. As recommended by the committee, I will move an amendment in consideration in detail to clarify that the intent is to provide an offence for tickets sold at greater than 10 per cent above the original sale price.

I note that some of the new provisions in the bill have been put in place to meet commitments the government has made to host the 2015 AFC Asian Cup and the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games. These provisions include the ability to control airspace above a major event, prohibit ambush marketing and street trading on roads and public land in controlled areas and establish major event lanes. They are comparable to provisions in major events legislation in other states and will not apply to all events. They will only be used when they are needed.

I would now like to address the eight points for clarification raised in the committee's report. In point 1, the committee has requested further information on the development of the Queensland government events framework and details of any criteria that may be included to assess a major event. The Queensland government events framework will outline the guiding principles for Queensland government agencies engaging in events or involved in supporting events operationally and financially. It will not include assessment criteria for a major event. As I said earlier, relevant criteria for the minister to consider in determining whether a major event is prescribed is included within the bill itself.

In point 2, the committee has asked whether there are any issues relating to the application of the Personal Property Securities Act 2009, a Commonwealth act, and the provisions of the bill relating to the moving and removal of vehicles. The bill provides for the removal of vehicles left in major event areas and outlines the process that must be followed by the major event organiser to move and remove vehicles and then dispose of abandoned vehicles.

Section 253 of the Personal Property Securities Act states that it is—

... not intended to exclude or limit the operation of any other law if that other law is capable of operating concurrently with this Act.

The provisions of the bill dealing with removal and disposal of vehicles are not inconsistent with the Personal Property Securities Act and the bill does not remove any security interest that may be on a vehicle. Both the bill and the act are capable of operating concurrently as provided under section 253. Let me explain how this happens now. A check of whether any money is owed on a vehicle is currently undertaken prior to disposal of vehicles under current transport legislation. If money is owed to a financial institution for the vehicle, the relevant financial institution is contacted and a direction sought as to what it wants to do. The financial institution may opt to gain possession of the vehicle, at which time it is required to pay all storage and removal expenses owed to the department.

In points 3 and 4 the committee seeks clarification on considerations for enlivening the ticket-scalping protections for a major event and the merits of reviewing ticket-scalping provisions in the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001 in light of the recent reports of the Senate Economics References Committee and the Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council. Factors that will be considered in enlivening the ticketing protections include any commitments or preconditions of hosting an event, the anticipated ticket sales and the likelihood of demand exceeding supply for tickets which would increase the risk of ticket scalping. The merits of the ticket-scalping provisions have already been reviewed as part of a broader review undertaken on the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001.

The Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council report on ticket onselling was considered during this review, as were national and international trends in the management of ticket scalping. Both legislative and non-legislative measures, which include enforcement and education,

are considered to be beneficial in managing ticket onselling in Queensland. While some private sector operators such as eBay and Ticketmaster favour a non-legislative approach or leaving ticket scalping to be addressed under the Commonwealth's general consumer protection legislation, other private sector operators such as event promoters favour some ticket onselling legislative control as it can complement their own initiatives to prevent profiteering by ticket onsellers in circumstances where demand exceeds supply.

Ticket-scalping provisions are often required by major event organisers as a precondition of hosting major events such as the Commonwealth Games. Ticket scalping becomes an issue at events where demand exceeds supply, and in these circumstances ticket-scalping legislation can help to prevent profiteering by ticket onsellers. This is generally not a big issue in Australia, with Ticketmaster informing the committee that less than 10 events per year would be sell-outs. Regardless of this, retaining legislation for ticket onselling sends a clear message that the government does not condone profiteering by ticket onsellers for major events at government funded venues. In the context of the Commonwealth Games, government also has a policy objective of ensuring that the games are affordable for Queensland families. Maintaining ticket-scalping legislation will help meet this objective.

In point 5 the committee seeks clarification of the intent of clause 31(1)(a) of the bill which relates to ticket touting in a major event area or controlled area. Major event organisers usually require a range of commercial protections as a precondition of hosting major events. This can include prohibiting ticket touting within major event areas and controlled areas. Prohibitions on persons selling tickets within games management areas were in place for the Melbourne 2006 Commonwealth Games. The Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2001 of Victoria prohibited persons selling or giving away tickets to the Commonwealth Games, whether valid, an imitation or forged. South Australia also deals with this issue in the same way in its Major Events Act 2013 where all ticket sales are prohibited within controlled areas for the event. However, outside of these controlled areas persons may lawfully onsell tickets that do not exceed the original sales price by more than 10 per cent.

In point 6 the committee requests clarification on the necessity for clause 25 given the search powers contained in clause 18 under part 5 of the bill. The capacity to inspect bags inside the major event area in addition to the capacity to search at point of entry are both required to provide for safety and security at a major event, and let me tell members why. There are a number of practical scenarios that could arise in which this power to search would be necessary, and they include where a person has procured a prohibited item after passing through the screening at the access control point; where a person has managed to slip a prohibited item through the screening point without being detected; where a person has exited the venue to smoke and then re-entered, particularly now that smokers are not permitted to smoke inside venues; or in events outside of the stadium such as a marathon or a triathlon.

In point 7 the committee has requested advice on how a major event organiser would communicate with the public that it is reasonably satisfied that the appointed authorised persons have the appropriate level of training, experience or qualifications. The bill requires the major event organiser to issue an identity card to an authorised person who is not a police officer. An authorised person is required to have their identity card clearly visible or to produce the identity card when using their powers. The identity card is the means by which the major event organiser shows the public that the person has the appropriate level of training, experience or qualifications suitable for appointment.

Point 8 for clarification relates to whether entering a property to cover or remove advertising would include a commercial building in a major event area and whether the consent element provided in subclause (5) would also apply to a business owner. Under the bill, unauthorised advertisements in major event areas and controlled areas can be covered or removed. This provision is required as the experience from past major events like the Commonwealth Games shows that fines are not always a significant deterrent because of the value that third parties can obtain from unauthorised advertising at a major event. Allowing an unauthorised advertisement to remain in place during the course of an event can detract from the sponsorship pool of the event and the official sponsors. The bill provides for prompt action to be taken to cover or remove unauthorised advertising in major event areas and controlled areas.

It would be impractical to get consent from the owner of a business who may not be present or contactable. This provision would be activated only for an event such as the Commonwealth Games where there are specific hosting commitments. I assure honourable members that this government's

approach to enforcement of commercial protection for the Commonwealth Games will not be heavy handed. They are the Commonwealth Games and are referred to as the friendly games. We will have a friendly and conciliatory approach to possible breaches.

Finally, I would like to address briefly the committee's recommendations. Of the nine recommendations made, the government supports eight fully in principle or in part. One recommendation is not supported. The government supports recommendation 1 that the bill be passed and, in this regard, it appreciates the committee's support. Once again, I thank the committee.

Recommendation 2 is that clause 12 of the bill be amended to provide that a major event is to be declared at least three months prior to the event. The government does not support this recommendation. While every endeavour will be made to ensure maximum lead time for a major event to be prescribed, it may not always be possible to meet an arbitrary time frame of three months. As I mentioned earlier, bidding for and securing events can be a long and complicated process. Although we usually know that we are hosting an event way in advance, the exact details that we need to prescribe the major event, such as the area where the event will be held and the times when events will occur, are not known until closer to the time, especially when multiple venues are involved. A degree of flexibility is also required for extenuating circumstances and last-minute changes. In addition, the bill requires consultation with a range of public authorities prior to prescribing an event, which can take time, but will ensure that the powers are appropriately exercised.

The government supports recommendation 3, that clause 11 of the bill be amended to provide that a controlled area is shown on a map in the regulation. Recommendation 4 relates to the basic search powers that are currently contained in clause 18(5) of the bill. The committee recommends that this clause be amended to include an element of reasonableness to reflect that a person can be asked to consent to a search only if they have been screened beforehand, such as by electronic screening, and to clarify the intent of the search powers under the clause. The government supports this recommendation in part. In its report the committee notes—

The powers are consistent with what is considered a basic, non-invasive search.

The committee also notes that—

... authorised persons are not provided with powers to frisk search persons.

As I said earlier, given the concerns that have been raised, I will move an amendment to clause 18 during the consideration in detail. The amendment has been redrafted based on existing section 568 of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000. It now specifically includes an element of reasonableness where an authorised person may make a request of an entrant. It also specifies that authorised persons may inspect an article in the person's possession and specifies that an authorised person can touch a garment that a person is wearing only if they are of the same sex as the person. To further address the committee's concerns in relation to clause 18, an additional subclause now specifies that only a police officer may ask an entrant to permit a frisk search. As the committee has already noted in its report, authorised persons are not provided with powers to frisk search persons, but the bill now makes this clear in black and white that only a police officer can frisk a person.

The committee's recommendation that a person can be asked to consent to a search only if they have been screened beforehand, such as by electronic screening, is not supported. Electronic screening will not necessarily be present at all events and venues. Therefore, there will still be some need to conduct a basic inspection such as a bag check.

Recommendation 5, that the bill be amended to provide that a regulation declaring a major event must provide cultural and gender sensibility training for all authorised persons undertaking searches, is supported in principle. As I have just said, I will be moving an amendment in consideration in detail to clause 18 that will provide that only a person of the same sex can touch a garment a person is wearing. This amendment is in line with my earlier comments that only people who have the necessary skills, experience and expertise can be appointed as authorised persons.

The government also supports recommendation 6 in principle, which proposes that clause 60 be amended to provide that an authorised person's identity card must differentiate between the powers specified in their instrument of appointment. There are a range of practical difficulties in specifying particular powers on individual identity cards. The government considers that there are other mechanisms that can help address the committee's concerns, such as signage at events and community awareness about the powers of authorised persons without creating an administrative burden for major event organisers in relation to the identity cards that they are required to issue. To

meet the committee's concerns, I will move an amendment to the bill during consideration in detail that will require a major event organiser to place a sign at each public entrance to a major event area identifying the powers of authorised persons.

The government supports recommendations 7, 8 and 9 and will move amendments during consideration in detail to address them. With regard to recommendation 9, I note the committee's concerns about clause 34 of the bill which prohibits unauthorised advertising on vessels. This clause is not intended to prevent legitimate businesses from operating within the area. For this reason, I will move an amendment during consideration in detail to include a reasonable excuse defence to apply. Again, I stress that, in the case of an alleged breach, a conciliatory approach would be taken to help strike the balance between protecting legitimate businesses and protecting commercial rights in relation to the event.

Once again, I thank the committee and the committee secretariat for their thorough consideration of this bill. I also thank my departmental officers and my ministerial staff for their work on this bill. In summary, this bill consolidates current legislation for major events into a single act. It reduces red tape and regulatory duplication. It will also meet the government's commitments with regard to hosting the 2015 Asian Cup and the 2018 Commonwealth Games.

The bill provides a streamlined framework to be used for future major events held in Queensland and puts Queensland on an equal footing with other states that already have similar major events legislation in place. In fact, I believe that our bill will do even more by enhancing our already excellent offering and event calendar and make Queensland an even more attractive destination for major events. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (7.57 pm): I rise to speak to the Major Events Bill 2014. Let me begin by thanking the chair and the staff of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee. I am a relative newcomer to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee and, in relation to this bill, I can say that I was pleased with the professionalism displayed by the chair of this committee. It has led to a level of scrutiny and analysis of the Major Events Bill that I think will benefit the parliament. This is demonstrated by the recommendations and points of clarification put forward by the committee. I hope the minister has seriously considered the committee's recommendations, because I believe that they add value to the major events framework in Queensland. I was pleased to see that the vast majority of those recommendations have been embraced, at least in principle.

The opposition will be supporting this bill, because it is clear that nationally consistent legislation will improve the conditions for organisations willing to bring major events to Queensland—something that all sensible people would appreciate. We all want to see an increase in tourism opportunities for businesses in Queensland which also give the community the opportunity to attend world-class events. Although it is likely that events such as the Asian Cup would still have come to Queensland if we had the existing legislation, we need to follow other states that have enacted or are in the process of legislating similar major events legislation to remove any hurdles for those event organisers.

I will highlight a few issues the committee had in relation to the Major Events Bill. In recommendation 2 the committee recommends clause 12 of the bill be amended to provide that a major event is to be declared at least three months prior to the event. Given the long planning phases associated with these events, it should not be a problem for the minister to declare a major event in this state at least three months out from the commencement date. We know that the Commonwealth Games is still four years away. We know that the Commonwealth Games was awarded to the Gold Coast before this government was even elected thanks to the good work of the former government in securing this wonderful event that will create perhaps up to 30,000 jobs and inject hopefully around about \$2 billion into the Queensland economy.

Recommendation 3 is self-explanatory. Maps of controlled areas depicted in the actual regulation is consistent with the G20 legislation and the Safe Night Out precincts legislation and should be taken on board to assist the community and the event organisers to ensure that the events run without incident. The last thing an event needs is a dispute over a boundary and whether a person or business is within an event zone or not. Argument would be distracting and might do reputational damage if the powers associated with this legislation are misused by mistake because the boundaries are not clearly mapped out. The map would make it clear and help all parties to reduce conflict.

In relation to recommendation 5 I think that cultural and gender sensibility training for all authorised persons undertaking searches is very important. The last thing any event needs is for a sexual harassment or unauthorised search to take place where a male touches a female inappropriately during a search. Reputational damage to an event or to a city hosting an event could cause financial or reputational damage that prevents tourists attending such events in the future.

I also wish to highlight my concerns with the response given by the department in the departmental briefing surrounding the issue of security guards' powers during major events. The explanatory notes state—

The Bill provides that an authorised person may direct a person to leave a major event area. However, this power is limited to a range of circumstances such as if the person is committing an offence, appears drunk or adversely affected by a drug, does not consent to search before entering a major event area, or does not produce a ticket or other evidence of their right to be in the major event area. A person who does not follow a direction to leave a major event area commits an offence. Only a police officer may use reasonable force to remove the person from the major event area.

It is this last sentence that concerns me—'Only a police officer may use reasonable force to remove the person from the major event area.' I understand that the government would want to restrict some of the authorised persons from using force against people. Some of the volunteers certainly are not trained to restrain people. I understand that the minister wants to make it clear that these people should not restrain people, but we know that people can play up at these events and I am worried about the unintended consequences of only allowing police to use reasonable force to remove people from an area. This legislation will replace the legislation that currently operates for motor-racing events in Queensland like the Gold Coast 600. I know that the Gold Coast 600 event is probably not as alcohol fuelled as the old Indy events that occurred in years gone by.

Mrs Stuckey: I didn't see you there.

Mr BYRNE: No, but I can see it on TV and watch the news. This bill as described by the department appears to limit the powers that security guards have in dealing with violent or intoxicated people within these precincts when they utilise these very same powers in nightclub districts all over Queensland every week. Many major events that I can think of have bars and licensed premises, they have late-night entertainment and sometimes events have people attending them who may be intent on disrupting the event through protest, streaking or generally disrupting an event. I get the impression that streakers can only be restrained by police now. I would like the minister in her address in reply to outline the intent of the government with regard to restricting the powers of security guards and the impact this might have on the number of police that are required to attend a major event in Queensland as a result. During the committee hearing I attempted to clarify the government's intent. I said—

... it is normal business practice, especially on licensed premises, that security guards can remove patrons from locations. Given what has just been described and what is in the explanatory notes about authorised persons, this seems to prevent security guards from being able to remove patrons from these premises. Is that the right interpretation?

The departmental officer said—

Not at all. The appointment of an authorised officer could include a security guard and they could ask a person to leave, but they cannot forcibly remove a person. The forcible removal of a person can only be done by a police officer.

I then said—

But in other locations the forcible removal of people from venues is within the remit of the likes of security officers. Whether that is answered yes or no, the next question then is about the number of Queensland police officers required to deliver this sort of model. I would have thought that relying exclusively on the Queensland Police Service to fulfil that responsibility would carry a very considerable burden in these sorts of events.

I wanted to know what the numbers were. I wanted to know what were the full implications of only police acting in this fashion. The departmental officer then went on to say that the department was trying to remove a number of duties from police to free them up at the event. I understand that. I understand that security and other authorised people are capable of doing some of the tasks like searching bags et cetera. That operates at stadiums and airports presently and police officers should not be undertaking those tasks. I attempted to clarify what the government was trying to do about this issue during the hearing. I said—

But the physical removal remains the domain of the Queensland Police Service?

The departmental officer replied yes. The member for Keppel said—

It says here that only police officers will be allowed to use reasonable force to remove persons from a major event.

The departmental officer replied, 'That is right.' Again I ask the minister to outline whether security guards can forcibly remove violent or intoxicated patrons from an event or do they have to on all occasions ask the police to remove them and, if so, will extra police be required to be on standby to physically restrain or remove these people when an appropriately trained security guard could do the job and prevent people from being assaulted?

I will speak briefly to point of clarification number 4, which states—

The committee requests the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games consults with the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing to review the merits of ticket scalping provisions contained in the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001 in light of the recent reports of the Senate Economics References Committee and Commonwealth Consumer Affairs Advisory Council.

The opposition supports the minister undertaking this review especially in light of a recent report from the ACCC into ticket pricing and booking fees which might affect Stadiums Queensland events. In light of technological advances in the sale and distribution of tickets and the ability to cancel tickets, a review of the system might be necessary. A review might take into consideration future technological advances such as persons using software to make bulk purchases through individual fake profiles seeking to then onsell tickets for inflated prices. Certainly the evidence in terms of convictions tells us that ticket scalping and overpriced onselling of tickets is not prevalent in the community at this time, with 53 ticket-scalping offences being prosecuted between 2007 and 2012. There is hardly, at this point, an avalanche of problems. Some of the reasons for that might be the number of people struggling to make ends meet who simply cannot afford to go out to these events, unemployment issues or, more likely, they are not prepared to pay excessive amounts to attend. Certainly this year the price of State of Origin tickets increased to a point where many members of the community simply could not afford to attend the event and the tickets ended up being discounted to be sold.

I move to brand protection. The explanatory notes state—

Clause 32 prohibits ambush marketing in a major event area or controlled area during a prescribed period. This includes promoting a person, thing or service; or doing something to suggest sponsorship or affiliation with the major event without the written approval of the major event organiser. The intention of this clause is to prevent marketing activity by a third party that seeks to "ambush" the goodwill or increased interest of a major event by suggesting that it is associated with the event, without paying for the privilege of becoming an official sponsor. This can include publicity stunts or handing out merchandise to spectators outside a major event area in the hope that it will be taken into the event.

Penalties apply to contraventions of this clause.

I support the intention of that clause, because sponsors pay big dollars to attach their brands to major events and many events rely on sponsorship to fund the event. I note the evidence before the committee that indicates that many major events, such as the Commonwealth Games, actually have it in their contracts with governments that ambush marketing legislation must be in place before the event can even go ahead. I am happy to support that clause.

During the committee hearings, much was made of the fact that the ambush and brand protection measures are modelled on the Commonwealth Games laws. I ask the minister how this clause operates in a practical sense because we, the opposition, are yet to get to the bottom of the mystery surrounding the *Southport Towards Twenty 18* book and the brand protection legislation that mirrors this clause from the Commonwealth Games legislation. During the estimates hearing, the member for Bundamba tried to get to the bottom of the matter surrounding the production of the *Southport Towards Twenty 18* book. We know that the book could have raised over \$200,000 and that the book was prepared on a semicommercial basis. We want to know where the money went. We know that during estimates hearings the opposition was promised an investigation of the book after Goldoc answered the questions on notice from the opposition. In response, the minister said, 'Goldoc is not aware of funding matters associated with the Southport book.' We know that it is an offence, just as it is in this legislation. We want to know whether anyone was prosecuted. In reply, the minister also said, 'Goldoc has not received any payment from Headline Ad.' We know the Commonwealth Games logo was in the *Southport Towards Twenty 18* book, so where did the money from that go? The minister said, 'Goldoc will continue to follow its brand protection procedures', but we do not know what has happened. The minister created a new member-of-parliament logo for use by members of parliament. That was interesting, but we never heard back from the minister about the action that she took in relation to the matter raised at estimates or what action Goldoc has taken and whether any profits from that book have been recovered. The essential question is: what happened to the money?

At least, that was the question up until today when we went to the website towardstwenty18.com.au. The website still has a copy of the *Southport Towards Twenty 18* book, but, for the information of the House, the page that had the Commonwealth Games logo appears to have been removed. Somehow, the Commonwealth Games logo has disappeared from the book so now the minister should answer the question of what action was taken. Was anyone directed to remove the logo from the website? Has Goldoc made any complaints to the appropriate authorities so that investigations can commence in relation to the offences related to the use of the logo? We need to know how the provisions of the Commonwealth bill that are directly reflected in here related to brand protection will operate practically or is it the case that they will only apply to some people in the community? I recall the minister's earlier comments about a friendly and conciliatory approach. That may well be the case, but we simply need the loop closed to know what has transpired after the questions were raised during the estimates process and the commitments given subsequently.

Mrs Stuckey: I am happy to do so.

Mr BYRNE: Good. I look forward to that. Again, I thank the chair and the members of the committee. It is a very thorough report and the opposition will be supporting it.

 **Mr GIBSON** (Gympie—LNP) (8.14 pm): It is with great pleasure that I rise to support the Major Events Bill as the chair of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee. At the outset, I thank all of the committee members involved in the deliberations on this report. I thank the submitters who presented and gave of their time. We had a teleconference hook-up with one of the submitters who was in London. I appreciate the time difference and their willingness to engage in the committee process. That highlights the value that our committee process is seen to have by international companies, as they are willing to work in with our local time frames to be involved via a teleconference process. I thank our secretariat. They do an outstanding job in taking the information that is gathered through the public hearings and the submissions process. They distil that quite succinctly and are able to present that information to us in a format that the committee can deliberate upon, thus ensuring that it is reflected in the report. We would not do the great work that we do on the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee without our hardworking secretariat. I thank them as well.

I am a great supporter of the committee process. I have been an advocate for it. I am fortunate to have been in this House to experience what it was like prior to the committee process being in place. I have experienced it in the transition phase and now that it is well and truly into its implementation phase. This bill is a great example of us taking good legislation and making it a little bit better. I thank the minister and her departmental staff for the way in which they engaged with the committee. They did so at a very productive level, which is how we go about it in this committee process. I also thank her department. Anyone who has appeared before the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee realises that we do not just rubber stamp. We challenge all the information that is presented to us. From time to time, public servants will be placed on the spot and the evidence that they present to us will be challenged. We expect them to have the answers. I thank the minister, because her staff came through this process in a particularly strong way, which is a credit to her and to her department. I recall very clearly what it was like in this House when bills were introduced by Labor ministers, there was no committee process and, despite the fact that you could present a minister with glaringly obvious errors in the legislation, they would refuse to adopt recommendations. Six or perhaps 12 months later, we would be back in the House debating an omnibus bill to deal with the unintended consequences from that particular legislation. That highlighted the failure of how bills were prepared and introduced into the House.

In this case, we have seen our committee making recommendations. I think it is to the credit of the committee and also to the credit of the minister and her department that eight out of the nine recommendations have been supported either in full or in part, or have been given in-principle support. Recommendation No. 2, which has not been supported, also highlights that the committee does not always get it right. There are times when we will take the evidence that is presented before us, we will identify a concern and we will make a recommendation about it. However, having listened to the minister's speech, we can accept quite openly that there are very good reasons why recommendation No. 2, which is that the bill be amended to provide a major event is declared at least three months prior to the event, should not be supported. I thank the minister for the way in which she was able to identify where the committee got it wrong. As good as we are—and we like to think that we are pretty good—from time to time we will miss the mark. As a House of review, particularly in a unicameral parliament such as ours, it is important that people view this whole committee process as providing an opportunity to represent the people of Queensland and to ensure that the legislation that

we are reviewing can be improved upon. It is not the place of committees to question policy. That is quite rightly the prerogative of the executive. They have been duly elected into this House to govern the state of Queensland. The committees can examine and determine whether a policy outcome is being achieved in the best possible way. Committees can look at the way in which those policy outcomes are being achieved.

I want to bring to the attention of the House a great example of where the committee process worked well. That is the work of the member for Burleigh within our committee. He quite rightly identified a simple change in wording. That was changing 'not greater than 10 per cent' to 'being at least 10 per cent'. We understood the policy intent. The policy intent was very clear. It was to replicate what was in the existing Stadiums Queensland legislation and bring that across into this bill.

This may be an issue for Parliamentary Counsel. The wording was not exactly the same. If it were not for the efforts of the member for Burleigh in questioning the department at that time and identifying that subtle difference in meaning someone who sold a ticket for \$110 that they purchased for \$100 would have been in breach of the legislation because that would have been at least 10 per cent. I commend the minister and the department for taking this on board. I also commend the member for Burleigh because it highlights how well this committee process can work.

Under the old experience and under what we experienced with Labor ministers bringing in bills and refusing to accept amendments on the floor, we would have had the situation where in six months, 12 months or two years time we would have been revisiting the legislation. We would have had an unintended consequence. They would have said, 'It was never our intent to do that.' Then we would be taking up the time of this House fixing minor problems. What we have here tonight is a bill that reflects and adopts those changes.

I would now like to speak briefly about the bill. As the minister has alluded to, this bill consolidates what is contained in a number of pieces of legislation. As we know, often there are situations where the public is not aware of the existing law which is in force. As we consolidate legislation it brings the law to the attention of people.

There were concerns raised by submitters with regard to various powers already contained within the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act and the Stadiums Queensland legislation. What we are seeing here are these powers being consolidated into the Major Events Bill. Is it wrong that those submitters raised concerns? No, it is not. Indeed it is part of a healthy democracy that those people raised those concerns. What we were able to identify through this process and what the minister and her department clearly identified through this process is that people need not fear the changes because in many cases they were already in force. What we were able to do though was ensure that where there were concerns that those concerns were addressed. I am very comfortable with the manner in which they have been addressed by this government.

The Major Events Bill was clearly formulated in light of the work that is occurring in our great state in the preparation for the Commonwealth Games. I wish to put on the record that I believe quite clearly that this bill will last well beyond the Commonwealth Games. Its benefits for Queenslanders will continue when the Commonwealth Games are but a fleeting memory. This is due to the way it has been structured and brought together. We have enabled a single piece of legislation to address a wide variety of issues—all of them linked to major events.

That brings me to my final point—the definition of a major event. We had a discussion with some who appeared before the committee about whether a One Direction concert is a major event. To a 15-year-old girl, it may well be a major event. It could indeed be the biggest event in her life. For the minister who is looking at me with a bemused look on his face, the member for Hinchinbrook, One Direction is a young, pop culture band. He may not have listened to their music. I am fortunate to have a 15-year-old daughter so One Direction—

Government members interjected.

Mr GIBSON: The minister is showing his engagement with pop culture. A One Direction concert or such things are not major events. A major event is something that is significant to the state of Queensland—something that is well beyond those events that we would like to think are major events. I would say very proudly as the member for Gympie that the Gympie Muster is a major event, but I recognise within the definition of this that—

Government members interjected.

Mr GIBSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I seek your protection. The Gympie Muster is not a major event and nor should it be considered so under this legislation. Those of us in Gympie recognise that it is an event that brings great pleasure to country music lovers within the state of Queensland.

Government members interjected.

Mr GIBSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, again I seek your protection.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Member for Gympie, if you are throwing it out there, you have to expect to get it back.

Mr GIBSON: Dare I not reflect upon the chair. I take your advice. This bill quite rightly provides a framework that will benefit major events. Whether it be after the Commonwealth Games and the world recognises what a great place Queensland is and we are asked to host another major event—the Olympic Games or another significant event—this bill will ensure that we have a framework in place that not only supports the promoters of those events but ensures that the people of Queensland and their rights are protected and enjoy those events knowing that they are attending an event that is safe, well governed and has strong processes in place. Whether it is an authorised person meeting them at the front gate of that event or all the way through to medical professionals who are having their experience recognised so that they can treat officials or players performing at those, it will be covered. It is with those remarks that I strongly support this bill.

 **Ms MILLARD** (Sandgate—LNP) (8.26 pm): I rise today to make a contribution to and support the Major Events Bill. Firstly, I would like to thank the secretariat of the all-powerful committee, as we refer to it—tongue in cheek, of course. In the coming months and years, Queensland will be front and centre for some of the biggest international sporting events. Of course, in just a few weeks time, Brisbane will play proud host to G20. In 2015 the Asian Cup will see thousands of football fans flock to Queensland. The Cricket World Cup returns to Australia next year, with heavyweights Australia and Pakistan set to play matches at the Gabba. In 2018 the Gold Coast will host the Commonwealth Games. Several other Queensland cities will also be hosting games events. To ensure that Queensland is ready to host these major events and so that it remains an attractive and inviting place for future events, we do need an efficient and streamline legislative framework that can be applied to major events across Queensland.

The Major Events Bill will amalgamate a range of different legislative requirements into the one act and remove the need to draft ad hoc legislation for specific events. This change will reduce the regulatory and logistical burden on event organisers and bring Queensland into line with many other Australian states.

The bill will provide for the declaration of a major event following public consultation and approval by the Governor, the delegation of an event's organisation and management, traffic management, commercial agreement and protections, registration exemptions, crowd management and safety, and police and security powers. Examples of duplicated acts which will be repealed or consolidated into the Major Events Act include the Motor Racing Events Act 1990, the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998 and parts of the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000.

The government recognises that not all the provisions contained in this bill will be relevant to all events. For instance, the Commonwealth Games will be a far more rigorous logistical challenge compared to the seven games Brisbane will host as part of the Asian Cup next year. The application of the act will be scaled to fit the event's requirements. We like to call this fit for purpose. Every effort has been made to ensure that this bill is workable and it has been developed after thorough consultation. I acknowledge the minister's commitment to working with the State Development, Industry and Infrastructure Committee by taking on eight of its nine recommendations.

This bill also demonstrates the Queensland government's commitment to cutting red tape and legislative duplication and helping to grow tourism as one of the four main pillars of the Queensland economy. The new standardised legislative framework will remove around 100 pages from the Queensland statute book and of course remove the need for further event-specific legislation to be drafted for major events.

To give a greater perspective on just how important this legislation is for the effective management of Queensland major events now and into the future, I believe it is important to look at the success of the Glasgow Commonwealth Games this year. Thousands of jobs were created in Glasgow and surrounds. Fifty-two million pounds flowed into the local economy, the city's East End has been transformed into a vibrant part of town that people want to visit, and 500,000 locals and visitors alike joined in community and sporting events around the city.

The minister has also pointed out the great benefits that come with hosting the Commonwealth Games—the creation of 30,000 jobs for Queenslanders, a \$2 billion injection into the Queensland economy and of course thousands of local, interstate and overseas tourists visiting and exploring our great state. Hopefully they will be going home telling everyone about our great state and that our cycle will continue.

Further to the initial and obvious boosts created by the Commonwealth Games, the Gold Coast and Queensland as a whole have the opportunity to harness the positive and lasting benefits of hosting the games. The athletes village will be turned into new homes for families; sporting infrastructure on the Gold Coast and around the state will be refurbished and upgraded, providing excellent facilities for athletes and the public well into the future; and of course the Commonwealth Games and the world-class athletes on display will hopefully provide the motivation for so many Queenslanders young and old to get active and engaged in sport. Of course that fits nicely with all of our Get in the Game programs as well.

In my own electorate of Sandgate we enjoy some great annual events such as the Einbunpin Festival, the Deagon Community Picnic Race Day and the Brisbane to Gladstone Yacht Race. During my time as the member for Sandgate I have been fortunate enough to support and be involved in the organisation of these events. While these events may not be on the same scale as the Commonwealth Games, the Asian Cup or the Cricket World Cup, I know the time and effort that goes into making them a success. I also know that anything we can do as a government that can reduce the regulatory burden on event organisers and make relevant legislation simpler to understand and apply will be very welcomed.

To ensure that Queensland reaps the full legacy benefits of hosting the games in the Asian Cup, the Cricket World Cup, the Gold Coast Commonwealth Games in 2018 and major sporting events in the future, we as a government will provide a legislative framework which is simple, effective and meets the needs of event organisers. I support and commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (8.31 pm): I also rise to add to the debate on the Major Events Bill 2014. At the outset I would like to thank the members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee, ably led by the member for Gympie and backed up by the member for Rockhampton. This is a great committee. I think we work really well together. The report that the committee has presented on this bill just proves how well the committee system works. Of course we could not do the job that we do without, as the member for Gympie said, the wonderful support of our ladies in our secretariat. They do a fantastic job. They do most of the work for us, I would have to say, and we fill in the blanks.

The Major Events Bill 2014 will provide a legislative framework for the streamlining of major events in our great state. I am glad to have had the opportunity to assist in making recommendations to the minister as part of our committee process—as I said, a process that I believe is working well and as intended. Queensland is a great state with great opportunity and this government has a plan for the future to make it even better. Major events are a significant contributor to that plan. They boost the state's economy in terms of bringing both business investment and visitors to Queensland.

There is one objective of the bill, and that is to support our major event providers with an efficient, effective and streamlined approval process with a one-stop shop approach. This legislation is a win-win for event providers and taxpayers of Queensland because by leveraging off these events we can increase tourism, create jobs and contribute millions of dollars to our economy.

Currently this bill will be used to conduct the Commonwealth Games, the 2015 Asian Cup and various V8 Supercar events across our state, as well as other major events which will hopefully be added into the future. As members know, we have just had a wonderful GC 600 on the Gold Coast. I would have to say that the GC 600 went even better than any of us would have hoped. Everything went very, very smoothly including our new transportation system on the Gold Coast, the G:link. I went to the GC 600 on Saturday and Sunday and I used the G:link and our bus system to get there and back. Even on Sunday after the race had finished I waited five or 10 minutes and I wandered out with the rest of the crowd and I waited in line for the G:link. There were a lot of people there, but I got on the first tram. Everything went absolutely perfectly. I got to Broadbeach and there was a bus waiting. I walked off the tram and on to a bus and I was back in Burleigh within 25 minutes.

Mr Minnikin: That's how public transport should be.

Mr HART: As the Assistant Minister for Public Transport says, this is how the system should work and this is how the system this government puts in place does work. This government gets it right, and this bill is another piece of legislation that the government has got entirely right. I am very proud to be standing here supporting this bill as the member for Burleigh on the Gold Coast.

As the House would be aware, the Gold Coast is famous for fun. Our minister keeps telling us this over and over again. Our ads tell us this. But everybody who lives on the Gold Coast knows that for a fact. The Gold Coast is famous for fun. In the brief time I have I would like to touch on a few things that the LNP government has achieved on the Gold Coast.

As I said, we had the V8 festival over the weekend and it was my pleasure on Sunday, 19 October to wave the chequered flag at the V8 BillyKart Derby in my electorate of Burleigh. We had bilycarts going down James Street. We had a three-metre ramp and we had various bilycarts at the top of that ramp and running down the street. It was my great pleasure to wave the flag and start most of the bilycart races. We had a few incidents on the day with a couple of wheels falling off the cart—you know, the little red cart. We did not have any real injuries, so that was great. Everyone had a fun day. I would say there were thousands of people there. That was just one of the many events that the minister has convinced the V8 group to put together as part of this overall major event. So congratulations again to the minister on organising that for us.

We had, as I said, the GC 600 on the weekend, and this Saturday we will be having the Pan Pacific Masters Games opening ceremony—another great event. There are a whole number of them that the Gold Coast benefits from over the years. The major event that we will be having in the near future is of course the Commonwealth Games. I will remind the House that we are just 1,254 days away from the Commonwealth Games, or less than 3½ years from the opening ceremony. The LNP inherited the games at the last election—

Mr Bleijie: You'll be there opening it up, won't you?

Mr HART: That is yet to be seen, Attorney-General. I am not sure exactly what will happen.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Ruthenberg): Attorney-General, I really need you to take your seat.

Mr HART: If I get the chance to wave a flag at something, I would certainly appreciate that, but we will wait and see. As I was saying, the LNP inherited the games at the last election with no money in the bank. There was no money in the bank for the Commonwealth Games, but our minister and our Treasurer and our Premier are finding the money to put on the Commonwealth Games. We are making the tough choices, and the games are now on their way to being fully funded. The games will leave a lasting legacy of infrastructure across the coast for future generations to see. It is only a matter of going to some of the wonderful websites that the Commonwealth Games committee has put in place to see how those venues are coming to fruition and exactly what that legacy will be for the Gold Coast moving forward.

For the listeners at home and the 84 members of parliament who do not call the Gold Coast home, I point out that some of the attractions and features we boast that are in our backyard include: 70 kilometres of beaches with an average water temperature of 22 degrees Celsius; 260 kilometres of navigable waterways, nine times more than Venice; our Regional Botanic Gardens and 2,245 parks covering 20,000 hectares; major shopping centres, small boutiques, specialty shops and markets; restaurants and cafes offering cuisine from around the world; evening entertainment including a large range of bars, nightclubs, cabaret restaurants and casinos as well as several venues that host musicals, ballet and the theatre; a large number of wildlife and theme parks including David Fleay Wildlife Park, which is in my electorate of Burleigh; World Heritage listed tropical rainforest hinterland with abundant wildlife and bushwalks; and world-class sporting and recreational facilities. Honourable members can see that when people come for a major event on the Gold Coast there is so much more to the Gold Coast for which they can stay and enjoy. It is our job as members of parliament to encourage people to hang around after these major events and to get out there and see some of these wonderful attractions that we do have on the Gold Coast.

As I mentioned previously, I am glad to have had the opportunity to review this bill and assist in making recommendations to the minister. During the submission phase we consulted and heard from a number of people including eBay, Queensland Tourism Industry Council, Ticketmaster, Office of the Information Commissioner, Queensland Law Society, the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games Corporation, the Australian Commonwealth Games Association, TEQ, Stadiums Queensland, LGAQ and CCIQ. We made nine recommendations to the minister. The first one was that the committee

recommends that clause 12 of the bill be amended to provide that a major event is declared at least three months prior to an event. We have already heard from the minister. As a committee member, I accept fully her explanation. In most cases you would be able to give three months notice of a major event, but there are instances—and I accept that—where you may not be able to give three months notice. Putting out that arbitrary figure is possibly not a good idea and I think we as a committee accept that. As I said before, this is one of the reasons that I say the committee system is working and is working very well.

The committee recommends that clause 11 of the bill be amended to provide that a controlled area is shown on a map. We have already heard from the minister and various other people as to why that is a good idea. I think that putting out a detailed map if at all possible is a great idea because it is a visual explanation of the exact area that the major event covers. Rather than having a list of street names or something like that, you actually have a visual representation of it. I thought that was a good idea.

The committee made several other recommendations with regard to the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act such as that a person might only consent to a search if they had been screened beforehand by such items as electronic screening. Maybe we needed to look at the wording of that particular recommendation. The intent was that people would not be asked to be searched if they had not had some preliminary check to start with, whether it is waving a wand over them, walking through an electronic sensor or something like that that has triggered a reason for a search. I accept what the minister has said with regard to that.

We were also concerned that an authorised person should not be permitted to touch a person or their possessions. I was really surprised by the response from the member for Rockhampton. He said that he thought perhaps some of the security guards should be able to forcibly remove people from the venue if they are causing trouble. I would have thought that at a major event we would have quite a distinct police presence. At every major event that I have ever been to there are police officers everywhere. That is part of a major event. It is part of the planning for a major event. There should be police officers near every entrance during the time that people are coming in. If anybody is causing an issue as they come into a major event, it is more than appropriate that the person who deals with that is a police officer. I just do not understand the logic that the member for Rockhampton was using in saying that we should expand that power to anybody who is authorised to conduct a search or discuss what sort of person should come into the event. It seems quite ludicrous to me. I am fairly certain that the minister will have a lot more to say about that as this debate goes on. I must say that I was stunned. It seems to be a complete move away from what we would typically expect the Labor Party to think. Maybe they needed to have something to complain about because they did say that they would be supporting the bill.

I actually commend the Labor Party for supporting this bill. It is great that they have seen reason with this—maybe I should not commend them. It is great that they have seen reason. The committee system has worked and we have been able to step through all of the issues that were brought up with the committee and the minister has accepted them. There were several other provisions about which the committee made recommendations. I think the minister has pretty well explained all of those so I will keep moving.

There are also eight points of clarification. I listened intently to the minister's second reading speech. I think she explained very well all of those points of clarification. I now feel far more comfortable with some of the issues that were contained therein. The important recommendation that the committee made was that the Major Events Bill 2014 be passed.

Mr Gibson: That is No. 1.

Mr HART: That is the No. 1 recommendation as it is in all committee reports.

Eight out of nine of the recommendations were supported in full, in part or in principle. It is worth again elaborating exactly how the committee process is designed to work. It has worked very well in this instance. If it is doing one thing, it is making legislation better. I think our committee in particular has been very successful in making recommendations that ministers have accepted that have been sensible recommendations. That is just because we are a very efficient committee. Again, I would like to thank my fellow committee members, the committee staff, Minister Stuckey and her department. Mr Deputy Speaker, if you have not got that impression already, I support the bill.

 **Mr CRANDON** (Coomera—LNP) (8.47 pm): I rise to make a short contribution to the Major Events Bill. First of all, I would like to open by thanking the secretariat for the professional way in which they managed this particular bill. I also thank them for all of the work that they do for the committee. I would like to also thank those who provided the feedback in the witness statements and in the conversations that we had with them. It was very enlightening. It certainly gave us a good understanding of where various issues might lie. I also thank the chair for his guidance and professionalism. I was late coming to this committee; I have been on the committee since June. He has certainly been giving me some guidance on working through the various issues that we have on our plate. There certainly is a lot of work for this particular committee. I also thank Minister Stuckey for supporting most of the recommendations, and they were very sensible recommendations that we made. I say thank you for explaining those points of clarification so completely for us. We now thoroughly understand all of the issues that were raised.

The bill meets a commitment made by this government to host the 2015 AFC Asian Cup—that is the soccer—and the 2018 Commonwealth Games. We also have the V8 Supercars on the Gold Coast, and I spent a very enjoyable Sunday afternoon down there—I must say that I can only take so much of that stuff and I did not have any earplugs, so that was a bit of a worry—just to get a sense of what these major events are all about and how things could really go pear-shaped if we did not have the right type of security in place. As I entered the facility I took particular note of the type of security that we had in the area. This bill will cut red tape and regulatory duplication as well. I think it is incredibly important that we keep on keeping on. We have made a commitment as a government to reduce red tape by 20 per cent over a period of years. I note that we are removing approximately 100 pages from the Queensland statute books as a result of this particular bill. It is not more work for people; it is less work for people. I think that is incredibly important.

It is interesting that the member for Burleigh brought up the fact that there are 1,254 days until the Commonwealth Games, because there is that number 54 again. Members would know that exit 54 is a major issue in the state seat of Coomera, so it is just coincidental that today we are debating the bill and there are 1,254 days until the Commonwealth Games. The reason I make the point about exit 54 is because exit 54 is the main conduit to the brand spanking new Coomera indoor sports stadium, a multipurpose \$40 million stadium that will be a legacy for the Gold Coast and something that is truly appreciated. Exit 54 needs to be upgraded so that we can make sure that we do have appropriate access to that magnificent stadium once it is built.

May I say that right next door to that magnificent stadium we are going to have the home base of the Titans. The Gold Coast Titans are moving right next door. I am looking forward to meeting with the Titans' hierarchy next week to have a bit of a chinwag about what their plans are for the Titans in the Coomera electorate, and I welcome them with open arms. It really is going to be an amazing facility: you have the indoor sports complex, the Titans' home base is right there and of course we already have many other facilities in place in that particular region.

I am not going to go through all of the points that my able colleagues have gone through in relation to the various recommendations that we made because there is no real need for me to do that. I do make the point that the Coomera electorate, where the new stadium is going to be built just down the road from exit 54, has around about 320 days of sunshine every year, so you can really appreciate the fact that the Coomera electorate is certainly where heaven meets earth when it comes to a place to live, work and play.

I commend the minister for bringing this bill to the House. I thank all of those who have been involved in the progress of the bill through the House and I certainly support the bill.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (8.53 pm): This legislation reflects a more modern world for staging events. Events are major tourist drivers for the economy. For the people of the Gold Coast, as has been mentioned many times here tonight, the 2018 Commonwealth Games will be a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to be part of an exciting world event. I hope they will put out a huge welcome not only then, but also in the next few years. What most people do not realise is that competitors and organisers come here to train and inspect our facilities and attractions. They certainly did that during the Sydney Olympics. We had huge numbers and set up a variety of legacy facilities after the event. The most recent Castrol EDGE Gold Coast 600, held in perfect weather—of which Coomera was a part—was a good clue as to what may well happen. That event is 23 years old and growing all the time. There have been some changes made to it over the years and most people would know it originally as IndyCar racing. It was quite a spectacular major event and gave us a lot of

clues on how to manage things. It was interesting how that evolved into an Australia-wide process and, quite interestingly, it has probably led to some of the changes that we might well be seeing in this bill.

In my electorate of Gaven, the Metricon Stadium and the events precinct located in Carrara will host the majority of the Commonwealth Games events. The LNP government refuses to do anything about the transport problems which plague residents and will certainly affect the people who participate in those events and leading up to the events. The LNP government has so severely cut the bus services in the area around Pacific Pines in the north to Worongary in the south that there are no services midafternoon and none on the weekends. This is okay if you are a triathlete or a cyclist and you are either running or cycling, but not everyone is. We need to maintain those services and we need to build them up for this major event. A comprehensive review of what has already been done needs to be undertaken and then we have to try to build that up for these very significant events, or otherwise the transport options will fail because of it.

There are other issues that people need to talk about and so far there has been no discussion on, but potentially the big problem is the queuing issue on the Nerang-Broadbeach Road. People do not realise that coming down the M1 the major queuing is currently occurring on Smith Street and it is building up. There is queuing on the Nerang-Broadbeach Road from about 2.30 until about six o'clock every day. There has been some discussion about road closures, but for those who do not know the Nerang-Broadbeach Road is a critical access path into the back of Broadbeach which goes down to the casino and past the Metricon Stadium. The reality is that no-one has talked about doing anything to that road, and it is a major thoroughfare and there needs to be a discussion about it.

For those who may be unaware, between the Nerang Railway Station and the Metricon Stadium you either use shanks's pony—in other words, you walk—or a shuttle bus. Although this works for the AFL situation, the upcoming Commonwealth Games is a much larger event and the idea of using shuttle buses entirely may fall over in that linkage phase. We need to discuss this problem, and I was expecting to possibly see an amendment to this bill which addressed this issue. I would implore the minister to start talking to a variety of providers and people who may be able to give us some advice about what is going on there such as the transport people who monitor these things all the time. We have massive numbers of cars on the motorway all the time. We will have them in the future too, but we are also going to have massive numbers of buses transferring people to and from the stadium. I am not just talking about athletes, but people who will come from a variety of places—obviously not everyone is going to stay on the Gold Coast—and they will be coming at all hours. This queuing on the motorway is an issue because it is very dangerous. The big problem is if it starts blocking off roads such as exit 71 into Southport, these are significant motorway access points and people really need to start talking about proactive strategies to make those things work.

At the most recent V8 events an interesting thing that occurred was that there were peak-time loading issues with the light rail. Light rail is a very successful strategy and one does not want to talk it down, but the problem is that people load at peak times when events start and finish and unfortunately if you cannot get everyone on at those times because the queues are too large, people start walking on the track because it is not fenced. They do not always walk along the footpath.

There is a significant issue that we need to address relating to how we will manage these peak-time loading issues and how we will improve public transportation. There is still no discussion about what is going on with regard to connecting the light rail to the metropolitan rail—it is not heavy rail—whether that will be at Parkwood or Nerang. I know that the member for Mermaid Beach was very keen on it going to Nerang. I understand that; he was very involved with the council originally. At least we need to know, as part of a public discussion, whether there will be a commitment to making that work.

The reality is that currently the light rail is dead-ended at Parklands, where there is no effective park-and-ride, despite the secure park that is linked to the hospital, and at the other end at Broadbeach similarly. In fact, there is a lot of discussion currently that in the renovations of Pacific Fair they will introduce a significant element of restrictive parking which will then mean that you cannot have an effective park-and-ride at the other end. We really need to have some sort of connection, either to Parkwood or Nerang. The Nerang option would be horrendously expensive—I understand that—but the Parkwood one, which would run up Smith Street, would certainly make sense. I would like to see that as part of some sort of events situation.

The other potential problem we face relates to the mountain bike competition to be held in the Nerang forest. The reality is that the area around the forest is very limited in terms of parking and there may be restrictions—it looks like there will be—as to where the movements can be. They are projecting somewhere between 2,000 and 3,000 people, but there is no effective bus service to move any of these people around. There is nothing at all after midafternoon and certainly nothing on the weekend. That is not to say that there will not be shuttle buses during the Commonwealth Games, but the reality is that before the games start there will be large numbers of people using these areas and we have to be able to move them from point to point. I do not think those sorts of plans have been put in place.

There will certainly be issues about noise which always come up with major events. Certainly that occurs with the V8s. Because these events are going to be held throughout these areas between Carrara and Nerang, noise will be an issue. Of course, we have a forest in the middle so there may be issues with regard to how we will manage wildlife. There are already issues with people who are defending the birds and even the deer, which are feral, and a variety of other things. Suddenly they start coming into play because you have the different groups saying, 'I want to protect this one over the other.' Those sorts of things will be critical issues coming up to the games.

We also have a problem with the NBN. There is absolutely no coverage. There are only two nodes. I have actually written to Minister Turnbull twice. Everyone will be wanting to use the internet at these things. Whether people believe it or not, they will want to connect using mobile phones and personal computers. We need to realise that we cannot just say, 'We are not going to have any service at all.' I got a letter back from Minister Turnbull that said, 'Look at the map. You do not get anything,' effectively. That is the plan for the Commonwealth Games. It is really not good enough. It will affect us all. I would be happy to show the minister the letters I have received. I have written another letter back to them saying how important it is to get internet connectivity in this area. The internet connectivity in Carrara, coming through into Nerang and going up to Pacific Pines and down to Worongary is not just appallingly bad; it is absent in a lot of cases. It will remain absent under the government plan.

Mrs Stuckey: Are you supporting the bill?

Dr DOUGLAS: I will tell you in a second. We have a big population and we host 12 million tourists a year. We have big events coming up. This is a good bill for trying to drive it forward, but there are some issues.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KING** (Cairns—LNP) (9.03 pm): I rise to make a very brief contribution in support of the Major Events Bill 2014. This bill will facilitate the staging of major events in Queensland, will bring our state in line with other Australian jurisdictions and will also add another string to the bow of Queensland when attracting major, significant events to our state.

The bill provides legislative provisions required for the Commonwealth Games in 2018 and other major events such as the Asian Cup and will include the declaration of the Cairns Convention Centre as a major event area for the basketball matches that our great city will host. The provisions will help us deliver a safe and memorable experience for all.

I think it is very important to note that this bill is another step forward in this government's very strong plan to cut red tape by removing approximately 100 pages from the Queensland statute book and replacing them with a more efficient and streamlined legislative framework. Extensive consultation was carried out with the relevant stakeholders including local councils such as those in Cairns, Townsville, the Gold Coast and Brisbane and the Australian Commonwealth Games Association, among many others.

While this bill of course relates to very significant and major events, I do want to take a brief moment to thank the tourism minister for her support of very, very special events in Cairns and Far North Queensland and acknowledge, as the minister would be aware, the significant economic contribution that those events, supported by this government, make to the Cairns economy. Since being elected this government has funded and supported numerous events in Cairns and the Far North and has contributed millions and millions of dollars to our regional economy. With the indulgence of the House—it is quite a significant list—I will try to read them very quickly.

Events supported by the government include AFL and NRL premiership matches in Cairns; the Cairns Indigenous Art Fair; the Cairns Amateurs Racing Carnival; the Cairns ironman and adventure festival, which goes from strength to strength year after year; the Cairns to Karumba Bike Ride, the

opening of which I was honoured to represent the minister at just recently; the Cardiac Challenge; the Cairns Ukulele Festival; the Cairns Chinese New Year Street Festival; the Crocodile Trophy; Feast of the Senses; Port Douglas Carnivale; Great Barrier Reef Masters Games; Big Talk One Fire, an important Indigenous festival in my electorate; the UCI Mountain Bike World Cup, which was a great success earlier this year; the Great Barrier Reef Marathon Festival, coming up in just a few weeks; and, of course, the biggest and most significant of them all, the Australian Tourism Exchange, ATE, for which Tourism Events Queensland provided significant support.

I commend the minister for foreshadowing amendments to the bill to address the recommendations made by the committee including, I think importantly, clarification around the intent and operation of search powers given to authorised persons. I think it is another clear example of the Newman LNP government's broader focus on listening and responding to issues as they are raised.

Like most if not all Queenslanders, I am incredibly excited about the 2018 Commonwealth Games, which will be based on the Gold Coast but, as mentioned, will stretch right across the state, including all of Queensland's—

Mrs Stuckey interjected.

Mr KING: I take that interjection from the minister. It is Queensland's games, including some great basketball events in my electorate of Cairns. I look forward to working with the minister on more events, both big and small, both in Cairns and right across Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr YOUNG** (Keppel—LNP) (9.07 pm): I rise to contribute briefly to debate on the Major Events Bill 2014. We no doubt see the significant benefits that major events bring to the economy of this great state. Locally, on a much smaller scale, I have seen the financial benefit to our region from events and how our motels, food outlets and shops benefit from increased tourist numbers. For major events, Queensland showcases our assets to Australia and indeed the rest of the world. Major events bolster tourism numbers and create employment. The financial spin-off from major events creates not only temporary but also long-lasting significant employment opportunities.

Tourism is one of our economy's four pillars. I commend the good work of the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games and her ministerial staff. The minister identified that Queensland had to be more attractive for major events and that we had to be on an equal footing with other Australian state and territory jurisdictions.

This bill cuts through red tape to produce a more efficient model by the creation of a single act to manage legislative requirements for major events. The single act consolidates the following provisions for major events. The declaration of a major event, a major event area and the organisers of a major event are pivotal to this bill. Transport management, commercial protection mechanisms and crowd and safety powers are just some of the provisions required to achieve successful event management.

I want to address the concern expressed in some quarters as to the authorised person. Major events require crowd control, management and security which require a huge labour component. By the declaration of a major event, authorised persons will be able to perform duties such as bag checks, directing people, protecting plant and equipment, and managing events. Police officers under this bill will be automatically appointed as authorised persons. All other persons appointed as authorised persons will have to complete the necessary training for that role they will perform. This will be stipulated in the regulation in the declaration of a major event. I add that only police officers can frisk a member of the public or use force to control a person or move them on.

The commercial protections are a necessary tool to protect sponsor investments. We have seen advantageous marketing strategies harm event sponsors who make these events possible through funding. These commercial protections prohibit street trading near the venue, illegal advertising and ticket scalping, all of which may create financial harm to the sponsors, which are pivotal to attract major companies and sponsors. These contractual protections are necessary. The flow-on effects from these major events through employment, tourism dollars and business migration to our great state are the real goals and this legislation underpins that investment by the state government, local government, sponsors and businesses associated with these major events.

The committee examined the criteria for the declaration of a major event. The Queensland Tourism Industry Council recommended a framework be developed to assist with determining the legislation for the event and the department is developing a framework, and again I commend the

minister. The committee made nine recommendations as a result of its examination of the bill, eight of which were embraced by the minister. The committee received five submissions and heard from 11 witnesses at a public briefing held on 29 September. It was a pleasure to work on this bill because I can see the real benefits to Queensland, particularly through employment and tourism. I stated earlier in my speech the benefit to my region through recent events which really bolstered our visitor numbers. Our businesses enjoyed the last couple of months with sporting and community events. Major events magnify that. I applaud the minister and her departmental staff. I also acknowledge the stewardship of the committee chair, Mr David Gibson, fellow committee members and the hardworking secretariat and research staff. I commend the passage of the bill through the House.

A government member interjected.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (9.12 pm), in reply: I do appreciate the 30 minutes on the clock. I am sure that the debate so far has really given us a lot of food for thought and there are quite a few comments that I want to make.

I begin by thanking all members for their contributions to the debate this evening, and even the two noisy ones who are sitting behind me at the moment! As I informed the House when I introduced this bill, a generic legislative framework for major events across Queensland will consolidate provisions currently littered across the statute book, making it more efficient in reducing red tape. This legislation will place us in line with other states that already have similar legislation in place. It will send a clear message that Queensland recognises the value of major events and that we are a pre-eminent destination for hosting them.

I remind the House that by major events in this bill we mean events of international or national significance—megaevents such as the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games, the 2015 AFC Asian Cup or our very exciting V8 Supercars events. These provisions will not be applied to concerts. I am sorry that the member for Gympie is not here, so his 15-year-old daughter will not have that status put on the concert she attends. It will not apply to fun runs and stadium events that already take place right across this great state every weekend. The bill allows the appointment of appropriately trained authorised persons to assist police officers in a range of tasks, and what we are talking about here is asking people to go through screening devices and have their bags checked. It is necessary to ensure the safety of persons within an event area and reduce the risk of people bringing in prohibited items.

Ticket-scalping provisions currently contained in the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001 and the Motor Racing Events Act will be extended to cover declared major events. This means that Commonwealth Games events taking place at the Gold Coast Aquatic Centre will now be covered. Some of these new provisions have been put in place to meet our commitments as a government to host these events. These include the ability to control airspace above a major event, prohibit ambush marketing and street trading on roads and public land in controlled areas and establish major event lanes, which should interest the member for Gaven.

I want to really thank all of the government members who spoke on this bill and in particular the member for Gympie, who chaired the committee. All government members spoke of the importance of introducing a bill like this. I acknowledge the member for Gympie's enthusiasm and his desire to get the best outcome. I believe that this has delivered a piece of legislation that we can all be very proud of. In terms of the definition of a major event, we have to tell him that in normal terms the Gympie muster is actually a major event. We upgraded it to that status, but if he would like us to downgrade it at some stage perhaps honourable members could tell him that I would be perhaps unwilling to consider doing that. It is a terrific event in our annual calendar. Let me also mention the amazing It's Live! campaign that we released last week that has a 12-month calendar of world-class events that are coming to your door somewhere in Queensland throughout the next 12 months.

I commend the member for Sandgate for her positive approach and support for the bill. I also commend the member for Burleigh for his keen interest. He spoke about his local involvement. I commend the member for Coomera for his particular attention to major events and his observations of the Gold Coast 600. I thank my assistant minister for his wholly supportive approach highlighting the economic benefits of regional events, both large and small. I put on record in the House now that we will be bringing a replica Commonwealth Games flag to his part of the world very soon. I also thank the member for Keppel for embracing the bill in the manner that he did.

I now turn to some of the comments made by the member for Rockhampton on a number of aspects of the bill. I thank the member for Rockhampton and the opposition for their support for this bill this evening. I am sure that we all can see the economic benefit that it will bring in terms of jobs and of course dollars to our great state. People will come once and tell their friends and they will come back again. A number of the issues raised by the member for Rockhampton, including the controlled area being shown on a map in the regulation and the cultural and gender sensitivity training for authorised officers, will be reflected through the amendments that I will be seeking to move during the consideration in detail stage.

I note that the member for Rockhampton discussed recommendation 3 from the committee report suggesting that the bill be amended in that a specific major event must be declared at least three months out from the event. I said in my second reading speech that the government does not support that recommendation. While every endeavour will be made to ensure maximum lead time for a major event to be prescribed, it may not always be possible to meet an arbitrary time frame of three months. While we usually know that we are hosting an event way in advance, the exact details we need to prescribe the major event like the area where the event will be held and the times that the events will actually occur are never known until much closer to the time, especially when utilising multiple venues. A degree of flexibility is also required for extenuating circumstances and last-minute change.

In addition, the bill requires consultation with a range of public authorities prior to prescribing an event which can take time but ensures the powers are appropriately exercised. The member also outlined the opposition's support for a review of existing legislative provisions to manage ticket scalping. Again, as I outlined in my second reading speech, this matter has been reviewed and no changes were recommended. Specifically, I outlined that the merits of ticket-scalping provisions have already been reviewed as part of a broader review undertaken on the Major Sports Facilities Act 2001.

The member for Rockhampton also raised issues about the government's intent in limiting the powers of authorised persons and the potential impact on the Police Service. I thank the member for Burleigh for clarifying these provisions for the House. Let us be really clear about this. This bill is remaking the existing provisions in the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act that apply to special events. They enable authorised persons to be appointed to provide assistance to police in performing inspections, to assist with safety and security, and in issuing directions. This provides flexibility in the resourcing and safety and security for major events, freeing up police officers to focus on more serious enforcement issues such as the removal of unruly patrons. It also ensures that a large personnel resource can be mobilised for major events, as we certainly saw when we were in Glasgow only recently. It does not limit the ability of security guards licensed under other legislation.

As outlined by the member for Rockhampton, managing safety and security at major events is vastly different from managing the nightclub environment. Major events typically have a police presence to ensure the safety and security of patrons. It is the government's view that police officers are the most effective resource to deal with the forcible eviction of an unruly patron. Under this bill, the government does not support the view that authorised persons should have the power to evict.

It is almost baffling that the member for Rockhampton is seeking to provide carte blanche powers to authorised persons, allowing them to search through personal possessions and to forcibly remove event attendees. It really flies against the submissions received by the committee and the community expectations highlighted in the media. Perhaps it is just another indication of the way that Labor has truly lost touch with Queenslanders. Providing a safe and secure event requires achieving a balance between providing security and upholding civil liberties. The government considers that this bill achieves this appropriate balance.

Finally, the member for Rockhampton discussed the provisions relating to ambush marketing and brand protection matters, which I said that I would address in my reply. Specifically, the member sought some clarification about a matter raised during the estimates process. I have received advice from Goldoc that it has completed its investigation into this matter in accordance with its usual brand protection processes. Goldoc has contacted three parties in relation to this publication. Two parties have voluntarily complied with the request made by taking down and removing all materials and information in breach of the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2011 Queensland. Goldoc is waiting for an acknowledgement from the third party in relation to the editorial preparation. Goldoc has received independent advice that the costs of pursuing a claim for a percentage of any profits would exceed the likely amount to be recovered. I trust that satisfies some of the questions that the member asked, or the majority of them.

I thank the member for Gaven for his support of this bill, but I really had to wonder a little bit if the member was not suffering from the glass-half-empty syndrome. These games are going to be very exciting and so will the events that we hope will be able to be supported through this bill. I note some of the matters raised in the member's speech, which I will try to address now. I am not sure if the member is aware that recently Goldoc undertook an initial consultation for what is known as the transport strategic plan. The release of the draft was supported through a range of communication activities to encourage community feedback on the plan. I am not sure if the honourable member put in a submission to that plan, but I suggest that he does so, because it is a fairly large undertaking. I also encourage the member to follow the progress of the Commonwealth Games on our website, Embracing2018. It is a really terrific website and there is a living document on there called Ahead of the Games whereby people can follow the progress of every venue. They will be able to see what is happening in that space as we count down to the games.

It has been an absolute privilege to bring a bill such as this before the House. The Newman government has recognised tourism as one of the four pillars of our economy. We understand that tourism, events and small business are intrinsically linked. They bring in enormous economic benefit and create many thousands of jobs in our great state of Queensland. That is why this bill will add to all of the other aspects of the plan that we have for a brighter future. It is another piece in our arsenal to help Queensland regain the position of No. 1 tourism and event destination.

I would again like to place on record my gratitude to my ministerial staff, my departmental staff and the parliamentary counsel for their drafting. This bill places us on a very solid platform to attract significant international events into the future. If members know of any biggies out there, could they suggest them or send them this way? I would like to thank the members of the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee for their prompt consideration of this bill. I would again also like to thank all of them for their wonderful contributions to the debate of this bill tonight. I would also like to thank that cross-section of the community who took the time to raise their views through the committee process. This robust scrutiny of the legislation was welcomed. It has provided for a better bill and one that will serve Queensland well.

I might just add that, as much as I welcome the opposition members saying that they are going to support this bill, it was a pity that they did not consider it worthy of their consideration, as they were absent from the public hearing on the legislation. Perhaps they would have heard a little bit more about some of the detail of the bill.

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 104—

Mrs STUCKEY (9.26 pm): I seek leave to move amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mrs STUCKEY: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 11 (What is a *controlled area*)

Page 11, line 4, after '12(3)(a)'—

insert—

and shown on a map included in the regulation

2 Clause 18 (Entering and exiting major event area)

Page 18, lines 12 to 19—

omit, insert—

- (b) the authorised person inspecting the person's belongings;
- (c) the removal of 1 or more outer garments worn by the person as specified by the authorised person and the inspection of the garments by the authorised person;
- (d) the removal of 1 or more articles from the person's clothing and the inspection of the articles by the authorised person;
- (e) the inspection of an article in the person's possession by the authorised person;

- (f) if the person is entering the major event area in a vehicle—
 - (i) inspection of the vehicle, or part of it, by the authorised person; and
 - (ii) the removal of an article from the vehicle and the inspection of the article by the authorised person.

3 Clause 18 (Entering and exiting major event area)

Page 18, before line 20—

insert—

- (6) An authorised person who is a police officer may frisk search a person entering the major event area if the officer—
 - (a) asks for and receives the person's consent to be frisk searched; and
 - (b) frisk searches the person under the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, section 624.
- (7) A person must not be asked to consent under subsection (5) or (6) unless the authorised person or police officer making the request—
 - (a) reasonably considers it necessary to make the request; and
 - (b) tells the person the reason for making the request.
- (8) For subsection (5), an authorised person may touch a garment the person entering the major event area is wearing only if the authorised person is the same gender as the person.
- (9) In this section—
 - belongings** see the *State Buildings Protective Security Act 1983*, section 4A.
 - frisk search** see the *Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000*, schedule 6.
 - inspect**, an article, includes handle the article, open it and examine its contents.

4 Clause 26 (Directing person to leave major event area)

Page 24, line 2, 'section 18(5)'—

omit, insert—

section 18(5) or (6)

5 Clause 31 (Resale of tickets)

Page 28, line 6, 'that is at least 10% more than'—

omit, insert—

greater than 10% above

6 Clause 33 (Advertising in controlled area or major event area)

Page 30, line 16, after 'when'—

insert—

covering or

7 Clause 34 (Advertising on vessel)

Page 30, line 18, after 'not'—

insert—

, without reasonable excuse,

8 After clause 74

Page 54, after line 16—

insert—

Subdivision 4 Notice of powers of authorised persons in major event areas

74A Signs to be erected at major event area describing powers of authorised persons

- (1) The major event organiser for a major event must erect a sign at each public entrance to a major event area for the major event describing the powers authorised persons may exercise under this Act in the major event area.
- (2) In this section—
 - public entrance**, to a major event area, means an entrance designated by the major event organiser for the major event as an entrance members of the public may use to enter the major event area.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Major Events Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Jann Stuckey's amendments [\[6383\]](#).

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 104, as amended, agreed to.

Schedules 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (9.27 pm): I move—

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

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. JA STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (9.28 pm): I move—

That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.28 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Federal-State Relations

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (9.28 pm): This year, during my budget reply I reflected on a number of matters. I mentioned that there were 11,000 fewer full-time jobs in Queensland than there were when the LNP started in March 2012. I mentioned that this government has never accepted that there was a GFC. I also said that, leading into the last election, Labor truthfully pointed out that Australia's vertical fiscal imbalance was a major influence on all states' revenue and expenditures. I also reflected on the fact that not once have I heard the Treasurer present in this House anything approaching a cogent appraisal of this issue and the implications for Queensland. That would require a level of appreciation and honesty that escapes the LNP's supernova plan for Queensland's future.

As recently as the last parliamentary sitting the Treasurer chose to try to make political mileage out of the truthful comments of the shadow Treasurer when he reflected on the state's revenue issues. The Treasurer simply could not resist the political opportunism. Therefore, it is with a sense of irony that over the weekend I saw the Prime Minister putting on the table his views. He said we could either adjust the state's spending responses down or we could adjust their revenues up. It was quoted in the media that the Prime Minister was intending to renew his plea for premiers to have a discussion about revenue. The Premier said as recently as the other day we are not in this to talk about revenue. I suppose this inconsistency between conservatives at the federal and state level is nothing new. I suppose it is easy for the Prime Minister, as he is in the game of stripping \$80 billion out of state school and hospital funding in the forward estimates as a result of the May budget. I would love to hear the Treasurer or the Premier in this House mount an argument that this decision is not about bullying the states and territories into a forced discussion about GST. Despite the opinions of the apologists out there, this is exactly what it is. So much for discussing things in good faith.

I only have a few moments left, but I would like to say something that could be interpreted initially as supportive of the Premier. The Premier made some comments leading up to estimates that were comments that a Premier should be making. Even though he was talking about the issue of state-level personal income tax provisions, what he is really admitting is that this revenue issue and the vertical imbalance with the federal-state arrangements are unsustainable into the future. I look forward to the day that I hear in this parliament the truth from this government about where the state's budget and fiscal trajectory sits.

Wamuran Men's Shed; Glass House Electorate, Roads

 **Hon. AC POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection) (9.31 pm): It is with great pleasure that I rise this evening to talk about what was probably one of the biggest events in the electorate of Glass House this year. Unfortunately I was in Bundaberg at

community cabinet at the time His Excellency the Governor-General arrived at Wamuran to officially open the Wamuran Men's Shed. Many members in this House would know the fantastic work that Men's Sheds do around the state bringing together gentlemen, and often women as well. I think there is a bit of woodworking that goes on, but I think what actually goes on is a lot of talking, coffees and cakes, and the occasional alcoholic beverage as well. It was a significant event for the Wamuran Men's Shed. I acknowledge the committee: president John Vayne; vice-presidents Bevin Peters and Doug Greening; treasurer Neville Parsons; and secretary Wayne Rye. I also acknowledge their chaplain, Albert Fairweather, who I understand gave a prayer at the opening when the Hon. Peter Cosgrove arrived.

I also want to acknowledge Dr David Easton who has been a GP in Wamuran for 25 to 30 years who also spoke at the official opening. He was one of the people who instigated the shed by setting up a steering committee after he recognised the need for men to have something to do, particularly when they retire, and be able to get support from other like-minded members of the community. Thank you very much to David for his foresight in pulling together that steering committee. The shed in the heart of Wamuran, with its solar panels on its roof producing plenty of energy, brings together a lot of guys around woodworking, providing camaraderie and a fantastic outcome.

In the time remaining I would like to address a number of road issues in the electorate. Several weeks ago I again did the 35-kilometre walk from Little Yabba Creek all the way into Maleny on the Maleny-Kenilworth Road. It was great to see our brand new concrete Grigor Bridge at Conondale. I thank Minister Emerson for doing what the previous government could not do. I also thank him for finally fixing the potholes and the landslides along the Maleny-Kenilworth Road.

There is, however, the outstanding matter of the goat track just north of Conondale. This 2½-kilometre stretch north of Lees Road does need widening. This is a prime tourist route, not to mention a residential route, between Conondale and Kenilworth and it needs fixing. I again stress the community's desire to see traffic signalisation at the corner of Reed Street and Steve Irwin Way in Glass House Mountains. We do not have significant accidents there because people know how bad it is, but we do get a lot of vehicles running up the rear of the vehicle in front and it is driving people to despair. I am working with Minister Emerson and will continue to work with him to bring about a solution for the Glass House Mountains community.

South Burnett Relay for Life; Amaroo Environmental Education Centre

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (9.34 pm): It is with pleasure that I rise in this House tonight to talk about the South Burnett Relay for Life. This was a most amazing event held in Kingaroy a couple of weekends ago. I congratulate Rowena Dionysius and her whole committee. Not only was it again a successful weekend but her and her committee and all of the teams together raised over \$105,000 for the Relay for Life. It was fantastic. This year we saw some 43 teams enter. I also congratulate the patron who does a lot of work and fundraising, Carl Rackemann, and the face of the relay, Roger Secombe.

There were some really lovely teams. This year I would like to acknowledge Sandy's Heroes. Sandy Freeman unfortunately passed away from a cancer related illness in 2008. It was lovely to see her son Nick present the Sandy Freeman Memorial Shield for the highest fundraiser. That went to Birds of a Feather. Not only are Birds of a Feather always high fundraisers but they are one of the largest teams as well. It was also wonderful to see other teams and people there, such as Linda and Darren Geiger who were part of Geiger's Gang. It was fantastic to see them out and about.

I would also like to acknowledge the year 10 Nanango State School team for being the highest fundraiser team there. I want to compliment my daughters, Lucy and Isabella, who worked very hard. Lucy in particular worked extremely hard and organised one of the Saint Mary's school teams. She raised a lot of money and organised their costumes. It was fantastic. I also congratulate and thank the teachers and all of the parents of those school teams who put so much effort into the South Burnett Relay for Life.

In the time remaining I want to touch on an amazing education facility 22 kilometres north of Toowoomba on the site of the old Kleinton State School called Amaroo Environmental Education Centre. I was invited there by the principal, Mr Cam McKenzie, and teachers Paul Carmody, Judy Green and Lee Reushle. It is a wonderful environmental centre that desperately needs another building to increase its space. It provides a fantastic resource for all of the small regional schools in

and around my electorate and those of Toowoomba North and right out to Warrego. It is a wonderful facility. I am pleased to be able to stand in the House to offer my support for the continuation of the Amaroo Environmental Education Centre. I will be calling on the education minister to assist me in increasing their facilities.

Somerset Hills State School, Groundskeeper

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (9.37 pm): At the outset I wish to correct the record in relation to a speech I made on 26 August 2014 about the groundskeeper's position at Somerset Hills State School. In my speech I referred to the removal of that position when I stated—

In the wisdom of policies overseen by the Newman government, the student numbers have declined, which apparently meant that the groundskeeper, Peter, needed to pack his bags and leave.

Subsequently I have been informed that the minister has advised that he had written to my colleague the member for Redcliffe advising that the position was safe. I am happy to accept that advice and am more than willing to correct the record in that respect. I accept that my assertion that student numbers had dropped due to Newman government policies was incorrect. Therefore, I unreservedly apologise to the House and assure Madam Speaker that I did not intend to mislead the House. As Madam Speaker will be aware, I received a letter from Madam Speaker dated 15 October 2014 regarding this issue and today is the earliest opportunity I have had to correct the record. I acknowledge that the same policies have applied under this and previous governments as to the number of students required to maintain this position and also that the number of students has been below 200 since 2008. But under the same policy the position was maintained until now. If there is to be any change that will be under this government so I would appreciate any advice from the minister that this is not going to happen.

It would be worthwhile providing the House with some background regarding this issue. During the Stafford by-election I received representation from the Somerset Hills State School P&C stating that the school's groundskeeper position was to be terminated. This attracted considerable media attention. I understand the minister did write to the Somerset Hills State School principal and the president of the school's P&C association allowing them to retain their groundskeeper with advice that the groundskeeper's position was safe. Therefore I was surprised last week when my office again received representation from the Somerset Hills P&C which conveyed to me that the groundskeeper's position was again under threat.

Yesterday I met with the groundskeeper who confirmed that he has received no notification that his position will be continued in 2015. Given the history of this issue, the minister should understand the anxiety that exists within the school community and that written reassurance would help to dispel the anxiety. The school has large grounds and, as I have previously advised the House, it caters for disadvantaged children in the area. I ask the minister to provide reassurance to the principal, the P&C president and the groundskeeper that the position of groundskeeper is not under threat in 2015 or into the future. I ask that this school be given special consideration. We look forward to receiving advice from the minister confirming that this position is not only safe in tenure until the end of the year, as the school fears, but also safe into the future. It is a proud school. It is a school that needs tidy and well-kept grounds to convey to the community that it is a school that cares for all who come through its doors.

Burleigh Electorate, Events

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (9.40 pm): I rise to update the House on my activities over the weekend in my very small electorate of Burleigh. On Saturday morning, it was my great pleasure to open the Mission Foods Primary Schools Netball Cup. There were 75 teams represented and 750 young netballers who were keen to compete over the weekend. I congratulate the South Coast Netball Association for hosting the carnival and Netball Queensland for organising the competition.

The Mallowa Drive Sports complex is a great complex. It has been aided by the Gold Coast City Council and the department of recreation and sport to redo some of its facilities, including the lighting. However, there is a bigger issue around that particular area. I would like to see a master plan developed for the Mallowa area, because it caters to many sports such as hockey, soccer and cricket, which all want to use the facilities. Therefore, it would be really great to see a master plan. I have been speaking to the minister about making that happen over the coming years.

After leaving the carnival, I went to the Burleigh farmers market, where I held an information booth for three hours. I talked to the people of Burleigh about the Get Ready campaign to prepare for the storm season. That is a very important issue in my electorate. The week before, we had given away a get-ready box. We went down to Bunnings and we put together a box that contained what people should have in their houses, such as radios, batteries, water and so on. We gave that box away in an online competition.

I then attended the GC600 for a couple of hours. As I said earlier today, I tested out the G:link on the way up there and the way back. I then went to the Palm Beach Soccer Club end-of-year awards. I understand the Palm Beach Soccer Club, which is the home of the Sharks, has about 12 awards each year. I presented the club's person of the year award. President Peter Williamson was there. The club has had a great year. They were the 2014 PS4 NPL champions. They won the NPL grand final. They were quarter finalists in the FFA Cup and they were the winners of the 2014 Macron Cup. They are definitely fighting above their weight.

On Sunday I went to the Palm Beach State School fete. I congratulate Nikki Robinson for the wonderful job she did in organising that fete. I sponsored a surfboard ride. It was interesting to watch people trying to get on the surfboard and stay there. Most of them could not. I was not prepared to have a go, but I did watch the process. I talked the principal into the ice bucket challenge and I managed to throw a bucket of ice over him.

(Time expired)

Gaven Electorate, Events

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (9.43 pm): Ten days ago, I was honoured to be invited to speak at the 12th memorial service in my electorate for the 88 victims of the Bali terrorist bombings in 2002. The Thwaites family lost one of their children, Rob Thwaites, who went to school with my son. I thank them for their kind invitation to attend the service. Each year, the service has been held at a Bali community memorial at Allambe Memorial Park in Nerang. It has transitioned into a much smaller, family based event. Events are held throughout Australia. Whilst this service is much smaller than it was, the Allambe organisers are very caring and compassionate towards the families, the survivors and the victims' relatives. It was an amazing ceremony. I am proud to have the memorial in my electorate. It was the first memorial constructed after the bombings. It was created in Bali and shipped to the Gold Coast in honour of the very innocent Australians who lost their lives.

On Saturday, I also attended a Relay for Life event at the Coomera Anglican College. It was a great team event that was predicted to raise \$50,000. It was the third such event to raise money for the Cancer Council. My wife, who is a breast cancer survivor, and I walked with a group. The member for Coomera, who is not here, came along, as did the member for Albert.

Mr Boothman interjected.

Dr DOUGLAS: That is right. It was in his seat. I thank him for being such a generous host and a good host. He walked with us as well. It was a wonderful event. As I said, it was a great team event that went all night. They partied hard as well, but they enjoyed themselves as they raised money.

Last night I attended the Nerang Neighbourhood Centre AGM. That wonderful group is now 25 years strong. It grows stronger every year, delivering year-on-year benefits for those whose lives are a little more difficult than most of ours. I congratulate the director Vicky, the bookkeeper Carol, Lisa who runs the food bank and Chairman Peter Young, a former councillor for the area who has stood for office again.

Unfortunately, some of the associations are doing it tough. Meals on Wheels certainly is struggling. I do not know what it is like elsewhere, but they are having a lot of trouble with competition—would you believe it—from Lite n' Easy and a variety of other such organisations. Meals on Wheels is having trouble keeping bookkeepers and other such staff. The government might consider helping those sorts of organisations before they fall over. Meals on Wheels is a very wonderful organisation that does a lot of good work feeding elderly people. They need some assistance at this point in time across the state.

Abbot Point Port and Wetlands Strategy

 **Mrs MENKENS** (Burdekin—LNP) (9.46 pm): At last we see some positive movement as the Abbot Point Port and Wetlands Strategy takes shape. As all in this House would be aware, the Queensland government has lodged two submissions with the federal government in relation to the Abbot Point Port and Wetlands Strategy. I can assure the House that my Burdekin constituents, the

proponents and businesses are eagerly awaiting the outcome. The referrals provide a win-win solution for the project and the environment, and I am sure common sense will prevail with the Port of Abbot Point expansion being able to kick off early in the new year, bringing the jobs and certainty people have been calling for.

I understand 50 to 100 workers will be engaged in the initial project works, creating a sediment settling pond onshore, so it will be crucial that work is timed to avoid any wet season. It is planned that clean tailings water will be processed via a natural sand-filtering system that will once again invigorate the once pristine wetlands. I also understand that the majority of the dredge material, almost 98 per cent of the filtered sands, will then be used to sensibly create the rail embankments to the port. Under the strategy, no dredge material from the port expansion will be disposed of at sea. It will be placed on land within the SDA and the nearby wetlands environment will be enhanced and rejuvenated.

This LNP state government realises the importance of the Caley Valley Wetlands and it is also looking forward to community feedback on this proposed enhancement. The aim is to create a better wildlife habitat, something that locals and tourists to our region will be able to enjoy for generations to come. There are endless possibilities and the state government project team is looking for a uniquely Bowen initiative. Parts of the wetlands have been degraded through historical agricultural and manmade structures. I can attest to that. In the 1950s and 1960s, the local duck shooters built a very long bund wall and, although their intentions were probably good at the time, it has obstructed the natural tidal flow. Feral pest and weed infestation, along with areas of high salinity, are impacting on the area's ecology. Only a small portion of the wetlands is in good shape, whilst the remainder resembles a lunar landscape. I am not quite sure what the Greens were up to whilst this important habitat for migratory bird species was left to slide into such a condition, like other areas under Labor. However, under this government's plans the wetlands will be renewed and will come back to life.

This LNP government has devised a common-sense approach that will develop the Port of Abbot Point as the key to unlocking the Galilee Basin and exporting those valuable resources to the rest of the world. Unlike those opposite, this government is about creating jobs, revitalising local communities such as Bowen, Collinsville, Ayr and Home Hill in the Burdekin electorate, boosting supply chain opportunities for our small businesses and helping to supercharge our local and state economies.

(Time expired)

Netball Queensland

 **Mr JUDGE** (Yeerongpilly—Ind) (9.49 pm): It was good to hear the member for Burleigh talk about netball and the netball cup held in his electorate. I want to talk about Netball Queensland. The headquarters of Netball Queensland is in my electorate of Yeerongpilly. Unfortunately netball, as Queensland's leading female participation sport, is not receiving funding equal to sports participated in by their male counterparts and it is being neglected by the Newman government.

Netball Queensland is being forced to fight for funding equality for female athletes and is basically being treated as second-rate citizens by the Newman government. In comparison, the Premier pledged to provide the Brisbane Broncos exclusive access to valuable land. Furthermore, the Newman government is proposing a cash splash for a superstadium, costed at \$186 million, in Townsville, subject to electors supporting asset sales and privatisation plans.

By comparison, Queensland Netball is seeking \$20 million—just \$20 million—for the delivery of a dedicated netball centre for Queensland. It is a disgrace that Queensland is the only major state not to have a dedicated netball centre. Western Australia and New South Wales will soon complete construction of purpose-built centres, and these will join facilities in Victoria and South Australia, ACT and the Northern Territory.

Frankly, it is a disgrace that Netball Queensland is being neglected and it should be afforded fair and equitable treatment. On this analysis it is evident that women's sport is running a distant second place when it comes to being afforded funding from the Newman government. The facts are that Netball Queensland represents 50,000 members and has more than 250,000 active and engaged netball volunteers, supporters and fans across the state.

A government member interjected.

Mr JUDGE: That is in electorates elsewhere other than Yeerongpilly, and, if you are not willing to stand up for them, I am sure they will hear about it.

The Newman government has been reliably informed that Netball Queensland does not have access to a required facility for the sport capable of meeting 7,100 court hours per annum for state-wide competitions, dedicated training programs and elite and high-performance teams.

Our Queensland Firebirds were recently the runner-up team in the world's best domestic netball competition—the ANZ Championship. The Firebirds have made the grand final in three of the past four years. There is no doubt whatsoever that Queensland needs a dedicated netball facility for our state's most played female sport and for one of our best sports teams in Queensland, that being the Queensland Firebirds. Money may be tight, especially because of the failure of the Newman government to grow a four-pillar economy as pledged at the last election. However, it should not be overlooked that the Premier has splurged \$80 million of taxpayers' money in his own electorate in an attempt to save his sad political career while neglecting Queensland's leading female participation sport and treating our female athletes as second-rate citizens in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Mount Ommaney Electorate, Small Business

 **Mrs SMITH** (Mount Ommaney—LNP) (9.52 pm): I am delighted to rise and shine the spotlight on small business in the electorate of Mount Ommaney. Firstly, I share with the House the achievements of the award-winning company Blast Movement Technologies. Blast Movement Technologies, which reside in the electorate of Mount Ommaney, recently won the 2014 Premier of Queensland's Exporter of the Year Award—they were the overall winner. That was in addition to taking out the 2014 Premier of Queensland's Exporter of the Year Minerals and Energy Award. They were also a finalist for the Queensland Telstra business award. They have a very impressive resume. That is just to name a few awards to add to the collection they already have, and I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate them.

Secondly, I would like to welcome a new addition to our business community—Gosford Quarries—and thank them for choosing the Sumner Park Industrial Estate in the Mount Ommaney electorate where they opened their doors just two weeks ago. This is a company with an over 90-year history which is synonymous with sandstone, and they will be having their grand opening this weekend.

Finally, what I would also like to talk about and share with you, Madam Speaker, is that last week I had the pleasure of representing the Attorney-General at the Workplace Health and Safety Symposium 2014. There I was pleased to share with the audience some very impressive results that this government has achieved. One of the programs that I was happy to share with the audience was the Injury Prevention and Management Program. That has been such a big success that this government has invested a further \$2.8 million towards doubling its capacity.

I also love to be able give practical examples of where this government has implemented its policies and programs and where they have had real positive benefits and impacts on a business. I want to talk about a local business that participated in this IPaM program. What this business, with staff of over 100 people, were able to achieve in a very short period of time was a reduction in injury, an increase in productivity, reduced working days lost, a happier workforce and because of that they were able to increase their production, and as a whole it was a win-win situation for everyone. What has also been so wonderful about that program is that this business has been able to reduce its workplace compensation premiums by over 17 per cent.

Coconut, Auntie M

 **Mr KEMPTON** (Cook—LNP) (9.55 pm): Madam Speaker, you have saved the best for last, of course. I would like to pay tribute to Maryann Coconut, an elder of the Thankiwith people on the west coast of Cape York. Maryann Coconut is 72 years of age and has lived in Napranum all her life. In this time she achieved a degree in community management at Macquarie University. In June of this year the Federal Court made a determination in respect of the native title lands for which Maryann Coconut is responsible. Madam Speaker, this is the speech that Maryann Coconut made on that occasion—

Fellow Countrymen, Women and Children

We are here to-day to give thanks to God for this great and wonderful event in the history of our people.

Our Land is being handed back to us after a long time.

We thank the Creator Spirit in giving knowledge and understanding to all the stake holders; such as the Court, the Land Council, including ourselves and others who have worked so hard to make this day a reality.

We are the Caretakers of this Land; given to us by the Creator Spirit who is the Creator.

We acknowledge Him to-day with adoration and thanksgiving.

We the Elders are the Gate Keepers. This is an age old role given to us by our Ancestors. Our knowledge and wisdom of our country is still strong; and will remain invisible and well guarded in our spirit till we die. Our spirit will pass this knowledge on to the next Elder in line.

Knowledge and Traditional Knowledge is sacred.

It can not be bought or grabbed by someone else. It will follow the right protocol, right pathway and the correct channel. This can not be stepped over or crossed.

We the gatekeepers can only open get in and come out and are ourselves at the right time when it is needed. Some people think that while Land was taken away from us without our permission, its cultural values, understanding and stories are gone from us.

I say no to this, because sacredness and wisdom are spiritual values that are in-built in us.

It may be unseen on the outside but visible and seen in our lives and our relationships together.

We come to-day as one people; as gatekeepers and caretakers of the ancient wisdom and culture of our Land and people.

I speak to the Land and Sea and thank them in waiting for us for just a bit longer; and our Creator who is kind, patient and loving enabling our Land to be returned to us for safe keeping.

Let us be happy and join in the spirit of celebration together.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 9.58 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, D'Ath, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Lynham, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, 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