



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

Hansard Home Page: <http://www.parliament.qld.gov.au/work-of-assembly/hansard>
 Email: hansard@parliament.qld.gov.au
 Phone (07) 3553 6344 Fax (07) 3553 6369

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Thursday, 24 August 2017

Subject	Page
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT	2449
Buckley, Mrs E.....	2449
PETITIONS	2449
TABLED PAPERS	2449
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2450
Queensland Economy.....	2450
Anzac Centenary, Spirit of Service Grants Program.....	2450
Marriage.....	2451
Pearson, Ms S	2451
Correction to <i>Record of Proceedings</i>	2451
Cross River Rail	2452
<i>Tabled paper: Building Queensland: Cross River Rail Business Case, August 2017</i>	2452
Economic Plan	2453
Health, Construction Jobs.....	2454
Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Economic Benefits	2454
Rheinmetall Boxer CRV	2455
Construction Industry, Suicide Prevention	2455
Cladding Audit Taskforce	2456
Powering North Queensland Plan	2457
Queensland Indigenous Procurement Policy.....	2457
Queensland Training Awards	2458
NOTICE OF MOTION	2458
Minister for Corrective Services.....	2458
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS	2458
ID Scanners	2458
Member for Clayfield.....	2459

Table of Contents – Thursday, 24 August 2017

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance	2460
Liberal National Party, Performance	2461
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'LNP SPENDOMETER—Total unfunded election promises'	2461
Youth Detention.....	2461
REPORT.....	2462
Office of the Speaker.....	2462
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017.....	2462
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	2462
Youth Detention.....	2462
Youth Detention.....	2463
Public Assets	2464
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Statutory Declaration by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Anastacia Palaszczuk, in relation to Labor not entering deals with One Nation at upcoming State Election.....	2465
Youth Detention.....	2465
Cross River Rail.....	2465
Youth Detention.....	2466
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Courier-Mail</i> online, dated 19 August 2017, titled 'Bail house plan to tackle overcrowding in Queensland's youth detention centres'	2466
Queensland Economy.....	2467
Youth Detention.....	2468
Schools, Information Technology	2468
Government Advertising	2469
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Screenshot, undated, of tweet regarding Cross River Rail.....	2469
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated October 2010, titled 'Darra to Springfield Transport Corridor—Stage 1'	2469
Health Services.....	2470
United Voice, Teacher Aides.....	2471
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article in the <i>Australian</i> online, dated 21 August 2017, titled 'Union blitz robs Queensland's classrooms of teacher aides'	2471
TAFE Queensland.....	2471
Badu Island, Police Station.....	2472
Budget, Communities Sector.....	2472
SAFER WATERWAYS BILL	2473
Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date; Declared Urgent.....	2473
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of media articles regarding crocodiles in Far North Queensland.	2473
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Extract from <i>Record of Proceedings</i> , dated 25 May 2017, regarding Safer Waterways Bill.	2473
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, titled 'Letter from lady who lives in Mourilyan (as taken from Hansard 10 August 2017)'	2473
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to	2475
Resolved in the negative.	2475
PETITIONS.....	2475
Motion to Take Note	2475
EDUCATION, TOURISM, INNOVATION AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE	2477
Report, Motion to Take Note	2477
COAL WORKERS' PNEUMOCONIOSIS SELECT COMMITTEE.....	2477
Report, Motion to Take Note	2477
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee: Report No. 3, 55th Parliament—A Mine Safety and Health Authority for Queensland including the committee's exposure draft Mine Safety and Health Authority Bill 2017.	2477
PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE	2481
Report, Motion to Take Note	2481
MOTION	2485
Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee	2485
STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL	2485
Second Reading	2485
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources Committee: Report No. 42—Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, government response.	2485
PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS.....	2486
Sugar Code of Conduct, Disallowance Motion	2486
Raine Island, Green Sea Turtles	2487
Caloundra Hospital.....	2488
Mackay Electorate, Innovation	2488
Hervey Bay Electorate, Health	2489
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, undated, from Ms Rachelle Boswell to the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Ted Sorensen MP, regarding surgery waiting times.	2489
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, undated, from an unknown person to the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Ted Sorensen MP, regarding surgery waiting times.	2489
Cross River Rail.....	2489
Electricity Prices	2490
Skilling Queenslanders for Work.....	2491

Table of Contents – Thursday, 24 August 2017

Roads, Nicklin Way	2491
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 26 June 2017, from the member for Kawana, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP to the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding proposed Nicklin Way upgrade.....	
	2492
Marriage	2492
STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL	2493
Second Reading	2493
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated 30 March 2015 by Ms Michelle Landry MP, titled 'News Alert: MPs launch dramatic fight to change fair work laws to ban 100% FIFO'	
	2508
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated 12 October 2015 by Mr George Christensen MP, titled 'Labor fails to deliver on 100% FIFO'	
	2508
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, undated, showing a screenshot of a '404 Page Not Found' message on webpage of Ms Michelle Landry MP.	
	2508
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Media article, dated 14 October 2015, by Mr George Christensen MP, titled 'CQ MPs take action to ban 100% FIFO'	
	2508
MOTION	2523
Minister for Corrective Services	2523
Division: Question put—That the motion be agreed to.	
	2529
The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.	
	2529
Resolved in the negative.	
	2529
MINISTERIAL PAPERS	2529
Ministerial Expenses	2529
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Public report of Expenses for Ministerial Offices for 2016-17.....	
	2529
Reportable Gifts	2529
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ministerial gifts register—Reportable Gifts 1 July 2016-30 June 2017	
	2529
REPORT	2530
Office of the Leader of the Opposition	2530
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Public report of the Leader of the Opposition Expenses 2016-17.	
	2530
STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL	2530
Second Reading	2530
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated May 2012, regarding the Alpha Coal Project.	
	2539
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated May 2013, regarding the Kevin's Corner project.....	
	2539
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated June 2015, regarding the Red Hill Mining Lease project.	
	2539
Consideration in Detail	2541
Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.	
	2541
Clause 3—	
	2541
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Mrs Deb Frecklington's amendments.....	
	2541
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	
	2542
Resolved in the affirmative.....	
	2542
Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.	
	2542
Clauses 4 and 5, as read, agreed to.	
	2542
Clause 6—	
	2542
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Anthony Lynham's amendments.	
	2542
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	
	2543
Resolved in the negative.	
	2543
Non-government amendment (Mrs Frecklington) negatived.....	
	2543
Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.	
	2543
Clause 7—	
	2543
Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.	
	2544
Clause 8—	
	2544
Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.	
	2544
Clause 9—	
	2544
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to.	
	2545
Resolved in the negative.	
	2545
Non-government amendment (Mrs Frecklington) negatived.....	
	2545
Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.	
	2545
Clause 10, as read, agreed to.....	
	2545
Clause 11—	
	2546
Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.	
	2546
Clause 12—	
	2546
Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.	
	2546
Clause 13, as read, agreed to.....	
	2546
Clause 14, as read, agreed to.....	
	2546
Insertion of new clause—	
	2546
Amendment agreed to.	
	2547
Clauses 15 to 18, as read, agreed to.	
	2547
Clause 19—	
	2547
Clause 19, as amended, agreed to.	
	2547

Table of Contents – Thursday, 24 August 2017

Clauses 20 to 31, as read, agreed to	2547
Schedule 1—	2547
Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.....	2547
Third Reading	2548
Long Title	2548
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	2548
Parole Board, Decision	2548
Pisasale, Mr P	2548
False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology	2548
PRIVILEGE	2549
False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology	2549
False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology	2549
False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology	2550
BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION LEGISLATION (NON-CONFORMING BUILDING PRODUCTS—CHAIN OF RESPONSIBILITY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL.....	2550
Second Reading	2550
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 43—Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products-Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017, government response.	2551
Consideration in Detail.....	2564
Clauses 1 to 34—	2564
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products-Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mick de Brenni's amendments.....	2565
Clauses 1 to 34, as amended, agreed to.....	2565
Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.	2565
Third Reading	2565
Long Title.....	2566
SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT	2566
ADJOURNMENT	2566
Gold Coast Light Rail	2566
Burnett Electorate	2566
Marriage	2567
Youth Unemployment	2568
Baker, Ms N; Mackay, Kanaka Graves.....	2568
Wilsonton State High School, Comments by Member for Ashgrove	2569
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Bundle of documents relating to the Wilsonton State High School.	2569
Algester Electorate.....	2570
Krauss Locomotive	2570
The Great White Campaign	2571
Logan, Dental Health Services	2571
ATTENDANCE	2572

THURSDAY, 24 AUGUST 2017



The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

Mr Speaker (Hon. Peter Wellington, Nicklin) read prayers and took the chair.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Buckley, Mrs E



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, we are well looked after by our catering staff and perhaps too well on occasion. Today I would like to recognise Mrs Ellen Buckley, who has worked in our cafeteria for a long time.

Mr Costigan: Catering royalty.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes. She is in the Speaker's gallery right above us.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Mr SPEAKER: There you go, Ellen! You cannot live that down, can you? I am advised that Ellen has worked in our catering section for just over 22 years, serving us well. I would like to thank all members for showing their appreciation by acclamation. Ellen will join me and my staff after question time this morning. Thank you, Ellen, for your years of service.

PETITIONS

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

Mulgrave Electorate, Proposed State Development Area

Mr Last, from 189 petitioners, requesting the House to withdraw the proposed closing date of 25 August 2017 for submissions that would establish a state development area over prime agricultural land and residential proprieties in the electorate of Mulgrave and to engage in proper and extended consultation with residents, businesses and organisations [\[1439\]](#).

Gas Fields, Personal Exposure and Biological Monitoring

Mr Pyne, from 171 petitioners, requesting the House to ensure that all residents of the current Queensland gas fields receive personal exposure and biological monitoring that tests for flaring chemicals [\[1440\]](#).

Law and Order

Ms Bates, from 1,078 petitioners, requesting the House to consider changes to legislation which make it an offence for any person, who is a witness to the commission of a serious indictable offence, to fail to report the commission of the offence and/or to fail to do anything within their power to stop the offence from being committed or continuing [\[1441\]](#).

Moggill and Ipswich West Electorates, New High School

Mr Madden, from 33 petitioners, requesting the House to build a new high school to serve families and residents of the suburbs of Mount Crosby, Karana Downs, Lake Manchester, Karalee, Chuwar and Barellan Point [\[1442\]](#).

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

MEMBER'S PAPERS

The following member's papers were tabled by the Clerk—

Member for Cairns (Mr Pyne)—

[1430](#) Letter and attachments (with redactions), dated 23 August 2017, from unknown person to Assistant Commissioner Codd APM, regarding Thomas Tate—Mayor, City of Gold Coast

[1431](#) Letter, dated 17 August 2017, from and unknown person to Mr R Pyne MP, regarding the YUPI/Challenge Group of companies and the Bremer Institute


[1432](#) Document, undated, titled 'Call for Cook Shire Council to be placed into administration: Part 3'

[1433](#) Extract from the *Australian*, dated 9 November 2015, titled 'Queensland's Crime and Corruption Commission slammed'

- [1434](#) Bundle of documents (with redactions), dated August 2017, titled 'Council: Ipswich City Council'
- [1435](#) Document (with redactions), dated August 2017, titled 'Council: Cook Shire Council'
- [1436](#) Document (with redactions), dated August 2017, titled 'LGAQ rehomes Sacked CEO's and others'
- [1437](#) Document, dated 18 August 2017, regarding Choice Australia Management Ltd.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Queensland Economy

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.34 am): My government is single-minded in our pursuit of jobs for Queenslanders—new jobs, better jobs, safer jobs and jobs for the future. This week we have seen the passage of the most significant changes to Queensland's retail trading hours in more than two decades, with a reform package that will cut red tape for business and create up to 1,000 new jobs.

I visited Brisbane energy technology start-up Redback Technologies, which plans to double its current workforce of 54 over the next six months. It is businesses like this, supported by my government's Advance Queensland research fellowship grants, which have seen an extra 94,500 Queensland jobs created since 2015 when we were elected—the equivalent of 100 new jobs every single day.

Data released by the federal government's labour market internet portal shows that last month online job vacancies in Queensland recorded Australia's strongest monthly growth of 1.5 per cent, rising to 32,600. Queensland's annual growth in vacancies came in at 11.8 per cent—also the highest in the country.


We are building Cross River Rail, a project that will bust congestion across the south-east for decades to come and support 3,000 jobs through its construction and 1,540 jobs ongoing. Six days ago, I was honoured to turn the sod on the \$250 million Townsville stadium, a project that will re-energise the CBD of the biggest city in northern Australia.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I know you are all enthusiastic.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My government has committed \$140 million to the stadium, a project which will deliver 750 jobs and see its first match played in 2020. Last night we passed the laws that give 15-year-olds access to proof of age cards, making it easier for young Queenslanders to get their first job, to open bank accounts, to get phone contracts and to enrol in TAFE and tertiary courses. We have seen great evidence of Queensland's path to the jobs of the future, with three Gold Coast state high school students from Merrimac State High School winning an international robotics competition in Japan, thanks to their school's science, technology, engineering, arts and maths program. Whether Queenslanders are looking for a new job, a better job or more security and certainty in the jobs they already have, my government is backing them 100 per cent of the way.

Anzac Centenary, Spirit of Service Grants Program

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.36 am): The service and sacrifice of Queensland's men and women during the First World War left a lasting imprint on our state. One hundred years on, I am proud my government is continuing to help local communities commemorate Queensland's involvement in Australia's military history.

Today, I am pleased to announce that \$190,000 will be awarded to local organisations under the latest round of Queensland Anzac centenary grants. This funding is delivered through round 3 of the Spirit of Service grants program. The Anzac centenary grants honour the service of Queensland's men and women in the First World War, as well as other significant military anniversaries. Through these grants, local groups are able to explore new and engaging ways to honour Queensland's military involvement and pay their respects to those who made the ultimate sacrifice. Local organisations are also able to receive funding for projects that will preserve war history, memorabilia and artefacts for years to come.


I am delighted this latest round of funding will support a total of 16 commemorative projects throughout Queensland. This is wonderful news for our local communities who will get to see and experience these works firsthand. Projects include the digitisation of honour rolls, musical performances, memorial restorations, exhibitions, research and an interactive reality program. For

example, on the Sunshine Coast, the Palmwoods Memorial Hall Association has received almost \$20,000 for a stained glass memorial window. In Roma, the local RSL has been granted \$17,000 to replace damaged plaques that form part of the living memorial of bottle trees on Heroes Avenue.


Local stories really have an opportunity to be heard through these grants, with organisations like the Rosalie Shire Historical Society receiving over \$8,000 to profile local First World War soldiers in a book, on banners and through digital archives. These projects ensure that the proud legacy of Anzacs is preserved and accessible for future generations.

It is wonderful that over 250 community organisations have received in excess of \$5.2 million in funding, as part of the Queensland Anzac Centenary Grants program. With over \$1.6 million in grants yet to be allocated, I encourage eligible Queensland organisations to apply for the remaining funding rounds. Round 4 of the Spirit of Service grants program, offering grants of up to \$20 000, is now open and closes 15 October 2017.

Marriage

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.39 am): Queenslanders will have a chance to have their say on marriage equality from 12 September. If Queenslanders want to ensure their vote is properly counted, the deadline for updating details with the Australian Electoral Commission is midnight tonight. I will be voting for marriage equality. I would also like to remind the House that my government has supported equality through the restoration of civil partnerships, age of consent equalisation, same-sex adoption, removal of the gay panic defence, an apology to the LGBTIQ community and introduction of a bill to expunge convictions for historical gay offences—and all without an unnecessary \$160 million survey.

Pearson, Ms S


 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.41 am): I want to pay tribute and acknowledge the tenacious and remarkable comeback of Australia's queen of the track, our very own golden girl, Gold Coaster Sally Pearson. Sally's win in the women's 100 metres hurdles final at the London World Championships once again demonstrates the true grit of Queenslanders. It is the same true grit and the same self-belief boxer Jeff Horn demonstrated in spades when he took the World Welterweight title off Manny Pacquiao.

During the last four years Sally has had to battle serious calf, Achilles and hamstring injuries as well as a badly broken and dislocated wrist suffered in a fall. Lesser athletes would have called it quits on their careers but not our Sally. After a dismal Rio Olympics she came home to the Gold Coast more determined than ever and decided on a plan to coach herself in a bold bid to claim another world championship.

On the eve of her 31st birthday, Sally—very much the underdog in London—proved that she is made of the right stuff, racing away to win her second world championship gold. Typically, her first reaction was to thank those who have been with her every day for the past year or more. Team Pearson, as Sally calls them, are a tight-knit committed group of friends—her mum, her husband and her two training partners. Sally once again did herself, her team and all of us proud. Her achievement has shown all our younger athletes what they have to do to be the best in the world.

I must acknowledge and commend all the hard work she has done since she became our official ambassador of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games in June last year. We are incredibly fortunate to have such a proud Gold Coaster in this role. Her stunning performance at the world championships is proof positive that Sally is bound for more golden glory—in front of her home crowds and on her home track at the fast-approaching Gold Coast Commonwealth Games next April. I cannot wait to be there.

Correction to Record of Proceedings

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (9.42 am): I want to take this opportunity to correct a statement I made on Tuesday in my speech on the private member's motion. I said—

This was also disclosed in relation to the boot camps and the former attorney-general. The Auditor-General's report talked about a link between donors and decisions that the former LNP government was making.

Those links were not required to be disclosed in the Auditor-General's report because it was on the public record, clearly available to anyone who searched the ECQ website, that one of the persons the former attorney-general granted a boot camp contract to was an LNP donor.


Mr Bleijie: What did I say about you making stuff up? You make stuff up, don't you?

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are still waiting to see your \$100,000 of secret donations. That is what we are waiting to see. You can talk all you want in this House but we are yet to see \$100,000 of secret donations—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. Thank you, Premier. Thank you, member for Kawana.

Cross River Rail

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.43 am): Cross River Rail will transform South-East Queensland. It will deliver—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, one and all. The Deputy Premier has the call. You will have a chance soon, Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

Ms Palaszczuk interjected.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Ms TRAD: Welcome to Thursday, Mr Speaker. Cross River Rail will transform South-East Queensland. It will deliver turn-up-and-go public transport services. It will help bus congestion for commuters from the Gold Coast, from Moreton Bay, from Logan and beyond. It will help reduce greenhouse gases by shifting more people onto public transport, and it will deliver jobs now and jobs for our future.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you will have a go soon.

Ms TRAD: It is fully funded with early works starting later this year. Since coming to office, the Palaszczuk government has got this vital project back on track after it was cut by the member for Clayfield when he was treasurer in the Newman government. In the last 2½ years we have completed the detailed business case on the rescoped project. We have established the Cross River Rail Delivery Authority, an independent statutory authority to drive delivery. We have worked with Brisbane City Council to fully integrate Cross River Rail with metro, obtained all major environmental approvals and, most importantly, secured full funding for the project in this year's state budget. By any measure, this is rapid progress for a major project—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members!

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, you are pushing my tolerance at the moment.

Ms TRAD: By any measure, this is rapid progress for a major project of Cross River Rail scale. Today we complete the planning phase with the release of the Building Queensland business case supporting Cross River Rail. I now table a copy of this document for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Building Queensland: Cross River Rail Business Case, August 2017 [[1438](#)].

It is a compelling case for action. It tells us categorically that we must take action now to keep the south-east moving. It says that population and employment growth in the south-east will be very strong over the next 20 years. The region's population will increase by 1.9 million, with 83 per cent of this increase outside the Brisbane local government area. The Brisbane local government area will be home to 30 per cent of the region's population but it will also be home to 48 per cent of the jobs. The majority of the employment opportunities will still be inside the Brisbane local government area.

This will put increasing pressure on our rail and bus services as well as our road networks. Bus and train travel in the am peak will grow rapidly. Bus passenger numbers will almost double from 77,800 to 149,700. Train passenger numbers will more than triple from 51,700 to 160,300 so we must act now before we reach a crisis.

We have rejected the view that we should wait until a crisis to take action because we know that Queenslanders deserve better. The region should not have to burst at the seams and grind to a halt before action is taken. One in three passengers should not have to stand on morning peak-hour trains all the way from the Gold Coast, as Infrastructure Australia has advised it wants to see. The case to act now could not be more compelling.

It will mean 18,500 fewer car trips every day by investing in Cross River Rail now; a future in which turn-up-and-go services transform the choices people have when planning their daily commute; and a 40-year horizon of new economic development opportunities being unlocked right across the South-East Queensland region. That is what this landmark investment means.

The release of the Cross River Rail business case draws a line in the sand. You are either for this project or you are against it. On this side of the House, we are for it. We are investing in it and we are getting on with building it. The Cross River Rail business case was developed with the support of expert advisers including PricewaterhouseCoopers, Jacobs and KPMG. It was peer reviewed by experts. This is a project more than a decade in the planning and the time for argument is over. We are getting on with the delivery of Cross River Rail so we can bust congestion, create jobs and deliver the future infrastructure that South-East Queensland needs.

Economic Plan



Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (9.48 am): The Palaszczuk government's economic plan is fostering growth, investing in infrastructure, encouraging innovation, building confidence and creating jobs for Queenslanders. Through our economic plan and across three budgets we are making our state's \$320-plus billion economy more innovative, more diverse and more productive. Regional communities and their economies remain a focus for us as we transition to a post mining boom economy.

Our economic plan aims to see all Queenslanders share in the results, benefits and opportunities that economic growth delivers. All reputable and reliable analysis and hard data show a turnaround in our economic performance since the January 2015 state election. Economic growth is up, our unemployment rate is down, business confidence is up and general government sector debt is down. Even from opposition, Labor very clearly told Queenslanders that there was a better way.

We have achieved a better way to deliver economic growth and fiscal responsibility without cutting front-line services and programs, without sacking 14,000 government workers and without selling income-generating assets. It is only by retaining those assets that we have been able to retain the revenue they generate and take decisive steps to direct those in the energy sector to help place downward pressure on electricity prices. We did not cut, sack or sell our way to an improved economic and fiscal position.

We said there was a better way and the results prove it. ABS figures show 94,500 net new jobs created under our economic plan. The Queensland State Accounts show growth in the 12 months to the March quarter of 3.9 per cent compared with the 1.4 per cent we inherited in the 2014-15 year. Thanks to our economic plan we have recovered from the depths of the 1.4 per cent growth we inherited.

Opposition members interjected.


Mr PITT: Mr Speaker, they hate good news in the economy. Economic growth is forecast to strengthen across the forward estimates, from 2.4 per cent in 2015-16 to 2¾ per cent for the next two years before strengthening to three per cent in 2018-19. We would be looking at a forecast above three per cent for 2018-19 if it were not for the devastating impacts of severe Tropical Cyclone Debbie and related flooding events which took three-quarters of a percentage point off our estimated economic growth.

While our economic plan has delivered a state economy that has regained its strength and growth, we do face some headwinds both at home and abroad. There remains uncertainty around the impact of the UK's Brexit negotiations. Uncertainty is also a feature surrounding the policy responses of the Trump administration in the US. We will always be buffeted by natural disasters beyond our control. Despite recent rain, Queensland rural producers continue to face challenges, with almost 70 per

cent of the state is still drought declared. We regularly confront tropical cyclones such as Debbie that this year caused around \$2 billion worth of economic losses and hit the balance sheet to the tune of about \$1.1 billion.

Yet despite these uncertainties, our state economy is undeniably strong and growing. This outcome has come about because of the deliberate, responsible and disciplined approach we have taken to managing our state's finances. The three state budgets I have delivered have all been in surplus and have forecast surpluses across the forward estimates—even before any upward revisions from spikes in world commodity prices flowing through to royalty revenues. We have been responsible economic and fiscal managers. We have not been careless spenders. We have stimulated the Queensland economy by making the right investments at the right time in the right places. Every commitment we have made and delivered has been fully costed and fully funded. I can assure Queenslanders that will remain the case.

Health, Construction Jobs

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (9.52 am): I have often stated in this place that the Palaszczuk Labor government continues the fine tradition of Labor governments of investing in Queensland public hospitals. Those investments support high-quality health care wherever Queenslanders live. They also support construction jobs—jobs in Atherton, jobs in Blackall, jobs in the Torres Strait, jobs in Rockhampton, Cairns, Mackay, Ipswich and Townsville, and jobs right here in the south-east corner.

I do not underestimate the importance of the Queensland Health capital program on creating construction jobs throughout Queensland. Some 1,200 construction jobs are supported by our Queensland Health capital works program in 2017-18. Yesterday I was pleased to visit the Redcliffe Hospital with the Attorney-General and member for Redcliffe to announce that the Palaszczuk Labor government will build a new multistorey car park at that hospital. There is no denying that it is difficult to find a car park at that hospital. When I was there, I heard stories of staff coming to work up to 90 minutes before their shift started simply to find a car park. That is entirely unacceptable. It is only the Palaszczuk Labor government that will fix that.


These are improvements in health infrastructure being delivered by Labor, improvements in health infrastructure that were completely ignored by the member for Clayfield when he was the treasurer. We have made an infrastructure down payment on substantial redevelopments at Logan, Caboolture and Ipswich hospitals, with \$112 million for planning and preparatory works on those three sites. That is on top of \$19.6 million for a new emergency department at Caboolture, underpinning 26 construction jobs. That is 26 jobs that the members for Pumicestone and Morayfield can be proud of. Like the Attorney-General and member for Redcliffe, they are strong advocates for health service delivery. They are advocates for health infrastructure in their community. That is unlike the member for Hervey Bay who, since his election, has only been able to deliver a billboard for his community—a billboard on the Bruce Highway taking credit for an emergency department upgrade at the Hervey Bay Hospital.

Mr Bleijie: You would rather a big mirror, wouldn't you!

Mr DICK: I would have to borrow your hair dryer and hairspray if I was going to use it. There was not a single letter or email from the member for Hervey Bay in support of the project, yet somehow he claims credit for it—a billboard taking credit for a project funded by Labor in its first budget, a billboard for a Labor project that will support up to 120 construction jobs, a project funded by Labor and being delivered by the Labor government.

I look forward to visiting the electorate of Hervey Bay with the Premier when we govern from Wide Bay in a few weeks time to remind the residents of Hervey Bay that it is only Labor that will deliver for them. Unlike the LNP, the Palaszczuk Labor government will continue to invest in health infrastructure right across Queensland to ensure that all people, regardless of where they live, have access to world-class, high-quality health care.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Economic Benefits


 **Hon. KJ JONES** (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (9.56 am): New economic modelling reveals the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth Games will deliver a multibillion dollar benefit to Queensland, driving jobs, tourism and economic growth. Griffith University's *Economic impacts of the Gold Coast 2018 Commonwealth*

Games report demonstrates our \$2 billion games investment is delivering a massive economic benefit. The report forecasts a \$2 billion boost to gross state product as well as \$2.6 billion in additional infrastructure investment accelerated by the games.

The Griffith University modelling is the most robust assessment of the economic benefits of any Commonwealth Games ever. The Griffith University report also confirms the games will deliver a multibillion dollar jobs legacy for this state. The report confirms the games will deliver at least 16,000 direct jobs and more than 30,000 direct and indirect jobs. Every dollar spent by the government attracts a further 70 cent private sector investment. Export lifts and foreign investment will be worth close to \$500 million in the four years following the games. This is all about the legacy of the Commonwealth Games

The Commonwealth Games is also a major winner for tourism. Griffith University estimates the games will attract more than 670,000 visitors during the games and hundreds of thousands of extra visitors in the years following the games. The Gold Coast Commonwealth Games will be the largest event that Queensland has ever held and we are determined to ensure that the Gold Coast and Queensland continue to deliver.

Rheinmetall Boxer CRV


 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.58 am): I am pleased to be able to advise the House that Rheinmetall will be bringing their Boxer CRV armoured vehicle to tour Queensland next month. At this stage, their tour will include Ipswich, Townsville and Rockhampton and I would encourage local businesses to make sure they get along to talk to the Rheinmetall team when they come to town to discuss their future opportunities in this wonderful project. I know Queenslanders are very excited about the prospect of Rheinmetall winning the \$5 billion LAND 400 phase 2 contract and building those vehicles here in Queensland. They will build a military centre of excellence here which will place Queensland at the forefront of military vehicle development, manufacture and support for the next 50 years.

This facility will be in South-East Queensland but is expected to provide jobs and supply chain opportunities right across the state. Rheinmetall expects the facility and its local supply chain partners across the state will generate 450 long-term jobs and could bring up to a billion dollars to Queensland's economy in the first 10 years. This does not take into account the support and maintenance of these vehicles for the next 30 years and the jobs and economic benefits that would flow into Queensland should Rheinmetall also be successful in phase 3 of the LAND 400 project or other defence contracts that may stem from this.

Rheinmetall has already announced a number of regional Queensland companies for their LAND 400 supply chain. They include Redcat Industries from Cairns, Global Manufacturing Group from Maryborough and Laserdyn Technologies from the Gold Coast. These companies and others will have the opportunity to supply into Rheinmetall's Boxer vehicle for the Australian market and also to enter Rheinmetall's global supply chain for their many other military projects. Local industry will benefit from the transfer of skills and technology that will increase many enterprises' global competitiveness and export potential in their own right.

Queensland's selection by a global defence giant like Rheinmetall is no accident. My department and I have put a lot of hard yards into this one for the future business opportunities and for the future high-skill jobs we want here in this great state.

Construction Industry, Suicide Prevention

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (10.00 am): In line with our election commitment, the Palaszczuk government is committed to doing everything possible to prevent suicide in the construction industry. Construction is a challenging trade. Our young tradies have a suicide rate of two to three times higher than the general community. The average age of suicide amongst construction workers in Queensland is just 36 years old.

In recognition of these challenges, a high-level delegation of industry stakeholders including employers, builders and unions together approached me as the responsible minister to request additional funding needed to tackle suicide in the construction industry. That is why recently the government announced \$1 million in funding over 18 months for suicide prevention organisation Mates in Construction to expand its already successful program to small businesses and to rural and remote


areas. Mates in Construction, or Mates as they are generally known, is a fantastic organisation making a real difference in reducing the high incidence of suicide in the construction industry, particularly amongst young men.

Last month I was proud to welcome Broncos captain Darius Boyd as Mates's inaugural ambassador at a small ceremony at The Landscape Construction Company at Red Hill. Darius is a great model for Queenslanders and his association with Mates was a natural fit for him. I cannot think of a better Mates ambassador than Darius Boyd, captain of the Broncos, premiership winner and Clive Churchill medallist, Australian player and, of course, a proud Queensland. Darius has confronted his own mental health issues. He knows full well the importance of reaching out and acknowledging when he needs help. I know he sees himself making a real difference in this role and I thank him for taking on this challenge.

The impact of suicide is devastating, affecting families, work colleagues, communities, service providers and first responders. This funding will help Mates spread the message in rural and remote areas that suicide is a workplace issue that we all need to address together. I am very much looking forward to working with Mates and Darius in the future.

The Palaszczuk government believes in investing in services that matter to Queenslanders, unlike the member for Clayfield, who only wanted to cut, sack and sell.

Cladding Audit Taskforce

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (10.02 am): Earlier this year, the government stood up an audit task force to examine the use of potentially nonconforming or noncompliant cladding on Queensland buildings. The task force comprises expert officers from the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and the Department of Housing and Public Works and currently reports through the Department of Housing and Public Works to me. Not only is the task force undertaking its work assessing Queensland buildings; it has also been a driving force in coordinating national activities and chairing meetings of similar groups of agencies that are being created across the nation.

My sole focus, the government's sole focus and what should be the sole focus of every member in this place is on supporting these officers as they conduct their work. No one in this place should opportunistically try to politicise or sensationalise the work of this task force. Let me be clear; I am not referring to, or criticising, the question sincerely asked of me by the member for Cairns earlier this week. I am pleased that the member for Cairns was able to receive a briefing from my agency that afternoon.

An orderly, methodical approach which avoids needless speculation is certainly something desired by the Property Council of Queensland, who have written to me. They said—

As you know the property industry is actively working with the Queensland Government to assess and address potential risks from non-conforming building products.

Public safety is the industry's primary concern.

We strongly support the systematic approach which is being taken by the Queensland Government to work collaboratively with property owners to share information, determine risk, and take appropriate action where there is concern that non-conforming cladding has been used.


It is clear that the work of the task force will continue for several weeks to come. This work must not be interrupted or delayed. Because this government's first priority is always to protect Queenslanders, we have made arrangements to ensure that interruptions or delays will not occur.

I am pleased to advise the House that the government has appointed Hon. Terry Mackenroth as an independent chair overseeing the governance of the audit task force. I am grateful to the Premier for accepting my recommendation that Mr Mackenroth be appointed. I am pleased that Terry has agreed to take up this important voluntary, unpaid role as a continued service to the state that he has served so well. Mr Mackenroth will convene the agencies each week and give them great support and leadership. He will report to me on the progress of the task force. He brings a unique mix of experience relevant to the task force's work. As members know, over the course of his distinguished career he was not only treasurer and deputy premier but also minister for housing, local government and planning. Terry Mackenroth was also the minister for police and emergency services during the creation of what is now the modern Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. This considerable experience, coupled with his considerable skill, will stand the task force in good stead. Terry's insights and leadership will be invaluable for the task force as it continues its diligent work.

Queenslanders should be assured that the Palaszczuk government is going to every effort to get ahead of these potentially dangerous products and stay ahead. The task force will continue to take an approach based upon an abundance of caution.

This is complex and involved work and will take time to be completed. This is not a problem that is unique to Queensland, but Queensland is leading the nation when it comes to tackling these potentially dangerous products. Our action, coupled with our truly world-class Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, means that we are leaps ahead of other jurisdictions here in Australia and abroad. I look forward to updating the House on the task force's progress under the guidance of Mr Mackenroth.


Powering North Queensland Plan

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (10.07 am): I am pleased to rise to speak about what this government is doing about energy in the north because for far too many years there has been no plan. It has taken a Labor government to do the hard yards and put together a plan that creates a secure energy future and at the same time stabilise energy prices. We already have half a dozen power stations in the pipeline, which will generate 100 per cent renewable energy. These include large-scale solar farms in Townsville and surrounding regions such as Ross River, Clare, Kidston, Lakeland, Collinsville and Normanton and a massive wind farm at Mount Emerald. These projects are expected to provide a \$1.6 billion boost to our economy and support more than 1,400 jobs during construction.

We released our Powering North Queensland Plan in June, which unlocks a series of energy projects to power the North Queensland economy and positions us and, more importantly, our children and their children to have a clean energy future. Powering North Queensland invests \$386 million to unlock additional renewable energy projects and support up to 5,000 jobs in the region. This includes a \$150 million reinvestment of Powerlink dividends for the study and development of the proposed transmission line. It will support 1,000 jobs for Powerlink and 3,600 jobs during construction of the proposed renewable energy projects. There is also \$100 million for a feasibility study into the proposed hydro-electric power station at Burdekin Falls Dam, which could support up to 200 jobs. We are also making sure that the Burdekin Falls Dam will continue to meet design standards with \$136 million towards improvement works. That is estimated to support around 250 jobs. These projects will help the Palaszczuk government open the door for the north to become a hub for the renewable manufacturing and services industry.

Our plan will power North Queensland communities and industries with energy and jobs for the future. It builds on our ongoing efforts to stabilise electricity prices for regional Queensland. During the next 12 to 18 months there will be thousands of jobs created across construction, transport, ports design and planning. These jobs are exactly what North Queensland needs. There is simply no need for a new coal-fired power plant: it will only take Queensland taxpayers back to the 19th century. We can have a clean energy future, and we can get there by working together with industry and making smart decisions that benefit all, including the north.

Queensland Indigenous Procurement Policy


 **Hon. M FURNER** (Ferny Grove—ALP) (Minister for Local Government and Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships) (10.10 am): The Palaszczuk government is committed to growing the economy and creating jobs, especially for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. We know that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people do not participate equally in the labour market. The unemployment rate for Indigenous Queenslanders is 18 per cent—three times—higher than the rate for non-Indigenous Queenslanders. That is why increasing economic participation for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people is a clear objective of the Palaszczuk government.

I am pleased to say that a new whole-of-government initiative has been launched to support the growth and development of Indigenous businesses and employment. The Queensland Indigenous Procurement Policy aims to increase the value of government contracts that are awarded to Indigenous businesses, support the Indigenous business sector and boost jobs for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Queenslanders. Under our new policy, we will require that by the year 2022 three per cent of what is spent on Queensland government contracts is awarded to Indigenous businesses. We know that this is achievable, and we are working across government to not only meet the target but also harness the growth we have seen in the Indigenous sector to beat it.

Through this initiative the Palaszczuk government will increase the proportion of the total spend on goods and services supplied by Indigenous businesses; support and link Indigenous businesses in the Queensland government supply chain; and support non-Indigenous businesses to increase their Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander workforce when supplying to the Queensland government. Following on from the Buy Queensland initiative, the new Queensland Indigenous Procurement policy will change how government partners with Indigenous businesses to obtain goods, services, capital works and infrastructure. This initiative will create or support viable employment options within Indigenous communities because we know that Indigenous businesses are significantly more likely to employ Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people.

Our new procurement policy is backing Queensland jobs. It is about levelling the playing field to ensure that local businesses—particularly Indigenous businesses—can get a fair share of government procurement. My department is working to undertake a range of implementation activities to support this wonderful policy, which will commence on 1 September. I look forward to discussing our new policy further and exploring more ways Indigenous businesses can thrive at our Investing Together Forum in Townsville next week.

Queensland Training Awards


 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (10.12 am): Creating jobs for Queenslanders is the Palaszczuk government's top priority, and it is vital that people have access to the training they need to secure real jobs and opportunities. For 56 years the Queensland Training Awards have become synonymous with excellence in training—shining the spotlight on those who are the very best in their fields. In total there are 14 award categories for apprentices, trainees, vocational students, teachers and trainers, as well as training providers, employers and community based organisations to showcase all that is great about VET in Queensland.

From more than 800 applications across the state 225 talented individuals and organisations were shortlisted to compete at seven regional finals across Queensland in July 2017. I was fortunate enough to attend some of these regional final events, which were a fabulous opportunity to celebrate the achievements of all of our finalists. Seventy-seven regional winners now progress to the state finals of the Queensland Training Awards, which will be held in Brisbane on 1 September. This will round off a series of National Skills Week events. It was a pleasure to attend a number of the regional finals to recognise firsthand the achievements of the nominees and finalists. In Townsville the North Queensland Vocational Student of the Year is Robert Douma. Robert's pathway to training has been a long one. After enlisting in the Australian Defence Force, Robert felt that he needed to experience more of the world before he could focus on his true passion: art. Following the successful completion of an Advanced Diploma of Visual Arts, Robert is now enrolled in a Bachelor of Arts degree which he juggles alongside a full-time tattooing apprenticeship.

The success of these finalists is a testament to the strength of Queensland's training sector from both public and private providers. Robert is just one example of the quality of each and every one of the finalists. Robert and his fellow state finalists represent the value of VET for Queenslanders. They are shining examples of the quality of the Queensland VET sector. I wish him and all of the other regional winners the best of luck for the state awards on Friday, 1 September. I hope to visit some of the nominees when I visit Wide Bay as part of the Governing from the Regions event in September.

NOTICE OF MOTION


Minister for Corrective Services

 **Mr MANDER** (Everton—LNP) (10.15 am): I give notice that I shall move—

That this House has no confidence in the Minister for Corrective Services following his treatment of the Pullen family.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

ID Scanners

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (10.15 am): The Attorney-General, who is responsible for liquor licensing, has a reputation for bungles, cover-ups and stuff-ups, and, I might say, not only in this parliament—as the member for Ferny Grove knows all too well from the federal parliament. Hasn't the

Attorney-General created a right royal mess of the ID scanners! This week the Attorney-General said, 'It's just teething problems.' I have three kids who have all had teething problems. The Attorney-General has put herself in one of those situations where you are standing out in the middle of an oval, you feel a big hole open and you just want the earth to swallow you up, because that is the week the Attorney-General has had with respect to this right royal mess. Yesterday she squawked that these are LNP laws. If they were LNP laws, where is the implementation panel? She abolished the implementation panel which was designed to sort out any implementation issues, but she arrogantly said that she knows best so she knew what to do.

Every day this week we have had a different story about what happened at Jade Buddha with Crown Prince Frederik. The police blame the OLGR; the OLGR blame the police. The minister said, 'Rules are rules. They apply to everybody.' Then the Police Commissioner denied that the Crown Prince was turned away and said that he was granted access. He said that he was 'whisked right through.' Strangely, the Attorney-General—who said that rules are rules and they apply to everyone—retweeted the tweet of the Police Commissioner. Despite saying the same day that 'rules are rules', she then retweeted the tweet and said that he had been 'whisked in' and there was no issue. Surely, he should have been asked for ID. Are you confused yet, colleagues? I certainly am.

Yesterday they released CCTV footage which shows that the Crown Prince was in fact turned away. The Police Commissioner came out yesterday afternoon at a press conference and said that the police did break the laws, but common sense should prevail. He apologised to Jade Buddha. Is the Police Commissioner saying that the police were right to whisk Crown Prince Frederik straight in, or is he saying that the police should have asked for ID? I am really confused as to what the government's strategy is with respect to ID scanners. Is there one rule for Queenslanders and another rule for everyone else? Is there one rule for the elite and one rule for everyone else who wants to go out?

Minister, the LNP did not implement this policy. This is on you, Minister. There was no public education campaign with respect to this. We had the State of Origin, and the OLGR said that the Caxton was denied approval for extended trading hours because the State of Origin is not culturally significant to Queensland. WTF? The State of Origin is not culturally significant to Queensland? The minister came out and said, 'No, that's not true,' but letters were released to show that it is true.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The member for Kawana might like to use abbreviations, but I do think his abbreviation is unparliamentary and I ask that he withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Kawana, will you please withdraw those comments. They are unparliamentary.

Mr BLEIJIE: I withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: I remind all members to please speak through the chair and not across the chamber.

Member for Clayfield

Ms Grace interjected.



Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games) (10.19 am): I take that interjection from the member for Brisbane Central: the member for Kawana is a big part of the reason we are sitting on this side of the House today.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Thank you, one and all. This is the Minister for Education's opportunity to share her thoughts with us.

Ms JONES: And aren't they looking forward to that? There is a veil of secrecy hanging over the head of the member for Clayfield. There is a veil of secrecy when it comes to the deal that the member for Clayfield has done with One Nation. There is a veil of secrecy hanging over the head of the member for Clayfield when it comes to his secret donations. Increasingly we are seeing that the member for Clayfield is unfit to be the premier of Queensland.


Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. I take offence at those particular comments and I ask the member to withdraw.

Mr SPEAKER: Will you withdraw the comments the member for Clayfield finds unparliamentary, please?

Ms JONES: I withdraw. It has been almost six months since it was first revealed that the honourable member for Clayfield's office was having direct conversations with One Nation about deals. At the time he said he did not know: 'I didn't know that my office—I had no idea that my office—one of his senior staff—was ringing up and meeting with One Nation.' That was his leadership response: 'I don't even know what's happening in my own office.' That is what the member for Clayfield said at the time. Apparently we are meant to believe that the member for Clayfield—the leader of the LNP—had no idea that his senior staff were wheeling and dealing with One Nation and then within weeks the LNP is polling in the member for Indooroopilly's seat about how people felt about a deal: 'How do you feel about a deal between the LNP and One Nation?' How did they feel!

The member for Clayfield expects Queenslanders to believe what he says when his own senior staff are having talks and discussions with One Nation, his own party is polling about a deal between the LNP and One Nation and how people feel about it, and what is his leadership response? 'I don't know anything about it! I'm the member for Clayfield and I have no idea.' Come on! It is about time that the member for Clayfield stood up for what he believes in, or is it the fact that he believes in nothing more than to cut, sack and sell? We know that that is what he stands for. Queenslanders know what he stands for. The member for Clayfield only believes in cutting, sacking and selling—selling people down the river. That is his modus operandi. He was called out on the fact that he would not stand up. Who by? I cannot believe I am quoting him, but Campbell Newman said that leaders take responsibility for the hard decisions that have to be made. It is time for the member for Clayfield to show who his secret donors are. What deals did he do with the secret donors and what has he promised them?

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Performance

 **Mr EMERSON** (Indooroopilly—LNP) (10.22 am): Queenslanders are now witnessing a bitterly divided Labor government that has lost control of parliament and is at full-blown war with itself. This Trad Labor Palaszczuk government is a government of cons, costs, crisis and, according to its own MP, corruption. We have seen the spectacle of the government losing four votes—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. There has been a reference made to the Palaszczuk-Trad Labor government. You have made rulings before in this House, Mr Speaker, that members have striven to abide by and I ask that you either provide guidance or revise the ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Yes, I have made comments in the past in relation to some words that the government members were using in relation to the opposition and I will be consistent with my findings.

Mr EMERSON: As I said, this is a government of cons, costs, crisis and, according to its own MP, corruption. We have seen the spectacle of the government losing four votes in just two days—unprecedented in Queensland politics, a government losing four votes in two days! We have a lame duck Premier unable to control her own MPs, unable to control her own deputy and unable to govern this state without having to ask the unions first. This poor Premier, who is now facing a full-blown civil war, says that she is hurt by all of this. The reality is that she is probably hurt because her own incompetence is now on display for all Queenslanders to see, as is her own impotence in the face of the unions. Today we have even witnessed the lawless CFMEU stare down this lame duck Premier, issuing her with a stark warning. How utterly embarrassing for this Premier! This Premier does not have the spine to punt the member for Bundamba. She does not have the guts to stand up to the CFMEU—except if it is to get a selfie with the likes of Dave Hanna. She does not have the guts to stand up to the member for Bundamba.

There has been a long list of Labor MPs who have lined up to criticise their own incompetent Labor government. Let us not forget the damaging comments from that self-proclaimed union thug the member for Maryborough when he lifted the lid on the looming Commonwealth Games crisis. We have even heard today from former Labor MPs on ABC Radio this morning throwing even more mud in this Palaszczuk Labor government civil war. The piece de resistance came from the member for Bundamba, who has been sitting up the back there biding her time waiting for the right moment and then boom—the great parliamentary tactician the Deputy Premier handed it to her on a plate and she went nuclear. The member for Bundamba had the guts to say how it is. We know that many on the backbench support her stance and have privately applauded her for her actions. We know that many of those opposite have in fact urged the member for Bundamba to speak her mind and put everything on the table. This is a government that is of cons, costs, crisis and corruption. This is a government that is divided—at war with itself—and quite frankly unfit to govern this state.

(Time expired)

Liberal National Party, Performance



Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment) (10.27 am): The shadow Treasurer just had three minutes to try and refute the good economic news that I handed down today and yet again he has failed. He wants to talk about Cs. He wants to keep talking about the three Cs. Why does he not add an extra C, but it is not what members would think: it is 'Crisafulli', because Crisafulli is coming and he is going to be getting your job clearly when he gets into this place. I had better not be too hard on the member for Indooroopilly though. He is well balanced. The member for Indooroopilly is well balanced: he has a chip on both shoulders!

Earlier I spoke about Labor's very good economic news and I can say that it is because of our economic and fiscal management, which has seen the economy grow and the creation of 94,500 jobs. Our plan has overseen 94,500 net new jobs created in this state without the need to cut, sack or sell. What do we see from this lazy opposition under the leadership of the lazy member for Clayfield? While we have been bringing confidence back and while we have been growing the economy and creating jobs, those opposite have been opposing our budget measures—our responsible budget measures. They have been racking up a bill and it is all there on the LNP 'spendometer'. I table a graph showing the LNP's unfunded promises.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'LNP SPENDOMETER—Total unfunded election promises' [1443].

Let us go through this. There is \$2.5 billion for the Roma Street educational and entertainment precinct with a new sports and entertainment arena—kerching!; \$1 billion for a South Bank science academy and aquarium—kerching!; and at least \$2.5 billion for a North Queensland coal-fired power station—kerching! Last night while seeking to score cheap political points they have actually added even more to the 'spendometer'. Just last night they voted to bypass a feasibility study on the Tully-Millstream project, and that is going to add another \$4.2 billion to the forward estimates—kerching! Then there are the revenue measures that they have opposed such as the defined benefits scheme surplus repatriation worth \$2 billion that we are putting towards infrastructure and debt retirement and \$2 billion from pausing the additional employer contributions to the scheme.

These are just a handful of the LNP's decisions which bring the LNP 'spendometer' to at least \$19 billion. If we add to this very long list the very fast train, the cost could top \$48 billion. We are now at the business end of the electoral cycle. Let us get some facts and some honesty from the LNP. The LNP must tell us what they will cut and who they will sack to prop up their unfunded promises. They must come clean on what assets they would sell. Will the lazy opposition leader go back to his 'wrong choices' and massively raise taxes, fees and charges? The LNP 'spendometer' is in overdrive. They will sack, cut or sell their way to government if they can. It is clear which side of the House is the responsible economic and fiscal manager—and it ain't the LNP.

Youth Detention



Mr WALKER (Mansfield—LNP) (10.30 am): We all know that this Labor government has been soft on crime, winding back everything from strong criminal gang laws to sensible juvenile crime measures. They have put the rights of offenders ahead of the safety of Queensland families. Last weekend, media reports uncovered Labor's secret scheme to ease overcrowding concerns in youth detention centres—that is, to build youth detention houses across the suburbs of Queensland. This is yet another con, cost and crisis foisted on the people of Queensland by a government riven by dissension and deceit. It is a further indictment on this Labor government that Queenslanders learned of these secret suburban detention houses through the media.

This has all come as a result of Labor's con job, knee-jerk transferral of 17-year-olds from adult prisons to youth detention centres without a proper plan to do so safely. Our youth detention centres are already at capacity and have been in crisis under the Attorney-General's mismanagement, with continual riots and lockdowns and staff safety put at significant risk. It has cost taxpayers over \$1.2 million to repair the damage.

If Labor cannot manage youth in these detention centres, what chaos will descend on suburban streets from detention houses? Labor's desperate determination to transfer 17-year-olds in November is like pouring kerosene on an open fire and has led to this poorly thought through solution. Labor's scheme means that young offenders charged with any type of offence, including serious violent offences, could be held in houses right next door to families across the state. There has been no consultation and no details provided on this secret scheme. Is it any wonder why?

Now we know why the Attorney-General was so coy when she was asked at estimates about the \$16.9 million allocated in the budget to alleviate overcrowding and capacity issues in our youth detention system. The Attorney claimed at the time that it was still being developed, but we know now that her secret plan was for these suburban detention houses.

Labor will not come clean about the cost of these suburban detention houses. Labor will not come clean about where these suburban detention houses will be located. Labor will not come clean about which of those charged will live in these suburban detention houses. Is it any wonder Queenslanders have no confidence that Labor will keep our community safe, given this level of secrecy?

It is clear that the government's commitments to openness and transparency are nothing more than empty rhetoric, with a series of secret reports and continual cover-ups such as the debacle we saw earlier this year with the Attorney-General's review into whether there was institutional abuse in our youth detention centres. A 600-page report could not answer that fundamental question and had a third of its findings covered up.

I call on the Premier to come clean with the people of Queensland, to end the cover-up and to reveal Labor's secret scheme, including locations, to Queenslanders. She must do what she said she would do and consult with local communities, which may have one of these suburban detention houses right next door.

REPORT

Office of the Speaker



Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I lay upon the table of the House the *Statement for public disclosure: expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017*.

Tabled paper: Statement for Public Disclosure: Expenditure of the Office of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017 [[1444](#)].

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will end at 11.33 am.

Youth Detention



Mr NICHOLLS (10.33 am): Will the Premier confirm that her government's answer to overcrowding in youth detention centres is to put youth offenders who have been charged with potentially serious offences back into the community in suburban detention houses that could spring up in streets and suburbs throughout Queensland?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. First of all, let us talk about the decision this government took. This government took a very significant and important reform decision—that is, to adopt the UN convention to ensure that 17-year-olds are not housed in adult correctional facilities. This brings us into line with every other state across the nation and sees us adopting world's best practice.

During the LNP's three years of government, when the Leader of the Opposition was the treasurer of this state, he had every opportunity to do the right thing by Queenslanders, to adopt not just Australia's national best practice but also world's best practice. My government has decided to do that and will ensure that we follow through with that decision. Unlike those opposite, who trashed the youth justice system in this state, who cut staff in this state—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Members, I am having difficulty hearing the Premier.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They cut staff in this state. They abolished one of the most effective programs, youth justice conferencing. From my recollection, that program had a success rate of over 95 per cent. The young offender would sit down with the victim—

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The Leader of the Opposition has asked a question about an important issue, raised by the shadow Attorney-General, about which I think the people of Queensland deserve an answer. I do not think the Premier's standing up and attacking the former government provides the information that the people of Queensland deserve.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Callide. I urge the Premier to not debate the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: As I was saying, figures from the Children's Court of Queensland in 2012 showed that 95 per cent of participants reached an agreement in that conference, 98 per cent of participants were satisfied with the resolution reached and 97 per cent would tell a friend to undergo—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Thank you, members. The Premier has the call.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are here talking about the whole spectrum of youth justice. Let me make it very clear that my aim is to break the cycle of offending.

Mr NICHOLLS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. The Premier has gone everywhere but to the question of whether her government's policy is to return people who have committed potentially serious offences into youth detention centres in the suburbs.

Mr SPEAKER: I ask the Premier to make her answer relevant to the question.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There are no youth detention centres in the suburbs. I reject what the Leader of the Opposition is saying. It is also unacceptable in this day and age to have such a high incarceration rate of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in this state. We will address all of those issues. Training and education are fundamental to breaking that cycle.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. I think you have answered the question.

Youth Detention

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is also to the Premier. In light of the Premier's failure to consult with Queenslanders about putting youth offenders back into the community in suburban detention houses, will the Premier produce the list of proposed secret detention houses?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. I reject the premise of that question that they are suburban detention centres. I reject that outright. My government is looking at a range of reforms to tackle and break this cycle of offending in this state. Young people need education, training and a job. My government is tackling all of those issues because it is the right thing to do. For the three years those opposite were in office they did nothing to try to break that cycle.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I would urge you not to debate the question with the opposition.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Their answer was to abolish youth justice conferencing, to name and shame young offenders, to establish boot camps in this state. I recall that there were escapes from the first boot camp that was set up by the former attorney-general. We had an Auditor-General's report talking about how ineffective the boot camp strategy was. Finally we have an Attorney-General focused on addressing all of these issues, who is more than happy to talk about these issues, unlike those opposite, who had to hide away the former attorney-general for a period of—what was it?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I am now looking for members to name under standing order 253A or other standing orders. I put members on notice. I am having difficulty hearing the Premier. Premier, do you have anything further you wish to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do. Five million dollars was cut from youth justice by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order on relevance. The question was will the Premier release the list of these suburban detention houses.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. In attempting to restate the question, the Leader of the Opposition has attempted to rephrase it by changing some of the words and I do not think we should fall for that.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not have a brilliant memory, but I think the Premier indicated earlier in her contribution that she rejected the premise of the question. She has answered the question.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has a point of order in relation to your relevance. Have you anything new to add to your answer that is relevant, otherwise I will ask you to resume your seat?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, I do, because we are talking about youth justice here. I am prepared to pinpoint and call out those opposite—\$5 million in cuts which would have impacted on training and getting people into employment.

Mr SPEAKER: I think we will move on. Member for Gympie, I can see and hear you very clearly. I can also see and hear you, member for Gaven. I am informed that we have students from the West End State School in the electorate of South Brisbane observing our proceedings in the gallery today. Welcome.

Public Assets

Mrs GILBERT: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the government's policy in relation to public ownership of assets and outline any alternative policies?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Mackay very much for that question. We on this side of the House stopped the sale of assets in this state. We honoured our election commitment, unlike those opposite. What did they do?

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. The member for Redlands is interjecting loudly. You have had a good go this morning. You are on the list. You are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We kept our assets in government hands and through our \$1 billion Powering Queensland Plan we are making sure our assets work for us. We are putting downward pressure on the future wholesale price which has seen a drop of around 20 per cent in Queensland. In those other states where they have sold the assets they have seen almost double-digit increases in their electricity power prices because they do not own their assets. We will keep our energy assets in public hands. I challenge those opposite to. Unfortunately, One Nation has not been very clear about whether or not they will keep—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Premier, I apologise for interrupting your speech when you are on a roll. The member for Hinchinbrook is also on a roll—it has been the same roll all morning. You are warned under standing order 253A. I find your comments are designed to disrupt the Premier in her answer. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We have been very unsure as to where One Nation sits in relation to this issue according to its website. We know that One Nation has a policy that has been very clear in relation to the Western Australia election where they plan to give \$2.3 billion over four years of our Queensland GST back into Western Australia. I reject that. I will stand up to that and I will ensure that that \$2.3 billion stays in Queensland to build our hospitals and to build our schools.

Ms Jones: What is Tim doing about it?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection.

Mr DICKSON: I rise to a point of order. The Premier's statement would be very relevant if she was in the Western Australia parliament.

Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Ms PALASZCZUK: So they accept it! They admit it! One Nation—\$2.3 billion. He has admitted it today.

Ms Jones: Now what's Tim doing?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection.

Mr SPEAKER: No, Premier, not yet. Member for Buderim, you have been here for some time—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: You've got your hearing aid in. Member for Buderim, you have been here for some time. I find that is a frivolous point of order and you are now warned under standing order 253A. Seriously, it is question time.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that as an interjection. I will have that on the public record, thank you very much. I take the member for Ashgrove's interjection asking what the Leader of the Opposition does when it comes to deals with One Nation. Let me make it very clear: Labor will not do a deal with One Nation. Last month the *Courier-Mail* contacted my office and asked me to provide a stat dec as a matter of urgency because it needed to be published in that paper. That stat dec has not been published, so I table it here in the Queensland parliament. That reaffirms my commitment not to do a deal with One Nation. Today I challenge the Leader of the Opposition to provide a similar stat dec.

Tabled paper: Statutory Declaration by the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, in relation to Labor not entering deals with One Nation at upcoming State Election [1445].

The *Courier-Mail* told me that it was a matter of urgency that I forward that signed stat dec for them to publish in their paper. That has not been published in the paper, so today I table it for all Queenslanders to see that I will not do a deal with One Nation, either before or after the election. The challenge today, the test of leadership, is for the Leader of the Opposition to table his stat dec in the House for all Queenslanders to see.

Youth Detention

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that one of Labor's secret suburban detention houses was originally slated for Cornwall Street in Annerley?

Mrs D'ATH: There are no detention centres or detention houses proposed. I take this opportunity to talk about the important issue of youth justice reform and the transition of 17-year-olds. Once again those on the other side have squibbed on where they stand on the issue of 17-year-olds. The flimsy policy—

Mr SPEAKER: I urge the Attorney-General not to debate the question with the member for Indooroopilly. You are welcome to speak to the topic in your answer.

Mrs D'ATH: The opposition is asking questions of the government using the terminology 'detention centres' and 'detention houses'. These questions are being framed this way for one reason and one reason only: to create fear in the community. It is scaremongering. It is what the LNP do best and it is what they do often. They go out to try to create fear in this community.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I urge you not to debate it with the member for Indooroopilly. Do you have anything further to add?

Mrs D'ATH: The opposition are asking questions that are designed for one reason. I am responding to the question around detention centres or detention houses. They are seeking to create fear in the community. What they are trying to do and what they intend to do is as clear as anything. Those on the other side of the chamber are disingenuous when they talk about these issues. They talk about initiatives around detention and remand in this state. They should look at the Children's Court annual reports that I tabled the other day. They show the decrease in youth crime in 2014-15. Those on the other side like to refer to that, and have in their little flyer that they call a policy. While acknowledging the decrease in youth crime, the reports also acknowledge that at the same time there was a significant increase in cautions by police. In other words, under those opposite, the police chose to caution young people as opposed to charging them, which saw a reduction in youth crime figures in this state.

I have no objection to the police using their powers appropriately to do that. However, those on the other side want to run around Queensland saying, 'We're tough on crime. We'll charge them and lock them up.' We will guarantee youth crime rates will go up and there will be more recidivism under an LNP government, because that is what their policy does. They do not tell all the facts. They do not say that what actually happened under their government was that fewer kids were charged as a consequence of policies adopted at the time. They are not genuine when they talk about 'soft on crime' and 'tough on crime'. They are scaremongering.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you for your interjection, member for Hinchinbrook. You were spot on.

Cross River Rail

Mr MADDEN: My question without notice is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier update the House on construction industry interest in the Cross River Rail project?

Ms TRAD: I acknowledge the interest of the member for Ipswich West in building infrastructure that the South-East Queensland region and the whole of Queensland need. We are getting on with delivering Cross River Rail. As I advised the House only two days ago, next week we will be hosting an industry briefing. This will be the first opportunity for construction and related firms to hear firsthand about the procurement process and the time frames around the delivery of this project. It has been just two days and already we have had more than 400 people register their interest in attending. In two days, 400 people from construction and associated firms have said they want to turn up to the briefing session next week. That shows how much interest and support there is for this game-changing project.

However, it is not just industry that supports it; we know that others support it. As I have said in this place, Graham Quirk has put on the record that he will not say a bad word about the project, because he knows it is needed, along with Metro. I was also impressed by the comments made by the LNP Deputy Mayor of the Brisbane City Council, Mr Adrian Schrinner. He said—

Ultimately we've got to get this locked in and just got to get cracking on it and I know that's what's happening now, which is fantastic.

He could not have said that when those opposite were in charge. He could not have said that when the member for Clayfield was treasurer and cancelled the project. He could not have said it then.

It is clear that it is only those opposite who stand in the way of delivering this project. The member for Clayfield has waged a relentless campaign to white-ant this project. He has cut it once and I believe, as does every person on this side of the House, that if he were to return to this side of the House he would cut this project again. If that is the case, he needs to stand in this place and tell all of those industry and construction firms that if they vote for him at the next election he will axe this project. He needs to tell the thousands of Queensland workers who will work on this job, including all of the apprentices and trainees that this project will employ into the future—those young workers who will see their full qualification done throughout the five years of construction on this project—that he will cancel it if he wins government. He needs to come clean with the people of Queensland around where he stands on this project, because if he does not there will be a lot of disappointed Queenslanders after the next election if he were to win, just like there was in 2012 when he came in to cut, sack and sell.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Mansfield, I am informed that we have students from St Mary's College in the electorate of Ipswich observing our proceedings from the gallery. Welcome.

Youth Detention

Mr WALKER: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General confirm that the proposed suburban detention house or, as the spokesperson for the Premier quaintly calls them, supervised bail facilities—

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. The Premier and the Attorney-General have made it clear that there are no suburban detention centres proposed. The repeated reference to suburban detention centres is deliberately misleading the parliament. Mr Speaker, I ask you to make a ruling.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, when I am taking advice from the Clerk, it is not an open invitation to have a squabble across the chamber. I find there is no point of order. If government members feel aggrieved by the tone of the question, they can raise the matter with me after question time in relation to those concerns. I will allow the member for Mansfield to ask the question. Member for Mansfield, please ask your question.

Mr WALKER: Can the Attorney-General confirm that the proposed suburban detention house or, as the spokesperson for the Premier called them, supervised bail facilities—and I table the *Courier-Mail* article referring to that—for Cornwall Street, Annerley, in the electorate of South Brisbane was scuttled by the Deputy Premier after works on that site had already commenced?

Tabled paper. Article from the *Courier-Mail* online, dated 19 August 2017, titled 'Bail house plan to tackle overcrowding in Queensland's youth detention centres' [1446].

Mrs D'ATH: I am happy to talk on this issue again to remind those opposite that this strategy of theirs is all about fear and scaremongering in the community. Those opposite will not be honest with Queenslanders about how their youth crime figures—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I would urge you not to debate the subject. Do you have anything further to add?

Mrs D'ATH: As I indicated earlier this week when talking about youth justice, there are a range of measures that this government is looking at in relation to the transition of 17-year-olds. We have made that very clear because we are absolutely committed to actually reducing youth offending and recidivism in this state. To do that we actually have to do more than come out with a five-point plan on one piece of paper that seeks to simply increase the number of charges and offences which in turn will mean more kids going into youth detention centres. We laid out that we were looking at an alternative—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Attorney-General, I would urge you not to debate the issue and make your answer relevant to the question. Do you have anything further you wish to add, otherwise we will move on?

Mrs D'ATH: Yes. I can advise those on the other side that there is no detention centre/detention house in Annerley.

Queensland Economy

Mr KING: My question is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and Investment. Will the Treasurer advise the House of the success of the Palaszczuk government's economic plan implemented over the past three state budgets and any alternative fiscal strategies?

Mr PITT: I thank the honourable member for the question. As the member knows, our responsible economic and fiscal management has seen growth higher, debt lower, unemployment lower and business confidence higher in this state. All of our measures are in the budgets—in surplus budgets—and are all fully costed.

We have been able to do all of this without cutting, sacking and selling like those opposite have become addicted to. In contrast to our responsible management, the LNP's spendometer of unfunded commitments is now at least \$19 billion, and could be as high as \$48 billion. This is an absolute disgrace. It is typical of the laziness of the opposition.

We know that Queenslanders rejected their cut, sack, sell mentality. If we had not done what we have done we know that there would be a significant difference. If we look at the LNP's unfunded commitments—look at their spendometer—they would have us tracking to over \$100 billion in debt. I cannot believe the irony of me having to say that after they used that phrase so many times when they were last in government—threatening people that that is what Labor would lead to. This is exactly where they are headed. It is an absolute disgrace. That is their approach.

I will go through the list of some of the things they cut in their last iteration of government. They said that public sector workers had nothing to fear—14,000 people were sacked. We know that that was a Campbell Newman led initiative. We know that the member for Clayfield, the lazy opposition leader, is cut from the same cloth as the former premier of this state. We know that what has been done before will happen again.

The reason I know that is that one of the favourite phrases of the member for Clayfield is 'if you want to look at future performance, you only need to look at past performance. It is one of the best judges and measures.' We know that that is his favourite saying. It is so true when it comes to the member for Clayfield.

What I am asking today is: how will they pay for these commitments? Whether it is \$19 billion or \$48 billion, we know that they will go to the well of their undisclosed donors. They could ask them to chip in for this. There could be at least 100,000 of them if they only donate \$1,000 each, but there could be more. If they do not go to those donors—because there is not enough of those donors—they could go to the five million people across Queensland. What if they decided to take an Obama style crowd funding approach? They would not be asking for \$2 donations. They would not be asking for \$5 donations. They would be asking for donations of more than \$9,600 per person—every man, woman and child—in Queensland to pay for the LNP spendometer.

It is clear that they have no ideas. They would have no idea how to pay for their ideas if they had them. They will continue to cut, sack and sell their way to government.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Everton, I wish to apologise to the member for Buderim. No offence was intended when I referred to your hearing aids.

Mr DICKSON: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. I appreciate that.

Youth Detention

Mr MANDER: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier suspend putting youth offenders into the community until the government has properly consulted with Queenslanders, other than the member for South Brisbane, about the location for these secret, suburban detention houses—AKA supervised bail accommodation options?

Ms PALASZCZUK: My government is seeking to tackle all aspects of the issue of youth offending. I think as a society we need to recognise that young people end up in detention for a whole range of reasons and a whole range of complex reasons. That is why we need to seriously look at and address those underlying issues and causes to break the cycle of reoffending. All of our youth justice measures will be an attempt to break youth offending in this state.

When I talk about the key elements of that work, I mean things such as moving to an evidence based, developmentally appropriate system which acknowledges the risks and needs of different age cohorts in the youth justice system. Secondly, and very importantly, there needs to be careful assessment of each child and young person's development, cognitive ability, health, welfare—

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. The question was about whether the Premier would consult with Queenslanders who might like to express the same views that the member for South Brisbane expressed about one of these facilities ending up in their street. Could I ask the Premier to indicate, in response to the question, whether or not she is going to consult with Queenslanders about this?

Mr SPEAKER: Premier, I would urge you to make your answer relevant to the question asked.

Ms PALASZCZUK: This government is a consultative government. We get criticised—

Mr Seeney: How many public meetings have you had in Annerley?

Ms Trad: Why don't you come to one, Jeff?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I think that is fair. The member for Callide goes to South Brisbane and I go to Kingaroy. It is a date with destiny. When cabinet has finished its deliberations in relation to this suite of measures to address a holistic approach to breaking the offending, of course we will make a public statement and, as we always do, we will consult with stakeholders and consult with the community.

Let me reiterate what the Attorney-General said here today. All the opposition are seeking to do is to create fear. The last time they created fear—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I know that that is maybe where you want to go, Premier, but I find that is debating the question. We might move on, if that is all right.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Before I finish, Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: No. Do you have anything further to add that is relevant?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I do. I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge in the gallery students from my old school, St Mary's. I welcome them to Parliament House.

Mr SPEAKER: In that context, I am informed that we have more students from West End State School in the electorate of South Brisbane observing our proceedings. Welcome.

Schools, Information Technology

Mr KELLY: My question is to the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism, Major Events and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister please outline how the Palaszczuk government is supporting IT in Queensland schools?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. I also want to acknowledge the students who are in the gallery today. The Premier, a great St Mary's girl, made a promise when she became Premier that she would put education front and centre of her government. She has absolutely done that, with record funding for all schools in Queensland—Catholic, independent and state schools—from our government.

This includes acknowledging that we know that, for the young children who are in the gallery here today, their job is most likely going to require STEM skills—75 per cent of jobs into the future will need IT and STEM skills. That is why as a government we have been working really hard with our partners to provide those STEM skills in our schools. This includes doubling the number of schools that now have access to high-speed broadband through a deal we have done with Telstra.

In addition to that, Mr Speaker, you would have seen in the most recent budget \$140 million for IT support staff in schools. This was the very first time that a government of any persuasion has directly funded IT support workers in our schools. Once again, this is something that government members—and I acknowledge the former principal here—have said to me their schools need, and I am very pleased to be the minister who has delivered.

This stands in stark contrast to the way that IT was treated by the honourable member for Clayfield when he was the treasurer of this state. Today we have heard a lot of carping about consulting. All of a sudden they care about consulting. For 2½ years apparently we have done too much consulting, but now all of a sudden they want to do consulting. I do not know who they have been consulting about this decision to change their position on consulting!

Needless to say, do members know who was not consulted? The 270 staff cut from the IT department in Education. There was no consulting there when they cut 270 staff from the IT department in Education. That is how futuristic they were in their thinking: 'Do you know what we should do? Let's gut the IT department.' That was a brilliant idea! We know this is what they do. Their solution to any problem or any issue is to cut, sack and sell. Queenslanders know it. They know that Campbell Newman and Tim Nicholls are cut from the same cloth.

They know that the member for Clayfield has a mantra, and that is to cut, sack and sell. That is all he stands for. I used to know this man. He was a councillor in the BCC. He used to believe in things like gay marriage. He used to believe in children not being locked up. I do not know where he has gone. He has gone. What we have here today is evidence that there is no Liberal Party left here in Queensland. Their shameful scaremongering this morning shows what we have been saying for ages, and that is that the member for Clayfield is spineless and will not be a leader. He is unfit to be the premier of Queensland.

Government Advertising

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. I table a screenshot of a taxpayer funded advertisement of the Deputy Premier inspecting the Cross River Rail stand at the Ekka. This video is little more than shameless self-promotion and appears to be a breach—

Mr SPEAKER: Deputy Leader, just table it. We have got the message. Can you repeat the question without the document?

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Sure.

Tabled paper: Screenshot, undated, of tweet regarding Cross River Rail [1447].

The video, as evidenced in that advertisement, is little more than shameless self-promotion and appears to be a breach of the advertising code of conduct, and I ask: how is this—

A government member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: We will have a third go in a moment. Whoever was interjecting, you are now warned. Who was it?

Mr Cramp: Logan!

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Logan—

Mr King: It was me.

Mr SPEAKER: All right, we have a couple of members. Members for Kallangur and Logan, you are both warned under standing order 253A. I was not able to hear succinctly the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's question. You can have a third go.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I tabled a screenshot of a taxpayer funded advertisement of the Deputy Premier inspecting the Cross River Rail stand at the Ekka. The video is little more than a shameless self-promotion and appears to be in breach of the government advertising code of conduct, and I ask: how is that any different to the 2010 breach when then premier Bligh showed real leadership and ordered the member for Inala to repay taxpayers for another politically motivated rail advertisement? I table that.

Tabled paper: Document, dated October 2010, titled 'Darra to Springfield Transport Corridor—Stage 1' [1448].

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. I was wanting to draw to your attention that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition was using a prop rather than seeking to table a document. I accept now that the member has tabled the document. The way she was waving it around was out of kilter with standards that have been established in this place for some time.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for the question. On the face of it, it looks like a very nice photo. The Deputy Premier was encouraging people to come down to the Ekka and have a look at the Cross River Rail project, which is a major city-changing infrastructure project for this state. When I meet with the heads of banking corporations, as I regularly do, they say that this government is committed to infrastructure in this state and it is helping to drive the economy.

Mrs Frecklington: Are you going to answer the question?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I am answering the question. I also recall a Christmas card that the Leader of the Opposition circulated when he was the treasurer. What was on that Christmas card? Can anyone remember?

Ms Trad: Strong Choices.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Strong Choices. Let us have a look at the Christmas card.

Mr Nicholls: That won Christmas card of the year. You're just jealous.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. He loved that Christmas card so much. We can remind the people of Queensland about the strong choices that he went to the last election with about selling Queensland's assets. I will say one thing: the Deputy Premier looks much better than the Leader of the Opposition in his paraphernalia.

Whilst we are talking about Cross River Rail, Cross River Rail is committed by my government, and under my leadership we will build Cross River Rail in this state.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. I think you have answered the question.

Health Services

Ms PEASE: My question is to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister please inform the House what the Palaszczuk government is doing to restore front-line health services?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Lytton for her question and her recognition of properly funding public health services. The member for Lytton knows firsthand the importance of front-line public health services because, alongside the Premier, she campaigned long and hard against the cuts inflicted on her electorate by the then treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition, and the Newman LNP government. They moved to close the Wynnum Hospital. It was a terrible thing for her community. Under the leadership of the then opposition leader, now Premier, I know that the member for Lytton campaigned long and hard to restore those services. She has done that tirelessly, and I commend her for that. We are restoring those health services cut by the member for Clayfield.

Everyone knows that when the member for Clayfield was treasurer he took a sledgehammer to jobs, he dropped an anvil on the Queensland economy and he cut services across the length and breadth of Queensland. Nothing was spared in his relentless pursuit of ideology over Public Service—4,400 jobs cut from the public health system in Queensland, including 1,800 nurses and midwives. He is the only treasurer in the history of our state to cut funding to mental health. He was a treasurer who cut funding to the Red Cross; a treasurer who cut funding to healthy eating programs in tuckshops; a treasurer who cut 177 health promotion and prevention officers from Queensland Health; a treasurer who cut \$8 million in annual grants to provide health prevention including programs that supported Indigenous child health, alcohol and drug prevention workers and community nutritionists.

The member for Clayfield closed the Barrett Adolescent Centre. We have had a lot of discussion in this House from the member for Everton and others calling on people on this side of the House to apologise for their actions, which they have done, but when will the member for Clayfield apologise to those families? What a bunch of hypocrites. They want to lecture us about apologies but they will not apologise for something that was done to those families. Until the member for Clayfield apologises, all of their complaints about everything else, all of their complaints about the apologies we should render, will be absolutely hollow. This is a man who has cutting, selling and sacking in his DNA. The Leader of the Opposition, if he had the chance again, would do exactly the same to the people of Queensland.

(Time expired)

United Voice, Teacher Aides

Ms DAVIS: My question without notice is to the Premier. I table a media report about United Voice soliciting for new members among teacher aides in Queensland classrooms, and I ask: why did the Premier jeopardise children's education around the same time as NAPLAN testing by ordering teacher aides to attend union meetings during class time just to pay off her union masters?

Tabled paper: Article in the *Australian* online, dated 21 August 2017, titled 'Union blitz robs Queensland's classrooms of teacher aides' [1449].

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. My understanding is that these provisions are under the enterprise bargaining agreement that has been in operation since 2006. Let me say something else: many of these workers are part-time or casual, and they have every opportunity to be briefed on what the enterprise arrangements mean for these workers. Why are they coming in here and attacking hardworking staff in our schools—teacher aides and cleaners? It was only the other day that a cleaner approached me and said to me that they are in fear about the next election if the opposition wins power. It is very important that we stand up for our cleaners in our state and our teacher aides in our state.

Ms Grace: They have rights too.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection: they absolutely have rights. They were treated so badly under the former LNP government when they were sacked and they lost their jobs. They were humiliated. I can remember meeting with people and discussing the fear they had and which they still now harbour against the dire prospects of Tim Nicholls, because we know the record of those opposite when it comes to sacking, selling and cutting in this state. We know the record.

That is why my government has put extra money into more teacher aides including more teacher aides for prep. The most important time in a child's education are their formative years in prep, and we will ensure there will be extra teacher aides across all of our prep classes under my government. That is what we will do. We will always stand up for the rights and conditions of workers in this state. I can recall that even the cleaners here in Parliament House were in fear of their jobs when the LNP was in office—absolutely in fear.

Make no mistake: Queenslanders fear the LNP. It strikes at their core because we know that 14,000 people lost their jobs. Let us never forget that, out of all the non-government organisations which had their funding cut, workers lost their jobs there too. The total amount would probably be around—

(Time expired)

TAFE Queensland

Ms DONALDSON: My question is to the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills. Will the minister please update the House on the Palaszczuk government's investment in TAFE Queensland and whether she is aware of any alternatives?

Mrs D'ATH: I thank the member for Bundaberg for her question—

Mr Bleijie: Sacking TAFE teachers, TAFE numbers down, empty buildings, apprenticeships down.

Mrs D'ATH:—and I take the interjection from the member for Kawana because once again there is a theme today: scaremongering.

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I heard your comments too, member for Kawana.

Mrs D'ATH: Scaremongering is the theme. The thing is, though, that the people of Queensland have their measure. They know when it comes to TAFE and investing in training and jobs in this state that the LNP have no credibility at all. It is the Palaszczuk government that is investing in TAFE. It is the Palaszczuk government that went to the last election committing to rescuing TAFE with \$34 million to reinvest in our great public training provider across this wonderful state.

As I travel around the state I meet time and time again with teachers who talk to me about the benefit of that funding and the difference it has made, especially through second chance funding. Over 12,000 training places have been made available as a consequence of that second chance funding. I have had the great pleasure of going to your local TAFE, Mr Speaker, and talking to staff about the training that has been given to people with disabilities. I remember standing with carers, parents and people with disability when in opposition as they cried because—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr Stevens interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I can hear you, member for Mermaid Beach. I can hear other members too.

Mrs D'ATH: We have great campuses, from Thursday Island down to Coolangatta, delivering quality training for this great state. The Minister for Education talked about the great teachers and teacher aides. I want to recognise the great teachers in our TAFE system—quality teachers in our TAFE system—and all of the staff in our TAFEs who everyday are seeking to make a difference in people's lives.

The only great idea of the member for Kawana as the shadow training minister was to create a tool allowance where people get their tools when they finish their apprenticeship. Apparently they do not need them as they are going along; it is at the end. 'Do not worry about needing any tools while you are training. At the end we will give them to you.' The federal Liberals will give them a tool allowance if they take out a loan and those on the other side will give them tools after they finish training. That is their grand idea.

The Leader of the Opposition needs to come clean. Cut, sack and sell is what they did in government when he was treasurer. What are the Leader of the Opposition's policies for TAFE if they were to form government? Will they create another QTAMA? Will they take the assets off TAFE?

(Time expired)

Badu Island, Police Station

Mr GORDON: My question without notice is to the Premier and Minister for the Arts. On a visit to Badu Island in the Torres Strait I met with elders, senior women and Councillor Laurie Nona. At this meeting it was shared with me the grave concern the community had over the lack of a bona fide police station to deal with an array of law and order issues, particularly family and domestic violence offences. Since this visit I have shared these views and concerns with both the previous and current police ministers and the ministerial champion for the Torres Strait, the member for Waterford. Is the Premier aware that on Badu Island there is a fully licensed hotel? Why is it okay for her government to support the sale and consumption of alcohol in this community but not provide a bona fide police service for the women and children of Badu Island who are suffering in silence?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Cook because that is a very good question when it comes to policing, especially in his electorate. I am aware that the Minister for Communities, as the ministerial champion, has had discussions about this and the Minister for Police is also aware of this issue. We will look to work with the member for Cook to address this issue as quickly as possible. Once again, some of these issues are operational so I am sure the police minister will also discuss this with the Police Commissioner. I want to thank the member for Cook for raising a very legitimate and very reasonable question in this House about matters that he sees are of fundamental importance in his community. We will undertake to address those issues and get back to him as soon as possible. I thank the member for his question today.

Budget, Communities Sector

Ms BOYD: My question is to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Will the minister update the parliament on the importance of this year's budget for Queenslanders working in our communities sector and how this investment compares to previous years?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for Pine Rivers for her question. Earlier this week I spoke about the investment the Palaszczuk government is making in Queensland's communities sector. We have created over 400 jobs in the NGO sector to support vulnerable families, as well as an additional 320 new jobs to come in this financial year—all going to wonderful non-government organisations which work to support some of our most vulnerable Queenslanders. We are investing in services that families need where they need it. A huge focus of our new investment is providing new services in some of our emerging ice corridors that we are seeing right across Queensland.

This investment stands in stark contrast to the treatment that local community organisations received under those opposite. When those opposite were in government and the member for Clayfield was the treasurer, a total of \$259 million was ripped from the communities sector. Not only was \$259 million ripped from hardworking NGOs; they were gagged so they could not speak out about it. It is the most disgraceful record that we have seen in terms of supporting the communities sector.

How heartless do they have to be to rip further funds from those already stretched front-line services? Bravehearts had more than \$45,000 cut. Foodbank in the electorate of Bulimba had \$45,000 cut. Foster Care Queensland, which supports our wonderful hardworking foster carers, lost \$240,000 in fiscal repair. Act for Kids, which does amazing work right across our state and is headquartered in the member for Clayfield's own electorate, lost \$460,000. What kind of government commissions a review into the child protection system and then cuts a staggering \$259 million from the organisations that work to support those vulnerable families?

The LNP did not stop there. Let us look at our domestic violence services. There was \$40,000 cut from DVConnect. The Sunshine Cooloola Services Against Sexual Violence had \$69,000 cut. Where were the LNP members on the Sunshine Coast outraged about these cuts? What about the Gold Coast? The Gold Coast Domestic Violence Prevention Centre lost \$140,000. We know that the LNP have one record and that is to cut, sack and sell.

Mr SPEAKER: Question time has finished.

SAFER WATERWAYS BILL

Portfolio Committee, Reporting Date; Declared Urgent



Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.34 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That—

1. under the provisions of standing order 136, the Agriculture and Environment Committee report to the House on the Safer Waterways Bill by 27 October 2017; and
2. so much of standing orders 136 and 137 be suspended as to allow the Safer Waterways Bill to be declared an urgent bill to enable all remaining stages to be completed by 16 November 2017.

We tabled the Safer Waterways Bill in May, the committee will report back in November and then it is likely to be tabled and debated in May next year. I have here newspaper articles which state why we need this bill to be declared an urgent bill. I table them.

Tabled paper: Bundle of media articles regarding crocodiles in Far North Queensland [\[1450\]](#).

Tabled paper: Extract from *Record of Proceedings*, dated 25 May 2017, regarding Safer Waterways Bill [\[1451\]](#).

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Letter from lady who lives in Mourilyan (as taken from Hansard 10 August 2017)' [\[1452\]](#).

The first article has the headline 'Crocodile captured that killed spear fisherman Warren Hughes in far north Queensland'. The second article is titled 'Crocodile caught and killed in Cindy Waldron search found to have human remains inside'. The next article is titled 'Report confirms that Queensland's saltwater crocodile populations are rising'. That article stated—

Crocodile populations in Queensland have been rising since the 1970s, placing more people in direct conflict with the dangerous reptiles in the north and Far North.

The next article is titled 'Crocodile kills and eats family dog on property near Innisfail'. The next article in the *Cairns Post* is titled 'Biggest rise in beach closures due to crocodiles in Far North in five years'. The next one is titled 'Hungry crocodile stops swimmers at Far North beach', and that article stated—

A hungry crocodile kept swimmers out of the water at one of the Far North's premier tourist destinations yesterday.

I will read this letter from a lady who had her dog taken recently. She stated—

We live on the banks of the South Johnstone River in Mourilyan, NQ. On Tuesday afternoon we lost our 6 month old purebred white Shepherd to a very large crocodile. As we live very close to the river our dog had gone down to the water's edge, failing to call her up to our yard we went down to try and get her when the crocodile just so quietly grabbed her and took her into the water, this was absolutely terrifying for both my partner and myself as we weren't aware it was there and it could of easily been us!

In October last year we lost another white Shepherd to possibly this same crocodile. About a half hour or so after our puppy was taken on Tuesday we were sitting there looking over the river when another 2 crocs showed up! It was like feeding time at the zoo.


A few months back 2 young boys were taking a short cut through our yard, when I asked what they were doing, they said they wanted to go fishing in the river, I warned them about the dangers but they insisted they'd be fine, point is, its private property but you can't always stop people from fishing on our banks, and we're not always here to warn people.


These children were going to exactly the same spot where that dog was taken by the crocodile. She continued—Please help us to do something about these monsters, we need dogs for security reasons, but it's simply too dangerous for them and traumatic for us. I forgot to mention my partner was down not far from the bank poisoning the grass as to keep it down, something made him turn around and look out onto the river to see this monster swimming towards the bank at him. Something clearly has to be done with these killers as we cannot swim in either our beaches or waterways here anymore.

We undertook a number of public meetings in Cairns and Port Douglas.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Dalrymple, my understanding is that we have agreed to allow you to speak to a proposal to bring forward the date that your bill would come on for debate. It is not about debating the substance of your bill. Do you have anything further to add in relation to why we need to support your call to bring forward the date of the debate of your bill?


Mr KNUTH: Yes. A number of public meetings have been held in Port Douglas, Innisfail, Mareeba and Cairns. This is a big issue as we are seeing that tourists are not coming or are not using our beaches as the warning signs instil the fear of being taken by a croc. That is why we need to bring this bill forward; it is for the economy.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (11.39 am): I rise to speak to the motion. I am supporting the motion moved by the Katter party. It proposes to bring forward debate on the bill by only three weeks, but how many lives could potentially be saved in those three weeks? The House has an opportunity today to bring this bill forward. I make this point very clear: if in those three weeks one life is lost, that may fall directly on this House. I ask members to take that on board.


 **Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE** (Sandgate—ALP) (11.40 am): I oppose the motion moved by the member for Dalrymple. This is a matter that has been sought to be debated in this House previously. It was rejected at that time. We have allowed the opportunity to have the debate today to allow the member for Dalrymple to give good reasons why this needs to be brought on earlier than the timetable provided for by the standing and sessional orders. Frankly, I do not believe he has given those reasons.

The reality is that croc catchers in our system already have the authority to choose how to remove problem crocs including by lethal force where that is deemed necessary. This is not an urgent matter in the face of some imminent danger; there is a set of arrangements in place that are managing these situations now. No government has ever done more on croc management than the Palaszczuk government. Targeted croc operations have more than doubled under this government, and that demonstrates that this is an area that is being managed prudently in the face of concerns that are being raised.

I want to note that that management needs to occur. We need to ensure that the understanding of how that management is occurring and the concerns in the community are considered properly by a proper, extensive committee process. That is why I oppose the declaration of this bill as urgent and I oppose the motion that the member for Dalrymple has put before the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.41 am): I have listened to the contribution of the Leader of the House and I acknowledge there are programs in place. However, we would not see—and perhaps a large portion of the public would not see—that what is being done at the moment is enough. Clearly, there are some risks when people are not going to beaches and when lifesavers are saying, 'We cannot recommend you can safely go in the water where people have gone before,' when people have been taken and when people have been killed. Surely that should provide for the parliament a sense of urgency. If that does not qualify for a sense of urgency, I am not sure what would.

I understand we need to review these things properly. However, it behoves the House to acknowledge when a sense of urgency is required to an issue. If that does not qualify, I do not know what would.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (11.42 am): I rise to oppose this motion. I am going to try to do so without anticipating a bill that is before the House. Our committee has taken this bill quite seriously. Part of the reason I will not anticipate the bill before the House is that as the chair of the committee and as a member of the committee—as all members of our committee do—I keep an open mind in relation to any legislation that comes before us. We work through the tenets of the legislation and try to understand the issues, listen to all sides of the argument and try to provide a report back to the House that provides guidance for members. That is exactly what we have done in this instance.

There have been some mentions in the media by other members of this House which to me were designed and made for political reasons. I raised concerns because I felt that those statements that were made in the media were not fair. I am really pleased that the members who made those statements acknowledged that and we resolved those concerns.

I want to put on record what the committee has done and what the committee intends to do. We received the referral. We have had a public briefing from the member for Dalrymple. While we were on a visit to the electorate of the member for Keppel in relation to another matter, we took the opportunity to visit a crocodile farm in that electorate. We talked to a gentleman who has been in this industry for over 40 years and had very strong views on certain aspects of the bill, particularly in relation to egg harvesting. We intend—and we have dates set down—for the Department of Environment and Heritage

Protection to come and brief us on this matter. We also have dates set down for public hearings on this matter both here in Brisbane and in Cairns. In those hearings in Cairns we are endeavouring to consult with local Indigenous groups that are interested or affected or who have views particularly in relation to egg harvesting matters.

We have also undertaken to visit Darwin and to look at their approach to managing crocodiles and to ensuring the safety of citizens in their state. We will also be talking to people who are involved in egg harvesting in the Northern Territory because it is legal and it is something that has been going on for quite a long time. We have worked our way through and we intend to report back here.

I am very concerned when members stand up and try to put pressure on a committee to work its way through these things using these sorts of tactics. Most of the things that we consider in this House are serious and dire and can have grave consequences for the people in our community. There is no doubt about that. However, that does not remove our responsibilities as legislators to work through issues carefully in a considered way. This is a serious issue, this is a serious bill and we will do that. I do not support the urgency motion.

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

AYES, 5:

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 79:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Gilbert, Grace, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Pairs: Furner, Crandon; Harper, Simpson.

Resolved in the negative.

PETITIONS

Motion to Take Note



Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (11.53 am): I move—

That the House take note of e-petition 2766-17 from 11,345 petitioners requesting the House to designate the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing the Brett Forte Way in perpetuity.


As all members are aware, Senior Constable Brett Forte's death in the line of duty in May 2017 has devastated many people across Queensland—most of all his family, friends and colleagues. I appreciate the suggestion from the 11,345 petitioners to name the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing the Brett Forte Way, and I thank each and every one of them for taking the time to bring this matter to the attention of the House. There is a formal process that applies to the naming of road infrastructure, and I have asked the Department of Transport and Main Roads to record the nomination for further consideration.

From a technical perspective, the recognised name of a road can be different to the name given to the road for administration purposes. For example, the administration name for the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing motorway will be the Warrego Highway in the east, and as the road heads towards the west it will become the Gore Highway. There has been significant community interest in the naming of the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing, both locally and statewide. Over the last 10 months the Department of Transport and Main Roads and the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports have received naming nominations from local government and community members. These nominations have been acknowledged and added to a local database for consideration at the appropriate time. I can advise the House that the department has been working on a specific Toowoomba Second Range Crossing infrastructure naming process and will be looking to commence public consultation in early 2018.

The naming of any project, particularly one as significant to the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley regions as this project, requires careful consideration and wide consultation with the community. The general procedure in relation to recommending recognition names for state controlled assets includes consultation with local government, local members of parliament, other affected districts or regions, local associations, industry bodies and peak community organisations. In particular, it is proposed that recognition names be nominated through community submissions for the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing as a whole; the 800-metre viaduct along the Toowoomba escarpment; and the 70-metre twin arch bridges over the New England Highway.

To encourage the local involvement of young people throughout the Toowoomba and Lockyer Valley regions it is proposed that all school children in the Toowoomba Regional Council area have an opportunity to submit suggestions to name the bridge over the Warrego Highway at Charlton and the bridge over the Gore Highway at Athol. Schoolchildren in the Lockyer Valley will be given the opportunity to name the overpass on the Warrego Highway at Helidon Spa. I can advise that formal submissions will commence in early 2018 through an online process, and a Toowoomba Second Range Crossing naming committee will be established to oversee the process, short-list and make recommendations to state government in mid-2018. Announcements of the recognition names will occur before the opening of the road to the public in late 2018. In early 2018 I encourage all committee members to submit their nominations online via the Department of Transport and Main Roads website.

Again I would like to thank all those petitioners who have taken the time to add their support to the proposal to name the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing the Brett Forte Way. The naming submissions received to date will be tabled with the naming committee and considered along with all other nominations received through the online process. Let me commend the member for Toowoomba North for the thoughtful way he has approached this issue. Again I thank all petitioners for bringing this valuable suggestion to the attention of the House.

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (11.58 am): I rise to speak to the petition that was put together by Ben Davis at 4BC which has over 11,000 signatures. I certainly thank the petitioners for putting forward Senior Constable Brett Forte's name as a suggestion for naming the Toowoomba Second Range Crossing. As the minister mentioned, there is a process involved in naming this infrastructure. Within the community there have been several names put forward, but today I would like to speak to why I think the Brett Forte Way should be given serious consideration by the government as it goes through the process.

Brett Forte was a police officer who, on 29 May 2017, paid the ultimate price in the Lockyer Valley. He lost his life as the result of a tragic and callous act. He was pursuing a known dangerous and violent criminal who had been in the purview of police for a long time. When the tragedy occurred Brett Forte showed great courage and valour protecting his fellow officers, and I believe history will show that those officers owe him a great deal. I want to talk about what we as a community owe the police force generally.

Every day when thousands of police men and women put on the uniform they put a thin blue veneer around our very civil society. They deal with some of the hardest, most violent and dangerous criminals that we see in Queensland so that we can all enjoy the luxuries that Queensland offers and the lifestyle that Queensland presents. Families and communities in Queensland are much stronger for knowing that we have a solid police force that is willing to both serve and sacrifice in the protection of our community, and every single officer should be commended for that.

Picking one of their own, Senior Constable Brett Forte, to name such a significant piece of infrastructure that travels from the Lockyer Valley, where his life was so tragically taken, up into the northern suburbs of Toowoomba, where his family lived, would be a very fine way to ensure that not only will the people of Queensland respect and understand the sacrifice that he made that day but also generations into the future people will ask, 'Who was Senior Constable Brett Forte?' They will know from the stories that are told what happened.

Having this piece of infrastructure bear his name is something that should be very seriously considered by the community and I would think that as we go forward many members of the community will show their support as we go through the formal process. Ultimately, it shows a great deal of respect from our community to the police force—an organisation in itself that every day goes out and does the things that others of us in Queensland do not want to do so we can enjoy our lives in comfort and security. Every day their families face the fear that something could go wrong while they are out there protecting our community. To have one of their own acknowledged in such a way acknowledges all police in Queensland and would certainly show our appreciation and our pride in the quality, professionalism and self-sacrifice that our police force is willing to make.

I thank the petitioners and Ben Davis from 4BC for putting this on the agenda. I thank the minister for giving it serious consideration and I look forward to going through the process and ensuring that we get the name that the community really wants for this piece of infrastructure.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.


EDUCATION, TOURISM, INNOVATION AND SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! In accordance with standing order 71, the notice of motion relating to report No. 34 has lapsed.

COAL WORKERS' PNEUMOCONIOSIS SELECT COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note

 **Mrs JR MILLER** (Bundamba—ALP) (12.03 pm): I lay upon the table of the House the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee report No. 3, *A Mine Safety and Health Authority for Queensland: including the committee's exposure draft Mine Safety and Health Authority Bill 2017*.

Tabled paper: Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee: Report No. 3, 55th Parliament—A Mine Safety and Health Authority for Queensland including the committee's exposure draft Mine Safety and Health Authority Bill 2017 [\[1453\]](#).


I move—

That the House take note of report No. 2, *Black lung white lies: inquiry into the re-identification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland*, of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee tabled on 29 May 2017.

On 29 May 2017 this committee tabled its landmark report titled *Black lung white lies*, condemning the catastrophic failure at almost every level of the regulatory system intended to protect the health and safety of coal workers in Queensland. The report made 68 comprehensive and considered recommendations for reform, at the heart of which was the establishment of an independent Mine Safety and Health Authority in Queensland to be charged with advancing the health and safety of our mining and resource industry workers. This committee was given the unique and important responsibility of monitoring and reviewing the implementation of its recommendations, including developing a draft bill for the consideration of the Legislative Assembly.

In tabling this report today, this committee not only fulfils its responsibility but also honours the commitment it made to the men and women of the mining communities across regional Queensland—to deliver a draft bill to the parliament in August. This exposure draft would provide for the establishment of the committee's recommended Mine Safety and Health Authority, headquartered in Mackay, as well as making a range of other key amendments recognised as necessary to enhance the integrity, accountability and responsiveness of actions to address coal workers' pneumoconiosis and other industry health and safety issues. Whilst not in its final form, this exposure draft will provide the basis for the ultimate bill, noting that some recommendations will be appropriately addressed through separate changes to subordinate legislation—importantly, including recommended changes to the coal workers' health scheme and to the occupational exposure limit for coalmine dust and associated monitoring and other requirements.

In tabling this exposure draft for consideration, this committee hopes to progress the implementation of these critical recommendations to protect our mining industry's most vital resource—that is, our valued workers. The select committee has recommended that the exposure draft be immediately referred to the relevant portfolio committee to review and report back to parliament by 5 October 2017. I encourage all of our stakeholders and interested members of the public to contact the portfolio committee and have their say on the exposure draft so that all of us—all members of parliament—can ensure we get this right, that we honour our mineworkers and their families and their communities. I dedicate this report to the generations of coalminers across Queensland—the men and the women who have cut the coal—and to all of their families. This is also for my dad and my grandad who will be forever remembered in this legislation. I commend this report to the House.

 **Hon. L SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (12.07 pm): I also rise in this discussion on the report to acknowledge and reinforce the words of the chair of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee and also acknowledge the great contribution, hard work and personal and emotional


diligence of committee members who have served on this committee, our committee staff but in particular the hundreds and hundreds of people who turned up to the various evidence-gathering meetings we have had throughout Queensland and the many dozens of people who have come before us to tell us their stories—quite harrowing and quite sad stories. One thing that this committee has done right throughout its processes of investigation, deliberation and report is undertaken to make sure that we approach this in a compassionate and bipartisan way, and we have done that in spades. Only recently after handing down the report the committee kept its covenant with the people who came before us in regional areas throughout Queensland and we went back and reported to them of our findings and of our recommendations.

I believe that assisted extraordinarily in not only building but also reinforcing confidence in the process we have undertaken and confidence in the fact that we will get a coal workers health scheme in Queensland that ensures that the hardships and difficult personal circumstances that workers and their families have been through will be addressed now and in the future.

We made 68 very deliberative recommendations. They have been well considered and are based on evidence and best practice throughout the world—not only in Australia but more particularly in places like the United States, which does this better than we do in many ways. The great irony is that, although we have very good compliance, our systems broke down. The United States does not have good compliance but does have excellent systems. We need to ensure we marry the best of both worlds. The United States was capable of identifying coal workers' pneumoconiosis; we were not.

We let down our coal workers in Queensland by giving them a false sense of security. They in the industry were told that this no longer existed—indeed, that it had not existed from the middle of the 1980s. It was quite bizarre and quite magical that it could disappear overnight. No-one really bothered to ask the questions. If you were a minister, you probably would have absolute confidence in the clinicians and other people advising you that it had in fact disappeared as a consequence of their due diligence and hard work. The reality is: that was not true. Many people were misled as a part of this—from ministers to the industry itself, the workers themselves and the workers' representatives.

As we go through the parliamentary process and the working draft of the bill, I encourage a proper, considered view about why we are making those recommendations—that there should be an independent statutory authority, that there should be a truly independent mine safety and health commissioner in Queensland, which we do not currently have, and that there should be a process to rebuild confidence in the industry. That means that some people will have to eat some humble pie. They will have to accept the fact that the establishment of that independent statutory authority based in Mackay is in the best interests of the industry. The authority will consist of an equal number of workers' representatives, industry representatives and external experts. That will ensure that not only will we be able to rebuild confidence but also there will be an independent oversight process, whereby it can report to a parliamentary committee, and other issues with regard to clinical competence and capability are considered. I acknowledge the minister's diligent work to address the recommendations of the Monash review. We now need the authority and the independence to ensure that the other aspects of this are properly embedded for the future.


 **Mr CRAWFORD** (Barron River—ALP) (12.13 pm): I rise to make my contribution to the consideration of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee report. We have spoken many times in this House about the fundamental failings of allowing coal workers' pneumoconiosis to go down the path it did. Whether you use terminology such as 're-emergence' or 'reidentification' or whether you say that it was always there, it now really no longer makes a difference. Whether you lay blame with the mines, the workers, the department, the medical surveillance, radiology, NMAs, the Department of Health or whoever, that no longer matters. The evidence is in that, collectively, Queensland has failed its coalminers. We must now work forwards to protect the industry and everyone in it, including the departments, the workers and the companies. We must now stop pointing fingers and accept that it happened—accept that Queenslanders were failed and that it occurred for years. We must fix it.

On 23 March this year in this House I expressed my confidence in our minister to draft legislation to put to this House and that it was expressed in a statement of reservation in an earlier report tabled around the same time. On 23 March this year, this House decided as part of the extended terms of reference for the CWP Select Committee, to include instructions to monitor and review the implementation of recommendations made by the CWP committee in its report 'including the development of a draft bill for consideration of the Assembly'. I repeat: 'development of a draft bill for the consideration of the Assembly.' There has been all sorts of scuttlebutt about this process: a committee-led bill, a private member's bill—what is it, how does it work, does it require a Governor's message, who writes it, who scrutinises it, what role does the minister have and what about the

department? It is the will of this House that the select committee develop a draft bill. It is in the motion that this House approved on 23 March this year. There is criticism by some members of this House over this. I say to them: do not make accusations behind my back over my performance on the select committee because you disagree with this process. This is your wish; this is your instruction. You voted for this. Do not criticise me for your process.

Moving forward, I have grave concerns about workers in our coal-fired power stations. I feel that we will see similar circumstances in those power stations as we saw in our open-cut coal mines. We have only just begun to investigate this and time will certainly tell where it goes. In conclusion, I thank the members of our committee: the chair, the member for Bundamba; the deputy chair, the member for Southern Downs; and the members for Whitsunday, Mackay and Dalrymple. I also thank the member for Greenslopes, who was a member of the committee for quite an extensive part of the inquiry, and the member for Mirani, who came on board a few different times and who is very passionate in this area, as we have heard in this House many times.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Order! Before I call the member for Whitsunday, I acknowledge that we have students and teachers from Grand Avenue State School, Algester State School and St Stephen's Primary School in the electorate of Algester joining us in the public gallery this morning. Welcome.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (12.18 pm): I also welcome those boys and girls visiting Her Majesty's Queensland parliament today, because we are speaking about something very important and very special. This document, *Black lung white lies*, weighs 1.4 kilograms.


I echo the sentiments expressed by my colleagues on the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee, chaired by the member for Bundamba and with my great mate the member for Southern Downs as deputy chair. The bipartisanship on display in this process was truly humbling. In fact, wherever we were people were amazed—retired and current miners and their families, the representatives of the CFMEU, the representatives of the mining companies that employ the workers. So many people said to us, 'Wow, that was just amazing.' That is putting it mildly.

As I said in the House last night, I will never forget the day constituent Chris Byron told his story in Mackay in November last year—well before we produced this Bible to make the system better. There are 68 recommendations and 34 key findings. To be parochial, the recommendation that the Mine Safety and Health Authority be headquartered in Mackay, the city I represent, certainly warms my heart. There are people across this state who have worked their guts out in the mining industry. Today, two dozen of them are gravely sick men. We owe it to them and to those who are yet to be diagnosed with coal workers' pneumoconiosis to get the system right after this fiasco, this debacle, that goes back decades. The reidentification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis for these people has been a long time coming.

Mrs Miller: Too long.

Mr COSTIGAN: Too long. I take the interjection from the member for Bundamba, the committee chair. When we travelled around the coalfields where they mine the black gold we eyeballed people, real people, and today those who have served on the committee—there have been a number of members, and I acknowledge the contribution of all members who have been there on this journey—are keeping our word to make the system better.


The development of the draft bill has been a rewarding process. It is important that people have their say on the exposure draft. I encourage all key stakeholders to have their say through the portfolio committee that has carriage of this. I remember when I was in Collinsville—we have had a few people with Collinsville connections in the gallery here today—wondering how many men were up there in the cemetery who were never diagnosed with black lung. Today we give people heart, people like Percy Verrall in the West Moreton and Chris Byron in my electorate of Whitsunday and all those in between, that we are looking to make the system better and that we will. I commend the report to the House.

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (12.21 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the report titled *Black lung white lies*. I have only recently joined the parliamentary select committee. I would like to commend the original committee on the work that it has done in compiling this report. All credit goes to the original committee.

Hearing the pain of the witnesses at the committee hearing I attended in Mackay was emotionally draining, especially knowing that with the due diligence of those responsible for the safety of workers, and those charged with doing the checks and balances on workers safety being carried out, we would not be here today talking about this topic.

The report clearly outlines systemic failures in the system and, more importantly, outlines recommendations that put an end to the working conditions that cause coal workers' pneumoconiosis and for ongoing health care for workers. Recommendation 1 is that there should be a truly independent Mine Safety and Health Authority established as a statutory authority and body corporate with responsibility for ensuring the safety and health of mining and resource industry workers in Queensland. It is important to have that independent body.

Recommendation 5 is that the Mine Safety and Health Authority be established in Mackay, ensuring that the commissioner, senior management, Mines Inspectorate, Coal Workers' Health Scheme and mobile units are all based in Central Queensland. It is really important that those who are overseeing the health and safety of workers live in the community where those workers live so that they understand the problems and they hear what is going on firsthand on the work sites. By establishing this authority in the city of Mackay they will see those people whom they are supposed to be looking after when they go to the supermarket, walking down the streets or having a barbecue with their neighbours. On the streets of Mackay one sees many miners in their hi-vis work gear, so this is the right place for it. With those comments I commend the report to the House.

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (12.24 pm): I rise to make a contribution to this debate of the motion to take note of the report of the select committee on the inquiry into the reidentification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland. A little over 12 months ago, in August 2016, the Leader of the Opposition moved a motion in this House calling on the government to establish a commission of inquiry into the re-emergence of black lung disease in coal workers in Queensland. That motion was not agreed to, but an amendment moved by the member for Mirani to instead establish a parliamentary select committee for the same purpose was carried. This is the report that the committee produced that we are discussing today.

The contribution from the member for Southern Downs to this debate mentioned that in 2004 there was a diagnosis of a former coalmine worker with coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland. Two years later there were two instances of former coalmine workers who were paid out sums of money from the workers compensation scheme in Queensland, but the fact is that it was only when the Commissioner for Mine Safety and Health's annual 2015 report made mention of the fact that there was potential for a re-emergence of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland that Queensland really woke up and Queenslanders were alerted to the potential for this insidious disease to come back in Queensland.

Last year when the motion passed this House to establish this select committee I pointed out, in support of the Leader of the Opposition's motion, that historically in Queensland it had been royal commissions that had been the catalyst for change to improve workplace health and safety legislation in Queensland with respect to the resources sector and in other jurisdictions as well. There had been some tragic disasters in Queensland's mining history which, although very rich and profitable for the state, also contain a number of tragedies. There were a number of royal commissions that changed fundamentally the way that resource industries were governed in relation to workplace health and safety.

I think that this select committee report and the select committee will be compared favourably in the future to those infamous royal commissions that delivered great leaps forward in mine safety and health legislation in Queensland. We have heard testimony from participants in the select committee, both members of the committee and people who participated in the process, that it has crossed party lines, it has put politics aside. The committee has taken an extraordinary volume of evidence from everyone involved in the resources sector and now there is a very significant report that has been tabled in the House, report No. 52 of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee, that it is now the responsibility of this House to take forward.

The member for Southern Downs acknowledged in his contribution that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines was working diligently to implement the findings of the Monash review. It has been clear from his contributions to the parliament that the minister is taking seriously his responsibility to progress those recommendations from the Monash review. That review was well done and went to the core of the technical issues and the occupational health issues involved in this matter. The recommendations in the select committee's report are wider, they have some more significant ramifications for how the workplace health and safety framework for the resources sector in Queensland is organised, and it would be well for all members to give the content of this report consideration and make that a priority for themselves in the lead-up to debate on the bill.



Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (12.29 pm): Like many in this House, I pay tribute to the committee members who put together this report, *Black lung white lies: inquiry in the re-identification of coal workers' pneumoconiosis in Queensland*. This is one of the most significant reports that we have seen in the parliament for a long time. On occasions I had the good fortune to be a part of the inquiry, which educated me on how bad things are and how we have probably let down many Queenslanders in regard to this issue. I pay tribute to the chair and the deputy chair, the member for Bundamba and the member for Southern Downs, and all committee members: the members for Whitsunday, Barron River, Greenslopes and Dalrymple, as well as the member for Mirani. As I said, I was lucky enough to be a part of the inquiry as well.

I pay tribute to counsel assisting, Mr Ben McMillan, and his brilliance in being able to identify issues and help the committee with its progress and its report. Ben brought to the committee table an absolute professionalism in everything that he did.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr MILLAR: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. He was able to disseminate the information that we were getting and helped us with how we could act on that information. Ben, thank you very much for being a part of this committee. Certainly, I thank you for all the work that you have done.

The report's foreword by the member for Bundamba and the member for Southern Downs strikes at the heart of the issue. As I said last night in the House, black lung or pneumoconiosis is not like a mine explosion. Black lung is preventable. When our coal workers go to work, they expect to be able to come home safely. They know there are risks in the mining industry, but they are visible risks. They are risks of moving trucks and machinery. However, this is a risk that we need to make sure that we rectify and we need to rectify it now.

The heart of this issue lies in the heart of the electorate that I represent, the seat of Gregory. We have many great mines and great towns built on the mining community. They deserve that we make sure we get this right. I commend everybody involved in this House. It is always good to be able to come together in bipartisanship and ensure that, when we face very important issues such as this, we get it right. Finally, again I pay tribute to the member for Bundamba and the member for Southern Downs who did an absolutely fantastic job in bringing together the report that has been tabled today. We need to act on these recommendations to make sure that this never happens again.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

PUBLIC WORKS AND UTILITIES COMMITTEE

Report, Motion to Take Note



Mr KING (Kallangur—ALP) (12.33 pm): I move—

That the House take note of the Public Works and Utilities Committee report No. 38, *Auditor-General report to parliament 5: 2016-17—energy: 2015-16 results of financial audits*, tabled 31 May 2017.

This report represents a summary of the Public Works and Utilities Committee's examination of the inquiry into the *Auditor-General report to parliament 5: 2016-17—energy: 2015-16 results of financial audits*. On behalf of the committee, I thank the committee secretariat and the Queensland Audit Office for their assistance in our consideration of the Auditor-General's report. We made one recommendation, which was that the Legislative Assembly note the contents of the report.

Our government entities, which are still in public hands, are: the generators, Stanwell Corporation and CS Energy; the transmission business, Powerlink Queensland, an entity I know well; the distribution businesses at the time that this audit was done, Energex and Ergon Energy; and the retailer, also Ergon Energy. We own quite a robust transmission network in Powerlink, which runs for approximately 1,700 kilometres from Cairns to New South Wales. As I said last night, from time to time Mother Nature takes its toll and it costs money to maintain and keep the network going.


We have kept those electricity assets in public hands, which provides a direct cost-of-living benefit to the people of Queensland. If members opposite had had their way when in government, many of those businesses would have been fattened up and sold off, and the profits would have been sent interstate or overseas. Instead of working for the people of Queensland, those businesses would have been working for the shareholders. Because we kept our power assets in public hands, for the benefit of all Queenslanders we are able to reinvest the dividends they pay into essential services such as the

uniform tariff policy. That policy sees us make payments in the order of \$500 million a year to ensure that regional Queenslanders pay similar prices for electricity as those who live in the south-east corner, despite the much higher costs of supply in regional Queensland. It does cost a lot to supply electricity to regional Queensland.

We have been able to leverage this ownership to ease the hip-pocket impacts of electricity price volatility being felt across the nation. We did this by directing Energy Queensland to remove the cost of the Solar Bonus Scheme from electricity bills over the next three years, reducing projected household bill increases by half, from 7.1 per cent down to 3.3 per cent. We directed Stanwell Corporation to modify its bidding practices to put as much downward pressure as possible on power prices. That action resulted in an immediate decrease by 10 per cent in forward contract prices, which have since continued to fall. We also directed Stanwell Corporation to restart Swanbank E Power Station, bringing it back online in time to increase supply for this summer's peak demand, placing further downward pressure on power prices.

The QAO concluded that the energy entities used good financial reporting practices to produce high-quality financial statements for 2015-16 in a timely manner. They also stated that the merger of Energex and Ergon into a single entity, EQL, is expected by its shareholders to result in cost efficiencies. Further, energy government owned corporations are financially sustainable and CS Energy's sustainability has improved. CS Energy had not reported a profit since 2008-09, except for 2014-15, and has accumulated significant losses. However, management have forecast the entity will be a profitable business in the medium term.

In conclusion, the Audit Office said that, in terms of sustainability and structure, they look at the way that the entities are funded, that is, the split between debt and equity. Obviously as debt rises the proportion of funding also rises, and there is more risk associated with debt. There is no indication in their reports that the debt and equity proportions are outside of industry practice. Our industry is in good hands. It is in state government hands and we are going to keep it there.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (12.38 pm): I rise to speak to the committee report on the Queensland Audit Office's report regarding energy. At the hearing we conducted, we heard from Rachel Vagg from the Queensland Audit Office. She tabled report No. 5, which is what we are speaking about. She said that the report summarises the results of financial audits of all state government energy companies: Stanwell Corporation, CS Energy, Powerlink Queensland and Energy Queensland Ltd. She talked about how Energy Queensland Ltd is the new merged entity that owns Energex and Ergon. She said that they also audited all entities controlled by the four energy companies and the regulatory submissions of the Australian Energy Regulator for Energex.

Here is the concern. In her summary of the audit she basically said that, as a result of all the restructuring, there is more debt, expenses are up more than revenue and profits have actually dropped by some 26 per cent. She stated at the hearing that overall debt has increased by \$4.6 billion as a result of the merger.

I turn now to the audit report at page 5 where it provides a very succinct summary of debt and equity. It states that total borrowings for all our energy entities is \$23.1 billion. The interest expense on that is \$0.96 billion. We are paying a billion dollars a year in interest. What I find amazing is that in 2015-16 the figure for accumulated losses for the combined entities was \$0.4 billion. They lost \$400 million. However, the declared dividend—the 100 per cent take that was imposed on the energy companies by the state to prop up the budget—was \$1.94 billion.


This is classic 'Labornomics'. Many of us in the House have run businesses. When businesses make an operating loss that is not the year that you pay yourself a dividend. It is certainly not the year that you go out and borrow more money to support a dividend payment to yourself.

Mr Costigan: You rein it in.

Mr MOLHOEK: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday; you rein it in. I refer to a comment made by the Treasurer. This morning the Treasurer stood in the House and said, 'Look at me. What a great job we are doing. We have delivered surpluses. We are doing all this great work.' May I suggest that part of the surpluses delivered are at the expense of the energy generators. What is happening is that this Labor government is robbing Peter to pay Paul. I had to laugh, because this is part of the Treasurer's action plan. The Treasurer stated—

In this context, the lower capital expenditure outlook for the network businesses also allowed the Government to increase the businesses' dividend payment ratios from 80% to 100% of net profit after tax, while still allowing for gearing levels to remain at the target ratios. The revised dividend payout ratios are intended to support more efficient capital management in the businesses.

Not only are we funding dividends by borrowing more money; we are taking 100 per cent of the money that we can get. For any business it is normally prudent to leave a little in the business. One of the questions I asked of the Audit Office was whether they could confirm whether the government was actually borrowing more for maintenance. One table in the report—and I cannot find the page number at the moment—simply identifies a whole lot of gaps. There are a number that say 'not disclosed' under maintenance costs. That was after we placed a question on notice. My question is: why is the government raiding all this money from our energy enterprises? What do they have to hide by not disclosing the true costs of maintenance and capital expenditure within those entities?

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (12.43 pm): I also rise to make a brief contribution to the committee report on the Auditor-General's report to parliament No. 5. In the committee hearing the Queensland Audit Office advised the committee—

Our analysis showed that expenditure growth outpaced revenue growth. This resulted in lower profits for the sector, down by 26 per cent from last year.

As the previous member said, that was the year in which a dividend was ordered to be paid. It does not make any economic sense whatsoever. They continued—

Revenue growth allowed by the regulator has declined, yet sector demand has increased. This means that costs in the supply chain have increased.

The Queensland Audit Office also advised that the publicly owned energy entities in Queensland face a number of financial challenges. It stated that some of these included—

Material reductions in regulated revenue, as noted before; increases in interest costs from shareholder imposed debt increases in the future—

Who is the shareholder? The Queensland government is the shareholder—those opposite. They continue—

... and the effect of future renewable energy targets on state owned coal-fired generators and the impact of changing technologies on the rest of the network.

The report also mentions the merger of Ergon and Energex—the biggest and most complex merger in the state's history. We received advice that this merger is so complex that the efficiencies proposed may never be realised. Ian McLeod said at the time that some 800 jobs will need to go in order to realise the efficiencies of this merger. No jobs have gone, except for his job. He lost his job for telling the truth. He was summarily axed by the Palaszczuk Labor government for giving those opposite good economic advice. A *Courier-Mail* article stated—

They'll spin a new company out of the merger of Energex and Ergon. And that company will do work unregulated by the AER revenue cap.

This is how they intend to get around the revenue problem. The article continues—

In other words, it will compete directly with electricians who earn their wage from private outfits both big and small across the state.


The Government has desperately sought to spin itself out of the controversy. It has used superlatives about how the company will offer consumers 'new technologies', and how it will 'fill gaps' where electrical businesses aren't viable. But Queensland has 10,000 electrical contractors, and Clean Energy Council mapping shows 1200 of them with solar are spread across most corners of the state. Cape York and the Torres Strait are the exceptions.

But that won't be enough to pull a profit from what shapes as a massive publicly funded electrical services entity.

If it is successful, this business will cost private electricians their jobs; if it's not, it will be a blight on the Budget and cost us all.

McLeod's exit may have been abrupt. Not having to deal with the fallout of this flawed idea, however, may be the best thing that has happened to him.

It would make Karl Marx smile. I could not have said it better myself. Is it any wonder that Redlands businesses and families are suffering under this government that is using them as cash cows and gouging electricity prices so that it can prop up its failed economic policies?

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (12.47 pm): I rise to speak to report No. 38 of the Public Works and Utilities Committee on the Auditor-General report to parliament No. 5 of 2016-17, titled *Energy: 2015-16 results of financial audits*. I do not think the member for Redlands was speaking to that report because he got very different information from it than I did.

I would like to begin by thanking the secretariat, the chair of the committee, the member for Kallangur, and my fellow committee members.

Ms Donaldson interjected.

Ms PEASE: Perhaps. I will take that interjection. The Auditor-General provides parliament with an independent assurance of public sector accountability and performance. This is achieved through reporting to the parliament on the results of its financial performance audits. A financial audit assesses whether the information contained in the financial statements of public sector entities is presented fairly and in accordance with Australian accounting standards and also determines whether relevant financial legislation and other requirements are complied with.

In previous years the energy, rail and ports, and water sectors were grouped together in one report to parliament, such as the report on public non-financial corporations for 2014-15. However, the Queensland Audit Office advised that the move to disaggregate this report into three sector based reports was a deliberate one to provide more targeted information to help promote accountability and improve public sector performance.

The Auditor-General's report was tabled on 30 November and was referred to the Public Works and Utilities Committee. We considered the Auditor-General's findings in relation to the financial audits of the four main energy companies—Stanwell Corporation, CS Energy, Powerlink Queensland and Energy Queensland—including audits of all entities controlled by those companies and regulatory submissions to the Australian Energy Regulator for Energex and Ergon.

The Queensland government owns the four main companies and 31 subsidiaries in Queensland which make up the east coast national electricity grid and are part of a supply chain which comprises generation, transmission, distribution and retail. In June 2016 a new parent entity, Energy Queensland Ltd, took control of Energex Ltd and Ergon Energy groups to merge distribution operations across the state. Energy Queensland Ltd was incorporated and registered on 20 May and Ergon began trading on 30 June 2016. It reported the consolidated transactions and balances of EQL, Energex and Ergon Energy for two years as if the subsidiaries had always been controlled by EQL.

The QAO reported that the entities used good financial practices to produce, in a timely manner, high-quality financials for 2015-16. It was stated—and I point out that the member for Southport did not mention this in his speech earlier—that the merger of Energex and Ergon Energy into a single entity is expected by its shareholders to result in cost efficiencies.

Our government owned corporations provide essential services for the people of Queensland—services that we Queenslanders rely on every day. They generate and deliver power. They make sure that households, businesses and irrigators have a safe and reliable supply of water and energy and they provide port facilities which are essential to our businesses and communities. Again, the member for Southport's suggestion that we 'rein it in' is simply an example of their cut, sack, sell policy.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Southport, the member for Lytton is not taking your interjections, so please allow her to speak.

Ms PEASE: The dividends that our generator GOCs pay to the government, as their owner, are the result of them operating commercially in what is a broken NEM which is no longer serving households, businesses or industry.

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Southport, I have asked you to cease interjecting. If you do so again, I will warn you.

Ms PEASE: The Palaszczuk government have reinvested these dividends into essential services for the people of Queensland—something which would not have been possible under the Newman-Nicholls government who would have flogged them off to the private sector.

Mr McEACHAN: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There was a ruling made earlier today about the use of that term.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry, but I did not hear what that term was.

Mr McEACHAN: It is akin to saying the 'Trad-Palaszczuk government'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. That is noted.

Debate, on motion of Mr Costigan, adjourned.

MOTION

Referral to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee



Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (12.53 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

1. The exposure draft bill titled Mine Safety and Health Authority Bill 2017 attached to report No. 3 of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee be referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee for consideration and report.
2. That the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee conduct an examination of the exposure draft bill as though it was a bill referred to the committee under Chapter 23 of the Standing Rules and Orders of the House.
3. That the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee report on its examination of the exposure draft bill by 5 October 2017.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL

Resumed from 8 November 2016 (see p. 4262).

Second Reading



Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (12.54 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I thank the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee for its consideration of the bill and note that the committee made seven recommendations to parliament, including that the bill be passed. I now table a copy of the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Infrastructure Planning and Natural Resources Committee: Report No. 42—Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, government response [\[1454\]](#).

This committee has a comprehensive understanding of fly-in fly-out, or FIFO, matters, being comprised of several members with firsthand experience of the importance of mining to their electorates. This bill reflects both the recommendations of its October 2015 FIFO inquiry report and the Palaszczuk government's election commitments.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee members and secretariat for their hard work, including holding public hearings in Brisbane, Emerald, Middlemount, Moranbah, Mackay, Rockhampton and Mount Isa. I also thank the many stakeholders and community members who participated in these hearings around Queensland and made submissions which formed part of the committee's consideration of the bill.

The government notes recommendation 1 and supports recommendations 3 and 7 from the committee's report. These recommendations clarify elements of the bill and are consistent with the scope of the bill as publicly consulted. Recommendations 4, 5 and 6 are also partially supported and extend the 100 per cent FIFO prohibitions and anti-discrimination provisions to all large resource projects.

Recommendation 1 of the report is that the bill be passed. Recommendation 2 of the report proposed amending the definition of 'nearby regional communities' to remove the words '100km radius'. This would leave the decision of distance for each project entirely to the Coordinator-General's discretion, with no base distance nominated in the bill as guidance. The government intends to retain a radius distance to help define the nearby regional communities in order to provide some certainty and guidance for stakeholders. Importantly, this will not divert significantly from the approach that has been the subject of extensive consultation.

However, I will later move an amendment to adjust the radius distance to 125 kilometres. This represents a reasonable balance between contrasting views expressed during consultation. The Coordinator-General would retain the discretion in the legislation to include or exclude towns on a case-by-case basis. This discretion would be supported by publicly available guidance material that would include the key criteria. Each decision would be informed by consultation with stakeholders. To provide transparency and certainty, the Coordinator-General will publish the list of towns and projects captured by the provisions on the Department of State Development's website.

The 125-kilometre distance remains a reasonable balance between contrasting views on the matter and, on balance, the majority view from feedback was to make the distance a bit longer. The distance represents an appropriate starting point or baseline distance to define which nearby communities should logically be considered within the project's local catchment area and therefore have a direct association with the project and benefit from it. I note that it was never intended to be an endorsement of a safe driving distance or take precedence over workplace health and safety legislation and obligations.

Recommendation 3 of the report is in relation to making it clear that the Coordinator-General may decide that a town with a population of 200 people or less is defined as a 'nearby regional community'. This recommendation is supported as it further clarifies the intent of those provisions of the bill. Later I will move an amendment to the bill to further clarify that the Coordinator-General has the discretion to decide on the definition of a 'nearby regional community' to potentially include a town with a population of 200 people or less. Each decision will be informed by consultation with stakeholders and be supported by publically available guidance material.

Recommendation 4 of the report suggested amending the bill to cover all resource projects in the vicinity of a 'nearby regional community', regardless of the size of the resource project or the date of its commencement. I will move an amendment to the bill to partially support this recommendation and apply the 100 per cent FIFO prohibition and the anti-discrimination provisions to existing and future large resource projects with a 'nearby regional community', regardless of when they were approved.

Applying the 100 per cent FIFO prohibition and the anti-discrimination provisions to all existing and future large resource projects operating in Queensland would mandate that this 100 per cent FIFO workforce arrangement is unacceptable. This is in line with the government election commitment to legislate against the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces for the operation of mines near a regional community.


In conjunction with this change, I propose to expand the definition of a 'large resource project' from those simply requiring an EIS to projects with 100 workers or more and with a site specific environmental authority. These amendments will not mean, however, that the bill will apply to all resource projects in Queensland regardless of size, as recommended by the committee. Accepting this part of the recommendation could increase the number of projects subject to the provisions of the bill to approximately 4,000 resource projects throughout the state. This bill remains focused on large resource projects where the use of FIFO arrangements are of greatest concern to regional communities and significantly impact local employment opportunities. This amended definition of a 'large resource project' will apply to two of the three main elements of the bill; namely, the 100 per cent FIFO restriction and the anti-discrimination elements.

Debate, on motion of Dr Lynham, adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Sugar Code of Conduct, Disallowance Motion

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (2.30 pm): I have stood in this place on a number of occasions and spoken of my support for sugarcane farmers and, in particular, those canefarmers who fall under the umbrella of the Wilmar Sugar Mills. It was with complete dismay that I learnt last week that Senator David Leyonhjelm, in what can only be called a political stunt, moved a disallowance motion in the federal parliament on the Competition and Consumer (Industry Code—Sugar) Regulations 2017, which contains the Sugar Code of Conduct. The fact that this disallowance motion was moved by a senator who has never visited the sugarcane-growing areas of Queensland and whose knowledge of the sugar industry you could chisel on the back of an aspro with a crow bar defies logic.

The purpose of the code is to regulate the conduct of growers, mill owners and marketers of grower economic interest sugar in relation to contracts or agreements for the supply of cane or on-supply of sugar including requiring and providing for precontractual arbitration of the terms of an agreement. It also ensures that supply contracts between growers and mill owners have the effect of guaranteeing a grower's choice of the marketing entity for the grower economic interest sugar manufactured from the cane they supplied. This is the share of exported sugar for which the grower has to bear the price exposure risk.

This code of conduct was introduced to create a level playing field between farmers and millers, setting a framework for a fair process when commercial contract negotiations between grower representatives and large milling companies failed to come to an agreement. The disallowance motion moved by Senator Leyonhjelm, if successful, would be disastrous for the sugar industry in Queensland and take away a vital dispute resolution mechanism that those on this side of the House have fought long and hard for. Not only is the Sugar Code of Conduct under threat by Senator Leyonhjelm's disallowance motion; so is the entire sugar industry in Queensland. This is a sugar industry which only a matter of months ago ended a three-year dispute which tore the heart and soul out of both farmers in this state as well as farmers in my electorate of Burdekin.

This is a senator who lives in NSW and is completely out of touch with how our sugar industry works. Just how out of touch, one might ask? Senator Leyonhjelm has stated—

If they want control over their marketing they always have the option of hiring a truck and sending their crop 300 kilometres down the road to a mill that sells into the socialist collective, if they don't like Wilmar.

These comments are absolute rubbish, because, as anyone who lives in a sugarcane-growing area knows only too well, growers are forced to sell their harvested sugar cane to the closest mill because, once harvested, it is a perishable product.

I am passionate about this industry and not just because of my role as the shadow minister for agriculture. I am passionate about this industry because it holds the livelihoods of many of the hardworking, dedicated constituents in my electorate of Burdekin. Senator Leyonhjelm's actions in moving this disallowance motion are putting those livelihoods at risk. Rest assured I will not be taking a backward step in fighting this ridiculous attempt by Senator Leyonhjelm to repeal the sugar code of conduct.

Raine Island, Green Sea Turtles




Mr CRAWFORD (Barron River—ALP) (2.33 pm): The Queensland government is currently engaged in a serious rescue mission in Far North Queensland. It is a rescue mission for thousands of green sea turtles. Every year up to 60,000 green sea turtles make their way to Raine Island, which is 620 kilometres north of Cairns, an area the size of a couple of football fields, to lay their eggs in the sand dunes. But the dunes have shifted over the years to cause a situation where tens of thousands of turtles lay eggs in the sand only to leave their young fall foul to flooding, drowning and a certain death. Mankind needed to intervene.

This is an area where the footprint of mankind is very limited, where tourists do not visit, where biosecurity is paramount and where generally only staff from the department of parks and wildlife and university researchers ever visit. But right now on Raine Island there are trucks, excavators and workers in high-visibility vests. We will move 15,000 cubic metres of sand—enough sand to fill six Olympic sized swimming pools—from the front of the beach to the back of the beach which is lower, reshaping an area 200 metres by 150 metres of prime turtle-nesting beach. By reshaping the beach and raising the sand height, we are lifting the nesting beach above tidal levels to prevent the drowning deaths of thousands of baby turtles still in their eggs. This rescue mission follows a successful sand reprofiling trial in 2014 which led to increased hatching success rates and nests staying above tidal levels for three nesting seasons in a row.

The work will include installing up to 600 metres of turtle exclusion fencing on the small cliffs to reduce adult turtle deaths. This will stop turtles who get up onto the small cliffs from falling down on their backs and dying of heat exhaustion. Turtles fall off these cliffs due to a particular rock edge and they end up on their backs. When they are on their backs they are unable to right themselves. Unfortunately, they lay in the blazing sun and within just a couple of hours they die a very cruel and unwarranted death—and one that has even attracted the attention of Sir David Attenborough. The department's staff have informed me that it is regular for them from their observation post to head down the stairs and flip turtles back over every day to right them and keep them alive.

The latest stage of the Raine Island recovery project will save thousands of green sea turtles which are listed as threatened which are a beautiful passive animal which can be found all throughout the Great Barrier Reef. These latest works will take another couple of weeks and be finished by mid-September. I congratulate the department and I congratulate JCU for being involved.

Caloundra Hospital

 **Mr McARDLE** (Caloundra—LNP) (2.36 pm): Today the health minister stood in the House and spoke about the capital budget for the Health portfolio. What he did not say, however, was that he and this Labor government in March this year closed the Caloundra Hospital ED after many years of service and put in place a clinic that works seven days a week but only 12 hours a day from 9 am to 9 pm. The people in Caloundra want that hospital operating 24 hours a day, seven days a week to provide services to people in Caloundra.


As I understand it, the public hospital that has been opened in Kawana this year will mean those who are most ill or seriously injured would attend the hospital at Kawana for treatment. In fact, the minister in estimates made it quite clear that category 1 and category 2 patients are increasing in attendance numbers throughout the state. This will put increasing pressure on the public hospital at Kawana and at the same time leave the facility at Caloundra underused and under-utilised.

Category 1 patients and category 2 patients are those patients who are requiring the most intensive treatment and most intensive care, and the figures given by the health minister at estimates make it quite clear that those numbers will increase as time goes by. Category 1 patients for the 2016-17 year increased by 10.4 per cent and category 2 patients by 7.1 per cent across the state. People in Caloundra realise that and acknowledge it. They also acknowledge the fact that Caloundra, like the rest of this state, has an ageing population, an increasing population and chronic disease in our community that is growing as time goes by.

What people in Caloundra realise also is that we need a full-time health service in Caloundra to provide the care needed for those people, their family and their friends. That is why in their thousands people signed a petition which I lodged in the House in the last sitting week. Well over 3,000 people signed the petition calling for the urgent care centre to operate 24 hours a day, seven days a week. People in Caloundra understand that SCUH will take the bulk of the most injured and most seriously ill patients across the Sunshine Coast, as it should, but what should happen is that Caloundra should have a clinic that operates 24 hours a day, seven days a week for the people of Caloundra and its increasing population. This will help to alleviate the pressure that is increasingly growing upon SCUH and that will continue to grow as time goes by, as population levels and our ageing population increase and as chronic disease increases right across the region.

We are asking the health minister to overturn the determination of March 2017 and put in place a 24-hour-a-day, seven-day-a-week facility that gives the people in Caloundra services they need for now and into the future. We also ask him to alleviate the issue of the public hospital in Kawana so we can work in conjunction.

Mackay Electorate, Innovation

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (2.39 pm): The Mackay region is jumping on the innovation bandwagon. The Mackay, Isaac and Whitsunday regional councils have created the economic body called the Greater Whitsunday Alliance, known as the GW3. The GW3 has received \$500,000 of Advance Queensland funding under the Advancing Regional Innovation Program. The funding will encourage local entrepreneurs, business leaders and key industries to work together to strengthen the region's diverse economy.


Already, the Mackay region has, through the GW3, formed collaborative partnerships with many innovative groups, like Split Spaces, Startup Mackay, the Innovation Centre, the Resource Industry Network and Central Queensland University. The network will build outreach locations throughout the regional areas and link them together for true regional innovation. This strategy will ensure people living in remote areas will be able to take part in these important programs. The collaboration will help the Mackay region develop our opportunities emerging in tourism, agriculture and mining equipment, technology and services. My electorate is determined to develop every innovative business opportunity and deliver jobs. Our aim is to position ourselves globally as an innovative, friendly area offering investment benefits for entrepreneurs, venture capitalists and large corporations.

Mackay businesses are also accessing the Small Business Digital Grants Program under the Palaszczuk government's Advancing Small Business Queensland Strategy. The Small Business Digital Grants Program provides funding to help recipients embrace digital technologies and opportunities by empowering businesses to be digitally savvy. It is important to provide our regional and innovative businesses with the tools to know how to sell their products online and to give businesses the opportunity to sell locally, regionally, statewide, nationally and globally.

Jody Euler, owner of redhotblue, said the grants will allow her to undertake upgrades to her website using the latest in innovation and coding. She will make her website interactive, educational and visually stimulating and provide different ways to deliver services. She told me that the grant will make her business more competitive and help her employ more Queenslanders. Advance Queensland research fellow Kameron Dunn will receive \$180,000 over three years to develop the biocommodity industry of turning sugarcane waste into liquid fuels and chemicals. This research can develop new diverse industries for agriculture—

(Time expired)

Hervey Bay Electorate, Health

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (2.43 pm): I am sick and tired of sitting in this place listening to the health minister's self-praise and propaganda about his handling of the Queensland Health service. Let us talk about Mrs Bosewell, who was categorised as a category 2 patient on 26 August 2016 after presenting at the A&E with very serious symptoms of bowel matter leaking into her vagina. Worse than that, Mrs Bosewell had to wait nine months for an operation, all while she was on antibiotics that would have knocked an elephant over to stave off the infections. She had to wait nine months for that operation. There is nothing to celebrate here, especially with those sorts of symptoms. When she finally got to surgery, the operation did not go well. The notes of the poor surgeon who was trying to save this woman's life described the hardships he had to deal with. He must have been under an enormous amount of pressure.

I recently wrote to the health minister to make an urgent plea on behalf of a lady who was recently in Hervey Bay Hospital and who was nil by mouth for six days and waiting a total of nine days for surgery on her leg. That is right—six days nil by mouth. That was a nightmare. Each time they realised they could not go ahead with the operation, the kitchen staff were not there or the meal service was over.

The most serious one I leave to last—and maybe the health minister will be less jolly about what he thinks he is doing. A doctor in our area took her own life. This doctor had inquiries in with her solicitor and with the health union representative. This doctor wanted to take time off to see her ill and dying mother. I was advised that the leave requested was denied. Days later she took her own life, and three days later her mother passed away. This is unthinkable. I table the letter that Mrs Bosewell wrote.

Tabled paper: Letter, undated, from Ms Rachelle Boswell to the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Ted Sorensen MP, regarding surgery waiting times [\[1455\]](#).

I will read into the record a note from inside a thank you card from a constituent we assisted. It states—

Finally, get surgery after three years of health issues and dealing with GPs and hospitals. I had an appointment 7 days after I contacted you and surgery six weeks later.


I table that thank you letter.

Tabled paper: Letter, undated, from an unknown person to the member for Hervey Bay, Mr Ted Sorensen MP, regarding surgery waiting times [\[1456\]](#).

The coroner in our area is lacking resources. I think there is only one staff member there and the situation is unbearable.

(Time expired)

Cross River Rail

 **Ms FARMER** (Bulimba—ALP) (2.46 pm): I want to know what the LNP is going to do about traffic congestion in South-East Queensland. The Deputy Premier today released the business case for Cross River Rail. We already knew there was a very compelling case for it. We knew it would produce 1,500 jobs a year for the seven years of its construction, we knew it would take 18,500 cars off the road, we knew it was going to revolutionise the way the rail and bus networks integrate and we knew it would provide huge savings in terms of traffic. Now the Deputy Premier has released the business case and it is very clear that you are either for it or against it.


Traffic congestion in my local area is one of the most critical issues, and my electorate is for Cross River Rail. We have done so many other things to address traffic congestion in addition to what Cross River Rail is going to deliver for us. I know it will save 14 minutes off travel on the Cleveland line, which is the critical transport conduit in my electorate. We have introduced Fairer Fares, which has encouraged people to access public transport right across the South-East Queensland corner. In my local electorate, after a huge fight and having the current transport minister and previous transport

ministers really listen to us, we now have \$6 million worth of park-and-ride either under construction or planned for construction around key railway stations. This will make public transport more accessible for commuters in the Bulimba electorate.

I want to thank the Deputy Premier for so closely considering the 1,400 signatures which I have gathered from my electorate from people who are saying that traffic congestion is a key issue for them. I can tell the House that it was not that hard to get those 1,400 signatures. We have all of those things happening. We realise in a peninsula like Bulimba that there is not one solution—we have to look at a range of solutions for traffic congestion, including active transport and how our transport services are operating. My people in my local area are saying to me that they want solutions and they want to know what we are going to do about this. They want us to be looking at this. We are eagerly awaiting the work that the Deputy Premier is doing on that study at the moment.

The Treasurer was telling us this morning that the LNP so far has made \$19 billion worth of unfunded commitments. I have not heard anything yet in any of those commitments about traffic congestion. If they do not realise that traffic congestion is a key issue in South-East Queensland, then they will very quickly find out that no-one will listen to them. It is a key issue in the Bulimba electorate. They need to put up. Cross River Rail is No. 1 and we need to know whether they are for it or against it.

Electricity Prices

 **Mr MILLAR** (Gregory—LNP) (2.49 pm): I rise this afternoon to put on record my utter disappointment with the way the Labor government is ripping off Central and Western Queenslanders. The Brisbane-centric Labor government's new joint venture between the state owned generator CS Energy and the private retailer Alinta Energy, which is expected to save South-East Queensland households \$350 is proving once again they are a government for Brisbane, not a government for Queensland. What about the rest of the state? What about the Central Highlands? What about the central west? What about the Channel Country, Emerald, Longreach, Clermont, Winton or Boulia?

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mr MILLAR: It is all right for Yeerongpilly, but the member does not care about Yaraka. He does not care about what is happening out there.

The rising cost of electricity is hurting individual families, small businesses, manufacturers and farmers in every part of Queensland. Every day I am hearing reports from people about the rising cost of kitchen table bills: electricity, water and rates. People are racking up credit card debt just to cover the cost of household bills. Some small businesses in the electorate of Gregory have seen their power prices and their bills triple.

The Labor government is using increased power prices to secretly tax Queenslanders. We are all paying for it. Under Labor's latest power price brainwave, only taxpayers in the south-east corner will benefit. The wholesale price of electricity has increased under Labor. We all know it started under Beattie and Bligh when they started to gold plate the network and it is only getting worse under the Palaszczuk Labor government.

Coupled with Labor's pursuit of the unrealistic 50 per cent renewable energy target, it is no wonder people continue to pay through the nose for electricity. Queensland cannot afford another—

Mr Bailey interjected.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Crawford): Order! Member for Yeerongpilly, I think we have heard enough from you. I will warn you if you continue.

Mr MILLAR: I think the rest of Queensland has heard enough from the member for Yeerongpilly. He is concerned about Yeerongpilly, but he is not concerned about what is happening in regional and rural Queensland. These electricity prices are hurting everyday mums and dads out there in regional Queensland and we have to remember that this is the wealth corridor, the wealth areas of Queensland. They pay their GST; they pay their taxes. They are workers in the coalfields and in the farming enterprises. They all put in towards the GST, their taxes and export dollars for Queensland.

As I said, Queensland cannot afford another three years of this sort of rubbish. I stand with members on this side who are committed to putting downward pressure on electricity prices and reducing the cost-of-living expenses for all Queensland households. All Queenslanders deserve to get a fair deal. People out there are hurting at the moment. They are using their credit card to try to pay

basic kitchen table bills—kitchen table bills that they cannot afford. They are trying to put kids through school and they are trying to put kids through sport. They are receiving massive electricity bills on their kitchen tables which they cannot afford and they are using their credit cards and overdrafts just to pay off basic household bills. It needs to be addressed.

Skilling Queenslanders for Work

 **Mr WHITING** (Murrumba—ALP) (2.52 pm): Today I want to talk about how the Palaszczuk government is putting young people in Deception Bay into jobs, work and training and that is through the incredibly successful Skilling Queenslanders for Work program. Traditionally, Deception Bay has had a higher than average rate of youth unemployment. I have talked to many of these young people—they have good hearts—and all they want is a break. Since becoming the local MP, I have made it a priority to get our local kids the training and the opportunities they deserve to get a job.

The figures on how we are bringing young people into the workforce through Skilling Queenslanders for Work programs in Deception Bay and the local area are incredible and speak for themselves. The outcome for Murrumba as at 30 June 2017 are: 482 people exited a Skilling Queenslanders for Work project, 68 have gone on to further training and 323 have got jobs through Skilling Queenslanders for Work. That is 323 young Queenslanders with that opportunity. The total Skilling Queenslanders for Work commitment to Murrumba to date has been: 23 projects with total funding of \$4.5 million.

I want to pay tribute to the Deception Bay Community Youth Programs and the Deception Bay Neighbourhood Centre. Deception Bay Community Youth Programs have put 156 people through their programs, 86 people have secured employment as at May 2017. The neighbourhood centre has put 149 people through their programs, and 59 people have got jobs through their programs.

At a recent graduation ceremony at Deception Bay Community Youth Programs I presented certificates to a group of young men who had received a certificate I in Conservation and Land Management. The Deception Bay Community Youth Programs are currently running a work skills traineeship called Busi Events, where the participants are doing a certificate I in business administration. The first group had 11 participants graduate, with five transitioning straight into employment and two going straight into university. Soon DBCYP will be running a program training young men and women through a course run by the Queensland Agricultural Training College revegetating and clearing noxious weeds in Hayes Inlet and the local national park. That is a tremendous opportunity for these young people.

These people would not have had their life turned around if not for the Palaszczuk Labor government because we brought this program back. We brought it back after it was cut by the LNP. They cut a program that creates real job opportunities and training for people in Deception Bay. These people would simply have been left behind if the LNP were still in government. I say to the opposition: what is their position on Skilling Queenslanders for Work? What would they be prepared to do if they got into government?

Mr Bleijie: We're keeping it.


Mr WHITING: Would they have been silent on it?

Mr Bleijie: I just said we're keeping it.

Mr WHITING: Is this one of their promises like that the public servants would have nothing to fear? They are keeping it? We will believe that when we see it.

(Time expired)

Roads, Nicklin Way

 **Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (2.55 pm): I want to talk about a serious issue affecting the livelihoods of a group of about 30 small businesses along Nicklin Way, from Main Drive to Waterview Street, Warana. Recently, I was briefed by the Department of Transport and Main Roads about a plan to use leftover funding from the \$22 million allocated for Sunshine Coast University Hospital access improvements to upgrade a small section of Nicklin Way. Honourable members might remember that it was the LNP that committed to delivering the \$440 million Mooloolah River interchange to ease congestion and support delivery of the hospital. However, the Labor government and the member for Yeerongpilly scrapped that project and, instead, provided an upgrade of four roundabouts on Kawana Way. This Labor government, without consultation with the local residents or business community, went ahead and developed—

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order. The member for Kawana is misleading the House. There was never a budget allocation for the Mooloolah River interchange by the Labor government. That is the truth.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is no point of order. You know the rules, member for Yeerongpilly. You can write to the Speaker.

Mr BLEIJIE: Without consultation they went ahead and developed a plan to remove all on-street car parking along the stretch of Nicklin Way, as I mentioned earlier, from Main Drive to Waterview Street. This is despite the fact that almost every small business operating along that stretch of Nicklin Way relies on these car-parking bays so their customers can access their shops. If these parking bays are removed, customers cannot access these shops. If their customers cannot access their shops, then they cannot make any money which means they will go broke and they will have to let their staff go.


The next part of this plan is just so bizarre. They are adding another set of traffic lights on Nicklin Way and directing traffic along Production Avenue through to Kawana Way. One major issue I see is that Production Avenue and the surrounding streets are part of an industrial estate which has constant heavy and commercial type machinery operating. The main roads minister is advocating that to improve access to the university hospital we should be directing traffic off Nicklin Way and sending them through an industrial estate, past concrete trucks, past forklifts, past reversing B-doubles to access the hospital. In what world would this be considered a sensible, safe and efficient plan? Not one small business owner in the affected area supports it. I thank the Kawana Chamber of Commerce for getting on board with the petition to make sure this does not go ahead. I have met with all the business owners and none of them support it.

On 26 June 2017 I wrote to the then minister, Mark Bailey, advising him of the very serious concerns we hold for the project. In my letter I requested an urgent meeting with the minister to facilitate a small group of local business owners to convey their very serious concerns. That was almost two months ago now and the minister has refused to even respond. I table a copy of that letter sent to the member for Yeerongpilly.

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 26 June 2017, from the member for Kawana, Mr Jarrod Bleijie MP to the Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply, Hon. Mark Bailey, regarding proposed Nicklin Way upgrade [\[1457\]](#).

I hope he did not delete my email. He should not have because it was not sent to his Yahoo account! I do hope the new Minister for Main Roads is more willing to listen to the concerns of the Kawana community and work with those who are affected to ensure we get the balance right. I call on acting Minister Miles to make the time available to allow small business owners, whose livelihoods stand to be destroyed, to have their concerns heard before proceeding any further with this crazy plan.

Marriage

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (2.58 pm): One of the reasons I joined the Australian Labor Party was that I fundamentally believe in the principle and the value of equality. Right now in Australia we are experiencing a significant historical moment in the question of whether or not we are, in fact, an equal society. I am talking about the marriage equality debate currently being put before the Australian people. A couple of days ago some pretty hurtful and hateful material came into the public domain in relation to this debate.

The Prime Minister of this nation said, in terms of the marriage equality debate, that you cannot stop people from saying hurtful and hateful things. In fact, you can and he could have. He had an opportunity to act like a leader and put this issue before the Australian parliament, as any good leader should have in terms of being national legislators, but he squibbed that because of his own internal conflict. Now what we have is a non-binding \$122 million opinion survey being sent out to the people of Australia so that they can express a view about whether or not we should have equal rights for gay and lesbian people in Australia before the Marriage Act. What we have is a \$122 million non-binding, non-compulsory opinion survey about marriage equality. On any account the Prime Minister of this nation has failed a fundamental test of leadership on this issue and it is outrageous that, as someone who has in the past expressed support for this proposition, he is not campaigning, not showing leadership and in fact that saying you cannot stop people from saying hateful and hurtful things.

As someone who has had lifelong friends who are proud members of the LGBTI community, can I say that my children are best friends with their children. We go on holidays together. For me to explain to my children why their relationship—which has been longer lasting than many relationships I know—


is different, is inferior, is 'less than' in the eyes of the law in Australia is very difficult. I want my children, children from gay and lesbian relationships—a lot of whom are in my electorate—and all children in Australia to know that I am going to be vigorously taking part in this campaign because I fundamentally believe in their equal rights.

STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL

Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2486, on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (3.01 pm), continuing: This amended definition of large resource project will apply to two of the three main elements of the bill—namely, the 100 per cent FIFO restriction and the anti-discrimination elements—however, this amendment will not expand the scope of the projects subject to the social impact assessment of the bill. The government maintains that this should be limited to future large resource projects where an environmental impact statement, or EIS, is required. The EIS process provides the best mechanism to address these matters in an integrated way with the rest of the environmental assessment.

Recommendations 5 and 6 of the report expand on recommendation 4 for two of the three core elements of the bill: the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO provisions and the anti-discrimination provisions. As mentioned, I will move an amendment to the bill to extend the 100 per cent FIFO prohibition to a wider definition of a large resource project regardless of its approval or commencement date. This amendment will partially support recommendations 4 and 5. The amendment will include a suitable transitional period to allow resource companies time to have appropriate workforce arrangements in place. The Coordinator-General will consult with the relevant stakeholders on large resource projects with a nearby regional community. If a large resource project contravenes the 100 FIFO prohibition, the Coordinator-General may require the owner to submit an operational workforce management plan.

The decision to require a plan will be informed by an investigation by the Coordinator-General into the workforce composition. The workforce management plan will be required to support local employment and transition the project towards a more appropriate balance between FIFO and local employment. The act will grant the Coordinator-General powers to approve these workforce management plans and place conditions on them. The workforce management plan provides the mechanism for a proponent to provide justification for the use of 100 per cent FIFO; for example, where they can provide evidence that local labour does not exist to meet the specific needs of the project. It will also provide a mechanism to enable adjustments due to fluctuations in labour markets which occur during the swings and cycles of a resource economy. The Coordinator-General would consider such information in deciding whether to approve the plan and in setting any conditions.

Recommendation 6 of the report suggested amending the anti-discrimination provisions of the bill to cover all resource projects in the vicinity of a nearby regional community regardless of the size of the resource project or the date of its commencement. I will move an amendment to the bill to partially support this recommendation and apply the anti-discrimination provisions to a larger number of resource projects with a nearby regional community. The anti-discrimination provisions would no longer be limited to future projects—that is, those with an EIS publicly notified after 30 June 2009. Lastly, recommendation 7 of the report suggested that the bill be amended to require the Coordinator-General to produce a guideline stating the requirements that must be included in a social impact assessment. I will later move an amendment to give effect to this recommendation.

In summary, the government's response to the committee's recommendations will ensure that residents in local and regional communities within 125 kilometres, or otherwise decided by the Coordinator-General, will be residents that must be given fair opportunities to apply for jobs and preferably prioritised for new mines where they have the necessary skills and experience. These residents cannot be discriminated against based on their close proximity to the mine. Communities of fewer than 200 people can be included as a nearby regional community for the purpose of the bill if decided by the Coordinator-General. Discrimination on the basis of where someone lives, or might choose to live, will no longer be able to occur for large mines with a site-specific EA and over 100 employees near a regional community, and there will be a prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO for existing large mines near regional communities.

This bill supports the government's Strong and Sustainable Communities policy framework. This bill is a clear demonstration of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to regional communities throughout Queensland, because the Palaszczuk government understands the importance of 'local'. That is why the Palaszczuk government introduced the Buy Queensland procurement policy, which has been welcomed with open arms by businesses and trades up and down the Queensland coast. It is why the Palaszczuk government continues to rollout the successful Building Our Regions program, which has delivered vital infrastructure for regional Queensland with more jobs, projects, councils and money out the door than the former government's totally discredited Royalties for the Regions program. That is why we are here in this House debating this bill today.

The Palaszczuk government went to the last election promising to overhaul FIFO in this state, and that is what we are delivering. This bill will prohibit 100 per cent FIFO workforce arrangements for operational workers on large resource projects near regional communities. It will prohibit discrimination against local residents in future recruitment processes for operational workers and enable existing FIFO workers to move into that local community if they choose. It will prescribe the social impact process for future large resource projects subject to an EIS. It will ensure that EIS assessment and approval processes for the social impacts of large resource projects are the same under both the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and the Environmental Protection Act 1994.

In summary: for those who live in a local or regional community near a large mine, you are now back on a level playing field. Recruitment will be done on the basis of the strength of the applicant, not the postcode of the applicant. Additionally, if a new large mine is proposed near a regional community, the mine will be required to look first at local and regional communities before they can look elsewhere for workers.

This country of ours is built on many informal principles or truisms that have been handed down to us from generation to generation and adopted by those coming to the shores of this country. In a harsh land without political or social class, with nothing but the bonds between us to carry us on, the one that resonates most deeply is that of the 'fair go'. The fair go is not a Liberal Party think tank. It is not a platitude to be carelessly thrown around. It is symbolic of the way this country has approached significant issues, recognising that we are an egalitarian nation; one that has a desire to treat someone just as they are; to treat everyone with respect and dignity; and not allow artificial barriers to restrict someone from seizing an opportunity and to ensure that we all operate on as much of a level playing field as we possibly can.

This bill gives regional communities that fair go. This bill gives workers back their choice, and in the spirit of the fair go let me be clear: existing contracts will not be affected. Workers who currently choose to live elsewhere and decide to FIFO into mines do not have to worry about their contracts. It is important that they, along with their families, continue to be secure in their employment.

This legislation allows workers to have the ability to relocate into these local and regional communities, providing a greater degree of freedom than what was ever previously afforded. I know firsthand how significant this issue is in remote and regional Queensland. Before the introduction of this bill, I heard from workers in South-East Queensland, Cairns and Townsville who want to live near their workplaces—workers who want to relocate their families, workers who want to escape the hustle of city life and live within the friendly surrounds of a regional community. This bill ensures that these workers can now relocate without fear of being discriminated against. This bill ensures that they can now relocate without fear of losing their jobs, and this can only be good for regional Queensland.

This job provides me the privilege of getting out into towns and communities the length and breadth of this great state and seeing towns that thrive on bonds between neighbours, that thrive on the strength of their local footy or Rotary club, communities that are proud and are fighters. As I travel throughout Queensland in towns like those through the Bowen Basin, this is one of the main issues that locals raise with me. I see the frustration in the faces of local councillors and mayors as they see their communities grapple with the effects of global economic insecurity. I see the concern in the faces of community leaders as they fear for the future of their local clubs. I see the worry in the faces of parents as they wonder what future prospects their sons and daughters will have in a rapidly changing economy.

What I can say to these people is that this bill will ensure that they will now be on that level playing field and they will be given that fair go when it comes to recruitment. Mines located near regional communities will no longer be able to advertise jobs by claiming, 'If you are not within 200 kilometres of Brisbane Airport, do not bother applying.' If you have the skills and experience for the job, you cannot and will not be excluded from consideration simply due to living nearby. I should caution against the demonisation of FIFO. FIFO is part of this industry. It is often necessary. What we are doing today is

humanising FIFO. We are sensibly giving it its rightful, appropriate place. It is all about achieving the right balance. Workers want choice. They want to decide whether to be a FIFO worker or to move to a nearby town that offers a different lifestyle that they may desire. It is not helpful or conducive for anyone to have communities alienated on the edge of projects.

As part of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to strong and sustainable resource communities, it commissioned two separate reviews into FIFO workforce arrangements—namely, a parliamentary inquiry by the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, and I commend it for its review, and a review by an independent FIFO review panel, also an excellent review. These processes have informed development of the bill. Diverse and often polarised views have been put forward by different stakeholders during the consultation processes on this bill. Two FIFO reviews, including the parliamentary committee consideration of the bill, also demonstrated some diverse and polarised views. This is the first bill to address FIFO which strikes a balanced and considered approach that will deliver positive social and economic outcomes for resource communities across Queensland.

Some stakeholders have observed that the bill's 100 per cent prohibition on FIFO workforces is not strong enough, as employing a small number of local residents would satisfy this requirement. However, the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO is only one element of the bill. This provision works in conjunction with the new social impact assessment guideline prescribed in the bill which will require emphasis to be given to prioritising local employment, developing skills through training and, in addition, we have the provisions in the bill that prohibit discrimination against employing people from nearby regional communities. Also, I will later move an amendment to the bill to lift part of the detailed consideration for workforce management from the draft social impact assessment guideline into the bill.

The bill will require a social impact assessment to consider recruitment being prioritised in accordance with the following hierarchy: firstly, recruitment from local and regional communities; and, secondly, recruitment to a nearby regional community. The elevation of this employment hierarchy into the bill will solidify the government's policy position that proponents prioritise local employment and build more sustainable regional communities. Together these initiatives will result in a fairer approach to the employment of local residents and a more appropriate balance between FIFO and local workers in each case.

Amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 included in the bill will allow anyone who lives in a regional community to be fairly considered for a job and not be discriminated against. As per the recommendations from the committee, the anti-discrimination provisions will be extended to apply to all large resource projects operating in Queensland regardless of their approval or commencement date. Industry representatives have expressed concerns about the perceived retrospectivity of the anti-discrimination provisions. The anti-discrimination provisions are not retrospective because they only apply to future recruitment practices for large resource projects. The purpose of any legislation is to change future behaviour. This bill ensures that workers from nearby regional communities are not discriminated against when future operational jobs are advertised. The anti-discrimination provisions also do not impact upon any hiring decisions made by resource companies prior to the commencement of the bill.

Impacts on large resource projects from the extension of the 100 per cent FIFO prohibition will be managed through providing for a reasonable transitional period for this provision. This will allow sufficient time for large resource projects to ensure compliance. The social impact assessment guideline prescribed in the bill will include the requirement to produce five detailed plans in an EIS for community and stakeholder engagement, workforce management, housing and accommodation, local business and industry content, and health and community wellbeing. The social impact assessment guideline will also have changes to further strengthen project assessment, monitoring, compliance and reporting requirements. The requirements of the workforce management plan in the social impact assessment guideline will be expanded to include details of worker wellbeing policies and management systems along with employee assistance programs that support the mental health of workers, particularly FIFO workers.

As part of the social impact assessment for a large resource project, the Coordinator-General will evaluate the capability of nearby regional communities to support local workers in the construction phase of a project. The proponent will be required to address this matter both in the social impact assessment and the EIS. I will later move an amendment to the bill to require the Coordinator-General to decide, as part of an EIS, whether the provisions of the bill should apply to construction workers for a project along with the operational workforce. The construction workers for new projects would only be included following a detailed analysis of the social impact assessment as part of the EIS. This amendment is appropriate as advice has been received on multiple occasions regarding the nature of

construction workforces—namely, that they are generally transitional and for short periods of time. The nature of construction is that workers must travel and the work will only be for a given period of time.

However, with the advent of large, multiple staged projects, some mines are engaged in construction for a considerable period of time. It is therefore appropriate that the Coordinator-General look at the capacity of local and regional communities to contribute to the construction phase of the project. We have moved amendments that ensure that, if through this process it is clear that capacity exists and is suitable, the Coordinator-General will include construction for the purposes of this framework. We want our local communities to get the full range of benefits that come with mining development, and that includes construction. Our amendments will ensure that local communities that have the sparkies, engineers, surveyors, builders and all range of workers to contribute during construction will be included in that construction. We are committed to ensuring this bill is implemented in practice, so we will put in place effective monitoring of projects to ensure compliance with the legislation. To achieve this, another amendment that I will move is designed to give the Coordinator-General investigative powers to seek information from any proponent relevant to the administration and enforcement of the act.

The government has committed to undertaking a post implementation review that will commence within 18 months to two years of the commencement of the proposed legislation. A post implementation review, similar in scope to a regulatory impact statement, will examine both the effectiveness of the anti-discrimination provisions and the cost of compliance to all stakeholders. The post implementation review will also examine the workforce arrangements for large resource projects and inform potential future reforms to the strong and sustainable resource communities legislation.

In April 2016 the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef and I announced the government's decision to prohibit underground coal gasification, or UCG, activity in Queensland. The amendments to the Mineral Resources Act 1989 included in this bill will put this prohibition in place by banning all 'mineral (f)' activity, including UCG and in situ oil shale gasification in Queensland. In 2009 the Queensland government established a process for three companies to undertake limited UCG trials to demonstrate the viability of the UCG process and whether it could operate within Queensland's strict environmental guidelines.

Along with this process, an independent scientific panel was established to report on the trials. The independent scientific panel report on UCG pilot trials demonstrated that there were unresolved issues surrounding the potential impact of UCG activities, particularly in relation to scaling up limited trial projects to commercial scale operations. Along with the issues associated with the trial projects to date, this uncertainty led the government to the decision that the potential issues of allowing the UCG industry to proceed outweigh any potential benefit.

While UCG and in-situ oil shale gasification activities will be prohibited, the holder of a mineral (f) development licence will be permitted, within the area of the licence, to carry out surface and sub-surface environmental rehabilitation and activities necessary for the decommissioning and removal of plant and equipment previously associated with carrying out UCG activities.

This bill not only achieves two election commitments; it also aims to benefit local communities near large resource projects and provide them with local business growth. More broadly, the bill will benefit local communities in the vicinity of large resource projects. It demonstrates how the Palaszczuk government supports the resource industry to ensure it operates to a world's best practice standard when entering land to carry out exploration and production activities and environmental rehabilitation of sites where such activities have been conducted.

In summary, this bill is the result of the Palaszczuk Labor government listening to the call of regional communities across Queensland. To the people of Middelmount, Moranbah, Mount Isa, Emerald, Weipa and all remote and regional communities in the vicinity of large resource projects, I can say to you that the Palaszczuk Labor government is a government that delivers on its election commitments. The Palaszczuk government promised to ban and overhaul 100 per cent FIFO in Queensland, and that is what we are delivering. I commend the bill to the House.



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3.22 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. This bill deals with the long-term legacy issues created by the former Labor government's decision in 2011—not very long ago—to allow two mines in regional Queensland to operate with 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces. This meant totally bypassing all of the local regional communities, local towns and local workers.

The only government in Queensland ever to approve and allow 100 per cent FIFO in Queensland was a Labor government. Only the LNP understands the importance of enduring partnerships between our regional communities and the resource companies—partnerships that have been forged through respect, sharing economic benefits, creating local jobs and business opportunities and operating sustainably. Only the LNP understands that there is no greater need for young people in our rural and regional communities than a job—a job that can provide the dignity and purpose of meaningful work. In terms of Queensland's youth unemployment situation, youth job losses have skyrocketed under this Palaszczuk government. Over 8,000 young Queenslanders lost their jobs in the past 12 months. In some parts of outback Queensland, youth unemployment nudges 60 per cent. These figures are completely and utterly unacceptable. We need to work harder to ensure these young people get jobs in rural and regional Queensland.

When in government, the LNP made it clear that we would never approve a 100 per cent FIFO resource project where it was located in the vicinity of a regional town. In clearly specifying that BMA Mines, Caval Ridge and Daunia could operate with up to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforce, the Bligh government ignored community views and set the company up to make extreme decisions that were not in the best interests of that region. Allowing 100 per cent FIFO for mines near regional communities was completely out of step with community expectations then and it is completely out of step with community expectations now.

Workers and their families should not be discriminated against because of their postcode. Labor's 2011 decision has allowed exactly that to happen. Guess what? Labor's bill on the table today does not do nearly enough to stop that discrimination from happening. The LNP's proposed amendments show that we back regional Queensland and we back jobs for regional Queenslanders. Our amendments will ensure regional Queenslanders get a fair go. Our amendments address the major concerns raised by a number of local governments and address a major concern from the union movement. We have listened to them.

This bill shows that the Palaszczuk government has abandoned the workers and now is pandering to the green groups to save its members' backsides, particularly those of the members for South Brisbane and Brisbane Central. The LNP is backing regional Queensland and putting regional Queenslanders first because it is in our DNA. Only the LNP truly understands rural and regional Queensland. A Labor government introduced this disaster to regional communities. Labor, the party that is supposed to back the worker, is presiding over a jobs crisis in our regions. Youth unemployment in parts of Gregory, Warrego, Mount Isa and Cook is running at 57 per cent because of this do-nothing Labor government. Youth unemployment has more than doubled since this government took power.

Over half of all young people in outback Queensland who want a job cannot get one under this Palaszczuk government. That is a crying shame. In many other regions, like Townsville and Wide Bay, youth unemployment sits at around 20 per cent. Average unemployment in the areas represented by the members for Mirani and Mackay is running at 6.6 per cent under Labor compared to just four per cent under the LNP. It was 2.6 per cent less under an LNP government than under this incompetent Palaszczuk government. In Mackay, unemployment peaked in the last two years, under the Palaszczuk government, at eight per cent. It is a hard figure for them to swallow because, like the member yesterday, they drank the Kool Aid. Unemployment in the Fitzroy region is getting worse—

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Those opposite laugh about it, but people out there are talking about what the Palaszczuk government is doing—that is, not supporting rural and regional Queensland. Some 2,900 jobs have been lost in the last year. Since Labor's election to government, some 3,900 jobs have been lost in the Fitzroy region alone. That region's unemployment rate is now 7.2 per cent. It has increased by almost two per cent under this incompetent government and has gone up almost one per cent in the last 12 months alone.

Under this government, unemployment in Townsville reached its highest level on record. Since Labor's election to government, some 7,500 jobs have been lost in the Townsville region. Under Labor, Townsville's unemployment rate reached its worst rate on record, 11.6 per cent. The current rate would be even higher if more than 7,000 people had not given up looking for work all together. The participation rate has completely plummeted under this Palaszczuk government's watch. The worker's party has abandoned the worker.

Only the LNP recognises the importance of the resource industry to the Queensland economy. Indeed, the resources sector remains one of the LNP's six priority industries which will drive and strengthen our economy. We appreciate that the resources sector has invested billions of dollars to

develop and operate long-term resource projects in our state. It is important that governments provide a stable and globally competitive regulatory framework. We have been very mindful of this in considering this bill. I know that the member for Callide and the member for Hinchinbrook will agree with me that the LNP is proud of our track record in supporting the resources industry. In government we worked hard to wind back the years of Labor's green tape and overregulation to help the resources sector in this state to be competitive at a time when it was most needed. The LNP believes a strong resources sector must be underpinned by thriving resource communities with infrastructure that affords regional Queenslanders with the same lifestyle and benefits as our urban counterparts.

The LNP's record stands in stark contrast to that of Labor governments past and present. The Palaszczuk government, and the Bligh government before it, treats rural and regional Queenslanders like second-class citizens by starving them of infrastructure investment. Earlier this year I saw the impacts of this neglect when I visited towns across the Central Highlands and the coalfields with my colleague the member for Burdekin, Dale Last, and the federal member for Capricornia, Michelle Landry. We met with local councillors, shopkeepers, small business owners and graziers in the communities of Glenden, Moranbah, Dysart and Clermont. These once thriving communities are now a shadow of their former selves due to the challenging coal prices. While locals mostly understand the commercial decisions made by mining companies to scale back operations during downturns, they are far less forgiving of this Labor government's absolute decimation of the statewide infrastructure budget and they were very, very loud and clear in their message to us that under this Palaszczuk government the region has been starved of infrastructure.

In its first budget this Labor government cut \$2 billion from the statewide infrastructure budget, effectively slashing infrastructure spending and leaving it to fall to its lowest ever level in Queensland. This government has such little loyalty to the communities that form the backbone of our regional economy that they have seen fit to spend billions of dollars less on infrastructure, hitting regional Queensland the hardest, where distance and isolation make roads, bridges, health and education infrastructure vitally important. Only the LNP believe in investing in our regions. The LNP understands how important an extra council road crew working on a local road upgrade can be to a small regional community. Investing in infrastructure creates the jobs that are sorely needed in the bush.

Mr Bailey interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Those who sit in this chamber now and carry on have cut the guts out of regional roads funding. They have slashed the Royalties for the Regions program—absolutely slashed it. Only the LNP understand about investing in the regions. That is why when we were in government we established the very successful Royalties for the Regions program to ensure our regional communities received their fair share of resource royalties. We understand that investment in regional Queensland creates jobs, boosts moral and creates a flow-on effect throughout regional economies. Between 2012 and 2015 the LNP Royalties for the Regions program invested in 147 regional community infrastructure projects.

A government member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: If you did not hear that over there on the other side—I hear a slight interjection—between 2012 and 2015 the LNP's very successful Royalties for the Regions program invested in 147 regional community infrastructure road and flood mitigation projects with a combined value of more than \$790 million.

Dr Lynham: You're delusional.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I will take that interjection from the minister. He said that I am delusional. Let me read out just some of the list. I do this for the minister because there is only one deluded person in this chamber right now and he is sitting opposite. There was \$20 million for the Blakeys Crossing Road project in Townsville; \$11 million for the Eidsvold-Theodore Road project; \$5 million for the Nogoa River upgrade in Emerald; \$5 million for the Roma levee project; \$9 million for the Collinsville to Bowen Road; \$8 million to the Arcadia Valley Road in the Central Highlands; almost \$13 million to the Kin Kora roundabout in Gladstone; \$6 million to the Marian water treatment plant; \$750,000 to build the Dysart medical centre; \$5.5 million to upgrade the Dysart water treatment plant; and even \$1 million to build a swimming pool in the tiny gulf community of Karumba.

The LNP delivered projects under Royalties for the Regions—projects that deliver for our communities, unlike the halve, slash-down, incompetent Palaszczuk government that was unable to deliver even a fraction of what we were able to deliver under the very successful Royalties for the

Regions program. The LNP has promised to bring back that program: half a billion dollars to ensure regional Queensland gets its fair share of infrastructure. We have committed to extend its scope. Previously the Royalties for the Regions program under the LNP was open to all councils in regional Queensland, but a future LNP government will extend the program to other stakeholder groups in those regions. Rockhampton, Mackay, Townsville, Moranbah, Clermont and Emerald are all important hubs for resources activity and host critical export infrastructure and many resource industry workers and their families. They have been largely ignored by this Palaszczuk government.

As I mentioned, there are several significant failings in Labor's bill that will mean regional communities will continue to miss out on the benefits of mining projects in their backyard. Labor's bill will not prohibit 100 per cent FIFO workforces during the construction phase. It will give an unelected public servant the discretion to apply the 100 per cent prohibition on FIFO workforces during the construction phase, but it will not mandate this very simple principle. We have just heard the minister carry on like he is the saviour for regional Queensland by saying maybe they will let it happen through the construction phase. Why talk about it? Why not just do it? I look forward to the minister supporting my amendments that will come before the House.

Regional communities deserve better. They deserve certainty. Labor's bill also does not mandate that a resource project proponent must consult with local communities through the social impact assessment process. Before I speak to the amendments the LNP is proposing to this bill, I would like to acknowledge the member for Warrego and the member for Gympie for their participation in the committee's consideration of this bill. The amendment we will be moving reflects on their hard work, the LNP's established position against FIFO and careful consideration of stakeholder views. I would like to acknowledge other regional members, including the member for Gregory who represented the LNP on related parliamentary inquiries and campaigned strongly for his electorate on this matter.

The amendments circulated in my name make two major changes to the bill. The first extends the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO workforces to the construction stage of large resource projects to nearby regional communities. Under the current bill the application of the 100 per cent FIFO workforces during construction phase is only at the discretion of the Coordinator-General. It is not, as the minister said, just a matter of right. He has not put it in the bill so it is not mandated. That is why the opposition has circulated those amendments.

This important change will ensure that during a multiyear construction phase of resource projects, jobs will be awarded to locals, providing a positive flow-on effect to regional economies. It will make a big difference to communities that have seen large workforces imported during long durations for construction projects. Those communities have felt the social and physical impacts of those projects, without being able to share the benefits through local job opportunities, particularly for our young people.

The second change is that, when preparing a social impact statement, the proponents of large resource projects will be required specifically to consult with local communities within the local government area in which the large resource project is situated. Formalising a requirement to consult with specific local communities will ensure those communities have a say as the projects are developed.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Order! One moment, member for Nanango. Minister, your interjections are not being taken. I suggest that you cease.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Maybe he cannot see me properly from where he should be sitting. The LNP will be giving local resource communities a voice. On this side of the chamber we all know that that voice has been completely silenced under those opposite. These amendments to the bill go much further than those of the government to ensure that our regional resource communities are consulted and that local job opportunities are available during both the construction and operational stages of a resource project.

The Isaac Regional Council raised the fly-in fly-out issue with me directly as one of their biggest concerns. They are worried about the effectiveness of the bill to solve Labor's damaging legacy. The Isaac Regional Council wants the prohibition of 100 per cent FIFO to include the construction phase of a resource project, just as we are proposing in our amendments. The LNP has listened.

The Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union also believes that the bill is too narrow and agrees with the LNP's view that the 100 prohibition should be applied not only to the operational phase of the mine but also to its construction. I say this for the benefit of the minister: in its submission, the AMWU

noted that while the bill includes a draft of a social impact assessment guideline, the process appears to be more focused on the impact of the large resource project on the nearby regional community and not on the impact, particularly the mental health implications, of FIFO employment on the FIFO workers themselves. Again, this issue has been left unaddressed by the Palaszczuk government.

The Electrical Trades Union supports the bill. The ETU also wants a 100 per cent prohibition for the construction phase of resource projects. If Labor really care about regional workers and regional communities, they too will support the LNP's amendments to ban 100 per cent FIFO during the construction phase of a project. Billions of dollars are being spent to construct resource projects. Thousands of jobs are created during that phase. Regional Queenslanders and regional communities deserve a fair go, but not just through the operational phase. Why not through the construction phase as well? They deserve to have a crack at those jobs.

I am looking forward to hearing the contribution of the member for Mirani. This is his chance to show this House that Labor understands Central Queensland families. It is those families who have told me that they want this House to support the LNP's amendments so that regional communities benefit during the operational and construction phases of resource projects. On this side of the House, we are waiting with great anticipation to hear the valued contribution of the member for Mirani, who I am sure will back in those Central Queensland families and back in the amendments of the LNP.

We all know that the member for Mirani has been a vocal critic of this Palaszczuk government. We read it on his Facebook page. He is a vocal critic of this incompetent Palaszczuk government. However, the member for Mirani needs to take responsibility for Labor not understanding families in Central Queensland. They are families he was elected to represent in the Labor caucus. They are families he was elected to represent in this House. Today he will get the opportunity to support the LNP and support the families of Central Queensland. I know that the member for Burdekin, my good friend Dale Last, vocally supports people who live in that area. I look forward to hearing the contribution of the member for Mirani in relation to Central Queensland. I look forward to seeing his support for the LNP's amendments because we know that we are the only party—the only side of the House—that supports our regional communities. Let the member for Mirani not forget that it has only ever been a Labor government that supported 100 per cent FIFO in this great state.

We all know that, deep down, the member for Mirani knows that this bill does not pass the pub test. How can you prohibit something in operation but not support it in construction? It is another con that is going to cost Queensland. We all know of the crisis that the Palaszczuk government has launched this House into in the past couple of days. I now challenge the member for Mirani to stand in front of any pub in a mining community and defend Labor's position not to legislate a ban on 100 per cent FIFO during the construction phase of a project.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I have another 36 minutes. If the minister would like me to continue, I am happy to do so. For the benefit of those opposite, I repeat the reason we are standing in this House today, discussing this issue. Let us go back to why we are in this House discussing this issue today.

Ms Leahy interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take the interjection from the honourable member for Warrego: it is because of them. It is because of those opposite. Today we are in this House discussing this issue because we have had to deal with the long-term legacy issues created by Labor. They were created by a Labor government decision in 2011 to allow two mines in regional Queensland to operate with 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces, totally bypassing our local towns, totally bypassing our young kids and totally bypassing our communities in those regions. The Labor Party says that they support the worker. It has been proven here today that it is only the LNP that will support the workers of rural and regional Queensland, unlike the Labor government.

The LNP supports prohibiting underground coal gasification in Queensland so that the Cougar Energy debacle in Kingaroy is never ever repeated. Labor failed to protect regional communities by approving that UCG project. It was another Labor fail. On the table today we have a bill to clean up Labor's mistakes in relation to UCG. The Labor Party is responsible for the Cougar Energy debacle and the environmental vandalism that occurred at the Cougar Energy site in Kingaroy. I am pleased that this amending bill will bury that issue forever for my local community of Kingaroy. I can tell the House that the debacle that the Labor Party created in relation to UCG caused appalling stress for my local community. It was an issue that continued until the LNP was able to say 'no more', that never again would we allow that activity to happen.

The government has foreshadowed a number of amendments to its bill. Those amendments highlight the substantial holes and flaws in the original bill. I look forward to hearing what the minister has to say about those amendments during the consideration in detail stage.

On behalf of this side of the House, I conclude by again stating that it is only the LNP that understands rural and regional communities. It is only the LNP that stands by our workers. It is only the LNP that will stand up for rural and regional Queensland.

Government members interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is obvious from the murmurings of those opposite that it is only the LNP that will stand up for our regional communities during the construction phase as well. These communities will be screaming out for a bite of cherry whilst that construction is happening. They will be screaming out and asking, 'Why can't my kid get a job in the resources industry that you are creating?' Those kids will be asking, 'Why can't I get a bite of the cherry?'


Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, one moment please. Member for Kallangur and member for Warrego, you will not have conversations and a debate across the chamber.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Nor with the Deputy Speaker.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is only the LNP that understands what is needed to ensure our regional communities and resource companies create partnerships that build stronger families, provide safe and livable communities and, most importantly, build the roads, dams and bridges that this great state needs.

 **Mr PEARCE** (Mirani—ALP) (3.51 pm): I must start off by saying that I am touched—

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Stewart): Minister, if you are going to interject you need to be sitting in your own seat and not in someone else's seat.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, we do not need your assistance.

Mr PEARCE: I am excited that the member for Nanango is so obsessed with me that she looks at my Facebook page often and that she has mentioned me so many times today. I thank her for that.

It is easy in the interests of playing politics to try to link the Bligh government to the start of 100 per cent FIFO. If you do not understand what happened, I will explain it to you. With regard to the Caval Ridge and Daunia mines, BMA went to the Coordinator-General and requested that the workforce change from 70 per cent fly-in fly-out to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out. The Coordinator-General made a recommendation, as an independent officer, to the minister. I understand that in those situations the minister is obligated to follow through on that recommendation. It is convenient to get up and try to blame the Bligh government when it was BMA that made that application around about 14 June 2008 and it was approved by the Coordinator-General.

The member for Nanango talks about unemployment. Why do you not get off your backside instead of having cups of coffee—lattes—with the big end of town and the multinationals? Why do you not raise it with them?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mirani, I remind you that you need to direct all your comments through the chair.

Mr PEARCE: What a fine chair we have, too.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mirani, that is not going to alter what I have said. You will still need to direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PEARCE: You are in bed with the multinationals. You do not really think about the workers, because if you did you would be out there having a say about what Oaky North is doing to their workforce. You did nothing for three years—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mirani, despite your flattering comments earlier you still need to direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PEARCE: The opposition did nothing for three years and now they want to walk in here and bung on a show to try to impress people out in the community who already understand what they are like. If those opposite had been listening to what is happening in Central Queensland they would know

that there has been significant community opposition to resource companies that maintain 100 per cent FIFO workforce arrangements and discriminate against the employment of local workers. If they had been listening they would have heard that loud and clear.

The proposed strong and sustainable resource communities policy framework will provide the tools for resource companies to work with state and local governments, local business and community members to enhance their social licence to operate. The enhanced social impact assessment process will require resource companies to provide local businesses with access to project supply chains and maximise opportunities to build resource communities that attract and retain workers and, most importantly, their families. Social impact assessment considerations will include the adequacy of training programs—which is not happening now—within the region to support employment opportunities for local workers on large resource projects. Partnerships between the resource companies and training providers are encouraged where possible.

As part of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to strong and sustainable resource communities, it commissioned two separate reviews into fly-in fly-out or FIFO work arrangements, including a parliamentary inquiry conducted by the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee and a review by an independent FIFO review panel. It was an election commitment of the now Premier, Anastacia Palaszczuk, that in government we would legislate against the use of 100 per cent FIFO operations near regional communities and introduce choice for workers to live in the resource communities near where they work. I thank the Premier for giving that commitment and for following through with it.

I am proud to be a Labor member in a Labor government. I care about workers. I care about families. I care about communities. I am proud to be a member of a government that has that commitment to the ordinary people of Central Queensland.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee and the review panel for their bipartisan work and acknowledge the government's extensive and ongoing work which has occurred on this matter. In the gallery today is the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council, Anne Baker, and Councillor Gina Lacey and Councillor Kelly Vea Vea, whom I hope to see in this place sometime in the future. I also want to thank the member for Gladstone, the member for Keppel and the member for Barron River who sat on this committee along with the member for Burleigh and the member for Gregory. They played a very positive role in the work that the committee was doing. It was good to see that those members could look at what was happening and were prepared to make positive comments in the committee process.

I remind BMA that this legislation would not be in this House today if they had pulled their head out of the sand and realised what was happening out there. They need to show good corporate spirit and work with the communities where the coal comes from. A lot of people forget that. My job as a local member is to make sure that people do not forget it.

The objective of the bill is to prescribe in legislation the social impact assessment process for large resource projects and to prohibit 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, or FIFO, workforce arrangements for operational workers on large resource projects—yea! I like that idea. I say to members on the other side who want to talk about the construction workforce: if you knew what you were talking about, you would know that construction workforces are mobile. They move from one big construction job to the next. They come back at times to work on maintenance and breakdowns on the big plants. They are not locked into one place. They are not like the workforce at the mine who want to live in the town with their family and close by to their workplace. Let us get that straight as well.

The bill will also amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 to prohibit discrimination against local residents in the recruitment process for operational workers. This is the crux of this legislation. This is why we are here today. The strong and sustainable resource communities policy framework will support resource communities to attract and retain workers and their families—great; improve participation of local governments in the social impact assessment process for each project—absolutely necessary; improve access for competitive local businesses to resource project supply chains; help protect resource workers' health and wellbeing; provide flexibility to respond to the peaks and troughs in the resource sector—if coal production goes up, there is an ability for the mining companies to look outside the local area; and minimise any consequential increases in costs to both proponents and governments in the assessment and operation of resource projects.

The anti-discrimination amendments will have a lot of people, particularly the mining companies, looking at how they can get around them and come back and give us a belt. If the mining companies want to find ways to get around their obligations and responsibilities, I am happy to come back into this

place and seek an amendment to the act. What we will have now is an act of parliament that we can amend. We do not have to go through the process of the last two years—seven years for some people—of putting this legislation together and bringing it into the House. The amendments will prohibit discrimination against locals during the recruitment process for new workers. They will also enable existing fly-in fly-out workers on relevant large resource projects to move into the local community if they choose. If they want to go there, they should be able to go there. When I came from New South Wales, I got the job if I moved my family to Dysart. That was the best thing I ever did.

Mrs Lauga: A lot of them do want to live there.

Mr PEARCE: A lot of them do want to live there. I speak to them all the time. They come and speak to me about it. These amendments will end this form of postcode discrimination in Queensland. It will become an offence to advertise positions in a way which prohibits residents from nearby regional communities from applying for a job on a large resource project. The anti-discrimination requirements will apply to all large resource projects and will only apply to future recruitment processes.

Under the new legislation, an aggrieved person—and I think this is a good thing—may lodge a complaint with the Anti-Discrimination Commission Queensland. If that person provides sufficient evidence, and the Anti-Discrimination Commission accepts the complaint, it will notify the resource company and commence a conciliation process. That is a good, fair way to go about it. If the person is dissatisfied with the outcome of the conciliation process, the commission may provide leave for the person to seek redress through the Queensland Industrial Relations Commission. The QIRC may award financial compensation to the complainant.

The strong and sustainable resource communities policy framework requires the Office of the Coordinator-General to adopt enhanced social impact assessment, or SIA, and compliance functions. This is a very strong point of the legislation. The social impact assessment has to be ticked off by the Coordinator-General. The key to this legislation is that the Coordinator-General will have the powers to pursue what is in the SIA and make sure it is happening. That is something I will be looking forward to seeing the Coordinator-General do over the years. Proponents will usually be required to monitor and report on compliance with their approval conditions and the implementation of their commitments. The Coordinator-General may also direct corrective actions where there is noncompliance or the agreed desired outcomes are not being achieved.

We are committed to ensuring this bill is implemented in practice. We will put in place effective monitoring of projects to ensure compliance with the bill. To achieve this, the Coordinator-General will have new investigation powers to request information from any proponent relevant to the administration and enforcement of the bill. That will be a tough job for the Coordinator-General. I wish him the best of luck with that, but it is necessary for that to happen. Where corrective actions are required, the Coordinator-General would seek to work collaboratively with project owners and their agents, rather than apply formal enforcement measures. For most projects, reporting by proponents would be annually but may become less frequent or be tied to more significant changes of the operation of the project such as expansion or downsizing of a mine.

The Coordinator-General would proactively respond to allegations of noncompliance with the bill. That is an excellent part of the legislation. For example, if a large resource project is suspected of having a 100 per cent FIFO workforce, the Coordinator-General will be able to require the owner of the large resource project to provide relevant information regarding the operational workforce arrangements. Keep an eye on them, I say. Failure to submit relevant information will have a maximum penalty of 400 penalty units, or approximately \$250,000 for a corporation. Knowingly giving false or misleading information to the Coordinator-General will have a maximum penalty of 1,665, or approximately \$1 million. Following the investigation, the Coordinator-General will be able to require the owner to submit an operational workforce management plan. Failure to submit an operational workforce management plan to the satisfaction of the Coordinator-General will have a maximum penalty of 800 penalty units, or approximately \$500,000. Go, Coordinator-General!

The Coordinator-General may also state conditions on the operational workforce management plan submitted for a project and the SIA in the project evaluation. There will be significant penalties for noncompliance with social conditions. The maximum penalty for noncompliance with an enforceable condition would be approximately \$1 million for a corporation. This penalty regime currently applies to noncompliance with all of the Coordinator-General's conditions imposed under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. The penalty for an offence of advertising in a way that would discriminate against local employment would be approximately \$250,000. I think this is a great part of

the legislation as well. I encourage mining companies to use words that mean something, not use words that are wishy-washy and that muddy the waters. It will be good to see advertisements in the media that are legitimate and to the point.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the work of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, the review panel, and acknowledge the government's extensive and ongoing work which has occurred on this matter. The committee made seven recommendations in relation to the bill in its report, including recommending that the bill be passed. The government response supports the majority of the committee recommendations and proposes several clarification amendments to the bill that would improve the operation of the legislation.

A considered approach has been taken to the legislation in order to ensure the right balance is achieved. That is what has to happen—the right balance. Issues with FIFO and local communities have been extensively reviewed over the last few years at a national and state level. The bill reflects the views of the broader community that 100 per cent FIFO workforce arrangements of existing large resource projects are negatively impacting nearby regional communities. It is now time to implement legislation to address the impact of FIFO.


The other great benefit to come out of this is that it will get the resource communities heavily populated again. Workers and their families will go to Rockhampton, Mackay and Townsville and spend money. That will help revive the towns of Mackay and Rockhampton, in particular, where there has been a massive decrease in population simply because there are no jobs in the area. You cannot expect people to continue living in the area if there are no jobs, and young family members need jobs.

I always talk about cash flow. If there is a positive cash flow, it has a positive impact on small business which might need to employ another apprentice or put on another shop assistant simply because more people are coming into their business and spending money. I think that is about a healthy economy. Those members opposite all like to think they can make that happen but the biggest problem they have is that they do not have a clue.

The bill reflects the views of the broader community, as I said, that 100 per cent FIFO workforce arrangements of existing large resource projects are negatively impacting the whole region, not just local communities. This legislation would be the first of its kind in Australia to manage FIFO and will be closely monitored by people like me and the Coordinator-General.

Queensland has been at the forefront of FIFO impacts given the proximity of many of our regional communities to resource projects. Those towns and communities are in the coalfields. The projects out there are big. They are big mining operations with plenty of workers and plenty of business flowing around. The reason Central Queensland does not significantly benefit from these operations is that we allow the big multinationals to go in there and have access to our resources. What has happened in the last couple of years has to stop.

I am pleased to note the government's commitment for a post implementation review that will examine the effectiveness of the legislation and the workforce arrangements for large projects. I will end on this point: if mining companies try to get around or find holes in this legislation, as I said before, I will be the first one back in this place with an amendment.

 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (4.11 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. In doing so, from the outset I acknowledge the contribution of the member for Nanango, our shadow minister who led the response for the LNP. It was a very robust and passionate contribution from the member for Nanango who has put strongly the LNP's position in relation to this bill.

From the outset I would like to acknowledge the robust representations that the member for Gregory, the member for Warrego and the member for Burdekin have made to the LNP about our approach to this particular public policy issue. They are passionate advocates for the communities that they represent and that they seek to represent in the future, and they deserve credit for the way they have advocated for their constituents.

The policy objectives and the reasons for the provisions of the bill which the minister has put forward are to ensure that regional communities in Queensland which are in the vicinity of large resource projects benefit from the operation of those projects. The bill will limit the use of fly-in fly-out workforces and ensure that local workers from nearby regional communities are employed in the operation of large resource projects.

As the explanatory notes accompanying the bill indicate, the bill aims to prescribe the social impact assessment process for large resource projects, prevent the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces for the operation of future large resource projects located near regional communities,

prevent resource companies discriminating against local residents in the future recruitment of operational workers, and support existing and new workers who choose to live and work in regional communities.

I would like to recognise that, in part, this bill is the result of a long campaign by the member for Mirani to try to achieve some outcomes on behalf of the CFMEU on behalf of whom he comes to this parliament. He is a delegate of the CFMEU in this place. He does so proudly. He wears his heart on his sleeve in that regard. He has been campaigning for a long time to see some change with respect to FIFO arrangements in the resources sector in Queensland.

Inconveniently for the member for Mirani, he has to face up to the reality of the situation that the only two resource projects in the state of Queensland that have ever received approval which explicitly allows 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforce arrangements are the Caval Ridge and Daunia projects and that they received that approval from the Bligh Labor government, a government of which he was a member.

The member for Mirani left this parliament in 2009 and the 100 per cent FIFO approvals for those projects occurred in circumstances where there was a boom in the resources sector in Queensland. There is no denying that: in 2008 there was a boom in the resources sector. Almost anyone who wanted to get a job in the resources sector at that time was able to get one. There was an extremely strong demand for labour, particularly in the coal sector at that time, because of the international export price of coal. It was in those circumstances that the Bligh Labor government gave that approval, and it is inconvenient for the member for Mirani but it is the truth.

The member for Mirani left this place of his own choosing in 2009. He then went away and reinvented himself as a community advocate for the CFMEU, which paid his salary. He went on a crusade in relation to his advocacy for those communities and that resulted in him attempting to come back to this place in 2012. He was unsuccessful in that regard, but in 2015 he was successful. What happened shortly after the 2015 state election was that we came back to the parliament and off he went as chairman of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee around the countryside holding community consultation. They took a lot of evidence with that referral to that committee, and they came back with a recommendation—the most substantial recommendation in that committee report which was debated in this place in October 2015—that there should be an amendment to the Anti-Discrimination Act so you were not discriminated against on the basis of where you lived. That was all they could find. After going around the countryside for months and months, that committee came back with the profound recommendation that Queenslanders ought not be discriminated against on the basis of where they live. Of course no-one is going to disagree with that vanilla, unremarkable recommendation. That is the summary of the contribution of the member for Mirani's campaign for almost a decade. It has resulted in that recommendation and the bill now before the House.

There are another couple of amendments in this bill relating to amendments to the Mineral Resources Act. The Mineral Resources Act will be amended to insert provisions that will prohibit all mineral (f) activity in Queensland. Mineral (f) activity within the act includes in situ gasification of coal—underground coal gasification, also known as UCG—and in situ gasification of oil shale which use similar processes to extract the mineral. This gives effect to commitments that the government has given previously to prohibit UCG activities in Queensland. Once again, those UCG activities in Queensland were initiated by the Bligh Labor government in 2009. They initiated three trials—

A government member interjected.

Mr CRIPPS: I beg your pardon?

A government member interjected.


Mr CRIPPS: They approved three trials; namely, Cougar Energy, Carbon Energy and Linc Energy. Those trials were inherited by the previous LNP government in 2012. I received the report of the independent scientific panel and subsequently referred that report from the independent scientific panel to the Chief Scientist who undertook a review. The recommendations of that review undertaken by the Chief Scientist and the ISP said that Carbon Energy and Linc Energy should be allowed to continue with their current trials; a planning and action process should be established to demonstrate successful decommissioning of the underground cavities used as part of the UCG process; and that until decommissioning could be demonstrated no commercial UCG facility should be commenced.

Those recommendations were implemented. The member for Nanango touched on the unfortunate situation facing the community around Kingaroy with respect to the Cougar Energy project. Communities represented by the member for Warrego have subsequently experienced a very

concerning situation in relation to the Linc Energy project. I understand the reasons the government has moved to ban UCG in Queensland. I think though that the carbon energy project, which was not found to be wanting in any serious way within the framework provided by either government, should be given the details of the government's decision with respect to why their particular project ought not proceed.

I also note that the in situ development of oil shale projects will be prohibited. This is in contrast to oil shale developments that are not in situ. I would like to make that distinction and differentiation between oil shale resources that are first extracted and then processed off site. The former LNP government developed a framework for the development of the oil shale industry in Queensland which stands to this day. I would like to encourage investors in Queensland to give consideration to the economic viability of developing those oil shale deposits, not in situ because the provisions of this bill will not permit that in future.

It is an interesting fact that Queensland has about 90 per cent of Australia's known oil shale resources, which is equivalent to approximately 22 billion barrels of oil. There is a robust framework in place that was developed and the member for Glass House and I were involved in that. It is important to understand that the oil shale industry is different from the shale gas or shale oil industry. The technical aspects of that can be secured by going to the Department of Natural Resources and Mines' website and looking up the fact sheet.

 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (4.22 pm): I rise this afternoon to speak in support of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. Before I speak this afternoon about the specifics of the bill, I would like to put on record here in this place just how incredibly livid I am that on Tuesday mining giant Glencore extended its lockout of 190 permanent workers at the Oaky North mine for a further 14 days, placing a financial and mental health strain on the workers and their families. I think this is incredibly un-Australian behaviour by a corporation which pays no tax. I believe Australian workers should not be treated like this.

This renewed lockout will make the total number of days that Glencore has locked out its workers up to 51 days. The timing is atrocious and belligerent by this company, because the 190 workers at the mine were set to return to work at midday on Tuesday. Glencore continues to show complete disregard for these workers by emailing them at 6 am on Tuesday telling them that they would be locked out for a further 14 days. I visited the locked out workers at their protest camp near Tieri on Saturday. Whilst I really felt the strength and unity of these men—they say, 'One day longer, one day stronger'—I also felt a sadness in them because Glencore has locked these men out of their work: the work that they are good at, the work that they are passionate about and the work that they love doing. The lockout extension comes on the back of mega profits for Glencore and shows the complete disdain that this foreign owned company has for its staff and their families. Glencore's Australian coal operators' revenue jumped from US\$1.77 billion to US\$3.1 billion in the past six months alone, so it is hardly doing it tough.

Glencore's agenda appears to be about breaking the workforce, bringing in labour hire contractors and blatantly casualising their workforce. It is an abhorrent way to treat workers who have helped Glencore earn their massive profits. The 190 locked out workers at Oaky North are standing up against casualisation of their workforce and fighting for their conditions to be maintained. This is not a strike over pay; these workers have been locked out of their work because they want their conditions regarding workplace representation maintained. I support them all the way. Standing up for workers is why I got into politics. There are some of the country's best and hardest working coal miners on this picket line, locked out of work. They do not deserve to be treated this way. I believe that everyone deserves fair representation in the workplace.

That leads me to the bill. I thank and congratulate at the outset the member for Mirani, Jim Pearce, for his passion, his stamina and his perseverance in standing up in this place with a good bill, a good Labor bill, before the parliament as a result of his tireless efforts to ensure the voice of regional Queensland and the voice of mining towns and mining families is heard. He has brought those voices together, all the way to this place. We have got good legislation before the House which will support mining towns to attract and retain workers and their families. It will help protect mining workers' health and wellbeing. It will help improve the social impact assessment process for mining projects. It will also help local businesses to provide goods and services to mining operations.

It was an election commitment of the current government to legislate against the use of 100 per cent FIFO operations near regional communities and introduce choice for workers to live in the mining towns near to where they work. This bill fulfils that commitment. This legislation will be the first of its kind in Australia to manage FIFO and will be closely monitored by the Queensland government. The

Queensland Labor Party has been at the forefront of FIFO impacts. We are the only party which has been able to deliver on banning 100 per cent FIFO and giving workers the choice to live in the mining towns near where they work.

Mining communities have been hurting, but the Labor Party is the only one that has listened to those mining communities, those mining workers and their families. They wanted choice and tonight we are delivering that choice. We are not joined at the hip like the LNP are to the mining companies. We have seen a primary example of the LNP joined at the hip, because the amendments that the LNP are proposing tonight are watered down because their mining company donors, the Resources Council and the big mining corporations have said no. We know that the big mining companies of this country say 'Jump' and the LNP say 'How high?'

Were the amendments proposed by the LNP—the watered-down amendments—drafted by the mining companies or the Resources Council? I only ask because it would not be the first time. Remember the time the member for Burnett gave a confidential parliamentary committee report to the Resources Council to edit and the Resources Council's amendments to the report were submitted by mistake by the member for Burnett without first accepting the tracked changes. The poor old member for Burnett got caught out because he forgot to accept the tracked changes made by the Resources Council so he was subsequently found guilty of contempt of this parliament. Were the amendments tabled by the LNP for this bill dictated to the LNP by the Resources Council again? I should hope not.

I am very pleased that this bill seeks to amend the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 to prohibit discrimination against locals during the recruitment processes for new workers. We heard from many regional Queenslanders living in mining communities throughout the committee's inquiry who were frustrated that they have the suitable skills and experience but were told they are not eligible to apply for jobs in the mining sector because they did not live in Brisbane or on the Gold Coast. This is so unfair. We heard stories about miners from resource communities, like Moranbah, going out of their way to try and have a postal address in Brisbane or the Gold Coast so that they would be eligible for a job in their very own community.

This will also enable existing fly-in fly-out workers on mining projects to move into the local community if they choose. We spoke throughout the inquiry to FIFO miners who would absolutely love the opportunity to relocate themselves and their families to the mining town which they fly in and fly out of all the time but the mining company they work for would not allow it. These changes will now give miners the choice when it comes to where they live, but it will also help rejuvenate mining towns in regional Queensland. These amendments will end this form of 'postcode discrimination' in Queensland because it will become an offence to advertise positions in a way which prohibits local people from mining towns from applying for a job at a mine.

Following the introduction of this bill, the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee conducted an inquiry into the bill and made a number of recommendations. I am pleased that the minister will now move amendments to the bill which will extend the ban of 100 per cent FIFO to all existing and future mining projects with a nearby mining town regardless of when they were approved and that it is not just limited to future projects. Previously, the anti-discrimination provisions of the bill only applied to mining projects which were publicly notified after 2009. However, the committee was concerned that there would be many mines older than that to which the anti-discrimination provisions would not apply. I am particularly pleased that the amendments to be moved by the minister mean that the anti-discrimination provisions will extend to all existing and future mining projects to ensure discrimination against local workers does not occur in future recruitment.

The amendments also amend the recruitment hierarchy that was in the draft social impact assessment guideline and elevate its importance by putting it in the bill itself. The proposed recruitment hierarchy now specifies that local people must be considered first and foremost in the recruitment of local jobs and then as a second preference the mining company will need to identify strategies to attract people to live in the community who wish to work at the mine. This amendment will help rejuvenate mining towns, with locals being considered first and then companies being required to consider people wishing to move to the local mining town as opposed to flying workers in and out. The amendments also change the radius and the definition of 'nearby regional community' to 125 kilometres and also clarify that the Coordinator-General may decide to include towns of less than 200 people as a nearby regional community.

The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring this bill is implemented in practice. We will put in place effective compliance monitoring of projects to ensure that mining companies are abiding by this bill. To achieve this, the Coordinator-General will have new investigation powers to request

information from any mining company about the provisions of this bill. For example, if a large resource project is suspected of having a 100 per cent FIFO workforce, the Coordinator-General will be able to require the owner of the large mining project to provide relevant information regarding the operational workforce arrangements. Also the enhanced social impact assessment process will require resource companies to provide local businesses with access to project supply chains and maximise opportunities to build resource communities that attract and retain workers and, most importantly, their families. Failure to submit the relevant information will have a maximum penalty of 400 penalty units, or approximately \$250,000 for a corporation. Knowingly giving false or misleading information to the Coordinator-General will have a maximum penalty of 1,665 penalty units, or approximately \$1 million for a corporation.

The Queensland Labor Party is the only party that listens to the concerns of regional Queensland and will act to ensure that workers, their families and regional communities will have a choice when it comes to where they work and live. In 2015 we saw the LNP's federal member for Capricornia and federal member for Dawson all over the papers claiming that they were the FIFO saviours; they were going to Canberra to fight for regional towns, to change the Fair Work laws and to ban 100 per cent FIFO. The member for Capricornia posted on her Facebook page in March 2015, 'Two Central Queensland federal MPs have launched a dramatic fight to change Australia's Fair Work Act in a bid to ban 100 per cent FIFO work practices that are devastating local jobs and towns.' She said that they were 'taking their fight to the floor of Parliament House in Canberra with a bill to make it illegal for companies to lock people out of jobs based on their home location'. The member for Capricornia said that she was 'fed up with inaction over 100 per cent FIFO' and that she was 'sick of waiting for the authority to act' and she promised that the bill would be debated in late May 2015. I table a copy of the Facebook post of the member for Capricornia from 30 March 2015.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 30 March 2015 by Ms Michelle Landry MP, titled 'News Alert: MPs launch dramatic fight to change fair work laws to ban 100% FIFO' [\[1458\]](#).

The bill was not debated at all in May. Fast-forward to October 2015 and the member for Dawson and the member for Capricornia issued a media statement with the headline 'Labor fails to deliver on 100% FIFO', and I table a copy of the statement from the website of the member for Dawson.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 12 October 2015 by Mr George Christensen MP, titled 'Labor fails to deliver on 100% FIFO' [\[1459\]](#).

However, when I clicked on the link to the statement on FIFO on the website of the member for Capricornia, I found that it had been deleted. The page was not found because the member for Capricornia is obviously embarrassed that she has not delivered as she said she would. I table a copy of that website page of the member for Capricornia.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, showing a screenshot of a '404 Page Not Found' message on webpage of Ms Michelle Landry MP [\[1460\]](#).

Mr Christensen said that Labor had 'drastically failed to deliver' and on 14 October Mr Christensen issued another media statement with a nice picture of the two of them, looking tough and cranky, saying that he and the member for Capricornia were taking 'action to ban 100 per cent FIFO' by introducing a bill into parliament on 19 October, and I table a copy of the media statement of the member for Dawson.

Tabled paper: Media article, dated 14 October 2015, by Mr George Christensen MP, titled 'CQ MPs take action to ban 100% FIFO' [\[1461\]](#).

They grandstanded only to end up with egg all over both of their faces, because what happened? In true LNP fashion, absolutely nothing! The member for Capricornia and the member for Dawson, two hypocrites, did absolutely nothing about FIFO. What we saw was these two running around in the papers claiming credit, talking about how they were going to change 100 per cent FIFO, but they did nothing. The bill was introduced on 19 October and on 15 April 2016 the bill lapsed. After all the promises by the member for Dawson and the member for Capricornia, after all the mudslinging, accusing Labor of doing nothing, it was the LNP that did nothing and it is now the Queensland Labor Party that is doing the heavy lifting and banning 100 per cent FIFO and ending postcode discrimination.

How embarrassing for the LNP members for Capricornia and Dawson to go on a rampage like they did, claiming credit for banning 100 per cent FIFO when they did not, bagging the Labor Party for inaction when it was their own inaction that resulted in the bill lapsing. The LNP will no doubt claim that the bill lapsed because the 2016 federal election was called. What have the two federal members done since the federal election 12 months ago? They have done absolutely nothing! It just goes to show that the member for Capricornia and the member for Dawson are full of hot air, making promises, issuing media statements, claiming credit and bagging others, but they do not have the guts, they do not have the stamina and they do not have the political ability to actually get things done. They failed on FIFO—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Millar): Order! First of all, member for Keppel, there are some phrases there that are unparliamentary. Can you just be aware of that, please.

Mrs LAUGA: They failed on FIFO, they refuse to support Central Queensland's Buy Local policy, they refuse to fight for Central Queensland's fair share of disaster recovery funding, they refuse to call on their very own Northern Australia infrastructure fund to get money out the door on much needed infrastructure projects and they sold out the landholders at Marlborough by pushing full steam ahead for the compulsory acquisition of land for the Singaporean defence force—


Mr Butcher interjected.

Mrs LAUGA:—not to mention the levy; I take the interjection from the member for Gladstone.

Only the Labor Party will listen to the concerns of regional Queensland and will act to ensure that workers, their families and regional communities will have choice when it comes to where they work and live. Only the Labor Party has the passion, the determination and the political nous to get these things done, to make the change happen.

This bill will bring hope and opportunity back to Central Queensland. No longer will mining money fly out of our region. Local workers living in Central Queensland mining towns will now be able to get work in the mines surrounding their towns. No longer will they be overlooked for Brisbane or Gold Coast workers. They will have a fair go at applying for the jobs on offer in the mines around their town. They will be back on a level playing field.

In turn, those Central Queensland miners will be drawing an income from the very mines which are situated around their own towns, and their disposable income will help their local towns flourish again. Their incomes can be spent at the local butcher, the local pub, the shop, the newsagency, and all of the local businesses in that town. The incomes of these local workers will help breathe new life back into the mining towns of Central Queensland. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms LEAHY** (Warrego—LNP) (4.38 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. I would like to thank the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee staff for their assistance with the inquiry and the professionalism with which they have produced report No. 42. I would also like to thank the members of the committee from both sides of the House for their participation in the committee process and also the member for Mount Isa, who joined the committee for the hearing at Mount Isa. The committee travelled extensively to regional communities to hear their views on this bill, which is probably better known to many in the regions as the FIFO bill.

The objective of the bill is to ensure that regional communities in Queensland which are in the vicinity of large resource projects benefit from the operation of those projects. I probably look at this bill through a slightly different prism to some of the other people in this parliament because I look at it in terms of the development of gas projects rather than coalmines. They are quite different. It is important to note that there are only two 100 per cent approved FIFO mines in Queensland. They were approved under the Bligh Labor government, and that is Caval Ridge and Daunia. The bill intends to limit the use of fly-in fly-out workforces and ensure that local workers from nearby regional communities are employed in the operation of large resource projects. This bill also bans underground coal gasification, and again it should be noted that all three UCG trials were approved under the Beattie and Bligh Labor governments.

I note there are also a number of amendments tabled in relation to this bill, and I look forward to hearing the minister's explanation of his amendments. The LNP opposition will also seek to amend this bill with a view to improving the bill as a result of the feedback received from communities and submitters. The LNP does not support 100 per cent FIFO resource projects. This has been a consistent and longstanding policy of the LNP. The LNP are putting regional Queenslanders first and want to see opportunities being provided to locals who live in regional communities. The LNP recognises that resource communities and local governments which have been impacted significantly by resource projects need to have a stronger social assessment framework to manage the impacts of those projects and ensure that Queensland has strong and vibrant communities that are attractive for resource workers and their families to live and work.

I have seen much of this firsthand in recent times in my electorate with the developments across the Surat Basin. One of these challenges is the steep peaks and troughs in the resource industry with the construction and development of projects. As I see it, the industry will always be like this: time is a cost to the industry and they need to get on with their projects. It is our responsibility to work with the

industry and ensure we are able to help them manage the impacts that their projects have on communities. I will now detail some of the shortcomings of the current bill and some suggestions from stakeholders as to how the bill could be improved.

Retrospective changes can increase the sovereign risk to companies and investors, and there are a number of companies affected by the retrospective provisions of the bill. The Coordinator-General advised that there are some 40 projects—about 15 coordinator projects and about 30 in the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. When a company sits down with a sovereign government and signs an agreement and at some time in the future the government signals that the agreement is broken, there is a sovereign risk issue that arises which did not exist before for investors and the company.

There are also concerns in relation to the reverse onus of proof provision contained in the bill. These concerns were raised on more than one occasion. This would not be the first legislation from the Palaszczuk Labor government to contain the reverse onus of proof. Do members remember the vegetation management legislation? Mr Martin Klapper, chair of the mining and resources law committee from the Queensland Law Society, told the committee—

Reversal of onus of proof by itself is a pretty serious step.

Mayor Joyce McCulloch of the Mount Isa City Council also raised concerns about the reverse onus of proof at the hearing in Mount Isa. She said—

Additionally, the governing legislation has proposed a reverse onus of proof which means the mining companies are considered guilty until they prove they are innocent of breaching legislation more specifically around the employment recruitment process of employing local residents versus FIFO employees. That is quite a severe change in the legislation and goes against the basic principles of the judicial system in Australia where you are innocent until proven guilty. This must be adequately addressed to ensure the rights and liberties of those concerned.

The definition of 100 per cent FIFO is written in the negative; it is also open to abuse. This definition could easily be subverted. If the company employed a couple of cleaners then they would satisfy the definition. David Sweetapple of Miles, who is a constituent from my electorate, raised this concern in his submission to the committee. He said—

... I feel the terminology of **100% FIFO** is deeply flawed.

Even I can see the resource companies will place one man in the community and claim **they are not 100% FIFO**.

He suggested that the proposed amendment needs to remove all reference to '100 per cent FIFO'. I might also advise the House that David and his family have lived through the resources peaks and troughs of resource developments in Wandoan and Miles for over 50 years. He has seen this happen firsthand in his own communities.

Ms Kirsten Pietzner, the principal adviser for resources and regional development from the Local Government Association of Queensland, made a very good suggestion as to how the bill should be improved. She advised—

We think it would be better if the bill was worded to say that the Coordinator-General must impose conditions on what a company needs to do to employ people from regional areas and if a company meets those conditions then they have met the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO. Then it is very clear what a company has to do in order to meet that prohibition. At the moment, the way that it is drafted, we think it is left open to 'you could employ two people and you have met the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO'.

There is no doubt that many communities feel the negative impacts of large-scale FIFO. This includes issues surrounding stress on community services, escalated infrastructure maintenance, contributions to the local economy, housing availability and affordability and lifestyle and safety issues, not to mention what happens with roads, FIFO workers and family impacts. For example, in the Surat Basin in my electorate during the development of the recent resources projects we had about 30,000 people living in the region who were then joined by another 30,000 resource workers in towns like Dalby, Chinchilla, Miles, Roma and almost every place in between. The region did not have the water, the sewerage, the housing or the roads to cope with the doubling of the population that occurred over a very short space of time.

More needs to be done to achieve a genuine partnership with local government, including requiring better consultation with local government—more than is currently provided for in this bill. Resource projects do make substantial demands on council assets and services as well as significantly affecting land use in the surrounding towns and regions. The LGAQ raised with the committee that both current and future projects should be required to have a social impact management plan which is regularly updated to take into account the actual impact of the project over the life of that project. When I move around my communities of Miles and Roma, Chinchilla and Dalby, I can see that there is a need for that to occur. There is a lot of merit in this suggestion; however, it needs to be a framework that

allows flexibility for the companies involved and the local government areas. There also needs to be recognition of the cyclical nature of the resource industry business, in particular the commodity market and its fluctuations. We have certainly seen fluctuations in oil and gas prices. What happens in the Surat Basin in Miles can be very different to what happens at Ballara in the Cooper Basin.

The question also has to be asked: do you think there is a need for the bill to apply during the construction phase and not just during the operational phase? Michael Kitzelmann, the chief executive officer of the Mount Isa City Council, said—

It is going to provide a much more equal diversification of the workforce into the local community if it goes from the beginning to the end of a mine.

I am sure he has had particular experience at Mount Isa and made that observation. There is also a suggestion that the social impact assessment process should in some way cover procurement from local businesses and supporting businesses and contractors. The bill, unfortunately, stops short of this.

I will now move to the ban on underground coal gasification. This is of particular importance to my electorate. In 2009 the then state Labor government established a process to undertake limited UCG trials to determine the commercial and environmental viability of this potential industry. They were known as Carbon, Cougar and Linc Energy. Unfortunately, there has been a very poor record of noncompliance: Carbon Energy was fined in December 2012 for releasing contaminated water and breaching the Environmental Protection Act; and Cougar Energy, which was mentioned earlier by the member for Nanango, was fined in 2013 for breaching the Environmental Protection Act. I quote from page 23 of the parliamentary committee report, which states—


Linc Energy went into voluntary administration on 15 April 2016. Former executives of Linc Energy face up to five years in prison, and the company faces ... fines of over \$8 million, if they are found guilty of the environmental charges laid against them in relation to the pilot project at Hopeland.

In July 2013 the Newman LNP government released the final report on the underground coal gasification pilot trials prepared by an independent scientific panel and reviewed by the Chief Scientist. I want to commend the LNP member for Glass House for his work as the minister for environment and heritage protection in ensuring that breaches of the state's environmental laws by Cougar and Carbon were brought to prosecution.

I also want to commend the LNP member for Hinchinbrook as minister for natural resources and mines who called in the Chief Scientist and the independent scientific panel to examine the future of the UCG industry. Companies were charged and fined and there was a report on how to decommission the industry in three years whilst the LNP was in government. What did Labor governments do with the industry since 2009—the five years they were in government? What we saw was Labor approve the trials and now it is back with a ban on the UCG process that Labor approved in 2009. I do not believe that we would be here in this parliament today talking about this ban if not for the work of the member for Glass House and the member for Hinchinbrook, and I want to thank them for upholding Queensland's environmental laws. I do, however, want to make the House aware of some of the irresponsible behaviour of the current Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection. The Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection has whipped up publicity that has potentially devalued the land in the Hopeland region near Chinchilla.

Mr Krause: Fearmonger.

Ms LEAHY: I take the interjection; he has been fearmongering. It is not responsible behaviour to race out to Chinchilla with a planeload of journalists on two occasions and pretend to talk to landowners to address their concerns. The current Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection has fuelled bad publicity for the region and his behaviour has only sought to reduce confidence in the region. His behaviour is obviously driven by pandering to the activists for green preferences in the city and it has not generated credibility locally when dealing with those local issues at hand. The Hopeland region is a thriving agricultural region. I have been on farm in the area and I have seen some very impressive summer crops—sorghum crops with high yields, oats crops right up to the cows' knees and some very healthy livestock and waterways. I cannot say that I have seen every paddock in the Hopeland district, but what I have seen produces high-value, good-quality agricultural produce from clean, green and good farmers. In conclusion, I wish to advise that the LNP does support the ban on underground coal gasification and I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KELLY** (Greenslopes—ALP) (4.52 pm): I rise to support the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill. One of the great pleasures of being a member of parliament is meeting the many new people you come across. By far one of the best people that I have met in my time here has been the member for Mirani. He is a terrific fighter for his community and he has clearly been shaped

by the experiences that he has had in his long life. The member for Mirani was the first person to make me very aware of this issue and he has stood up on many occasions in many forums and spoken about this issue.

Last year when I had the really great privilege to be a part of the Coal Workers' Pneumoconiosis Select Committee I had the opportunity to tour through many of the communities that the member for Mirani represents which he had been talking about, so I had the opportunity to see firsthand the concerns that have been raised by the member for Mirani. I came away convinced that what he had been talking about and the concerns that he had been raising were very valid and very real and having very negative impacts on the people whom he represents. It made me realise that the member for Mirani was right in that something needed to be done about this and I am glad that this bill is heading in the right direction.

I will never forget spending that time in Middlesbrough. In fact, I jogged around the town with the member for Southern Downs and the member for Barron River. We saw empty houses, people struggling and shops shutting down. We spoke to local people and they were very distressed by some of the things that were going on in their town. Over the years I have had the privilege to work with many nurses who have had partners involved in fly-in fly-out mining and the impacts I saw on my professional colleagues were quite significant and quite real. Some families handled it well because it was something that they chose to do, but other families were not so lucky. They were involved in fly-in fly-out simply because they had no other options. I remember one colleague in particular who would have liked to have moved closer to where her partner was working and enrol her kids in local schools and she had the capacity to get work there in the nursing field but was unable to do so because of the employment structure. That is a great tragedy.

Oftentimes people will say, 'People do this because it's their choice.' It is true that in some cases that may be their choice, but realistically for many other people there is no real choice. Their only choice is to have no job or take that job, and many workers have no doubt found themselves in that situation at times. Our movement understands that. We understand what that means for working people. In fact, the genesis of our movement was really a reaction against workers having limited or no choice in what they do. We have understood right throughout our entire history that workers cannot be treated just like any other input into the business. We cannot treat them like a widget. We cannot treat them like a roll of wire. We cannot treat them like finance or capital. We cannot treat workers that way because workers at the end of the day before they are a worker are a mum, are a sister, are a dad, are a brother. They are a human being and we cannot treat these people in this way, and we have always recognised that in this movement.

There has been a myth perpetuated—and it is a myth that we have all bought into over many years—that this is the way things have to be done and that this is the way we have to structure our work. We are going to grapple with this in coming years, because more and more large organisations and large corporations are telling us, 'This is the way that we have to do it.' The reality is that this is the way we choose to do it because this is the way we absolutely maximise profits and at the end of the day the people who suffer are those working people. This bill is starting to tackle that very deep issue. We have a choice and as legislators we have a choice tonight to enact legislation that will deal with that very issue and will treat workers like people.

I want to acknowledge the minister for his fine work on this bill. He does the heavy lifting. The member for Keppel mentioned that heavy lifting earlier and I want to echo that sentiment. The minister has done extremely heavy lifting on this bill. It is a difficult and tricky issue because everyone is telling us that it is impossible and it cannot be done, but he has done it. The minister has done it. I have seen his fine work here. I see the fine work that he is doing in relation to CWP. He is a minister who is doing the right thing and is working hard and I commend the minister. I also want to commend members of the committee for this report and thank them very much for putting it together. Mostly I hope that this bill passes the House and gives those workers in that industry the opportunity to be treated like people, to make real choices, for some of them to choose to live in their communities, to build their communities and to make a real contribution in the towns that they live in. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (4.58 pm): I rise to speak on the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. This bill aims to ensure that residents who live in communities in the vicinity of large resource projects benefit from those projects. It will require the owners or proponents of large resource projects to prepare social impact assessments of the projects to employ people from nearby regional communities and not to discriminate against residents from nearby communities when finding employees for the projects. It also aims to prohibit certain activities including in situ gasification of coal and oil shale.

While the intent of the bill is about making sure that Queensland regional communities remain attractive and vibrant for resource workers and their families to live, work and play, there are a number of issues that require clarification. The fact that it has taken the state Labor government 2½ years to provide legislation on this matter is yet another example of the government's ineptitude, dithering and incompetence. Despite that long lead-in time, it is a major concern when we look at the sheer volume and consistency of stakeholder criticism of the proposed legislation.

At the outset let me be clear: the LNP has a long held position that we do not support 100 per cent fly-in fly-out resource projects. It is only the ALP which has approved 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mines. Our position in relation to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out projects has been consistent and longstanding. This position was based on putting regional Queenslanders first and seeing real opportunities provided to locals and not just window-dressing, which is the default position of Labor administrations.

I have heard members of the Labor Party talk about fly-in fly-out workers. I remind them that the Bligh Labor government approved the Daunia and Caval Ridge mines as 100 per cent fly-in fly-out. Under the current bill, the application of the 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces during the construction phase is only at the discretion of the Coordinator-General. The LNP believes that the prohibition on 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces should apply to the operational and construction phases of large resource projects adjoining nearby regional communities. We also believe that the definition of a nearby regional community should omit the 100-kilometre radius and be reclassified to include towns with a population of less than 200. This is at the discretion of the Coordinator-General.

The government is running around in circles claiming that it is interested in attracting investment to regional and rural communities in the interests of job creation. The reality is that much of that talk is just spin. It panders to unproductive, wealthy, inner-city, elite green activists with their anti-investment, anti-jobs, anti-mining, anti-agriculture agenda. It is stifling investment. The activists want to close down productive industries in regional and rural Queensland and will use any tool at their disposal to demonise those who work in them. That is why we should be cautious that additional assessments required before a project is approved do not become a tool to stop investment.

We should also be cautious about the reverse onus of proof and retrospectivity arrangements in this bill as they can undermine investment decisions and increase sovereign risk. The Queensland Resources Council advised—

The reality is that, if a company sits down with the sovereign government of a state, signs an agreement and that agreement at some point down the track is broken, that signals to investors more so than the company—but certainly to the company as well—that there is a sovereign risk issue here in Queensland that did not exist five years ago. That is, a government signs an agreement and breaks it.

Increasing sovereign risk does not help companies to choose to invest in the state. The QRC pointed out—

In a world where one of the big multinational mining companies ... has a choice of which country to invest in—they do not just look at Australia; they look at all the places around the world where they have investments—anything that creates an uncertainty in their investment or sovereign risk profile is detrimental to us attracting that investment here.

The potential increase in sovereign risk is a direct result of approving retrospective measures in the bill. To apply new sets of laws retrospectively sets a bad precedent for our legal system, undermines public confidence in the legal system, is a breach of trust and is essentially unfair and not decent. A fundamental aim of our legal system should be legal certainty. People take this into account when making decisions. They make a specific judgement based on the laws of the day. Companies and citizens are entitled to assume that laws are stable and that decisions they make in reliance on the law will not later be brought into question.

Under questioning from the LNP members of the committee, the Coordinator-General advised that about 40 projects are affected by the retrospective provisions of the legislation. The opposition is very mindful that the decision of the Bligh Labor government to approve 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workers for the Daunia and Caval Ridge mines was out of step with community expectations and consequently disadvantaged regional Queenslanders. However, the company involved, Billiton Mitsubishi Alliance, BMA, advised that its design of and investment in the projects 'was based on the ability to resource labour based on the government's approvals enabling 100 per cent FIFO'. They said—

As a consequence we invested in good faith in the necessary infrastructure needed to support this model.

The retrospective obligations ... are inconsistent and incompatible with the significant operational and infrastructure investment we made in reliance on these approvals, and undermine the way that we are able to operate and use that infrastructure.

If we are to get this state moving again, we cannot and should not be changing the rules midway and moving the goalposts. We should set in place correct parameters before projects start. Here we see that a Labor government eager to ensure its re-election allowed a project to have 100 per cent FIFO workers and now another Labor government seeks to apply retrospective measures.

In this bill the government has again resorted to introducing reverse onus of proof measures which remove and undermine basic legal rights and, in the words of the QRC, this 'flies in the face of existing commercial and contractual relationships'. The Queensland Law Society advised that the reverse onus of proof which has been placed on owners and principal contractors is unworkable, unjust and a departure from well-established rule of law principles. Additionally, it considered that the drafting of the clause is too broad and has the potential to lead to frivolous and unsubstantiated claims. All of us know where that leads.

In the last few years we have heard of numerous examples and cases where frivolous and unsubstantiated claims have been made purely to shut down projects and silence the community. The Law Society is concerned that respondents will not be in a position to discharge the reverse onus when it is not the party making the relevant decision about employment. It said—

... removing the presumption of innocence is unjust. It is a departure from well-established rule of law principles and must be thoroughly and rigorously justified, if used. That has not occurred here.

The Society has a fundamental objection to the reversal of the onus of proof in prosecution and processes that can lead to punitive outcomes.

The government has form in wanting to reverse the onus of proof. The Queensland Law Society reminded the committee in its submission that it had made the very same objection to the vegetation management proposals when it said the reverse onus of proof measures are 'a step backwards for justice in the state' and that 'administrative convenience or procedural efficiency does not justify erosion of the principle of presumed innocence of an offence until proven guilty'. Let us be very clear: reverse onus of proof means that the mining companies are guilty first and have to prove their innocence. Mayor Joyce McCulloch of the Mount Isa City Council raised concerns, saying—


... means the mining companies are considered guilty until they prove they are innocent of breaching legislation ... That is quite a severe change in the legislation and goes against the basic principles of the judicial system in Australia where you are innocent until proven guilty.

These projects can bring to regional and rural communities many opportunities. They can boost the local economy and bring jobs, infrastructure and business opportunities. FIFO employment means that these benefits are potentially denied to those local communities while at the same time increasing stress on community services, escalated infrastructure maintenance, contributions to the local economy, housing availability and affordability, lifestyle and safety issues, and FIFO worker and family impacts.

The provision of a social impact assessment seeks to ensure that residents in the vicinity of a large resource project benefit from the operation of the projects. The LNP believes that the impact assessment should include an obligation to consult with the local community within the local government area in which a project is situated. The LGAQ and some councils have called for a widening of this requirement to undertake an SIA to more projects. I offer a word of caution. We must be cautious that this will deliver desired outcomes and that it is not a tool to significantly delay projects. We have to be mindful that the resource sector is already one of the most—if not the most—regulated industries in Queensland and Australia. As the Queensland Resources Council said—

There is no question that regulation has its place to protect the environment and to assess the social and economic impacts on local communities, but this bill goes one step further and prescribes workforce arrangements that would limit the flexibility necessary to respond to the cyclical nature of business and in particular the commodity market and its fluctuations.

I support the bill and urge members to support the LNP amendments.

 **Mr LAST** (Burdekin—LNP) (5.09 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016 and to support the amendments as proposed by my colleague the member for Nanango. I note that the committee recommended this bill be passed. I am aware that the minister also proposes to move a number of amendments.

The issue of fly-in fly-out workers for mine projects has been the subject of much debate and I have no doubt will continue to be the subject of much discussion in the future. This bill before the House will certainly change the way that mining companies establish, maintain and operate their workforces. There is no question that if our mining towns are to survive changes are required to FIFO mines. With

the recent changes to the electoral boundaries, the Burdekin electorate is now home to the majority of the coalmines in this state. It has truly become the economic powerhouse of the state, and I could not be prouder than to stand here tonight as the member for Burdekin and talk about an electorate that is widely regarded as one of the most diverse electorates in the state of Queensland.

I note the objectives of the bill are to ensure residents of communities in the vicinity of large resource projects benefit from the operation of the projects by requiring the owners of or proponents for large resource projects to prepare a social impact assessment for the projects, to employ people from nearby regional communities, not to discriminate against residents from nearby regional communities when employing for the projects and to prohibit certain activities including in situ gasification of coal and oil shale.

I can attest to the impact that a FIFO workforce has on some of our rural and regional communities. I have had the farcical situation in Collinsville where FIFO workers are prohibited from leaving their accommodation camp, which means these workers contribute absolutely nothing to the local economy of Collinsville. I have seen the planes land at Moranbah airport and the workers loaded onto a bus and transported out to the mining camp and I have seen that process reversed. If we are to have vibrant functioning mining towns, if we are to grow these communities, then we need the workers to live in those communities.

I am passionate about my rural towns and it pains me to see the decline that many of these communities are experiencing, communities like Glenden and Middelmount which have suffered massive reductions in school student numbers to the extent that in the case of Glenden the high school is now under serious threat of closure. I am now being contacted by parents expressing their concern at the quality of the education being provided to their children because of the dwindling numbers of students in the schools. That is not a reflection on the quality of the teaching staff in the schools—far from it—because in most cases these staff are going over and beyond their duties in order to provide the best possible education to the students who attend their schools. It is more about choice: choice of subjects, choice in sport, choice in arts and cultural pursuits and, most importantly, jobs.

There is no question we need a more effective balance of workforce accommodation arrangements for these mine projects, more community and stakeholder engagement, effective local business and industry content and enhancement of health and community wellbeing. I have been very vocal in my calls for locals to be employed on large resource projects and to encourage FIFO workers to move into the local community if they choose. Many of these small communities are seriously hurting and the drain in population towards the coastal centres has taken a huge toll on schools, businesses and the general wellbeing of these communities. I see absolutely no reason why locals should not be considered for jobs in mine projects and they should be allowed to live in the community if they so choose. I was talking to a very concerned mother in Clermont six weeks ago who gave me the example of her son having to move his family to Brisbane because the local mine had stipulated all workers would be FIFO from Brisbane. This was a family who were more than happy to stay in Clermont and yet they have been uprooted and moved away from their friends, family and their community in order to meet company workforce requirements.

I note the issue of retrospectivity was raised during committee hearings. I would ask the minister to clarify this issue and the potential impact it may have on both local communities and mining companies going forward. Certainly there needs to be clarification on the transitional period for proponents to meet the 100 per cent FIFO restriction because, as members know, there are two coalmines with a 100 per cent FIFO workforce, namely Daunia and Caval Ridge—approved, I might add, by the Bligh Labor government.


I completely support the recommendation for a social impact assessment for large resource projects which will provide for community and stakeholder engagement, workforce management, housing and accommodation, local business and industry procurement and health and community wellbeing. Consultation is vital, particularly with local government authorities and community organisations because the commencement or, in fact, shutdown of a new coalmine can have substantial ramifications on a local community. Local government authorities and, indeed, state and federal governments all need time to plan and deliver the necessary infrastructure to meet the demands of a rapidly expanding population which can occur with the construction of a new coalmine. After all, you do not build schools, hospitals, police stations et cetera overnight and, as we all know, there are many facets that make up a vibrant community or, if I was to go back to the title of this bill, a strong and sustainable resource community.

The issue of what constitutes 'nearby regional community' is important when discussing the issue of local employment and the numbers and qualifications of potential employees available. Certainly I am a strong advocate for employing locals first because, as we know, there is a job crisis in the bush, particularly among our youth, and if we are to halt the population decline in our mining towns then we need to provide the necessary job opportunities to keep the people in those communities. More importantly, if we find families who are willing to live in a mining town we should be doing everything we can to retain them and support them to continue living in that community.

Furthermore, there needs to be a prohibition on local workers being forced to live away from home in camp accommodation. I have seen firsthand the impact on families that FIFO can cause when mine workers are away for extended periods, when these workers miss birthdays, anniversaries or they cannot be there when a loved one is sick. It is not an easy lifestyle. It is hard work.

I fully support the amendment to be moved by the member for Nanango to extend the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO workforces during construction and operation for large resource projects proximate to nearby regional communities. As an example, QCoal has recently commenced construction of the Byerwen mining project 20 kilometres west of Glenden, a project that will employ 100 employees during construction and 300 during operation. There also needs to be an understanding that many of our mining communities have strong linkages to their nearest regional centre and lines on a map do not necessarily translate to availability of employees. Indeed, when one travels through the coalfields the tyranny of distance becomes a significant issue, with many employees travelling substantial distances to and from work.

In summing up, I support the bill before the House and the amendments that will be proposed by the member for Nanango. The LNP is backing regional Queensland and we are backing jobs for regional Queenslanders. I am passionate about rural and regional Queensland. I am passionate about all those towns that are struggling for survival and I make this pledge here today: that I will never give up in my quest to grow these communities and give all the residents who live in these towns the same opportunities, services and support as those enjoyed by our city cousins.

 **Mr RUSSO** (Sunnybank—ALP) (5.16 pm): I rise in the House to speak to the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill and to support the passing of this very important piece of legislation. The bill deals with fly-in fly-out and other long distance community work practices in regional Queensland. It is a very important piece of legislation to address the exploitation of not only coal workers but also families and businesses that form part of the community in regional Queensland.

I first became aware of the serious social impact on regional communities, especially those in the Bowen Basin, as chair of the Finance and Administration Committee when we visited these communities during our committee's inquiry into the labour hire industry. Whilst we received many stories of exploitation of workers in the mining community, it became obvious to me that both labour hire and fly-in fly-out have contributed to the demise of any social cohesion in these rural communities.

It was during one of these hearings that I had the opportunity to hear evidence from Kim Sinclair, and I will highlight some of the issues that Kim raised with me during our inquiry into labour hire. I recently phoned Kim to refresh my memory of some of the real issues facing people and businesses in regional Queensland. Kim lives in Moranbah. She is a mother and a miner. She lives at Moranbah with her husband and two daughters, Mia and Isla. She has been out of the industry for about 4½ years but she wants to start working back in the industry she knows. Kim can see the entrance to the mine from where she lives. She can see it in operation but she cannot work at the mine as it has a fly-in fly-out only policy. She would have to fly to Brisbane and then travel to Moranbah and return the same way, even though the camp is literally 15 minutes from her home. She would have to perform fly-in fly-out in order to gain paid employment in the career of her choice. Kim has witnessed families going through the same situation. Families are having to leave home in order to get paid employment of a permanent nature. It is tearing families and communities apart.

Kim has lived in Moranbah for 14 years and is a long-term community member. She moved there to raise her family. Kim buried her mother in the Moranbah cemetery and she says that to have to leave Moranbah to find employment would cause her great sadness. Kim has also witnessed the impact on businesses. She has watched one after the other shutting their doors. Because there are fewer people in the town, the money is not there either. The town as a whole is suffering. Prices have to be increased in order for businesses to sustain their premises, but as there is no money coming in from consumers people have to leave town. It is a double-whammy effect. The towns that are affected are Moranbah, Dysart, Middledmount, Coppabella, Nebo, Clermont and Tieri. Any region shown on a map of the Bowen Basin would be affected.

Kim says that it goes even further. For a few years FIFO has affected the greater communities of Mackay, Townsville and Brisbane. It impacts families in the metropolitan cities, because it changes family dynamics. Of the large number of FIFO workers, most are male. Dad has to fly from home to access work, which causes stress on families. Mostly, that work is not permanent. FIFO affects not just the regional areas with which it is usually associated; it also affects the metropolitan areas.

Kim has also noticed that there are not enough kids for the local footy club to fill a team and that young people have limited access to sport. She told me that her four-year-old wanted to participate in Little Athletics, but because they no longer have as many kids in town they cannot run athletics every week. Each week they decide whether or not it is run and it depends on whether they have enough kids. A similar situation exists with swimming lessons and ballet classes. It gets harder and harder to take children to such casually run things and they also have difficulty finding trainers.


Kim has also noticed the impact on local services, such as hospital and dental services. She says that sometimes getting an appointment with her GP proves difficult. As a community member and a local resident, it is annoying and frustrating for her to be unable to access services that people in metropolitan areas take for granted. She also notes that money is not staying in town but is taken back to the hometowns of the workers.

Kim says that for her the main thing is that she usually comes at it from a casualisation perspective. FIFO is the biggest thing that affects her. While it used to be a preferred method of employment, now people do not have a choice. They cannot sustain and grow the community. For Kim, the FIFO bill represents the ability to have a choice; it does not represent the ability to abolish FIFO as that may not suit every family's needs. She says that not having to move away from a close community, enabling the family to stay together, would be a good start. Marriages have been breaking down and children are left behind. Families are unable to make the choice that would best suit that family.

I ask those opposite to stand up, be counted and support this bill. This bill is about looking after communities and the people who live in those communities. This is something that the LNP falls short on, time and time again. The LNP would be best known as the party that has no heart or social conscience when it comes to dealing with the big end of town. The LNP would rather keep their big business mates on side than vote for legislation that would make better the lives of regional Queenslanders.

When one reads the report by the Public Works and Utilities Committee, one sees that a lot of the issues that Kim raises are the types of issues that the committee heard about. I thank the member for Mirani and chair of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, Jim Pearce, for his hard work in this area. I know how passionate he is about workers in the coal industry and how hard he works to ensure that his community has a voice in this House. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Before calling the next member, I acknowledge participants of the Queensland Servant Leadership Forum who are in the gallery this evening. They are being hosted by a number of members, including the member for Glass House, who now has the call.

 **Mr POWELL** (Glass House—LNP) (5.25 pm): I too acknowledge the participants of the Queensland Servant Leadership Forum. It is great to again host them this year, having done it for a number of years past. I thank those of our colleagues from both sides of the chamber who are participating in the forum this evening. It is a wonderful opportunity for us and, hopefully, for the participants.

This evening I will make a very short contribution to the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016 or, as it is known colloquially, the FIFO bill. I will restrict my comments primarily to my role as the shadow minister for local government. I commend the work of the committee and, in particular, the work of the LNP representatives on that committee. In their statement of reservation, they picked up on the fact that many councils—in fact, just about every council—that submitted on this bill, including the LGAQ, sought greater consultation when it comes to the impacts of these kinds of projects.

Mr Costigan: There is a bit of theme there, isn't there?

Mr POWELL: There is a bit of a theme; I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. I quote from the statement of reservation in the committee report—

Many communities often feel the negative impact of large scale FIFO.

I would add that, as well as communities, it is the local governments themselves. The statement continues—

This includes issues surrounding stress on community services and escalated infrastructure maintenance, contributions to the local economy, housing availability and affordability, lifestyle and safety issues and FIFO worker and family impacts.

The LGAQ advised more needs to be done to achieve a genuine partnership with local government, including requiring better consultation with local government than that currently provided for in the bill. Resource projects make substantial demands on council assets and services as well as significantly affecting land use in and around towns.

Councillor Dane Swalling, Deputy Mayor, Cloncurry Shire Council outlined to the Committee these three benefits—jobs, infrastructure and business opportunity—will only be obtainable by genuine collaboration between the mining company and local government with the outcomes enforceable by the state. A suitably structured and enforceable social impact assessment process can deliver these outcomes.

The current bill does not address the concerns of councils such as Cloncurry Shire Council, the Isaac Regional Council or the LGAQ more generally. In its submission, the LGAQ put it pretty eloquently when it stated—

As part of introducing a systematic approach to managing the social impacts of the resources sector, it is vital that local government be recognised as more than a stakeholder and is instead acknowledged as a 'partner-in-government'. Significant improvements can be made in managing the impacts of resources projects on communities if information regarding a project is provided early to local councils and agreement is reached on managing these impacts *before a project commences*.

I might add, before construction of the project commences. The submission continues—

While both the SSRC Policy Framework and the SSRC Bill make welcome progress in this area, more needs to be done to achieve a genuine partnership, including:

- Requiring greater and more meaningful consultation with local government than that provided for in the SSRC Bill.

On that note, I acknowledge the work of the shadow minister, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, in bringing forward the amendments that are before us tonight, one of which specifically enshrines as a minimum requirement that a proponent or owner of a large resource project undertakes consultation with the local community within the local government area of the location of the large resource project as part of the social impact assessment. I think it is only fair that if a project of this nature is going to impact on a local community and on the resources and assets of a local council then those councils and their communities should be brought into the equation, discussions, assessments and outcomes at a far earlier stage. The amendments to be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition achieve that.

In conclusion, I challenge the contribution of the speaker prior to me. He suggested that somehow the LNP is not standing up for these local communities against large resource companies. Let us have a little history lesson. The LNP has never approved a 100 per cent fly-in fly-out operation in the state of Queensland—ever.

Mrs Frecklington: Who has?

Mr POWELL: I take the interjection from the Deputy Leader of the Opposition. There is a party in this chamber that has. In fact, they have done it not just once but twice. That party is the Labor Party. Any suggestion that it is the LNP that is failing to support regional communities in the state of Queensland is utterly false.

I go to the nub of what the member was saying. If that member is genuine in their rhetoric around supporting local governments and local communities to ensure that they are sitting at the table at the earliest possible opportunity to address, identify, mitigate and prevent negative impacts on their assets, on their resources, on their communities and—dare I say—on individual families then that member and those opposite should support the amendments that will be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition this evening.

I am unashamedly standing up for local governments and local communities, alongside the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the LNP opposition. I call on those opposite to do more than engage in rhetoric in this chamber—

Mr Walker: Lip-service.

Mr POWELL: I take the interjection from the member for Mansfield. They should do more than pay lip-service to the councils, the communities and the mums and dads around the state of Queensland. Step up to the plate and support the amendments.



Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (5.31 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Strong and Sustainable Communities Bill 2016 before the Queensland parliament. This bill was introduced to ensure that regional communities in Queensland, which are in the vicinity of large resource projects,

benefit from the operation of such projects. The bill will limit the use of fly-in fly-out workforces and ensure that local workers from nearby regional communities are employed in the operation of large resource projects.

On this side of the House, we have always opposed fly-in fly-out mines here in Queensland. The LNP has always understood the importance of continuing strong partnerships between regional communities and resource companies. These partnerships must be shaped through respect, sharing economic benefits, creating jobs and associated business opportunities and ensuring operating sustainability.

Another important issue to be considered with respect to fly-in fly-out options is the impact such arrangements have on both employees and their families. Employers in the mining and resources sector often prefer fly-in fly-out options when the cost of establishing permanent communities or a sufficient quantum to attract families to live locally exceeds the cost of airfares and temporary housing on their relevant work sites.

On the employee side of the coin, fly-in fly-out employment can put stress on family relationships. The impact of absent fly-in fly-out parents on their children has been compared to that of military families, before, during and after deployment. A research paper published in Australia in 2014 suggested that children of fly-in fly-out parents suffer emotionally from the absence of the relevant parent.

It is also important to note that a federal inquiry in Australia in 2012 found an increase in substance abuse, sexually transmitted infections and mental illness in workers on a fly-in fly-out roster. It is fair to say that fly-in fly-out work has the potential to create stresses and challenges that may exceed the coping mechanisms of many in our community. The workers themselves often have long working rosters in arduous conditions. This can disrupt normal daily routines and contribute to poor physical health, with significant disturbances in sleep patterns. Fly-in fly-out work can be lonely and workers can lack social support from family and friends while they are away.

The amendments to this bill proposed by the LNP will 100 per cent prohibit fly-in fly-out workforces both during the construction and operation stages of large resource projects proximate to nearby regional communities. The amendments will also ensure local communities are consulted as a part of the social impact assessment for large resource projects. We on this side of the House are committed to backing regional Queensland and, importantly, backing jobs for regional Queenslanders. Our amendments will assist in ensuring regional Queenslanders get a fair go.

A number of local governments have raised concerns, and the amendments of the LNP will address these concerns. It is vital that the Palaszczuk Labor government adopt the amendments to be moved by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nanango.

Only the LNP has been consistently opposed to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mines in Queensland. I would also like to make the following observations. There is no doubt that economic rationalist policies have had a significant impact on many rural and regional communities where market failure often exists. Having worked in communities like Mungindi in south-west Queensland and visited many other communities which in part rely on the mining and resources sector, including Mount Isa and Moranbah, it is my view that there is an absolute requirement to maintain the social and economic integrity of such communities.

When I was president of the Rural Doctors Association of Queensland I had many conversations and meetings with local government representatives, industry groups, small business operators, farmers, graziers and others about public policy strategies that could assist with pressure bandaging the haemorrhaging of rural and regional communities so as to prevent the further loss or undermining of their integrity. Many of these conversations related to health care and health workforce development, but I have no doubt that this legislation will assist with developing, maintaining and ensuring the integrity of relevant rural and regional communities where the resources sector is a vital part of their viability.

Queensland's youth job losses have skyrocketed under the Palaszczuk Labor government. Over 8,000 young Queenslanders have lost their jobs under the Labor government over the past year. In some parts of Queensland youth unemployment is nearly 60 per cent. Youth unemployment in parts of the electorates of the member for Gregory and the member for Warrego is at 57 per cent, which has more than doubled since the election of the Palaszczuk Labor government in 2015. Fortunately, the LNP has a terrific \$100 million get Queensland working package which will certainly assist with addressing youth unemployment. The LNP has a plan to build a better Queensland.



Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (5.36 pm): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. Communities in regional Queensland, and especially the small towns of the Bowen Basin, have been suffering from the scourge of the commonly known practice of FIFO. FIFO, when forced onto workers, is socially, emotionally and economically devastating. The workers suffer and the townships suffer. One hundred per cent FIFO takes away the choice from workers about where they can live. The large mining companies forcing 100 per cent FIFO on workers are showing they have no moral or ethical commitment to the surrounding communities in which they operate.

There are many problems with FIFO, not just for workers and their families, but also for councils in the region of the mining operations. I will outline some of the issues that have been raised with me. Local councils have been left providing infrastructure and services for a large number of people moving and staying casually in the region. The workers are not permanent and they do not pay rates. They take their wages back to their own communities. Councils are left with collecting rubbish, building roads and providing water and sewerage services. This is a huge impost on townships with no monetary gain. The FIFO workers also access local hospitals and emergency services, putting further stress on local services. The services that are in those towns are only built for the small number of people who live there permanently.

Mining companies, or the companies running the work camps for the mining companies, often do not even try to support their local communities by using local suppliers or producers. Supplies are often trucked in, putting more pressure on the road systems, while workers go from the airport to the mine camp, making no purchases in town.

Sadly, I have spoken personally with workers who have been sent letters from their mining employer giving them two choices. Some people would think it is good to get two choices, but the choices have been: (1) move to a specific set of postcodes away from Central Queensland; or (2) start looking for another job. These letters were being sent to workers based in Mackay at the height of the mining downturn. If you lose your job, you probably will not get another one. A lot of people bought their homes at peak prices. If they chose to sell up and move on—that is if somebody bought their house—they would be looking at huge losses. If they chose to stay in Mackay they may not get another job or, if they could get another job, it would be on a lower salary or it would be intermittent work and they may lose their home.

Established workers were being forced away from their family, support and friends. Children were being pulled away from their schools and peer groups. Some workers were faced with the situation of having to fly from Central Queensland to Brisbane and back again so that they could keep their job. They needed to show that they had left the centre to keep their job. They did this so that they did not have to uproot their families. One Sunday morning I ran into an old friend of mine. They were having a going-away breakfast for their adult daughter and son-in-law. Both were mining engineers and they, too, had been given a letter. It did not matter what job you did on a mining site, you were getting the move-on letters.

The amendments in this bill extending the prohibition of 100 per cent FIFO workforces to all existing and future large resource projects where there is a nearby regional community, regardless of when the project was approved, and also expanding the definition of a 'large resource project' beyond those projects with an environmental impact statement to include projects with an environmental authority and 100 or more workers will be good for our communities. This bill supports communities and it supports their workers. In closing, I would like to thank the work of the member for Mirani, Jim Pearce. He has been a true stalwart for miners and their families. I commend the bill to the House.



Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (5.42 pm): I would like to make a contribution to the Strong and Sustainable Resources Communities Bill 2016. This has been a long time coming. This is a very important piece of legislation for the communities I represent in the seat of Gregory. I am talking about towns like Emerald, Clermont, Capella and Tieri that have suffered under the impost of 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces. These towns have lost people over many, many years.

Mr Costigan: Good people too.

Mr MILLAR: They are good people. I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday, who understands that we need to keep people in these towns. It is absolutely vital. In towns like Emerald over the last three or four years we have seen businesses close. We have seen people leave town. We have seen schools impacted. We have seen sporting groups, Rotary clubs, Lions clubs and community organisations being impacted by 100 per cent fly-in fly-out or the fly-in fly-out mentality in the mining industry.

I, like a lot of members in this House, have firsthand experience of the impact of fly-in fly-out. Not only does it impact our businesses, but families moving away from towns like Blackwater, Emerald, Capella and Tieri impact the local sporting clubs. It impacts the local Rugby League fixtures where one year they have a full club of players and the next year they are forfeiting because families have moved away.

We want coalminers and their families to live in our towns. We need them to live in our towns. I remember growing up as a young boy back in the eighties and going to primary school. Plenty of my mates that I played football with—whether it was the Capella Roadrunners or the Emerald Tigers—were sons of miners, and they were good mates. Their living in those towns was absolutely essential to the economic growth of those towns. It is important that these towns survive. Every day we see families leaving these communities. It is not only fly-in fly-out that affects towns like Emerald, Capella, Clermont, Tieri and all of those mining towns in the Bowen Basin but also drive-in drive-out where families have decided to move to the coast but the husband continues to have a job in the Central Highlands. That has an impact on the economic viability of those towns.

I understand the importance of the enduring partnerships between mining towns and the resource companies. It is important that we have a close connection. Resource companies are important. Coalmine workers are important. Businesses are important. Those partnerships are forged through respect, sharing the economic benefits and, most importantly, creating local jobs and business opportunities. Also, the spin-off of that is other jobs in those towns. A healthy population in those towns provides more jobs in local businesses, whether it is a new auto-electrician starting up or a mechanic or a new tyre-fitting shop. The more population we have in those towns, the more viable they are. We must make sure that we have legislation that continues to improve that and grow those jobs.

The LNP government made it clear that we would never approve a 100 per cent fly-in fly-out resource project where it is located in the vicinity of a regional town. I was listening to the member for Keppel before. I would like to remind the member for Keppel and others that it was in 2009 that the BMA mines, Caval Ridge and Daunia, could operate with an up to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforce. The government that gave that approval was the Bligh Labor government. They ignored local community views and set the company up to make extreme decisions that were not in the interest of the region. That has had a huge impact on towns north of the seat of Gregory, towns like Moranbah. The mayor, who has been a vocal advocate of making sure that we do not have 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, is here today. It is important that we continue to support those towns. I pay tribute to Mayor Kerry Hayes from the Central Highlands Regional Council. He is another vocal advocate of making sure that we do not ever see 100 per cent fly-in fly-out.

A major mine that is going ahead—and we want it to go ahead—is the Adani mine. They have made commitments to our local regional towns such as Emerald, Clermont, Charters Towers and Capella. I want to make sure that people who are employed at that mine do come from those towns and also come from towns such as Jericho, Alpha, Barcaldine in Western Queensland because it will provide an economic stimulus to that region.


One hundred per cent fly-in fly-out for mines in the vicinity of nearby regional communities is completely out of step with community expectations. It shows how out of touch it is when the government still allows 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces for these mines during the construction phase. I would like to pay tribute to our deputy leader, Deb Frecklington, on her amendments. The deputy leader has the balance right. The LNP amendments will prohibit 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforces during construction and operation for large resource projects in the vicinity of nearby regional communities. They will ensure that local communities are consulted as part of the social impact assessment for large resource projects.

The LNP is backing regional Queensland. We are backing jobs in regional Queensland. Our amendments will ensure that regional Queenslanders get a fair go, and that is important—getting a fair go at having an opportunity to be employed in those mines. Our amendments address the major concerns raised by a number of local governments and the major concerns of other groups. They are about making sure that we have the right legislation in place so that people can take advantage of it. Regional Queensland is important to all of us. It is the economic backbone of this state. It generates the royalties which go into state government coffers. It also provides the economic stimulus that Queensland needs when it comes to making sure that we can grow our communities, build our roads, build our schools and build the infrastructure we need out there.

What is concerning is Queensland's jobless rate, especially in regional Queensland. The jobless rate and the unemployment issues that we have in regional Queensland are very concerning, especially for places such as the outback where we have seen youth unemployment skyrocket to about 57 per

cent. It is unacceptable to have a youth unemployment rate that high. We have people out there who need jobs, and we have to do everything in our power to make sure they have jobs. The youth unemployment rate in parts of Gregory, Warrego, Mount Isa and Cook is not acceptable and we have to do something to fix that. Over half of all young people in outback Queensland who want a job cannot get one.

Unemployment in the Fitzroy region is getting worse, with another 2,900 jobs lost in the last year. We need to ensure there is an opportunity for people to get jobs in local mines. It is important for the economic wellbeing of the regional towns which I represent and which the member for Warrego, the member for Mount Isa, the member for Cook and the member for Callide represent. These are important regions, and we need to ensure that if there is a job at a mine they are able to apply for that job and are able to work at that mine. That is incredibly important.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (5.51 pm): It is a great honour to follow in the footsteps of my great mate, my Capricorn dancer mate from Central Queensland. He is very passionate about Central Queensland and the Capricorn region right across the coalfields and the central west. It is interesting to hear his take on the situation regarding fly-in fly-out and the impact across those Central Queensland communities. The member for Gregory's family and my family have been out in that part of the world for a long period of time—well before there was a Bowen Basin, I dare say. Our respective families have seen the development of the Bowen Basin with all those towns that have evolved and that have been rattled off by members by both sides here tonight.

Many of us remember the good old days of growing up or having friends, mates and relatives working in those coalmining towns. What has happened in recent times is heartbreaking, because we have seen families ripped apart and communities crippled because of what has happened before. The Labor side have to hear it again. The people of rural and regional Queensland, as we approach a general election, need to remember that the only two mines which have 100 per cent FIFO arrangements were approved under the former Bligh Labor government.

There are people in this chamber to this day who were there when that tick of approval was granted. It is two nil. I do not want to look back in the rear-vision mirror too much tonight, but we need some context and perspective to this Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, which is commonly referred to as the FIFO bill in communities both on the coast that I represent and on the other side of the hill, as we say in the vernacular, across the other side of the Eton Range in the Bowen Basin.

I acknowledge the presence on the parliamentary precinct here tonight of the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council, Councillor Anne Baker, whom I have known for a long time—for the best part of 30 years. Whilst she comes from the other side of the political divide, it is interesting to see what the Isaac council and other councils had to say in relation to this bill. I refer to the Isaac take on this. They want to see a prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO to include the construction phase as per the LNP's amendments which will be moved in the House tonight by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition.

We have heard members of the government talking about how this is going to fix things. Well, that is not quite true because the construction element has been forgotten about by this mob. Government members—and I look at the member for Sunnybank, who was one of the contributors in this regard—should think about the construction workers. I heard what the member for Mirani said, and I accept his passion for all things Central Queensland. He has a great history in the mining industry. I heard what the member for Mirani had to say from upstairs on level 12 in my office earlier in the debate this evening about construction workers. We are not talking about the construction of powerlines in the late sixties and early seventies from Broadsound and on to Nebo, Strathmore and Collinsville with construction workers moving from camp to camp literally. There was no Bowen Basin back then; it was the Brigalow Belt. How is that for a bit of nostalgia, member for Gregory? Perhaps he is watching from level 12, because that is what it was.

The member for Gregory spoke about the disruption to community life, as did the member for Sunnybank, who talked about Kim in Moranbah and the impact on local communities and local football clubs.

An opposition member: Families.

Mr COSTIGAN: Families—the Capella Roadrunners or the Moranbah Miners. They used to have two football clubs in Moranbah. They do not have enough juniors to form teams. Caval Ridge and Daunia were approved to be 100 per cent FIFO mines by the former Bligh Labor government. When we talk about FIFO in my part of the world, in my constituency, it is a dirty word because people understand the haemorrhaging of our mining towns in our great hinterland. I am proud to say that my

region makes a big contribution to this state. As last I recall, 56 per cent of Queensland's exports come from the ports of the Mackay-Whitsunday area—our region, our backyard, the Bowen Basin. From Collinsville in the north to Moura in the south, it is the Bowen Basin that has been keeping the lights on in Queensland.

What has happened in the past is regrettable to say the least. These amendments that have been flagged by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition deserve to be supported here tonight. There is no doubt about that. I acknowledged Isaac Regional Council and Mayor Baker. I also acknowledge Councillor Lacey and Councillor Vea Vea who are on the parliamentary precinct here tonight. Of 14 items in the bill, they are significantly concerned with the effectiveness of seven items and they have concerns with the other seven, so it is far from perfect as far as the councils in Moranbah or Clermont are concerned.

I heard what the member for Burdekin said about Glenden, a great town established in 1983. It is staring down the barrel of losing its high school. That was the last port of call of Don McDermid, the principal of Proserpine State High School, which is in my electorate. He left a great legacy there before coming to the coast to run the high school in Proserpine, and his old school is staring down the barrel of closure. It is the only high school in the former Nebo shire where my family came from 150 years ago nearly. You were lucky to go to school in those days let alone a high school. Amazingly in those days they even had a doctor. Now some of these towns struggle to have doctors because people just fly in and fly out.

In my part of the world FIFO is a dirty word on the coast. Late last year before Christmas as a nasty Christmas present for my constituents we saw the Premier go to Townsville to announce that the FIFO hubs for the first mine—the first cab off the rank—in the Galilee Basin would be Townsville and Rockhampton. That was purely for political reasons because the Palaszczuk Labor government knows they are on the nose north of Noosa, especially in rural and regional Queensland. They need to sandbag those seats, especially along the Ross River and in Central Queensland—the seats of those five first-term Labor MPs.

I have told anyone who will listen, I have told the *Daily Mercury*, I have told people up the street, and they are not mugs because they are all listening. Labor are sandbagging the seats of Mundingburra, Townsville, Thuringowa, Keppel and Gladstone because they are desperate. I mention Mackay Airport and Rob Porter and the great investment there. They have rolled out the red carpet for Adani and they have even offered them their own terminal, but we missed out and so did Proserpine's Whitsunday Coast Airport. The welcome sign at the Whitsunday Coast Airport says 'Gateway to the Whitsundays & Coalfields,' but guess what. We missed out as well. We have all these empty houses on the coast on the back of the downturn in the resources sector, and we have Townsville and Rockhampton becoming the FIFO hubs on the coast. I accept what I heard from the member for Gregory earlier because we need to have people living in these communities, drive-in drive-out, because on the LNP side we believe in choice.

Debate, on motion of Mr Costigan, adjourned.

MOTION

Minister for Corrective Services



Mr MANDER (Everton—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House has no confidence in the Minister for Corrective Services following his treatment of the Pullen family.

The appalling behaviour of the Minister for Corrective Services towards Gary and Leanne Pullen has been laid bare for all to see over this last week. This side of the House has no confidence in a minister who would treat a grieving family so cruelly. The Pullens are a family that have been through hell over the last five years—with the killing of their son, Tim, and then the added pain of not knowing where his remains are today. This pain has been exacerbated by the way that they were used, in their own words, like pawns by the Minister for Corrective Services.


Knowing full well that their son's killer had been granted parole only a few days before, the member for Morayfield had no qualms about parading the Pullens like a trophy at a press conference celebrating the passing of the bill. Gary and Leanne were led to believe that their son's killer would be covered by this legislation, and the minister made a conscious decision not to inform them. Whilst the minister may have been bound by confidentiality, if he had just an ounce of decency, he would not have invited them to the press conference and he would not have celebrated with them on the passing of the bill, adding to their belief that this law would cover their son's killers. What we are talking about here is

moral leadership—or, more accurately, a lack of moral leadership. You just do not do that to people, particularly people who have been rocked by an enormous tragedy in their lives and people who are still grieving the loss of their son.

Today it got worse. When the minister eventually rang the Pullens to apologise for his behaviour, he reassured them. He stated that he was comfortable with not revealing he knew that their son's killer had been granted parole knowing that this decision in light of the new legislation would be reviewed. He dangled false hope in front of them. He gave them hope that this decision would be overturned. Today we find out that that original decision to grant Benjamin Oakley parole—after serving just over 18 months of an eight-year sentence and not having revealed the location of Tim Pullen's body—was upheld. They are devastated, they are gutted and they are confused. They wonder why that law was passed in the first place if it does not cover one of Tim's killers who is still serving time in jail.

I appeal to the House tonight. I appeal to the crossbenchers to consider whether the Pullens have been treated with dignity and with respect by the Minister for Corrective Services. I appeal to the Premier to show moral leadership and to stand the Minister for Corrective Services down. How could any family of a victim of crime have confidence that this minister has their back? We would not know any of this if it were not for the actions of a public servant who had a conscience and had the highest integrity to out himself. We would not have known any of this had that person not shown moral courage himself. I urge the House to show Queenslanders that this type of behaviour by a minister of the crown is totally unacceptable. Members can do that by supporting my motion of no confidence in the Minister for Corrective Services.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Stretton, I am informed by the member for Nudgee that we have many leaders from the Queensland Servant Leadership Forum observing our proceedings from our public gallery. Welcome.

 **Mr PEGG** (Stretton—ALP) (6.06 pm): It was very interesting to hear the member for Everton talk about moral leadership and confidence. I might address his record in relation to moral leadership a bit later in this debate, but, when it comes to confidence, we all know that the member for Everton has plenty of confidence in himself but I am not sure how much confidence he has from his colleagues given his actions in recent times.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. What is your point of order?

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. That is an appalling misuse of this parliament in a debate such as this for a speaker to lead his contribution to the debate with a personal attack on someone who has just spoken. That is appalling.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Point of order, Mr Speaker. Clearly, that is not a point of order that the Leader of Opposition Business has sought to make. He is seeking to make some sort of debate about something. There are many examples where people have done that, including many examples today where members of the opposition have done that very thing. Mr Speaker, I suggest that you rule the point of order out.

Mr SPEAKER: I find there is no point of order.

Mr PEGG: I am more than happy—

An opposition member interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. If I remember correctly, the member for Everton was listened to in basically silence, so I expect similar respect to be provided to the other speakers who want to participate in this debate.

Mr PEGG: I am very pleased to be contributing to the debate here this evening. I take this opportunity to highlight the great work of the Palaszczuk government and the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services. Unlike the cut, sack, sell LNP, our government, through the hard work of Minister Ryan, has been restoring front-line services in vital areas to keep Queenslanders safe. For instance, the minister delivered a Queensland Fire and Emergency Services certified agreement in March this year. This approved QFES certified agreement was presented to operational employees employed under the Fire and Emergency Services Act 1990 of QFES and was overwhelmingly endorsed by 98 per cent voting in support of this agreement. This is a substantial result.

Compare this to the LNP's significant attacks on the same members within the fire and rescue ranks. Describing the LNP's 2012 certified agreement as appalling is being too kind and it certainly was not showing any moral leadership. The LNP offer was so unfair to the courageous men and women of

the then Queensland Fire and Rescue Service that the staff were forced into arbitration as the LNP tried to strip away pay and workers' rights. As we heard in this place earlier, this is what the LNP do: they cut, they sack and they sell. This stands in stark contrast to the Palaszczuk government and Minister Ryan, who continues to invest in services for the benefit of all Queenslanders. Not only do we invest and restore services but we are a government that consults and listens to our communities.

This is where it gets very interesting. We heard about moral leadership from the member for Everton. I wonder what kind of moral leadership he was showing when he was the minister for housing in this place and he had his three strikes policy in relation to public housing tenants. We have not heard too much about the member for Everton—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, the member for Everton made some very critical comments against the minister and the government listened, as I recall, basically in silence. I expect similar respect to be shown to all members during this debate.

Mr PEGG: It seems that the member for Everton has a real enthusiasm for strikes. He loved handing out strikes when he was the minister for housing. He loved boasting about the strikes that he handed out to public housing tenants. He boasted about the 49 strikes he issued in Cairns, Toowoomba recorded 16, Townsville nine and Mackay five.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. The motion before the House is about the confidence the House should have in the minister in relation to his handling of one particular issue. The contribution that is being made by the member at the moment nowhere near addresses the substance of that motion. It is appallingly unsuitable to take an opportunity in this debate to launch such a personal attack.

Mr SPEAKER: I would urge the member for Stretton to make his comments relevant to the matter we are debating at the moment.

Mr PEGG: I certainly do agree with the member for Everton that having confidence and moral leadership in this place is very, very important. The member for Everton made remarks about the Minister for Police who, in my view, is doing a fantastic job, which is very challenging, under difficult circumstances. The member for Everton liked handing out strikes. One, two, three, and they are out—the three strikes policy. He loved it. He had a flawed and failed three strikes policy when he was the minister for housing—

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. My point of order goes to relevance to the motion before the House. The member is clearly straying from the substance and the form of the motion, Mr Speaker. I would ask you to bring him back to the substance of the no confidence motion in the minister.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, I would urge you to make sure your comments are relevant to the motion before the House.


Mr PEGG: Mr Speaker, thank you for your direction. I think it is really important in this debate about moral leadership and confidence that the member for Everton is held to his own standards. I think it is very important. I will not repeat his record as housing minister any further. That is clearly a first strike for the member for Everton; that is strike one. What happened then? The member for Everton then became the education spokesperson in this place.

Mr NICHOLLS: I rise to a point of order. Mr Speaker, you have given, I think, some considerable leeway and some considerable direction to the member for Stretton and his continued refusal to accept that direction would clearly reflect on the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Stretton, I would urge you to—final warning—please make sure your contribution has something relevant and connected to the motion. If you persist with this line of argument I will sit you down and call the next speaker.

Mr PEGG: Not only do we invest and restore services but this government is a government that consults and listens to our communities, and I think that is very important. For instance, in January this year Minister Ryan announced the creation of the Emergency Volunteers Advisory Forum. This is about key representatives across Queensland coming together to discuss issues and events affecting the volunteer sector. Then in May this year Minister Ryan released the QFES 'Volunteerism strategy discussion paper' towards developing good strategies, directions and priorities for a volunteer model that is sustainable and represents public value. I cannot let this opportunity go by without noting last month's state budget in which Minister Ryan announced a range of important funding initiatives. This is the difference between this minister and those opposite, between this minister and the member for Everton: we value investment in jobs and front-line services—

(Time expired)

 **Ms DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (6.14 pm): I rise to second the motion moved by the member for Everton and to put on record that I have no confidence in the Minister for Corrective Services. I urge all members to stand up for the Pullen family, who were so shamefully played by the member for Morayfield. I would note that in that disgraceful contribution the member for Stretton could not even defend the minister on the matter of substance contained in the motion in any way. In doing so he has in fact condemned the minister because he has demonstrated that the behaviour of the minister is completely indefensible.

The conduct of the Minister for Corrective Services has been despicable. Like the LNP, Queenslanders are appalled at the disdainful treatment of Leanne and Gary Pullen. Dragging this family out and parading them in front of the media, knowing that one of the grubs that murdered their son, Tim, was up for parole ahead of this legislation being enacted was one of the cruellest things that I have witnessed in my time in this House. This minister hides behind confidentiality provisions, but where were his moral provisions? The minister, knowing what he did, could have and should have suggested to the Pullens that they not be part of a PR stunt. A compassionate person would have done that.


What did the minister do when his dirty little secret was exposed? He defended his actions and the family he duped was left shattered and revictimised. They were hung out to dry and left to pick up the pieces of their broken hearts once again. Worse still, this minister gave a homicide victim's family false hope that a supposed review of the matter by the Parole Board would mean that Benjamin Oakley would remain in jail until the whereabouts of their son's body was disclosed. I thought Labor could not go any lower, but the events of today have caused them to plummet to a new low.

The minister's actions to date have been a breach of trust of the Pullen family and a breach of trust of all victims and their families. How could any victim or their family ever again trust the member for Morayfield as the Minister for Corrective Services? His actions demonstrate that his position is untenable, and this House should pass a vote of no confidence in him.

I am proud to say that it was the Nicholls-led LNP team that led the way in ensuring that no-body no-parole laws were implemented in Queensland. From the announcement of our policy in November 2016 we have been determined to ensure the laws were passed through the parliament as quickly as possible. Only after being shamed to act and dragged kicking and screaming did Labor introduce its own set of laws that did not go far enough and meant they had to adopt our very sensible amendments. Our laws applied to criminals who have not yet been released from jail on parole, not those already on parole or out of jail.

Labor's parole system and the Minister for Corrective Services have not delivered a safer Queensland. They have simply left a family gutted. The minister should have done the honourable thing and not used the Pullen family for his own political grandstanding. Any decent minded person with an ounce of empathy would have done that. For the member for Morayfield to claim that he was bound by secrecy and then shamelessly invite the Pullens to stand next to him was indeed despicable.

Losing a child under any circumstance is heartbreaking, but I can only imagine the pain that comes with losing a child to murder. The Pullens do not imagine that pain; they live it. The pain of not being able to lay your child to rest is unimaginable to me as a mother. For the Pullen family it is not unimaginable; it is very, very real. Every member of this House should speak up for the Pullen family and support this motion of no confidence in the Minister for Corrective Services. Any decent minded person with an ounce of humanity would support this motion, and Queenslanders will stand to judge those who do not.

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (6.20 pm): I rise this evening to oppose the motion moved by the member for Everton in this House and to express my support and confidence in the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and the government.

All those who seek and attain public office are cognisant of the oaths we swear: to work in the interests of those we are elected to serve and to abide by the laws we all swear to uphold. It is a solemn and serious responsibility. As elected members of this House we are the beneficiaries not only of the honour to serve but of the great gift of the public's trust. It is a gift that is special and must be handled with care. We are therefore bound by duty and compelled by conscience to comply with the law and to do the right thing, to seek advice and to navigate our way through, particularly those members of the executive and particularly at those times when we confront complex and difficult issues.

Parliament, quite rightly, is a chamber of robust debate—our way of civilising the contest of ideas whose fate is determined by a free election of eligible voters. It is the people of Queensland, the people of our state, who ultimately hold us to account. They make the final determination of whether or not

they feel we have met the standards they set for us. The elections we hold in this state provide the mechanism by which our parliaments are constituted and our governments are formed. They reflect the will of the people. It is no trivial matter to challenge their judgement by moving motions such as the one we are moving tonight, which seeks to withdraw the confidence of the people's house in the member chosen by the voters of Morayfield and nominated by the Premier to be the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and to discharge his responsibilities as Minister for Corrective Services.

The member for Morayfield, the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services, is as diligent and industrious as any minister in this House. In the 10 months since he was appointed he has travelled across the length and breadth of this state visiting regional and remote communities, visiting serving police officers who protect the people of our state across the length and breadth of our state, visiting those firefighters who do the same thing, supporting our government's commitment to ensure that Queenslanders—no matter where they live, no matter who they are, no matter where they come from originally—have a fair shot of living a life free of violence and the travails of crime.


We are bound by law not to reveal all we know. That is the truth for those of us who serve in the executive government. There are confidences we are compelled to keep and information we are prohibited from sharing. The same law covers all public servants in this state who are not given a choice to release information because the law binds all of us. It is not a choice we make. It is not at its heart a political decision: it is a restriction placed upon us by legal provisions that have been drafted in this House by many of us to protect the rights of all citizens.

The minister has made it clear that he was bound by a duty of confidentiality not to release information. He discharged his duty and he should not be held to any other account than doing his duty according to law. The granting of parole is not a decision made by the Minister for Corrective Services. It is quite properly—and should always be—a decision independent of executive government, and those who seek to politicise that decision-making process would undermine a fundamental tenet of the rule of law. It would undermine—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I apologise for interrupting, Minister, but there is too much discussion. You have the call.

Mr DICK: The minister has at all times acted in accordance with what he understood were his responsibilities and what he was advised were his responsibilities. He has kept the confidence that he felt he was bound by law to respect. Respect for the rule of law is central to everything that we do in the executive and that all members of parliament should do. Those politicians, including those members of the opposition, who want to climb into the high castle of moral leadership should come with clean hands—not an opposition that ignored families who were damaged by the Barrett closure. If they want to climb into the high castle of cruelty—and they are the words that have been used tonight—they should come here with clean hands. We will not be judged by the LNP when they are yet to apologise. This minister has apologised. No-one could understand the suffering of the Pullen family, but this minister has apologised, quite properly, to them.

 **Mr WALKER** (Mansfield—LNP) (6.25 pm): The previous speaker used the phrase 'gift of the public's trust' and that is precisely what this debate is about tonight. It is not about whether the minister has crisscrossed Queensland more times than anyone else. It is not about whether he set up more advisory committees than anybody else. It is about whether he has fallen below the standard that requires us as a House to say that he no longer has the gift of the public's trust, and I believe he has fallen below that standard.

For me this debate goes back to 9 December last year. That is when I went to the Queensland Homicide Victims' Support Group's night of recognition. I was there with the member for Everton and we had the privilege of sitting at the table of the Pullen family. Leanne was the guest speaker that night, and she spoke about what the homicide of her son had done to her family. I felt awkward, I must say, going to that function. Before I went I thought, 'How am I going to deal with sitting in a room full of people who have suffered so much worse than I—who have suffered a homicide in their family?' I found a room full of resilient people, but I also found a room full of people who I knew had to be handled with the utmost dignity and care. That is what I found.

We have heard lots of excuses tonight about the minister's behaviour. One excuse was that he was bound by confidentiality under the law. That is not right. There is a provision in the act that would allow him, in the public interest, to receive a clearance to speak to the Pullens about the matter. It is


not right that he was bound by the law. It is not the fact that he had to attend that press conference and stand there next to the Pullens. If he felt that confidentiality bound him, he should have absented himself from the press conference and let the Attorney-General do it. He did not do that. He turned up at the press conference knowing full well the information that he had and he used those people.

The other issue that I want to raise tonight is the issue of the review. It has come to a head, as it happens, today with the decision being announced. I want to know a bit more about that review, because I suspect that the Pullens may have been led on in relation to that matter as well. I do not know the full legalities of it, and no doubt we will hear in due course formally from the Parole Board, but I cannot see anything in the Parole Boards Act that allows them to review a decision. I want to know whether it was a fair dinkum review, or whether it was an acknowledgment by the Parole Board that in fact they did not have the power to review the decision.

I also want to know why, if there was a review, it happened so quickly. It happened before the legislation we passed in this House the last time we sat, and it was held out to the Pullens as something which might salvage the dreadful situation in which they find themselves. I want to know why the Parole Board made the decision before that legislation was proclaimed. Why is that? Why were the Pullens led to think in this House only the last time we were here, sitting up in the gallery there—I went up at the same time as the minister was up there talking to them—that this would save them, when in fact the tragic set of circumstances that we have seen roll out has now rolled out.

I put it to the minister that he needs to explain those things. I put it to him that he has fallen below the standard that the member for Woodridge just said and whether in those circumstances he deserves the gift of the public's trust. We all make lots of mistakes in our roles as members of parliament or ministers and many of them we just have to be forgiven for, but some we cannot be forgiven for. It is a serious matter, but I believe that is the case we are looking at tonight.

There is an old joke about politicians: politicians are people who have friends they have not even used yet. It is about using people that we are talking about tonight, and that is a standard—the sort of standard that the member for Woodridge was talking about involving the gift of the public's trust. That is the sort of standard where if you have fallen below that the House cannot endorse it, so we have a serious decision to make tonight. I think it is clear that the particular course of behaviour that we have seen warrants this House taking that step, warrants this House saying that there is a standard that we are not going to say we will fall below, that we have seen it played out before us and that we have no confidence in this minister.

 **Hon. YM D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (6.30 pm): I rise to speak in opposition to this motion. The police minister has already stated that he has contacted the Pullens and apologised to them. Today the police minister has put out a statement stating—

All decisions by Parole Board Queensland and its President are made independently and without political interference ...

However, he goes on to say—

While I cannot interfere with decisions of the independent parole board, personally I do feel disappointed in the decision.

I can understand why the Pullens feel the way they do.

He further states—

As I have previously stated, the President of the Parole Board Queensland made it clear to me that any decisions that the Parole Board had made for future granting of parole would be reviewed in-light of the new 'No Body, No Parole' laws.

The Corrective Services (No Body, No Parole) Amendment Bill 2017 was passed by Parliament this month, but is yet to be assented.

I understand that the Parole Board Queensland review has now been finalised.

I do empathise with Leanne and Gary Pullen. I know that right now is a very difficult time for them, as it has been over a number of years, but having heard this decision today from the Parole Board they will be feeling distress at that decision of the Parole Board. We do need to remind ourselves that those decisions are made by an independent body and the timing of those decisions is made independent of government. That does not make it any less distressing for the families and the victims in these circumstances, but importantly it is that independence that we must remind ourselves of.

It is difficult when this parliament passes laws that we know will make a difference in people's lives but that sometimes those laws do not capture certain circumstances. There will always be those times where someone is not captured by those new laws and does not benefit from those new laws. Having said that, I am proud of the laws that this parliament has passed. I am proud of the no-body

no-parole laws that this government introduced. They are good laws and they are also laws now that mean that anyone who has been granted parole, if they breach those parole orders and they return to prison, will be captured by these laws and the Parole Board will be required to apply these new provisions in considering any future parole applications.

I do take issue with the comments from the member for Aspley in that they did not make Queensland safer. They are good laws. We should all be proud of that. We were not dragged kicking and screaming to introduce these laws. They were recommended out of a comprehensive review by Walter Sofronoff and my department undertook extensive work to consult on what those laws should look like—looking at other jurisdictions and trying to develop the best model going forward, not simply just picking up one jurisdiction and saying, ‘That looks good. Let’s do that one.’ Rather, we actually looked at the best model going forward. Even though we did all of that, we still recognised that there was a gap there and we moved an amendment, as did the opposition, to strengthen them even further to give us the strongest no-body no-parole laws in this country.

Every homicide victim’s family that I talk to and every stakeholder that I talk to acknowledge that they wanted the opportunity to go to a parliamentary committee and put submissions on this issue. They wanted to make sure that the laws were not rushed and we got it right, and that means sometimes not everyone benefits from those new laws. I will finish with what I started with: we certainly empathise with the Pullen family right now and the distress that they are going through. The police minister has apologised. The police minister has done great work in his portfolio and continues to stand up for our emergency service workers, our corrective services and our police every single day. We need to remind ourselves when we are having this debate and let the people of Queensland know that these are good laws that will help many, many families into the future. We should be proud of those laws. I oppose the motion before the parliament and I ask that those across the chamber also oppose it.

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

AYES, 42:

LNP, 39—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 40—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Gilbert, Grace, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

Pairs: Furner, Crandon; Harper, Simpson.


The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.41 pm to 7.45 pm.


MINISTERIAL PAPERS

Ministerial Expenses

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (7.45 pm): I lay upon the table of the House the public report of ministerial expenses for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017. This report is tabled in accordance with the Financial Accountability Act 2009. The report shows my continued commitment to managing costs responsibly and running effective government for all of Queensland.

Tabled paper: Public report of Expenses for Ministerial Offices for 2016-17 [[1462](#)].


Reportable Gifts

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (7.45 pm): I also take the opportunity to table the register of reportable gifts for the financial year ending 30 June 2017 for ministerial offices and the Office of the Leader of the Opposition. I commend these reports to the House.

Tabled paper: Ministerial gifts register—Reportable Gifts 1 July 2016-30 June 2017 [[1463](#)].

REPORT

Office of the Leader of the Opposition

 **Mr NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (7.45 pm): I lay upon the table of the House the public report of office expenses for the Office of the Leader of the Opposition for the period 1 July 2016 to 30 June 2017.


Tabled paper: Public report of the Leader of the Opposition Expenses 2016-17 [[1464](#)].

STRONG AND SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE COMMUNITIES BILL


Second Reading

Resumed from p. 2523, on motion of Dr Lynham—

That the bill be now read a second time.

 **Mr COSTIGAN** (Whitsunday—LNP) (7.46 pm), continuing: As I was saying prior to the dinner break, Mackay and the Whitsundays need those FIFO hubs, particularly in relation to what is happening in the Galilee Basin and the \$16 billion Carmichael coalmine. The Labor members for Mackay and Mirani have been silent on this, which is disappointing.

I am proud to show my support for the great sugar-milling town of Proserpine tonight by wearing this pin. Proserpine is experiencing a world of pain on the back of Cyclone Debbie. There was a lot of hurt beforehand economically, with the resources industry downturn and 8,000 jobs lost. We need some help, and those FIFO hubs are important. I want to make sure that no-one here is under any illusion—the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Nanango, made it quite clear—that the challenge tonight is for all members to support the LNP's amendments.

 **Hon. CJ O'ROURKE** (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (7.47 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016 and what it will mean for the people of North Queensland. The Palaszczuk government made a commitment at the last election to legislate against the use of 100 per cent FIFO operations near regional communities and introduced choice for workers to live in the resource communities near to where they work. This bill honours that commitment. This government made a commitment to strong and sustainable resource communities and commissioned two separate reviews into FIFO arrangements. These were conducted by the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee and the independent FIFO review panel, chaired by Gladstone Ports Corporation chief Leo Zussino.

The objective of the bill is to prescribe in legislation the social impact assessment process for large resource projects and prohibit 100 per cent fly-in fly-out work arrangements for operational workers. The bill also includes amendments to the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991. As the Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland, I understand the frustrations of people who live in and love the north but cannot get a job in their own backyard. I hear this from mums and dads who struggle to keep a job but cannot imagine raising their family anywhere else. I hear this from local leaders who want to see unemployment rates drop. This is why, when I talk to stakeholders and my ministerial colleagues about proposed projects, I always ask early and ask often what is happening to ensure any jobs can be jobs for locals.


The resources sector is a major employer in North Queensland, and locals in many communities across the north have experience in and want to be employed in mining jobs. The reality, however, is that when a lot of resource jobs are advertised they are not advertised locally, they are not open for locals to apply and they are advertised in the south-east and touted as Brisbane FIFO jobs. The people of the north are effectively locked out from even applying for those jobs, regardless of whether they are willing and able to work and have the relevant experience. This bill will end this shameful practice by amending the Anti-Discrimination Act to prohibit this blatant postcode discrimination against locals during the recruitment processes for new workers.

The amendments will also enable existing fly-in fly-out workers on certain large resource projects to move and become part of the local community if they choose. Quite frankly, if existing FIFO workers want to join and help our northern communities to grow further we want them to come and join. Changing the law to allow this to happen is common sense. It is also important that I point out that the anti-discrimination provisions will not prevent resource project operators preferentially recruiting local workers. I personally would love to see some of this type of discrimination happening for our locals who

need jobs. The anti-discrimination provisions will also not apply to most small or medium-scale resource projects because those projects are not usually subject to an environmental impact assessment process.

This is a very measured bill that delivers the best outcomes for all. I am also pleased that the strong and sustainable communities policy framework will provide improved opportunities for local governments to participate in project impact assessment processes. I regularly meet with many mayors in North Queensland and understand the unique knowledge that they have about their local community's needs. I think the fact that the strong and sustainable communities policy framework will maximise the opportunities for competitive and capable local businesses to access resource projects' supply chains will mean more jobs for locals and growing innovation for the north. I personally know of many, many highly capable local businesses in Townsville who are ready and rearing for more opportunities to grow their business and I am proud to be part of a government that can deliver the right policies to allow this to happen.

Finally, I want to acknowledge that the strong and sustainable resource communities policy framework will also help protect worker health and wellbeing. It is important to me that workers are protected. While I want the people of my town to get jobs, I equally want them to stay safe and well in those jobs. In closing, this bill means a lot for the people of the north. No longer will there be 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workers and no longer will locals be discriminated against when it comes to the jobs. This will make our northern communities stronger and sustainable. I cannot wait to hear from locals who will get the jobs. It is for these reasons that I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr WEIR** (Condamine—LNP) (7.51 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the debate on the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. As has been stated by many members on this side of the House, the LNP does not support a 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforce. My sister and my brother-in-law spent many years in Blackwater in the eighties and early nineties. Darryl spent 15 years working in the mines there. Blackwater was a thriving town at that stage, as were the towns of Dysart and Moranbah. There was a high school in Blackwater where Emma and Darryl's three girls went to school. The eldest began her working life in the town of Blackwater.


Mr Costigan: Used to be three footy clubs there.

Mr WEIR: That is exactly right. There was a golf course. It was a thriving town. There was a Woolworths. There was a big shopping centre. Now there are a lot of empty houses. It is nowhere near the town that it was. The 100 per cent fly-in fly-out mines in Queensland came in under the Bligh era. It has devastated those communities. It is definitely not in the community's interest.

Since the redistribution, the seat of Condamine includes a mine, the New Hope mine at Acland. One only has to look at that mine to see how the town and the communities around that mine depend upon that mine, whether they are contractors, car dealerships in the town of Oakey, kids at school or farmers. There are a lot of small farms around that area. They are not large enough to survive on their own and a lot of small block owners work at the mine. That is why it is such an emotive issue in Oakey. That town has become so reliant on that mine. The thought of it closing is something that a lot of people are struggling to come to grips with. It has been through the Land Court process. It is now going through a judicial review. New Hope has challenged the decision. We are awaiting the outcome. The residents are well aware that the minister could overturn it and make the decision himself. I think everybody out there is hoping that is not the case. We will wait for it to go through due process. If it does not proceed it will have a big impact on the town of Oakey.

One of the amendments that was mooted by the member for Nanango is the social impact assessment. That is vitally important. In the Bligh era when the gas industry first started out in the Dalby, Chinchilla, Miles area it came at those areas at 100 miles per hour and they were not prepared for it. We had workers camps spring up all around the area and then they started building houses in Chinchilla, Miles and Dalby. Motels were built. Everyone thought this period of boom was here for a number of years to come. That was not the case. When it went through the construction stage there were businesses that went broke. Motels sold up. It caused a lot of pain and grief. A bit of forward planning would have made a big difference and made those communities much more sustainable than they currently are. They are working their way out of it, but it has taken a toll on all of those communities. A social impact assessment and consultation with the local community is vitally important.

In relation to Central Queensland and Adani, with the youth unemployment in those areas one would hope that they do employ as many people locally as possible because that means apprenticeships, traineeships and a future beyond mining. I support the amendments foreshadowed by the member for Nanango and reiterate that we do not support a 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workforce.

 **Mr KNUTH** (Dalrymple—KAP) (7.56 pm): I support the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. I believe that this bill ends 100 per cent FIFO. It also removes the discrimination aspect of living in the mining town and having no hope of getting a job in that 100 per cent FIFO mine. Locals can now apply for a job at the mine and not be discriminated against because they are a local. People who live outside the mining town region can apply and move to that mining community without being discriminated against. Caval Ridge is right at Moranbah's door and it is very disappointing that the BMA 100 per cent FIFO mine does not support the community one iota. They do not employ locals. They do not support local businesses. They do not buy bread or bakery items from the local bakeries; they source bread 1,000 kilometres away.

FIFO workers use hospital resources, ambulance services and QGAP resources. They stretch services to maximum capacity yet at the same time these big mining companies deliver nothing to those communities. I will give members an illustration of what these communities have been going through year in, year out. If a person wanted a job at Caval Ridge, right at the door of Moranbah, they would have to fly to Brisbane at their own cost, get on a plane, fly back to the camp and stay there for 10 days or however long it may be, fly back to Brisbane and then fly back to Moranbah to be at home with their family for the next few days. That is discrimination.

The Bligh government was responsible for the 100 per cent fly-in fly-out debacle. They did not listen to the communities or the local councils. I acknowledge Mayor Anne Baker, Councillor Kelly Vea Vea and Councillor Gina Lacey who have led the campaign. Without them this bill would not be before the House. Their dedication, passion, determination and their will to see something that was unjust pushed aside has resulted in this bill, and this is a very proud moment for them and for me as the member of parliament for that region.

The Bligh government was kicked out and I believe that FIFO was a factor in that, as were asset sales. They lost government and were reduced to only seven seats. When the Newman government was voted in there was a belief that they would do something about FIFO, but they got into bed with the mining companies and did nothing for the resource communities. I hear the LNP boasting and bragging about caring for the communities and the workers, but where is their bill? Where is the LNP legislation? There is none! We were expecting the Newman government to resolve the problems of FIFO, but the first thing they did was to sack 16,000 workers. They spent \$750 million on the Taj Mahal in William Street, while Moranbah people had to fly to Brisbane simply to get jobs in the mining industry. The best they could do was to get rid of the pensioners' lawn-mowing vouchers. Most of the members I see on this side of the House were very proud members of that Newman government.

Mr COSTIGAN: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the member for Dalrymple's passion for his community, but I ask you to rule on relevance.


Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): There is no point of order.

Mr KNUTH: I believe that the passage of this bill to prohibit 100 per cent FIFO will be history making. I do not believe that the LNP deserve to take any credit for it. What did they do about the canegrowers? Nothing! They set a perception that they did something. Did they introduce legislation? No! They talked about how they were going to do something about ethanol, but what did they do? Absolutely nothing!

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Dalrymple, you are straying well away from the purpose of the bill. I urge you to come back to the meaning of the bill.

Mr KNUTH: This bill will mean that people who live in those townships will be able to apply for jobs without being discriminated against. I have seen that happen. I have talked to mums who are concerned that their children cannot get jobs in the local mine unless they move to Brisbane. No doubt this legislation will strengthen those resource communities. This will create an atmosphere where families are confident to come and stay and play sport and go to school, which is what mining communities used to be about.

I support this bill. The Coordinator-General is to ask for a social impact assessment, which is a very good aspect of the bill. The councils, which have been ignored over the years, will have greater control of and input into who is employed in the mines. Employees will not be discriminated against on the basis of where they live. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (8.03 pm): Tonight I rise in the House to support the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill. This bill delivers on a key election commitment of my government, the strong and sustainable resource communities policy. From the outset, I pay tribute to the former member for Mackay, Tim Mulherin, who played an absolutely crucial role in developing that policy as he travelled around Queensland.

My government understands and listens to regional Queensland. When I was opposition leader, my team visited Moura, Dysart, Middelmount, Blackwater and Moranbah to develop a policy in consultation with the people directly impacted by the lack of opportunity to work near where they live. During those visits, we heard firsthand of the impacts on regional towns and businesses, of workers being forced out of town, of shops closing and schools losing teachers and students. I heard their stories firsthand. I heard their concerns. That is why we committed to our policy to end 100 per cent fly-in fly-out which will be delivered by this bill.

At the Moranbah Community Workers Club, I remember being approached by families concerned about the future of their communities. I met with the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council, who is here to see the passage of this historic legislation through the House tonight. She has fought tirelessly for her community to make this bill a reality. I acknowledge Mayor Anne Baker and Councillor Kelly Vea Vea, who are in the gallery tonight.

I vividly remember that, on one of those trips, I met with a cleaner at the workers club. She told me that she was incredibly concerned about the future of her son, who was at school. I asked her to tell me about the impact on her family. She said that, for a start, her husband had to leave the town that he loved and the family that he loved, merely to fly back in to work at that mine. That was a disgrace. She said to me, 'I want a future where my son can grow up and live in his community, able to work at the mine that is just down the road. He should not have to leave the community that he loves.' Make no mistake: that practice has put severe strain on families across our state. Tonight, with the passage of this bill, that strain will be lifted. I heard stories of workers flying out of mining towns to then fly back in, just to be able to work in the mines within a short distance of their homes. Excluding local people from working in local mines is, in my view, discriminatory, unfair and unjust. Providing jobs and fair working conditions and protecting Queensland families is what motivates me in everything I do.

Just last week I visited Mount Isa, Moranbah and Tieri. Those are strong communities with a sustainable future, thanks to this bill. I thank the member for Mirani, Jim Pearce, for accompanying me on a couple of those visits. I was very concerned about what I heard from workers and families in Tieri. I expect mining companies to operate in accordance with the social licence that is provided by resource communities. There needs to be a return to the negotiating table with workers to fix this issue for the sake of the families in their communities.

Last week I heard stories about stores being closed and schools losing students, although not just one or two students; they have seen a dramatic reduction in school numbers because of the uncertainty faced by the mining communities. This bill is about what Labor fundamentally stands for, which is to provide safe, secure employment for Queenslanders regardless of where they live in our great state. This is about protecting our regional towns and protecting what is iconic about Queensland. It is about stopping our regional towns from closing, stopping the loss of kids from schools, stopping the closure of local businesses and shops. It is about ensuring a sustainable future for children living in those towns across our state. It is absolutely crucial for families in mining towns to have access to secure long-term jobs, close to where they live.

My government believes that workers should have the fundamental right to choose to either live locally with family and children or commute to work. This bill restores choice for workers to live in the resource communities near where they work by stopping the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces near established resource communities. It restores the social impact assessment process for large resource projects and sets it in legislation, including a recruitment hierarchy, making it harder for the LNP to ever wind back the social impact assessment processes in the future.

This bill prevents resource companies from discriminating against local residents. I think it is not until you visit those communities that you understand what this is really all about and you cannot do that sitting in Brisbane. This has been postcode discrimination. It has been unfair. Tonight we are fixing it. This bill stops 100 per cent FIFO on construction workforces where there is a capacity in the local community to do the work. Queensland workers should never be forced into FIFO arrangements where there is an opportunity to live in a nearby regional community.

The other thing I want to say about some of our great regional communities across our state is that they are not only iconic Queensland locations but also communities that we on this side of the House value. They are communities that we fundamentally value and we want them to be sustainable into the future. I do not want to see towns closing up because of these unfair and discriminatory practices. Tonight we back our regional towns in our state. We back our workers living in these regional towns. We back those families that those workers provide for living in those regional towns across our state.

The LNP cannot be trusted on FIFO promises. In their statement of reservation on this bill the LNP raised concerns about sovereign risk. As usual, the LNP say one thing in government and then do another. Former premier Campbell Newman committed to not supporting 100 per cent FIFO at the 2012 election. The member for Callide, as the deputy premier, then walked away from that promise. The member for Callide approved more FIFO accommodation and further watered down requirements—

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Member for Hinchinbrook, you are not in your allocated seat. If you feel the need to interject, you should do it from your own seat.

Ms PALASZCZUK:—for resource workers to reside in the Bowen Basin. The member for Callide said ‘not supporting 100 per cent FIFO’ actually referred to not supporting it at every single Queensland mine. He said decisions to have 100 per cent FIFO were the right decisions at the time. The member for Callide said that the 100 per cent FIFO deal for the two BMA mines created choice for workers. ‘If they want to live locally, there are plenty of opportunities to work locally,’ he said.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Listen carefully. My government will not permit the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces for the operation of mines located near a regional centre or existing mining community.

Opposition members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We on this side of the House will stand up for regional communities.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member of Hinchinbrook, I will warn you if you continue to interject as you have been doing.

Ms PALASZCZUK: My government, unlike the LNP, delivers on its election commitments. We are meeting our election commitments to prohibit 100 per cent FIFO workforces near established resource communities and to help our iconic regional towns to stay strong and sustainable into the future. This bill delivers on the same—

Mr Stevens: You are rewriting history.


Ms PALASZCZUK: I take that interjection. Tonight we are making history. Tonight we are backing regional towns in this state, unlike those opposite.

An opposition member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Do you want to go into the cuts to services you made to those communities as well while you were at it? I am happy to remind you about all of that as well.

The bill delivers on the same distance requirement for consideration of local workers of 125 kilometres as our Buy Queensland procurement policy. I call on the LNP to join me in putting Queenslanders first in relation to this policy as well. I have always believed that there should be a choice. If people want to live in resource or regional communities, they should have the opportunity to apply for jobs there. I commend the bill to the House.

(Time expired)

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (8.13 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate of the Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016. FIFO is a relevant issue to the electorate of Mount Isa. I think the federal parliament’s report on FIFO was definitive. FIFO is a cancer of the bush. It is a burning issue in places like Mount Isa and Cloncurry where there is constant tension with companies that seem to have an increasing appetite for breaking up permanent workforces, having a contract workforce and flying them in. It diminishes those communities that exist around those mines.

That tension will always exist. There will always be a need for government to be in the middle of that tension. Companies will do what they always do. They will extract as much benefit and as much profit from those operations until the government holds them accountable in terms of their responsibilities to the community, the state and the nation. Just as we do not like people coming into our country and extracting our resources without putting something back into our country, we do not like people doing that to our state and our towns.

A new company was coming into town and they made a big song and dance about the fact that they were starting up operations a couple of hundred kilometres south of Mount Isa. They proudly declared that they were starting up their operations there. The response from the chamber of commerce was, ‘Who really cares? It is a FIFO workforce. We might get a few service contracts down there.’ It

was supposed to be a big announcement of a mine, but people's genuine reaction was, 'What do we care? We will get no jobs out of it. The royalties will go down to Brisbane. I am not sure why we are supposed to be excited about this. You might make a profit out of it.'

That is at the heart of what this is about. We live out there. These companies would find it very hard to operate in these places if they did not have the stable base of government services, airports and the things that the ratepayers provide. They need a stable workforce in order for them to operate. If they are near McKinlay and break down or need a tyre, there is a mechanic and tyres in Julia Creek. They can rely on that. They are happy to rely on these towns, but, unfortunately, so many of these companies do not give back to the towns. The biggest way they can give back to these communities is by providing jobs. Jobs are, far and away, the most important thing we need. We need jobs before royalties or anything else.

The last time I checked, Ernest Henry Mining, a Glencore operation, which is only 20 or 30 kilometres out of town, had about 30 per cent of locals employed in their workforce and the rest are FIFO employees. In recent discussions with Townsville Enterprise, I said that they should be championing issues around rail infrastructure and utilities charges more than me because they would have more of their people working in the north-west than I would have from my electorate. There would be more Townsville and Brisbane FIFO employees out there than locals.

Jobs are precious. I am not saying that we should have ownership of all the jobs, but there should be some benefit for those areas. We can blame everyone, but both sides of the House have had their hands dirty in this respect. I acknowledge that this is a positive move in the right direction.

In terms of the construction side of the bill, I believe that there are some proposed amendments. I think there is some merit in those. Dugald River near Cloncurry is a mine that is starting up in my area. A big FIFO workforce has been moving in there. That construction period has taken a while. Unfortunately, I do not think there were many checks and balances. There has been some good work done by the unions to get a local workforce for that operation. Unfortunately, it has not been enough. There are a lot of empty houses in Cloncurry. Unfortunately, we do not have enough workers at these places.

One attitude that really annoys me—and I have heard it said in this House before; perhaps it has been said with the best of intentions—is when people say, 'You have to give people a choice where to live.' I do not agree with that. If there is a couple living on the Gold Coast and they are offered a job in Mount Isa, we have developed a culture in Queensland where we have to say, 'Live wherever you want. You can fly up there. You can stay at the Gold Coast or you can move to Mount Isa.'

I love living in Mount Isa. No-one is going to consciously displace their wife and kids and move up to Mount Isa to take a job. Perhaps 80 or 90 per cent of people would move to Mount Isa if they were made to and then they would say, 'What a wonderful life we have made for ourselves here.' That is what people did for the 70 or 80 years before FIFO. They thought it was a great place to live, as I discovered. Until they are forced out of their comfort zone of the coastal and metropolitan areas they will not have the opportunity to experience life in regional areas.

I do not accept the proposition that people cannot be made to work somewhere. If we all adopt that, we are going to have a slow descent into a culture of keeping FIFO going. We are stopping 100 per cent FIFO, but we are not forcing anyone to have 70 or 80 per cent local content in places where they should such as Cloncurry and Mount Isa. There is good intent here, but in some ways it will not go far enough. I understand that there are differences. Coalmining areas around Moranbah have a very different dynamic to mining base metals in the north-west minerals province where there are longer distances to travel. It is difficult to put form around in terms of policy; I appreciate that.

Another point that I would like to raise is the impact of FIFO on services in the towns. I remember the previous mayor of Cloncurry Andrew Daniels talking to me about the hospital. The hospital in Cloncurry by rights would have had two doctors allocated to it based on the numbers in the census data. It was Dr Bryan who said that they had about five doctors working there, because they were lucky to have combined it with the local practice—Dr Bryan is a go-getter. They have five or six doctors there at any one time servicing the hospital in Cloncurry to keep up with all of the FIFO workers who come into town. There are old ladies sitting in line waiting two hours longer than they should otherwise because FIFO workers are there using the services.

Unfortunately, we get complaints from locals in the town that a lot of FIFO workers come to Mount Isa and say disparaging things about the place because they have not made the effort to integrate into the community, play sports and enjoy the wonderful benefits we have of living there. They go away with a negative outlook of the place. I do not think that is healthy for anyone. Unfortunately, we have become

too complacent. I think there is a culture in Queensland now where a mine manager talks to his engineering mate and says, 'Mate, don't bother moving out to Mount Isa. They'll take you on a FIFO basis. Just play hardball with them and they won't make you move out there.' We have all become complacent in saying, 'You cannot make them do it.' That is rubbish. We can make these people move out there. It might not be for everyone. We do not have the infrastructure for everyone, but there are empty houses and empty shops, and there is a lot of forgone activity and benefit that we will never see again because these opportunities are not captured.

It is easy to pick on mining companies, and some of them do have a case to answer where they are trying to break up the workforce and deliberately mess with the permanent workforce, but we do need to acknowledge the increasing pressures on mining companies that have been imposed by government in other areas—that includes utility charges, with the rising costs of energy, rail and water. You cannot keep putting this pressure on all of the mines and then expect them to do the community service that they have done in the past as well. You cannot have it both ways. I am all for making them base their workforce locally, but at the same time we need to acknowledge that we need a healthy and vibrant mining industry. I believe that balance can be found.

We definitely need this legislation to tighten things up, to make sure that there is government intervention to force a commitment from these people—that, when the market does not prevail, there are conditions imposed upon them, that they have a responsibility to give back to these communities. Jobs are the most important thing they can offer to these remote communities. These opportunities do not come around very often. Mining companies will most often do what they do best, and that is extract those resources with as much profit as they can. Unfortunately, that has meant an increase in the use of FIFO workforces and that should be stopped. In that case, I believe there are some very strong merits associated with the intent of this bill.



Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (8.23 pm), in reply: I thank the honourable members for their contributions to the debate today. I thank the members of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee for their contributions to the debate and, once again, for their admirable consideration of this bill.

The bill actions the outcomes of the 2015 parliamentary committee inquiry and review panel into fly-in fly-out workers and delivers on a key Queensland government election commitment. This government committed to implementing a locals first program, legislating against the use of 100 per cent FIFO workforces for the operation of mines located near a regional community. The bill achieves this commitment. The committee recommended that the provisions in the bill be extended to all projects, regardless of commencement date and size. The bill will be amended to partially support these recommendations.

The 100 per cent FIFO prohibition and anti-discrimination provisions will apply to all large resource projects, not just future large resource projects subject to an environmental impact statement or an EIS with an evaluation report which has been publicly notified since 30 June 2009. The definition of a 'large resource project' will be expanded to include a large resource project that holds a site specific environmental authority and has more than 100 workers. A balanced approach has been taken and the bill will retain the application to large resource projects.

A large resource project operating in Queensland now or in the future will need to give fair opportunities to local and regional workers. The elevation of the employment hierarchy elements into the bill solidifies the government's position that local and regional employment and recruitment to the regional community is prioritised. These provisions will work in conjunction with the Anti-Discrimination Act 1991 amendments which prohibit discrimination against employing people from nearby regional communities. The bill will ensure Queensland's local and regional communities in the vicinity of large resource projects benefit from the operation of these projects.

The bill will also prescribe the social impact assessment, or SIA, process for new large resource projects which will be supported by an enhanced SIA guideline. The bill and SIA guideline are the key elements of the broader strong and sustainable resource communities policy framework. The framework will support resource communities to attract and retain workers and their families, protect workers' health and wellbeing, provide improved opportunities for local governments to participate in the project impact assessment process, and maximise opportunities for competitive and capable local businesses to access resource project supply chains.

The Mineral Resources Act 1989 amendments will prohibit underground coal gasification, or UCG, and in situ oil shale gasification activities. The government formed the view, having regard to uncertainties expressed in the independent scientific report on UCG and the issues arising from the

trial projects, that the risks of allowing this industry to proceed to full-blown commercial scale operations outweighed any potential benefits. It should be noted that the bill allows activities relating to environmental rehabilitation to be carried out where UCG activities have been conducted. The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection will monitor this rehabilitation.

I would now like to turn to specific issues raised by members during this debate. I think the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has finally jumped a shark when it comes to attempting to tie issues to the Greens. Clearly, she has paranoid delusions of Greens under the bed. What have we heard today? We have witnessed here today a clear demonstration of the Liberal National Party in 2017. The member for Gympie criticises the government for the time we have taken to listen, get this right and do something. The irony is that they did absolutely nothing in three years—no legislation, no change to project—

Mr Perrett: Two and a half years it has taken for you lot.

Dr LYNHAM: Sorry, I will correct that—2½ years, was it? There was no change to project approval conditions. They had the opportunity in the three years they were in government to bring a bill on this issue to the House. They had three years to do it. They had the opportunity to introduce their own bill. They had the opportunity today to come back with meaningful amendments. What they have returned with today is mere tinkering around the edges and not achieving much by contrast. We are focused on the big issues here, not just tinkering with some small amendments. It is not only that; what they have returned with is mostly already in the bill. It is already there—for example, consultation with the community. What a revolutionary concept for those over there. Consultation with the community—what a concept! It is so revolutionary it is already in the bill. It is referenced in clause 9(3)(a)—

(3) The social impact assessment must provide for the following in relation to the project—

(a) community and stakeholder engagement;

Those opposite had not even read the bill before they came in here. The social impact assessment guidelines already state that any cross-agency reference group would include relevant state government agencies and local governments. It is in the bill twice already. They have not read the bill. The bill includes specific reference to the requirement for the proponent to consult with local government in the development of a social impact study. That is three times it is in the bill.

The amendments I will later move will also require that local government be consulted in the development of an operational workforce management plan where 100 per cent fly-in fly-out has been identified as an issue. In addition, I quote from page 4—

An assessment of potential impacts and opportunities across each stage of the project life cycle is to be formed by the social baseline study as well as feedback from stakeholder engagement.

I wonder whether they even read any of the materials. I refer to the member for Nanango's contributions to the debate suggesting the blind adoption of construction workforces. As mentioned in my second reading speech, our amendments will ensure that, if a town has the suitable skills and capacity to contribute to the construction phase, they will be included in the framework. The construction phase is in. Although FIFO accommodation arrangements are usually an appropriate and widely accepted means of managing the impacts of resource project construction in regional communities, it is not intended that the 100 per cent FIFO and anti-discrimination provisions apply automatically to construction workforces.

The operational phase of projects is where the long-term jobs are. These long-term jobs will encourage families to move to regional communities and support sustainable resource communities. Generally jobs are only of a short-term nature during the construction phase. The much bigger operational phase creates the types of jobs where we will see the greatest overall and long-term benefits for the community.

The engagement of large construction workforces over a short period of time has the potential to cause strains on housing, provision of social services and the wellbeing of regional communities. The use of FIFO workers during the construction phase of large resource projects is a key measure in mitigating and managing these potential strains on regional communities and economies. However, I acknowledge there will be many circumstances where construction projects for a large resource project extend over a long period of time or where local skills exist and the nearby regional community therefore has an expectation of supplying workers suitable for the project.

I note the contribution of the member for Mount Isa. He nominated a case where there was a long construction period. We have allowed that to occur where construction workers will be included. An amendment to the bill will ensure a decision by the Coordinator-General must be made on whether

the provisions of the bill should apply to the construction workforce. This decision will occur during an EIS evaluation and will be supported by publicly available guidance material that would include criteria to inform each decision.

The EIS process includes stakeholder consultation on the impacts and opportunities associated with the construction workforce. This is the appropriate time and the right place to consider the application of the provisions to a construction workforce. The opposition proposes to build in inflexibility by removing the Coordinator-General's discretion when such capacity is not present or cannot be developed.

Somehow I doubt that councils, communities and unions are doing somersaults over the fact that the LNP was too spineless to introduce its own bill into the House during its time and tenure. The LNP understands the needs of regional communities and workers so well that over three years it failed to introduce any bill at all. It was too weak in its three years of government and it is too weak to put forward anything substantial now. They complain about Caval Ridge and Daunia but what did they do? They did absolutely nothing.

They were asked to change the conditions—indeed, they promised—and all they did was defend the 100 per cent conditions. When we were here they defended 100 per cent FIFO. They talk the talk, they say they represent regional communities but all they did was defend 100 per cent FIFO when they were here. If their amendments alone were accepted here tonight, Caval Ridge and Daunia would still be 100 per cent FIFO. If we accepted what they wanted tonight, from today forward Caval Ridge and Daunia would still be 100 per cent FIFO. I hope that Mayor Anne Baker is listening to this, because if their amendments alone were accepted tonight Caval Ridge and Daunia would still be 100 per cent FIFO. Those opposite come here after three years of inaction as utter hypocrites because their amendments tonight would mean those mines would still be 100 per cent FIFO. It is the Labor Party which is changing this. It is the Labor Party which is bringing families back to regional communities.

I refer to the member for Hinchinbrook's contribution to the debate. If it was so obvious, why did he not do something about it when he were sitting over here? The member for Nanango mentioned that rural areas need to be supported with infrastructure—the same as urban areas—and that rural areas have been neglected. The social impact assessment process will ensure impacts from large resource projects are appropriately managed. This is the first time that SIA has been mandated in legislation, and conditions will now apply to both the Coordinator-General's EIS and the Environmental Protection Act's EIS projects.

The member also raises the important issue of FIFO workers' mental health. Quite clearly, the social impact assessment guideline which I tabled in this House last November explicitly includes requirements for mental health and wellbeing. Read the materials. The bill and the SIA guideline will combine to support resource worker health and wellbeing. The requirements of the workforce management plan in the SIA guideline will include details of worker wellbeing policies and management systems, along with employee assistance programs that support the mental health of workers, particularly FIFO workers.

On this side of the House, we have members who have worked tirelessly on giving regional communities this fair go. Those opposite have had their chance and they passed on it. They were too gutless to bring any new amendments into the House. They were too gutless to bring a bill into the House. We came into this House and expanded protections and freedoms to an extra 10,000 existing workers. Ten thousand existing workers have expanded protections and freedoms as a result of this bill tonight. It is people like the member for Mirani who have worked tirelessly to get bills like this through this House.

These amendments tonight will benefit 18,000 residents in Mount Isa, 13,500 residents in Emerald and 9,000 residents in Moranbah—thousands of residents in regional communities that you betrayed. We are standing up for regional communities in Queensland. You talk the talk but do nothing. For three years you talked the talk and did absolutely nothing.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! Minister, I ask you to direct your comments through the chair.

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, they had three years and did absolutely nothing. It must be contagious. The member for Hinchinbrook suffers from a major case of should have, would have, could have, but he didn't. He just didn't. He just sat there. It appears to have spread down the front bench to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition's chair.

During their term in government how many restrictions did they place on mining projects? None. They say that the LNP did nothing to allow it, but they did nothing to restrict FIFO. They had many opportunities to do something about FIFO. I refer to the Alpha Coal Project. It was the first project approved under the LNP and there is not one FIFO condition in there at all. I table that document.

Tabled paper: Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated May 2012, regarding the Alpha Coal Project [1465].

I refer to the Kevin's Corner project, another project under the LNP. There is not one FIFO condition in there at all. I table that report.

Tabled paper: Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated May 2013, regarding the Kevin's Corner project [1466].

Mr Cripps: They're not the same as Caval Ridge and Daunia, are they, doc?

Dr LYNHAM: He may say that, but they are very different to the Red Hill mining project, which was the first mining project under the Palaszczuk Labor government. The prohibition of 100 per cent FIFO was within our first mining project, before this legislation. We talk the talk. We support our regional communities. We are supporting Mount Isa, Moranbah and Emerald. We talk the talk. I table that report.

Tabled paper: Coordinator-General's evaluation report on the environmental impact statement, dated June 2015, regarding the Red Hill Mining Lease project [1467].

This was the first ever attempt to limit FIFO in project approval conditions. The Coordinator-General did not approve 100 per cent FIFO and the proponent of Red Hill was conditioned to produce an operational workforce management plan for the Coordinator-General's approval. We simply cannot trust the LNP when it comes to FIFO promises.

In 2011, Campbell Newman toured regional Queensland stating that there would never be 100 per cent FIFO arrangements for any mine. That was 2011, and he toured right through regional Queensland. Their election strategy documentation said that there would be no 100 per cent FIFO. Then they came to government and did absolutely nothing. Instead, we saw them fight amongst themselves behind the scenes. The member for Whitsunday in April 2014 said he would raise the issue of 100 per cent FIFO with the then deputy premier. The member for Callide said that he supported 100 per cent FIFO for some mines as it helped workers choose where they wanted to live. The deputy premier at the time said he supported 100 per cent FIFO. The former member for Gregory—I will not leave him out—described 100 per cent FIFO as 'evil' and something 'the current government is trying to rectify', even though the member for Callide supported 100 per cent FIFO.

They did not rectify anything. In three years there was nothing but broken promises—no legislation, no policy, no conditions, no restriction, no action. I just hope that those opposite retain this legislation if they are ever returned to government. That is the question: if they are ever returned to government, will they respect this legislation? We introduced the bill. We went through the committee process. We came to this House today to move amendments after listening to the community's views, but the opposition want to come in here and speak to matters already provided for.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Those on my left—the member for Hinchinbrook, the member for Gregory and closely followed by the member for Gympie—are getting very close to a warning.

A government member interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I do not need any help from those on my right.

Dr LYNHAM: If anybody wanted a demonstration of why not to vote for the LNP, they would just have to look over that side of the House—little care, little involvement, little substance. Just cut, sack and sell.

I refer to the member for Warrego's contribution to the debate regarding retrospectivity of the bill. The anti-discrimination provisions are prospective from the commencement of the act. These provisions apply only to the future recruitment of workers on large resource projects after publication of the list of towns and projects on the Department of State Development's website, required by clause 13. The impact of applying the 100 per cent FIFO prohibition to existing large resource projects will be mitigated by a transitional period to allow resource companies sufficient time to transition their workforce to a more appropriate balance between local and FIFO workers. Of course, the anti-discrimination provisions only apply to future recruitment. This is not retrospective legislation. Laws which have an effect on actions to be taken in the future are not retrospective. For the member for Warrego's benefit, the purpose of this bill is to change future behaviour.

The members for Warrego and Gympie raised the reverse onus of proof. The bill provides for a reverse onus of proof when a complaint is made to the Anti-Discrimination Commission of Queensland. This is necessary to give workers a fair opportunity. It is not possible for an applicant to have all the information on the recruitment process, so it is reasonable that the onus should be on the proponent to provide it. Reverse onus of proof currently applies under the Commonwealth Fair Work Act 2009 and the Industrial Relations Act 2016. Resource companies are familiar with the reverse onus of proof because it applies to other complaints about discrimination and workplace rights within the jurisdiction of the Fair Work Act 2009.

The member for Warrego states that the 100 per cent FIFO provisions are not going far enough. The prohibition of 100 per cent FIFO for all large resource projects is a key element, but it is just one of the components of the bill and should not be considered in isolation. It operates in conjunction with the anti-discrimination provisions and the revised social impact assessment guideline. All three work together to get the best balance between FIFO and local recruitment. It would not have been feasible, even if it was desired, to try to set FIFO target limits for each individual project.

In practice, the most effective and right balance for workforce accommodation arrangements on each project will be reached collaboratively with the project proponent, local government, the community and the Coordinator-General on a case-by-case basis during the EIS process. The member also claimed that SIA does not cover local procurement but of course it does. In fact, one of the plans submitted in an SIA is a 'local business and industry and content plan'. Again it demonstrates that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has not even read the bill and that the member for Warrego had her speech prepared without even reading the bill at all as well.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I take offence to those comments and I ask the minister to withdraw.

Dr LYNHAM: I withdraw. I note the member for Hinchinbrook's concern regarding the government advising Carbon Energy about the details of its decision to prohibit UCG. The issues arising from two of the three trial projects, and the uncertainty about commercial scale operations highlighted by the independent scientific panel, led the Queensland government to the decision that the potential risks of allowing these projects to grow to full-blown commercial scale operations far outweigh the potential benefits to the state. Carbon Energy is well aware of this. I also note the member for Hinchinbrook's statement that he understands the reasons why the government has formed this view. That is acknowledged.

The former Queensland chief scientist, Dr Geoff Garrett, wrote to the chairman of Carbon Energy outlining that the company had satisfactorily completed the two key recommendations required by the final report of the independent scientific panel and that Carbon Energy was the only pilot participant to meet these requirements. Whilst Carbon Energy did receive correspondence from the then Queensland chief scientist that indicated it had completed the requirements of the independent scientific panel process, this project only operated on a limited trial scale and significant uncertainty exists about the potential impacts that may occur if a commercial scale operation is permitted. Ultimately, this uncertainty led the Queensland government to the decision that the potential issues of allowing UCG projects to grow to commercial scale were simply not acceptable.

The Palaszczuk government remains committed to delivering resource projects while balancing them with the potential economic benefits to the community. I thank all who have contributed to getting this bill to the House tonight. In particular, I would like to thank the chair of the committee, the member for Mirani, who has fought tirelessly on this issue since day 1 of the Palaszczuk government and many years prior to the election of the Palaszczuk government. The member for Mirani's constituents can be rightly proud of the hard work and dedication he has given to this issue. I know that people in the gallery also truly respect the work he has done.

To all those who made submissions—from the local business men and women, mums and dads, to the councils, industry groups and unions who recognise the importance of this bill to regional Queensland communities—I thank you. I thank the departmental officials for their tireless work in what has been a complicated and lengthy process. We have delivered a bill to the House that the people of regional Queensland can rightly be proud of. I commend this bill to the House

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Clauses 1 and 2, as read, agreed to.

Clause 3—



Mrs FRECKLINGTON (8.49 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 3 (Object of Act)

Page 6, line 12, before 'operation'—

insert—

construction and

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Mrs Deb Frecklington's amendments [\[1468\]](#).

The amendments we are moving tonight are really clear cut. I spoke about these in my contribution to the second reading debate on this bill. It is so disappointing that the minister just has not got it at all.

An opposition member: It's dismissive.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: It is so disappointing and dismissive. The minister is completely dismissive. The amendment that the LNP is moving will expand the bill to include the construction phase. Those opposite should listen to themselves. If they had listened to what the Premier and the minister just spoke about in this House they would all be voting for this amendment because that is what the Premier, the minister and all the other members across the House went on about.

The LNP amendment is simple. It is very clear that when a community is going to be affected by the construction of a resource project this amendment will allow for that construction phase to not be limited to 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, and that is what the government wants. This amendment prohibits that. Alongside this amendment we intend to insert a very sensible definition of 'construction phase'. It defies logic that the government would prohibit 100 per cent FIFO during the operational stage but not during the construction phase.

During his contribution the member for Mount Isa talked about a mine in his area that has been under construction for three years. Now we have the government saying that it is okay for it to be 100 per cent fly-in fly-out, but when it gets to the operational phase they are not allowed to have 100 per cent fly-in fly-out. It defies logic. Like I said during my contribution to the second reading debate, it does not pass the pub test. We know that the member for Mirani knows that as well. That is why the amendment has been moved.

The LNP want to give all of regional Queensland a fair go and not just during the operational phase of these resource projects. Our regional communities and the workforce in those areas deserve to be given a fair go during the construction phase. That is why the LNP have moved the very sensible amendment which, as I stated in my contribution, is supported by many unions, many local communities and particularly regional councils.

(Time expired)

Dr LYNHAM: I note the deputy opposition leader's contribution regarding the amendment. The member for Nanango said that it was a simple amendment. It is a very simple amendment; in fact, it is too simple. It is so simple that it is unworkable. We have that goal of having construction workers included in the 100 per cent FIFO limitations, and the member for Mount Isa gave a specific example of a mine. In fact, our legislation will allow 100 per cent FIFO not to occur in that mine; it will allow local communities in that mine because it allows the discretion—it allows that flexibility—for the Coordinator-General to decide.

This simplicity makes it unworkable. It is prescriptive in the utmost. It makes the legislation unworkable. The Coordinator-General must be allowed the flexibility to decide in the case of a construction phase that goes for a long period of time. We can incorporate that construction workforce in the town if the town has the facilities for a construction workforce. If we take a short, sharp construction burst of workers and make them all live in that regional town, where is the housing for them? If they are there for four weeks, where is the housing for them? Where is everything going to be for them? Then they have to go away again. It is nonsensical; it makes no sense at all.

We on this side of the House stand for construction to be included in this legislation as well as the operational phase. We have the mechanisms for this to occur in our legislation.

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

AYES, 42:

LNP, 38—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Pyne.

NOES, 40:

ALP, 39—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Gilbert, Grace, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Pairs: Furner, Crandon; Harper, Simpson; Power, Stuckey.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 3, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 4 and 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6—



Dr LYNHAM (9.02 pm): I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 6 (Prohibition on 100% fly-in fly-out workers for large resource projects)

Page 7, lines 10 to 18—

omit, insert—

(1) This section applies to the owner of a large resource project that has a nearby regional community from the day that is 6 months after the designated day.

(1A) For subsection (1), the designated day is the day the Coordinator-General publishes the name of the large resource project on the department's website under section 13.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Strong and Sustainable Resource Communities Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Anthony Lynham's amendments [\[1469\]](#).

The purpose of amendment No. 1 is to extend the prohibition on 100 per cent FIFO workers to all large resource projects that have a nearby regional community. The LNP's amendments here tonight only apply to future projects that have an environmental impact statement. Our projects extend to 150 mines. With the LNP's amendments they would only extend to 40. This is very important, as I reflect again. With their amendments we would still have Daunia and Caval Ridge operating as 100 per cent FIFO mines into the future.

I would also like to reflect on the stark difference between the member for Mirani and the member for Gregory. The member for Mirani fought hard over three years to get this bill through the House; the member for Gregory fought for three years to get a similar bill through the House and was totally rejected by those opposite.

Amendment agreed to.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 6 (Prohibition on 100% fly-in fly-out workers for large resource projects)

Page 7, line 19, before 'operational'—

insert—

construction phase or

This amendment essentially continues on from the previous amendment which was, very sensibly, just accepted by this House. As I outlined in my contribution to the bill, this amendment relates to the extension of the FIFO bill to the construction phase as well as the operational phase of large resource projects. As we heard during the contributions of the Premier and the Minister for Mines, the government has moved this bill to get rid of FIFO during the operational phase of resource projects. They talked about the construction phase also, and this amendment will cement it into the bill. My previous amendment was to clause 3, 'Object of act'; this amendment inserts it into the provisions of the bill. It is essential that this amendment follows our first amendment because, as the member for Mount Isa said, it cements the opportunity for our regional communities to be heard. When a resource company comes to town, this amendment will enable a local mum or dad to say to their son or daughter,

‘Guess what, guys? You can get a job while they’re constructing the project.’ What a great idea that would that be, given they could then move on and get a job with that proponent during the operational phase.

As members on this side of the House know—particularly the members for Gregory and Warrego—the construction phases of those large resource operations can take years and years to complete. The member for Mount Isa spoke about that. At its heart, this amendment deals with the fact that we need to expand the prohibition of 100 per cent fly-in fly-out workers to the construction phase of a major resource project which is coming into one of our regional areas. We on this side of the House stand by what we said during our contributions to this debate—that is, we need to stand up for our regional communities. We need to stand up for everyone outside of the south-east corner. If a mine comes to town, our kids need to get a job not only in the operational phase but also in the construction phase.

Dr LYNHAM: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition is correct: this amendment moves it into the content of the bill. It is the same argument. We would like flexibility in the arrangements so the Coordinator-General can decide. I fear that if this is included in the bill the bill will be unworkable. I think the sentiment is correct: we both want a construction workforce within the bill; it is just about the mechanism of how we insert construction workers into this bill. It is totally unworkable on their side—

Mrs Frecklington: How?

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, the minister is speaking to the matter. Give him a chance.

Dr LYNHAM: For it to work it does require the discretion of the Coordinator-General to decide which projects it is suitable for and whether that is during the construction phase or not. We both have the same sentiments. It is essentially the same argument. We want a construction workforce included within the bill. We want construction workers to be involved in mines in Mount Isa, we want construction workers in Emerald and we want them all around the state, and the way we have worded the bill allows this to occur because it allows flexibility. There is total inflexibility in the way the LNP and the Deputy Leader of the Opposition have worded it. The prescriptive nature of it makes it simply unworkable.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 38—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 1—Katter.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 39—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D’Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Gilbert, Grace, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O’Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 1—Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Furner, Crandon; Harper, Simpson; Power, Stuckey.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mrs Frecklington) negated.

Clause 6, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 7—



Dr LYNHAM (9.14 pm): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 7 (Prohibition on 100% fly-in fly-out workers for large resource projects taken to be an enforceable condition)

Page 7, lines 26 to 30 and page 8, lines 1 and 2—

omit, insert—

7 Requirement for operational workforce management plan if s 6 contravened

- (1) This section applies if the Coordinator-General is satisfied, after requesting information under section 14A from the owner of a large resource project that has a nearby regional community, that the owner has contravened section 6.

- (2) The Coordinator-General may, by written notice given to the owner (a **requirement notice**), require the owner to prepare a plan (an **operational workforce management plan**) for the project containing the matters stated in a guideline made by the Coordinator-General under section 7A.
- (3) In preparing the operational workforce management plan for the project, the owner must consult with the local government for each local government area within which all or part of the project, or a nearby regional community for the project, is situated.
- (4) If the Coordinator-General gives the owner a requirement notice for the project, the owner must submit to the Coordinator-General an operational workforce management plan for the project that complies with the requirement notice—
 - (a) within 3 months after receiving the requirement notice; or
 - (b) if the Coordinator-General allows a longer period by written notice to the owner, within the longer period.

Maximum penalty—800 penalty units.
- (5) The Coordinator-General may, by written notice to the owner—
 - (a) approve the plan for the project; or
 - (b) if the plan does not comply with the requirement notice, approve the plan subject to stated conditions.
- (6) Also, the Coordinator-General may state conditions for the project that relate to the plan.
- (7) If the Coordinator-General states a condition under subsection (5)(b) or (6), the stated condition is taken to be an enforceable condition for the project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 157A.
- (8) Except as provided in the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, part 7A, neither the Land Court nor the Planning and Environment Court has jurisdiction in relation to conditions stated for the project under subsection (5)(b) or (6).

7A Coordinator-General may make guideline for operational workforce management plan

The Coordinator-General may make a guideline stating the matters that must be included in an operational workforce management plan for a large resource project and must publish the guideline on the department's website.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 7, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 8—



Dr LYNHAM (9.15 pm): I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 8 (Offence relating to advertising or document about recruitment for large resource project)

Page 8, lines 5 to 15—

omit, insert—

- (1) This section applies to the owner of a large resource project that has a nearby regional community.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 9—



Dr LYNHAM (9.15 pm): I move the following amendments—

4 Clause 9 (Requirement for owner of, or proponent for, large resource project to prepare a social impact assessment)

Page 9, after line 19—

insert—

- (3A) For subsection (3)(b), the social impact assessment must provide for the recruitment of workers for the project in the following order of priority—
 - (a) workers from local and regional communities;
 - (b) workers who will live in regional communities.

5 Clause 9 (Requirement for owner of, or proponent for, large resource project to prepare a social impact assessment)

Page 9, line 21, 'may'—

omit, insert—

must

Amendments agreed to.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 9 (Requirement for owner of, or proponent for, large resource project to prepare a social impact assessment)

Page 9, line 26, 'for the'—

omit, insert—

for, and the community of, the

This amendment amends clause 9 of the bill which requires the owner of, or a proponent for, a large resource project to prepare a social impact assessment. With regard to the clause as it stands in the bill, I am quite sure that the minister will stand up after this and repeat the comments he has made in the House that the community is listed in proposed subsection (3)(a) in the bill. I have moved that the clause should be amended to include the words, and quite rightfully so, 'and the community of'. That is what needs to be inserted into this clause in the bill because currently the definition as it stands within the bill only says 'community'. The question for many of these regional areas would be what community is that? That is why we are amending it to say the community within that local government area. Again, it is common sense to consult with your own local community—the community that is going to be affected by one of these large proponents, and I think that is fair enough. When we go into a community to try to work out what is in the best interests of that community, we should be talking to the people on the ground within that area—not someone in Brisbane, not someone sitting in Mineral House or somewhere outside of the area.

An opposition member interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection; we should be talking to the real people on the ground. It is those communities that need to have a voice, those communities that have a right to be heard. The amendment as moved will ensure the resource project proponents are required to consult the local communities during that social impact assessment process. Importantly, to be defined as those communities you need to be able to live and reside within that local government area. That is a very important distinction from how the minister has prepared this bill. We need to ensure that we just do not say the word 'community' and then tick it off by saying, 'We consulted with whoever.' I would put to the minister that we need to be consulting with the people on the ground. It is a minor amendment that we could rightly say is at the fringes, but people at the fringes of those communities deserve to have their voice heard when a major proponent is going to come into their region and disrupt their community.

Dr LYNHAM: I agree with everything the Deputy Leader of the Opposition said, but in fact it is already in the bill so there is no need for an amendment. The provision is already included in the bill in clause 9(3)(a), and the social impact assessment must provide community and stakeholder engagement in relation to the project. In my speech I asked if the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had read the bill. It is already in the bill.

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

AYES, 39:

LNP, 38—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Davis, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 1—Katter.

NOES, 43:

ALP, 39—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Gilbert, Grace, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 1—Knuth.

PHON, 1—Dickson.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Pairs: Furner, Crandon; Harper, Simpson; Power, Stuckey.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mrs Frecklington) negatived.

Clause 9, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—



Dr LYNHAM (9.26 pm): I move the following amendments—

6 Clause 11 (Coordinator-General may state conditions to manage the social impact of large resource projects generally)

Page 10, line 20, before 'the EIS'—

insert—

evaluating

7 Clause 11 (Coordinator-General may state conditions to manage the social impact of large resource projects generally)

Page 10, lines 23 to 31 and page 11, lines 1 to 4—

omit, insert—

(3) If the Coordinator-General states a condition under subsection (2)—

(a) the stated condition is taken to be an enforceable condition for the project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 157A; and

(b) the Coordinator-General must give a copy of the stated condition to—

(i) the proponent for the project; and

(ii) if the large resource project is a project for which the proponent has published an EIS notice under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, section 51(2)(b)—the chief executive of the department in which the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* is administered; and

8 Clause 11 (Coordinator-General may state conditions to manage the social impact of large resource projects generally)

Page 11, line 14, 'Neither'—

omit, insert—

Except as provided in the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, part 7A, neither

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 11, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 12—



Dr LYNHAM (9.26 pm): I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 12 (Coordinator-General may nominate large resource project as a project for which persons employed during construction phase are workers for this Act)

Page 11, lines 20 to 23—

omit, insert—

The Coordinator-General, as part of evaluating the EIS for the project, must decide whether to nominate a large resource project as a project for which a person employed during the construction phase of the project is a worker for this Act.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 12, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—



Dr LYNHAM (9.27 pm): I move the following amendment—

10 After clause 14

Page 12, after line 16—

insert—

14A Coordinator-General may require relevant information

(1) The Coordinator-General may give a notice under this section to a person requiring the person to give the Coordinator-General information relevant to the administration or enforcement of this Act.

(2) The notice may be given only to a person the Coordinator-General suspects on reasonable grounds has knowledge of a matter, or has possession or control of a document dealing with a matter, for which the information is required.

(3) The notice must—

(a) be in the approved form; and

(b) state the person to whom it is issued; and

- (c) state the information required; and
 - (d) state the period within which the information is to be given to the Coordinator-General; and
 - (e) state the reasons the information is required.
- (4) A person given a notice under this section must comply with the notice unless the person has a reasonable excuse for not complying with it.
Maximum penalty—400 penalty units.
- (5) If the person is an individual, it is a reasonable excuse for the individual to fail to comply with the notice if complying with it might tend to incriminate the individual.
- (6) The person does not commit an offence against subsection (4) if the information sought by the Coordinator-General is not in fact relevant to the administration or enforcement of this Act.

14B Giving Coordinator-General a false or misleading document

A person must not, in relation to the performance of the Coordinator-General's functions, give the Coordinator-General a document containing information the person knows is false or misleading in a material particular.

Maximum penalty—1,665 penalty units.

Amendment agreed to.

Clauses 15 to 18, as read, agreed to.

Clause 19—



Dr LYNHAM (9.28 pm): I move the following amendment—

11 Clause 19 (Insertion of new ch 5B)

Page 15, lines 6 to 20—

omit, insert—

nearby regional community.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 19, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 20 to 31, as read, agreed to.

Schedule 1—



Dr LYNHAM (9.29 pm): I move the following amendments—

12 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 25, line 15 and 16—

omit, insert—

large resource project means a resource project—

- (a) for which an EIS is required; or
- (b) that holds a site-specific environmental authority under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* and—
 - (i) has, or is projected to have, a workforce of 100 or more workers; or
 - (ii) has a smaller workforce decided by the Coordinator-General and notified in writing by the Coordinator-General to the owner of the project.

13 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)

Page 25, lines 20 to 29—

omit, insert—

nearby regional community, for a large resource project, means a town, the name of which is published on the department's website under section 13—

- (a) any part of which is within—
 - (i) a 125km radius of the main access to the project; or
 - (ii) a greater or lesser radius decided by the Coordinator-General and notified in writing by the Coordinator-General to the owner of the project; and
- (b) that has a population of more than—
 - (i) 200 people; or
 - (ii) a smaller population decided by the Coordinator-General and notified in writing by the Coordinator-General to the owner of the project.

14 Schedule 1 (Dictionary)


Page 26, lines 8 to 10—

omit.

Amendments agreed to.

Schedule 1, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.29 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. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (9.29 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.


MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

Parole Board, Decision

 **Hon. MT RYAN** (Morayfield—ALP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services and Minister for Corrective Services) (9.31 pm): Today Parole Board Queensland announced that it had completed its review of its earlier decision to grant parole to prisoner Oakley following the no-body no-parole legislation passing the parliament. This decision was made by Parole Board Queensland independently and without political interference.


While I cannot interfere with decisions of the independent Parole Board, personally I am disappointed with this decision. As I have previously stated, the president of Parole Board Queensland made it clear to me during a meeting earlier this month that any decisions that the Parole Board had made for future granting of parole would be reviewed in light of the new no-body no-parole laws. I can understand why the Pullen family feel the way they do and I again extend my sincere heartfelt apologies to them.

Pisasale, Mr P

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.32 pm): Yesterday the member for Nanango asked me a question without notice in relation to allegations of corruption against the former Ipswich mayor, Mr Paul Pisasale. This question also asked about actions taken as a result of those complaints. I can advise the House that the Department of Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning has searched the complaints database and can confirm five complaints since 1 February 2015. I am advised that these five complaints include 10 discrete allegations involving the conduct of former Ipswich mayor, Mr Paul Pisasale.

In summary, the status of the 10 allegations are: one allegation was referred to the Regional Conduct Review Panel with Mr Pisasale fined \$5,000 and ordered to make a written submission of error; two allegations were referred to the CCC; one allegation was referred to the council CEO for a preliminary assessment; two allegations were referred to the Remuneration and Discipline Tribunal and are still pending; and four allegations resulted in no further action. Of these four allegations no further action was taken for the following reasons: in one instance the department agreed with the CCC there was no evidence of corrupt conduct or another type of conduct described in the Local Government Act; in one instance the department found the allegation lacking in substance; in one instance the department found the matter was not about the conduct of a councillor and addressed the matter directly with the council; and in one instance the department found the matter not within the department's jurisdiction.

False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology

 **Hon. JA TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport and Minister for Infrastructure and Planning) (9.34 pm): On 10 August the House passed a motion noting the failure of the Turnbull government to fund its share of the NDRRA category D support for Cyclone Debbie

affected communities and called on the Turnbull government to fund its share of the category D package. The member for Glass House has subsequently written to yourself, Mr Speaker, on 15 August taking issue with a characterisation in my media release of the same day where it stated that the LNP had failed to support the motion. The characterisation was based on the fact that the speeches made by the LNP members during the debate would certainly lead one to believe that they were not supporting the motion. In fact, opposition members inferred the failure by the Turnbull LNP government to fund the severe Tropical Cyclone Debbie category D package was the fault of the Palaszczuk government—I refer to the statements made by the member for Glass House at page 2213 of *Hansard*—and due to illegitimate claims—I refer to statements by the member for Glass House at page 2213 of *Hansard* and by Dale Last at page 2216.

None of the LNP speakers indicated they supported the motion. Additionally, when the votes were called it is my very clear recollection and that of many government members that the opposition vocalised neither an 'aye' vote nor a 'no' vote. The member for Glass House has stated that the motion was passed with unanimous support and to the best of his recollection no verbal dissent was made to the vote. If it is the case that the LNP supported the motion as alleged by the member then I am both surprised and heartened by their support. As I said, it was certainly not my perception based on the debate. My recollection is that the motion was agreed to as recorded in *Hansard* because the opposition chose to vocalise neither an 'aye' nor a 'no' vote.

I apologise to the House if I may have unintentionally breached standing order 266 by suggesting to the House that the opposition failed to support this motion for the people of Whitsunday, Mackay and Rockhampton.


Mr Minnikin interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Chatsworth, you are warned under standing order 253A. There is no need for the interjections.


Ms TRAD: However, the more accurate characterisation is far more disgraceful. Those opposite simply did not take a clear position on this important issue and did not have the fortitude or spine to vocalise an 'aye' or 'no' vote in the debate.

PRIVILEGE

False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology

 **Mrs GILBERT** (Mackay—ALP) (9.37 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. On 10 August the House debated the motion moved by the member for South Brisbane in relation to NDRRA category D funding. After speaking in the debate a draft media release was sent to me by a media adviser. I had a brief exchange of emails stating that the opposition was silent on the vote. It was misconstrued as a vote against. I apologise to the House and can state that it was never my intention to publish a false or misleading account of the proceedings before the House.

False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology

 **Mr MADDEN** (Ipswich West—ALP) (9.37 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. On 10 August the House debated a motion moved by the member for South Brisbane concerning NDRRA funding. I did not speak in the debate but I was in the chamber while the debate was taking place and at the conclusion of the debate I was under the impression the opposition failed to support the motion. Subsequently, on 11 August I posted a short Facebook post on my Ipswich West Jim Madden page—


Ms Bates interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Mudgeeraba, your interjections are not appropriate. If you persist I will take the appropriate action. If you want to carry on like that you can do it outside. The member is making an apology, as I understand it.

Mr MADDEN: Subsequently, on 11 August I posted a short Facebook post on my Ipswich West Jim Madden page to the effect that the opposition did not support the motion moved by the member for South Brisbane. Mr Speaker, I subsequently received correspondence from you on 17 August that caused me to review *Hansard* for 10 August. I found that in fact when the question was put that the motion be agreed to, *Hansard* recorded that the motion was agreed to.

I can advise the House that I then deleted my Facebook post regarding the motion by the member for South Brisbane debated on 10 August in its entirety. Further, I apologise to the House for my error and I can state it was never my intention to publish a false or misleading account of proceedings before the House.

False or Misleading Account of Proceedings before the House, Apology


 **Mrs LAUGA** (Keppel—ALP) (9.39 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising. Mr Speaker, I received correspondence from you on 17 August with respect to a post I had put on Facebook regarding a debate in this place on the topic of disaster recovery funding. Whilst at the time I thought my characterisation of the LNP's vote on the motion was correct, I apologise to the House as I understand now that my comments were not a true reflection of the proceedings. I have since deleted the post.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members, for those apologies.

BUILDING AND CONSTRUCTION LEGISLATION (NON-CONFORMING BUILDING PRODUCTS—CHAIN OF RESPONSIBILITY AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 25 May (see p. 1447).

Second Reading

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (9.40 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read second time.

I commence by expressing my thanks to the Public Works and Utilities Committee for its thorough consideration of the bill. In particular, I thank the chair of the committee and member for Kallangur, Shane King, and all of the committee members for their work on the inquiry. I also thank the committee staff. I acknowledge the stakeholders who took the time and effort to make a submission to the inquiry, as well as those who appeared at the public hearing to express their thoughts, experiences, concerns and support for the bill.

I acknowledge the contribution to the public hearing process of Julie and Don Sager, Dan and Debbie Kennedy and, in particular, Michael Garrels. These exceptional people, some of whom are with us in the gallery today, spoke openly to the committee about the tragic circumstances of their life-changing loss. In particular, I again thank Michael Garrels and his wife, Lee, for their tireless advocacy for the improvement of safety in workplaces for all Queenslanders, in memory of their son Jason.

This is historic legislation. These laws will prevent tragedy across Queensland worksites and keep Queenslanders safe from dangerous, nonconforming building products as they go about their day-to-day lives. As legislators, we have an enduring responsibility to strive for safer workplaces and a safer built environment. There is not a point where we will be able to declare mission accomplished on safety, but we must always strive to improve. We are required to stay one step ahead of the innovations in building products and the increase in global manufacturing of those products. This bill makes that a responsibility shared across industry, as it should be. The products that are in our shipping containers, on our shelves and on our construction sites should be safe for the consumer at the end of the line. They should also be safe for workers on site during construction, where the risk of fire is often the highest. That is a focus of our bill. Our chain of responsibility regime will be a model for the rest of the nation.

Once again, I acknowledge the Garrels family and all of those who have been fighting tirelessly for change. Laws like this do not fix the tragedy of those families' situations. They cannot bring back a loved one such as Jason. That is all the more reason why I have been moved by the leadership of Michael and his companions. To act with such selfless determination to protect others from tragedy is to be commended. I know that, with this bill, their work will not be finished. They will continue to push for better safety and Queensland will be better for it.

I will now address the recommendations in the Public Works and Utilities Committee report on the bill, which was tabled on 4 August 2017. I am pleased to note that there is no dissenting report. The committee made three recommendations, the first of which is that the bill be passed. I thank the committee for their support for the bill.

The committee's second recommendation states—

The committee recommends that the Queensland Building and Construction Commission develops a protocol with the Office of Industrial Relations to ensure that the notification requirements contained in section 54A of the bill do not result in licensees being required to make separate notifications to these agencies about the same matter.

I can advise the House that the Department of Housing and Public Works has been working with the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and the Office of Industrial Relations to formalise an information-sharing arrangement under a memorandum of understanding. Once finalised, the MOU will set out an agreed protocol for the notification requirements. It is intended that the protocol will provide that the licensee makes one notification that will be received by both agencies simultaneously. Our goal here is to have seamless regulation between those two regulators so that no Queenslanders falls through the gaps. Of course, we will avoid administrative duplication and any unnecessary costs. This is a constructive and thoughtful recommendation and exactly what the government intends those agencies to do.

The committee's third recommendation states—

The committee recommends the Minister, in the second reading speech, provide advice on the estimated cost of implementing and enforcing the proposed legislation and what the likely impact will be on the Queensland Building and Construction Commission budget.

I am pleased to advise the House that the government has relieved the Queensland Building and Construction Commission of the burden of paying for Queensland's subscription and participation in the Australian Building and Construction Board and our entitlement to make use of the National Construction Code. Those costs have been imposed on the QBCC in the past by others. It is an inappropriate cost for the regulator to carry, as the QBCC is not a policy or a standard-setting body. The cost relief given to the QBCC is sufficient to cover the anticipated increase in the day-to-day costs of the QBCC arising from these new powers and, in particular, the sampling and testing of suspected nonconforming building products. I table the government's response to the committee report.

Tabled paper: Public Works and Utilities Committee: Report No. 43—Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products-Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017, government response [\[1470\]](#).

I will now outline the key elements of the bill. The bill establishes a chain of responsibility, placing duties on the building supply chain participants—the manufacturer, the supplier, the importer and the retailer—to ensure that building products used in Queensland are safe and fit for purpose. Additional duties will be placed on the parties in the chain of responsibility to ensure that building products are accompanied by appropriate information. The bill requires that parties in the chain of responsibility must not make false or misleading statements about a building product's performance. These duties more fairly allocate responsibility for the management of nonconforming building products across the supply chain. It corrects the situation we currently have in Queensland where the only safeguard currently preventing a dangerous building product being incorporated into the built environment is the vigilance of a trade contractor or a professional certifier.

These laws will enhance the work currently being undertaken by the Cladding Audit Taskforce. For the benefit of the House, I again state my appreciation to the Hon. Terry Mackenroth for volunteering as honorary chair of the task force. Terry has given much service to our state and it is commendable that he has chosen to take on further voluntary service. Our audit task force is leading the nation in responding to the issues arising from aluminium composite panels.

Coupled with the nation-leading laws proposed in this bill, Queenslanders should have confidence that their government is approaching this problem head-on. The bill strengthens the QBCC's enforcement and compliance powers. Under these laws, the QBCC will be able to take a range of actions where a party fails to comply with their duties. This includes the use of modern compliance tools, such as enforceable undertakings. The QBCC's power of entry will also be expanded. Currently, they can only enter active building sites. The bill will allow them to enter finished buildings. Recent experience highlights that nonconforming building products can often become apparent well after the construction project has concluded.

The bill will also provide for the establishment of the Building Products Advisory Committee in legislation. The committee is currently administratively established by the QBCC and provides an information-sharing and coordination point between the relevant Queensland regulators, such as

Workplace Health and Safety and Queensland Fire and Emergency Services. The committee will be a key source of information, guidance and collaboration between relevant regulators and to the government about issues relating to nonconforming building products.

I will now turn to the workplace safety amendments in the bill. Amendments to the QBCC Act in the bill will fulfil the community's expectation that the QBCC should take into account the conduct of a company when considering the suspension or cancellation of a licence. Licensees who fail to meet their obligations to ensure the safety of workers and who expose workers to risk should not have the privilege of holding a building and construction industry licence in this state.

The bill will establish a requirement for the QBCC to share information with workplace health and safety regulators, including the regulator under the Electrical Safety Act 2002, the Workplace Health and Safety Act 2001 and the Public Health Act 2005. The bill allows the QBCC to suspend or cancel a licence or take other disciplinary action if a licensee has caused death or serious injury or is causing serious risk to health and safety on a building site. It also allows the QBCC to take action if a licensee is convicted of an offence or is in breach of relevant legislation.

I intend to move minor amendments during consideration in detail that will clarify certain sections of the bill. These amendments will provide further clarity about the ability of the QBCC to share information and definitions and better reflect the desired intent of misrepresentation by linking it to compliance with the relevant regulatory provisions. They will also amend the bill to ensure there are protections in place when issuing recall orders and clarify that the laws will operate extraterritorially.

I also propose to amend the bill to allow for practice standards to be made. These practice standards will state how a person in the chain of responsibility can discharge their duty and provide clarity to persons in the supply chain who have a duty and provide guidance to the QBCC for enforcement purposes.

This bill is a demonstration that this government takes our commitment to the safety of Queenslanders seriously. I am proud that Queensland has been leading the national response to nonconforming building products. I am proud that through this bill we will improve the safety regime for people on Queensland's building sites. I commend the bill to the House.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Before I call the member for Burnett, I would like to welcome to the gallery the Australia African Women's Association.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!



Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (9.51 pm): From the outset, I point out that we will support the objectives of the bill in their entirety and the amendments that we have seen and had the opportunity to discuss. The prevalence of nonconforming building products is a major concern for the Queensland building and construction industry. Submitters to the committee highlighted that the proposed legislation addresses a current gap in enforcement in providing for a building product regulator.

Consumer products are well provided for under Australian Consumer Law, as is the construction of buildings under the Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991 and the Building Act 1975, which calls up the National Construction Code, the NCC. The community and industry expect that all building products sold are fit for purpose; however, this expectation is not always met. This legislation moves towards meeting that expectation.

It was explained to the committee that over the last decade we have seen a deterioration in the integrity of the building and infrastructure supply chain mainly due to the reliance by all parties on outdated, inefficient and easily exploited, paper based or non-transparent procurement practices. This bill presents Queensland with the perfect opportunity to bring all stakeholders in the building supply chain up to date by utilising digital product data, digital procurement and, more importantly, digital verification technologies. These technologies are going to be essential to offer internationally aligned compliance solutions that can cope with the ever-increasing number of imported products being used in Queensland building and infrastructure projects.

It is important to provide some clarity and highlight the importance of this legislation. An example of the problems caused by a nonconforming product is the Infinity electrical cable experience. According to the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, Infinity and Olsent branded Infinity cables installed in up to 22,000 homes and commercial premises failed to meet electrical safety standards due to poor quality insulation—that is, the plastic coating. Testing found the insulation on the TPS and Orange Round range of cables become brittle prematurely, which may present a safety hazard if the cables are disturbed and the insulation breaks. Cables exposed to prolonged high temperatures will break down faster.

Another example of the problems with noncompliant product was the Lacrosse fire in Melbourne. In the Lacrosse fire event it seems that a product that may have been manufactured in accordance with a specific standard—in this case external cladding—was subsequently incorporated into a building in a manner or for a purpose that did not comply with relevant codes or standards. Following the fire, the Victorian Building Authority undertook an audit of 170 buildings in Melbourne. The audit report notes that in the case of the Lacrosse building fire, the Metropolitan Fire Brigade identified that it was noncompliant use that caused the fire. There are current issues around dangerous materials in Queensland that we acknowledge have been addressed in the minister's second reading speech tonight. We need to pass these reforms to address those concerns.

The LNP members of the committee support the overarching framework provided in the bill, as it: creates a chain of responsibility; imposes specific duties on all parties in the supply chain; imposes appropriate penalties when parties fail to meet their duties; and provides the Queensland Building and Construction Commission, the QBCC, and the minister with the necessary range of powers to enable them to target all parties in the supply chain. However, as is the case with all legislation there are some provisions that raise concerns.

As the bill is currently drafted, there is potential for the regulatory structure to become overwhelmed as many investigations into minor issues or commercial matters may require many months, if not years, and significant money to establish whether an issue exists and who may be responsible for it. The legislation includes provisions concerning safety that may duplicate existing controls defined in the workplace health and safety legislation. We are concerned that two regulators sharing jurisdiction for the same incident may form different conclusions.

There are definitions concerning safety that need to be provided and made consistent with other regulations. For example, there is no definition of 'serious risk' even though it can lead to a loss of a licence. A nonconforming building product is vaguely defined as one that 'is not safe' and then specifically defined as one that 'meets the relevant regulatory provisions'. Safety underpins the relevant regulatory provision. This duplication appears unnecessary and could result in confusion.

The architects, building designers and engineers who specify building products must be explicitly included in the chain of responsibility. Information requirements need to be practical and workable, recognising that 4,000 building products can be installed in an average home. For installers or contractors, the duty to provide product information to owners should link to the existing building certification process.

In determining who is held accountable in the event of a breach, it needs to be clear that the parties can rely on the undertakings of those further up the chain. It will be important that the QBCC is appropriately resourced to properly undertake this role. It is unreasonable to expect licence holders to cross-subsidise a product compliance regime. Further to that, given the likely significant cost, it is necessary that an RIS be undertaken.

Nonconforming building products in buildings last long after a building site has ceased to be a workplace, and products that pose no safety threat during construction can quite easily do so after building is completed. Also those with a duty of care to workers may find it difficult to assess products for their potential to be unsafe, due to the products being procured prior to their arrival in a workplace or in a form or part of an assembly that does not allow for inspection. This is raised and pointed out because it brings into question the bill's reliance on workplace safety reporting as a completely effective means to control nonconforming building products.

I will now move to certain areas of the bill and raise suggested amendments to the QBCC Act that would overcome several of the main issues in existing building legislation. I highlight specifically the failure of the Building Act 1975 to control occurrences and the spread of nonconforming building products as a result of relying on implied warranties and not placing any explicit responsibilities on parties in the building supply chain—other than the building certifiers—to comply with building legislation, standards or the National Construction Code as a primary duty. Relying too heavily on building certifiers, who generally are ill equipped to identify all the technical compliance requirements for all of the products and materials in a building, as the only mechanism for compliance is not enforcement.

LNP members support the expanded objective to regulate building products, but point out some concerns that the bill focuses on safety as the primary measure of a product's unsuitability for purpose and the primary trigger for all actions under the proposed bill. It raises concerns that safety, to the exclusion of all other product attributes or structure that may contribute to a product potentially being nonconforming, will not capture the bulk of the products being consumed.

We also support the introduction of the Building Products Advisory Committee. In tackling the problem of nonconforming building products, the sharing of information is vital and must be brought together in a central point. Industry holds much of that information. We assume that they will be part of the implementation of any action. They should therefore be represented on that committee.

LNP members support the exchange of information amongst regulators and relevant agencies provided that current proceedings are not affected and that privacy considerations are addressed. It would be preferred if minor modifications could empower the QBCC to be more effective in fulfilling their responsibilities.

We support the role of the commissioner having power to 'publish information about building products'. This information must be timely and widely communicated. Too often the regulator is aware of a product that is not fit for purpose and because that information is not shared it continues to be installed. There is a consistent message that the industry, especially in the product supply chain, needs to do better in fulfilling their responsibilities to verify legitimate product certification and installation information.

We agree with a definition of nonconforming building product that links the product with its intended use. Separating a product from how it is intended to be used has been a loophole that has allowed products that are not fit for purpose to be sold and installed.

The 'chain of responsibility' is the right approach, as it clearly provides obligations to building product manufacturers, suppliers, importers et cetera. The providers of building projects need to be held to the same standard as licence holders. The role of specifiers—architects, building designers and engineers—needs to be explicitly defined in the chain of responsibility. As the legislation is currently drafted, these important roles are not included. We would also like to better understand how the chain of responsibility will work in cases where building products are brought in from outside Queensland. The industry operates in a global market, and there are very few building products that have their entire supply chain in Queensland.

Under section 74, each person in the chain of responsibility has an equal and shared responsibility for ensuring 'a product is not a nonconforming building product for an intended use'. Within the chain, accountability must be clearly allocated. Those in the chain must be able to rely on the undertakings of those further up the chain. Accountability needs to be allocated to the first person in the chain who breaches their duty. Installers or contractors at the end of the chain should not continue to bear the brunt of the responsibility even when they have undertaken due diligence and relied on information in good faith.

The additional duty relating to accompanying information is an important requirement and something that has been missing in many cases where there has been a product failure. The bill recognises the different information requirements of those in the chain of responsibility and the owner of the building. The distinction is important. Information requirements for licensed contractors or installers are already comprehensively addressed by way of the building certification process. This already provides the necessary information to building owners and should continue. On the other hand, new measures to ensure manufacturers and suppliers are also providing appropriate information are necessary. The exact nature of the 'required information' must be practical and reliable. For the contractor or installer this needs to link into the certification process. For the manufacturer it needs to be generated by an independent third party. This has not been detailed in the bill and we ask that it be given further consideration.

Individual licence holders are already held to account. The same should apply across the chain. The expectation on executive officers to follow a process of 'due diligence' is reasonable. The legislation is silent on the extent that a person in the chain can rely on representations provided to them from those also in the chain. This is a critical omission that needs to be addressed. Those in the chain must be able to rely on the undertakings of those further up the chain.

We support the duty to notify the commission if it becomes aware or has reason to suspect that a building product is a nonconforming building product for an intended use. As the responsible person has a duty to provide this information within two days, we would expect that the commission has a similar obligation to act on the information in a timely manner. It is important that nonconforming building products are not only found early but also removed from the supply chain early.

We also support the requirement that a regulator be notified in the case of a 'notifiable incident'. In the interests of good outcomes, this should be to either the commission or Work Safe Queensland. Requiring two notifications to two Queensland regulators will, at best, create what we believe is

unnecessary duplication and, at worst, create conflict and confusion in the required action. This duty needs to be time bound. A person in the chain cannot be expected to maintain records of their projects for an indefinite period.

We welcome the expanded powers for the commission to direct anyone in the chain of responsibility to remove or minimise safety risks and not just licensed contractors. We support the expanded powers for the commission to direct anyone in the chain of responsibility and not just licensed contractors to get on with the job of removing or minimising safety risks.


While division 4 details that a recall order may be made against '2 or more responsible persons', it does not set out how the commission will determine who will be accountable for a recall. Only those who have breached their responsibilities under the duties should be held responsible for a recall. LNP members appreciate the need to provide 'reasonable help' to the responsible person in the event of a recall. It is important that privacy considerations are addressed so that there is no conflict in responsibilities.

We support the exchange of information amongst regulators and relevant agencies provided current proceedings are not affected. We support the expansion of the cancellation or suspension of a licence provision to include any 'relevant Act in relation to building work carried out under the licence'. We would seek clarification as to what is regarded as an 'offence' under each of these acts. For example, is a provisional improvement notice or a prohibition notice under the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 regarded as an 'offence' and therefore grounds for losing a licence?

The second proposed change to section 48 is a concern. Contractors should not be at risk of having their licence suspended or cancelled unless there has been a case proven against them. The principle of natural justice should prevail. The current draft of the bill does not provide this protection but rather allows the regulator to cancel or suspend the licence of whoever is in control of that site if any work occurs on the site that results in death, grievous bodily harm or serious risk. The term 'serious risk', we believe, must be defined or preferably amended to be consistent with related terms across the relevant legislation.

Notification of particular safety matters should be occurring once to one regulator. Requiring two notifications, as alluded to, is an unnecessary duplication and is likely to lead to confusion. We support the expansion of the disciplinary action provision to include a 'relevant Act in relation to building work carried out under the licence'. The second proposed change to section 74B is a concern and the principle of natural justice should prevail.

In conclusion, I welcome the proposed amendments. I look forward to the minister's contribution on some of those matters that I have raised. I acknowledge those who submitted to the committee. As the minister read out a list of them, I will not duplicate it. I think it is good to acknowledge the committee members and the way they have gone about this. This is important legislation. We are happy to work with the minister and the government to get this legislation through the parliament. It is important for Queensland, and we support the passage of the bill.

 **Mr KING** (Kallangur—ALP) (10.06 pm): I rise to speak to the Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017. As chair of the Public Works and Utilities Committee, I would like to thank the members of the committee, our hardworking secretariat, as always, and those individuals and organisations who lodged written submissions on the bill. I would especially like to thank the heartfelt contributions from family members at the public hearing where they talked to the committee about the tragic circumstances that resulted in the loss of their loved ones.

Every year when I attend Workers' Memorial Day we grieve the loss of workers who have died while doing their job. I have said quite a few times in this place, and I repeat: nobody should go to work each day with any other expectation than to return home in the same physical and mental condition as they left in. The committee hopes that if this bill is passed—and I am sure I can speak on behalf of the committee—lives will be saved and injuries prevented. I acknowledge that there was no statement of reservation and we worked well together on this good piece of legislation.

Our committee made three recommendations. Recommendation 1 was that the bill be passed. In recommendation 2 the committee recommended that the QBCC develops a protocol with the Office of Industrial Relations to ensure that the notification requirements contained in section 54A of the bill do not result in licensees being required to make separate notifications to these agencies about the

same matter. I understand that this is happening, and I thank Minister de Brenni for clarifying this. In recommendation 3 we recommended that the minister, in the second reading speech, provide advice on the estimated cost of implementing and enforcing the proposed legislation and what the likely impact will be on the QBCC budget. Once again, I thank the minister for clarifying that, as recommended.

I will speak briefly about nonconforming building products. Nonconforming building products are products and materials that are claimed to be something they are not. They do not meet the required standards for the use in which they are intended or are marketed or supplied with the intent to deceive those who use them. The explanatory notes for the bill advised—

Non-conforming building products pose a significant risk to health and life safety, as their use threatens the integrity of a building, putting all those who enter and use the building or building site potentially at risk. The use of non-conforming building products within a building can also impose significant costs on owners to rectify damages or undertake remedial actions.

We heard during the public hearing that even with something as simple as cyclone rods, which you can buy from Bunnings, there are two different types. The member for Southport will agree with me here. There are different grades and they can make a huge difference to the integrity of a building. Some are meant for sheds; some are meant for high-rise buildings. They are both sold at the same place and should never be mixed up. That is what we need to fix.

The minister in his introductory speech noted that in 2014 it took fewer than 15 minutes for a lit cigarette left on a balcony to cause 13 floors of the Lacrosse building in Melbourne to be engulfed in flames, and that fire was the result—apart from the cigarette—of highly flammable nonconforming aluminium cladding, a cheaper imitation version of a conforming product.

Our committee noted that currently there is limited ability to effectively regulate building products at either the national or state level, with the existing regulatory framework disproportionately focused on the end of the supply chain; the existing building regulatory system does not have any mechanism to trace building products through the supply chain from manufacture to installation; and globalisation of the supply chain has compounded challenges to ensure building products are suitable for their intended use. This bill is a big step in the right direction to help turn this around and make sure everyone in the supply and building chain ensures that only appropriate products are used. If the federal government would adopt similar legislation to stop inferior products coming into the country in the first place, we could make a far bigger change.

During the public hearing we heard from the Garrels family about the tragic case of 20-year-old Jason Garrels, who was fatally electrocuted after coming into contact with temporary construction wiring on a building site. I acknowledge Michael and Lee for the work they did and those who were here in the gallery and other families who were tragically affected. The coroner's inquest into Mr Garrels' death recommended amendments be made requiring principal and building contractors to report any death or serious injury on a building site to the QBCC. In response to this recommendation, the bill provides that QBCC licensees must notify the QBCC about activities on a site that might represent a work health and safety issue. This includes where a person has not complied with a notice issued by the Electrical Safety Office or Workplace Health and Safety.


The amendments protect the privacy of licensees who report workplace health and safety issues through new confidential provisions. In addition, the QBCC will have an obligation to report to health and safety regulators about notifiable incidents. A notifiable incident is the death or serious injury to a person or an accident that exposes a person to risk of serious injury or illness.

The bill further enables the QBCC to enter information-sharing arrangements with other agencies, in particular, work health and safety regulators. Information can be shared to help the QBCC or any other agency to perform its functions or by disclosing the information if it is necessary to protect the health and safety of a person or property.

As we are all aware, workplace health and safety can be a matter of life or death, and time is often of the essence. These amendments will ensure that the QBCC is directly notified of these matters so they can take immediate action. The amendments also encourage a responsive, multiagency approach to work health and safety in the building and construction industry.

I would also like to draw your attention to the amendments in the bill that expand the grounds upon which the QBCC may take disciplinary action against a licensee or suspend or cancel a licence. These grounds include where a licensee has been convicted of an offence relating to work health and safety laws or if the licensee's work on a building site may have caused the death of a person, grievous bodily harm or a serious health and safety risk.

Given the severe consequences that may arise from risky behaviour and breaches of work health and safety legislation, it is appropriate for the QBCC to be able to take these matters into consideration. Licensees who fail to meet their obligations to ensure work is safe and who expose workers to risk should not be able to benefit from holding a QBCC licence. Further, licensees who uphold health and safety should not have to compete with those who do not. These legislative amendments bring new rigour to the work health and safety, and will ultimately benefit the entire building and construction industry. I commend this bill to the House.

 **Mr MOLHOEK** (Southport—LNP) (10.13 pm): I rise to speak to the Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017. An important feature of this legislation is the chain of responsibility, not just nonconforming building products. As the deputy chair of the committee, I have to say that it was very difficult to consider or perhaps justify a statement of reservation given the seriousness of the impact of nonconforming building products and some of the negligence that has occurred within the chain of responsibility over many years.

In the committee report we summarise the main features of the bill, and I want to touch on them very briefly. The bill proposes to implement a chain of responsibility that places a duty on supply chain participants for building products, specifically designers, manufacturers, importers, suppliers and installers, to ensure that building products are safe. As we heard from the chairman, there are many and various products that are available in the market. Some are high quality and some are not, and I wish to elaborate on that further in my speech this evening.

The second part of the bill is to impose additional duties on parties in the chain of responsibility to ensure that building products are accompanied by appropriate information and require that parties may not make false or misleading statements about a building product's performance. The third key feature of the legislation is to enable the government through the administering minister and the Queensland building regulator, the QBCC, to investigate and effectively respond to incidents of nonconforming building products.

I want to bring the House's attention to the definition of a nonconforming building product because I think it is important to have this on the record. Nonconforming building products are products and materials that are claimed to be something that they are not. They do not meet the required standards for the use in which they are intended or they are marketed or supplied with the intent to deceive those who use them.

In the explanatory notes from the minister we were advised that nonconforming building products pose a significant risk to health and life safety as their use threatens the integrity of a building, putting all those who enter and use the building or building site potentially at risk. The use of nonconforming building products within a building can also impose significant costs on owners to rectify damages or undertake remedial actions. Other consequences can also impact on the construction, manufacturing, trade, import and retail sectors.

At the very outset I highlighted the issue of the chain of responsibility. It is not just the safety of our workers and our tradespeople who work on these construction sites. There are also significant long-term potential consequences for consumers, many of whom are families who have bought their first home or perhaps who have been renovating a home, as we heard from some of those who appeared at the public hearing, and I will touch on that in a moment. Particularly in larger scale buildings, the consequence, as we have seen in more recent times, can be quite significant and life threatening.

We had many submissions over the course of the hearings and I want to run through a few highlights. In particular, I want to touch on the one that the chairman raised earlier. We heard from the Building Designers Association of Queensland in respect of the proposed legislation. James Dunstan spoke at length about a simple product: a cyclone rod—a common threaded bolt that is used in the construction of homes in North Queensland to ensure that houses are securely fastened to the ground and that they will not blow away. The point he made is that there are different standards of cyclone rods and that they are commonly sold in major hardware stores but not always clearly identified as those which are suitable perhaps for building a chicken coop out the back of a farm and those that are plated to what I think he described as a zinc 275 standard, which means that the life of those cyclone rods is significant and the home owner who has had a house built using the correct materials can be confident those rods will have a long life.

We heard a very lengthy dissertation from James Dunstan, from the Building Designers Association, around the difference between nonconforming products versus the nonconforming use of products and substitutions. That is why this concept of chain of responsibility is so important. It may not always be the fault of the product; it may be the fault of the installer, the architect, the designer or the person who is actually specifying the products to be used in the particular project or construction.

We heard from a number of other organisations throughout the day. One of the groups that came to see us was the Property Owners' Association of Queensland. They raised concerns around faulty building products which have been imported without proper notification of fire testing and without proper resistance warranties. They raised for the committee's attention the fact that there are requirements that this information be properly stamped on the back of the product. Again, it was interesting and quite educational to hear about some of the challenges.

We also heard from the Bureau of Steel Manufacturers, which was not a group I expected to turn up. They raised concerns around the proliferation of cheap, imported and often substandard products entering our nation. A lot of formwork or steelwork—I am not sure whether it is formwork or steelwork—or a lot of finished steel products that are being imported and bolted into frames at buildings do not always meet the high standards that we have here in Australia.

We heard from the department around the failure of Infinity cable and we asked the department to provide some advice as to what action had been taken. Fines were imposed on the importer at the time, while investigations revealed that the original product that was imported did comply but then there was a lapse in quality. The concerning thing is that many home owners who had that cabling installed in their homes back in 2012 and 2013 were advised to contact their electrician and make a claim to have the faulty cable replaced. However, based on the department's best access to information, they revealed that there are still many home owners who have not had that cable replaced. In many cases, people have bought and sold the homes and have moved on and are not even aware that some of the cabling in their homes may be of this poorer quality.


I want to touch on the public hearing and I want to thank all of those who came to the hearing, as the minister and the chair have thanked them. We had many of the trade organisations there. We heard from the Housing Industry Association, Master Builders and the Master Plumbers Association. The Master Plumbers Association spoke at length about the importance of installing plumbing products that have the appropriate watermark on them so that people know they are getting a quality product that is going to last a long time.

Most moving on the day was those families—and I believe some of them are in the gallery tonight—who came to share their very personal stories. The chair, others on the committee and I commended them for their courage. It was compelling and very moving to hear such firsthand accounts. I particularly want to thank Don and Julie Sager for their willingness to come along and share with us their story. I also want to thank Michael Garrels and Dan and Debbie Kennedy. All of them have lost sons to unfortunate incidents.

The one story that particularly moved me and that I wanted to touch on was the Sager family. They talked at length about the dangers of asbestosis and they highlighted their concerns. It was surprising to hear through the hearing that, despite the fact there is so much awareness around asbestos—and certainly there are many legacy issues with older homes, dwellings, schools, halls and many other buildings that have asbestos in them—there are still new products slipping through the system and not being picked up by border control or the appropriate bodies at an import level. Some of these products, sadly in this day and age, still represent a significant threat to the wellbeing of our workers and families who eventually move into some of those dwellings.

This highlights the fact that as a parliament there is still more work for us to do in terms of exploring the issue of asbestosis. I note there is a requirement to maintain a register of public buildings with asbestos and for those records to be quite detailed, but there is still no real requirement to maintain a register for residential buildings and older houses. For many do-it-yourselfers and many tradespeople who undertake basic repairs, there is significant risk if they are not aware. I suggest that is another area we will need to look at in the future.

I will close with those comments. I am pleased to say that we are supporting the legislation. It provides for some sensible reforms. We did highlight some concerns about the QBCC's approach to budgeting and financing the future measures. I am satisfied for now with the answers that came from the QBCC. We need to remain vigilant with the monitoring of nonconforming building products and chain of responsibility. We also need to make sure that the QBCC continues to operate efficiently and effectively and in the best interests of all Queenslanders.

 **Mr McEACHAN** (Redlands—LNP) (10.26 pm): I rise to add a very brief contribution on the Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the work of my colleagues on the committee, chaired by the member for Kallangur. The most compelling part of this committee hearing process for me was hearing the statements from the families of those men who were tragically killed and how that has been translated into this legislation.

It is considered that more can be done to facilitate safety on building and construction work sites and to meet the coroner's recommendations. The bill will achieve this by increasing the role of the QBCC in reporting work health safety issues, enabling the QBCC to consider these issues and expanding the grounds upon which the QBCC may take disciplinary action against a licensee, or suspend or cancel a licence. The grounds will include where a licensee has been convicted of an offence relating to work health and safety laws or where the licensee's work on a building site may have caused the death of a person or grievous bodily harm or a serious risk to the health or safety of a person.


The committee made three recommendations. The first was that the bill be passed. The second was—

... that the Queensland Building and Construction Commission develops a protocol with the Office of Industrial Relations to ensure that the notification requirements contained in section 54A of the bill do not result in licensees being required to make separate notifications to these agencies ...

I note the minister has addressed that, and I thank him. The last recommendation was that the minister provide advice on—

... the estimated cost of implementing and enforcing the proposed legislation and what the likely impact will be on the Queensland Building and Construction Commission budget.

I also note and acknowledge the effort by the minister to ease that cost pressure with the licensing of QBCC. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Ms PEASE** (Lytton—ALP) (10.29 pm): When I was elected to represent the bayside seat of Lytton I promised to stand up for all baysiders, to listen and to act sensibly for my electorate and for all Queenslanders. Through my parents I learned that even though we had little, there were others who had less. I saw them help others out and fight for the rights of others. By example they taught me a set of values—good Labor values. I have carried these Labor values impressed upon me by my upbringing throughout my working life and no more so than now.


My parents taught me the importance of standing up for my values, looking out for others, a sense of fairness and righting wrongs. I am proud to be part of the Palaszczuk government, a government that is doing just that. The Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill is the first of its kind in Australia. Queensland has been leading the charge as part of a national work on ways to address nonconforming building products. This bill is a culmination of that work, and other jurisdictions are now watching with interest on how this legislation proceeds. This was largely prompted by the Lacrosse Tower fire in 2015 where it was found that a contributing cause was the combustible external aluminium wall cladding on the side of the building. This had also been the subject of much discussion due to the tragic fire in the Grenfell Tower in London on 14 June.

At a forum of building ministers in 2015 agreement was reached to establish a senior officers group comprising representatives from all states and territories and the Commonwealth to develop and implement strategies that address nonconforming building products. This involved researching and developing a report on how to address this issue. Queensland accepted the challenge of chairing the group and undertaking secretariat functions. The senior officers group researched the issue of nonconforming building products and undertook stakeholder engagement. The submissions received during the consultation in 2015-16 formed the basis of the eight recommendations which were adopted by the Building Ministers' Forum in February 2016 and helped inform implementation strategies. Queensland developed principles to inform a robust regulatory framework in close collaboration with the Commonwealth and other states and territories. This received endorsement at the Building Ministers' Forum in April 2017. As part of this work, Queensland has also worked closely with the Commonwealth to develop a national website to provide information and publish known nonconforming building products. This website will allow the QBCC to provide the Commonwealth with details of proven nonconforming building products and will provide the industry and the community with valuable information on which products are not safe to use for a particular purpose.

This bill will also protect the lives of many Queenslanders by helping to improve safety on building sites and includes provisions to make it easier for the Queensland Building and Construction Commission and the public to identify and act upon nonconforming building products. When the QBCC is made aware of a potential nonconforming building product, they will conduct a preliminary risk assessment to consider the size and seriousness of the use of the building product. Nonconforming building products may also come to the attention of the QBCC through a range of people including builders, plumbers, building certifiers, contractors and members of the public. New provisions in the bill also place an obligation on a person in the chain of responsibility to notify of a suspected nonconforming building product. This applies where the person becomes aware or reasonably suspects that the building product is a nonconforming building product for an intended use.

These legislative amendments bring a new rigour to work health and safety and will ultimately benefit the entire building industry and construction industry. I would like to thank all of those who made a submission. In particular I thank the families who have lost loved ones who provided evidence at the hearings. I thank them for their strength, determination and courage. I acknowledge that the family members are here today in the gallery.

Queensland's Labor governments have a proud history of looking after workers and their rights. I have spoken in the past of my great-grandfather Percy Pease, who joined the Queensland Labor government in 1920. His government was one of the first of its kind in Australia to introduce health and safety regulations and workers compensation. Nearly 100 years later the Palaszczuk government continues with this proud Labor tradition, leading the nation by introducing a bill that will make it easier to identify and act upon nonconforming building products, save lives and make worksites safer. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr PERRETT** (Gympie—LNP) (10.33 pm): I rise to speak briefly on the Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. I am usually very cautious about heavy-handed governments imposing more red tape and compliance on our lives and businesses. There is always the concern of overreach and whether it conflicts with plain common sense as well as imposing additional costs, ensuring compliance and audits, and duplication with other responsibilities. However, any reasonable person would regard the measures in this bill as providing a prime example of government meeting the practical expectation of the community. It seeks to introduce a number of measures on products as well as make the workplace safer. We are talking here about the expectation of our community, about protecting workers—protecting young tradies who should be able to come home after a day at work.

The amendments relating to building workplace safety were initiated after the dreadful tragedy of the death of a young 20-year-old Gympie boy. Jason Garrels was only nine days into a new job when he was tragically electrocuted on the job in 2012. Jason was electrocuted when a cable covering slipped off a switchboard he had been carrying and came into contact with live wires. Jason's case resulted in the coroner saying—

I am firmly of the opinion that—

Jason's bosses'—

lack of experience, and knowledge, in relation to the wiring requirements of the subdivision led to the incident occurring. I was amazed to find that a licensed electrician whose own admitted experience related to "fixing fans and domestic white goods, and coldrooms", could simply apply for an electrical contractor's license which allowed him to be the responsible electrician for the wiring of an 81 lot duplex subdivision.


It took more than four years before the director of the company that Jason was working for was finally charged with manslaughter. No parent should have to wait that long to see action. A parent should also be confident that their children—young adults with their future before them—can go to work in the secure knowledge that their workplace is as safe as it could be. Jason's parents, Lee and Michael who I understand are in the public gallery this evening, have lobbied hard for changes to how electricians are trained and licensed in Queensland and for safety in the workplace. Their influence on the bill before us was acknowledged in the introductory speech.

The coroner investigating Jason's death recommended that, if the law does not already provide that the principal contractor and building contractor are obliged to notify the Queensland Building and Construction Commission of any death or serious injury on site, the law needs to be amended to impose this legislation on them. As a result, the amendments in this bill seek to increase the sharing of information with workplace health and safety regulators. Measures include requiring licensees to report notifiable health and safety incidents, breaches and risk to the QBCC; allowing the QBCC to suspend

or cancel a licence or take other disciplinary action if a licensee has caused death or serious injury or is causing serious risk to health and safety on a building site; and to take action if a licensee is convicted of an offence or is in breach of relevant legislation.

In light of the reporting obligations, the committee has recommended that the QBCC develops a protocol with the Office of Industrial Relations to ensure notification requirements do not result in licensees being required to make separate notifications to these agencies about the same matters. It has also called on the minister to provide advice on the estimated cost of implementing and enforcing the new measures and their effect on the QBCC budget.

This is about making sure that licensees meet their obligations to ensure the safety of the workplace. That is why I support the bill and once again acknowledge the debt we all owe Lee and Michael Garrels for their advocacy on making the workplace safer.

 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (10.38 pm): I rise to speak on the Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products—Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill. The Minister for Housing and Public Works introduced this bill on 25 May this year. I recall that during his introductory speech he cited the example of how in 2014 it took less than 15 minutes for a lit cigarette left on a balcony to cause 13 floors of the Lacrosse building in Melbourne to be engulfed in flames. That fire was the result of highly flammable, nonconforming aluminium cladding, a cheap imitation of a conforming product. The minister had no way of knowing—and it is eerie to think—that a little less than three weeks after he spoke those words in this place, the Grenfell Tower in North Kensington in London would suffer a similar fate. Sadly, 80 people died or are missing and presumed dead. I understand that low-grade building cladding was responsible for the fuelling of the inferno in London.

The minister told us that the bill will implement a chain of responsibility that places duties on supply chain participants, specifically designers, manufacturers, importers, suppliers and installers. We do this so as to ensure that nonconforming building products are not incorporated into our built environment, and that is a very positive measure by the government. I note that, to date, the onus has fallen upon our tradies, developers and certifiers to be de facto product quality assurance inspectors. As the chair of the committee and member for Kallangur wrote in his forward to the report—

Nobody should go to work each day with any other expectation than to return home in the same physical and mental condition that they left in.

I am certain that is the overwhelmingly unanimous view of everybody in this place. I note from the report in relation to the nonconforming building product amendments that consultation indicated that, particularly in the interests of public safety, building industry participants, stakeholders, home owners and the community supported the proposal to impose duties on participants in the building product supply chain. I understand that there was also support for the Queensland Building and Construction Commission to be given the necessary powers to investigate and address instances of nonconforming building products.

There seems to be a view generally that the issues which are the subject of the amendments contained within the bill need a national approach. Indeed, I note that the ACCC also submitted that there is a need to improve the regulatory powers available to building regulators and that there should be national consistency across Australia. The ACCC also supports the view that regulators need to have appropriate tools to take action against suppliers supplying unsafe building products, that they must enforce compliance with regulations and that they have the ability to compel product recalls and direct remediation.

In 2014 I met with three people in my office from Advancetech, a company in my electorate at Kunda Park. They advised me that they were the importers and distributors of particular Avanco branded DC solar power isolators. An internal fault within the isolator could potentially cause a house or building fire. At the time the isolator had been distributed by Advancetech and sold through electrical wholesalers or direct to solar contractors and installers in Queensland, New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Western Australia. Some 27,000 of these isolators had been sold in Queensland alone.

Ultimately, a nationwide recall was issued after investigations by the Electrical Safety Office and a number of independent reports from the University of Queensland and Queensland University of Technology. Some days after that recall was announced the company was placed into liquidation. At the time, information available to liquidators was that the company would be unable to meet the cost of

replacing all affected isolators, which was estimated to be more than \$3 million. Nobody wants to see a local family owned company meet its fate in that way, but when we think about it, in that single case there was the potential for up to 27,000 home and building fires in Queensland alone. The current system of identifying and recalling faulty products seems to have worked appropriately in that case, but if improving the system of weeding out faulty buildings products is enhanced by virtue of the measures in this bill, then I am all for it.

With regard to workplace safety, we see from the explanatory notes that the coroner, after the inquest into the tragic death of a young man on a building site, recommended—

If the law does not already provide that the principal contractor and building contractor are obliged to notify the Queensland Building and Construction Commission of any death or serious injury on site, then the law needs to be amended to impose this obligation on them.


In such matters the coroner is probably the only person who hears all the evidence, examines all the statements, exhibits and other material presented to the court, so I think it safe to say that he or she is best placed to make such a recommendation. As legislators, we should heed that advice.

The explanatory notes state that it is considered that more can be done to facilitate safety on building and construction work sites and to meet the coroner's recommendation. I note that the committee's report states—

Currently the QBCC can take disciplinary action, and suspend or cancel a licence if grounds for disciplinary action exist, that is, a breach of the QBCC Act. However, the QBCC is currently unable to take into consideration convictions under laws that relate to safety in the workplace, nor is it able to consider work that a licensee may have undertaken that caused death or grievous bodily harm to a person or involve serious risk to the health or safety of a person.

I note that the bill intends to provide the QBCC with the power to suspend or cancel a licence if the licensee is convicted of an offence against the QBCC Act, the Building Act 1975 or another act prescribed by regulation and provide the QBCC with the power to suspend or cancel a licence if building or other work on a building site under the licensee's control may have caused the death of, or grievous bodily harm to, a person or involve a serious risk to the health or safety of a person. The explanatory notes also advise that this will enable the QBCC to consider workplace health and safety issues associated with building work when deciding whether to cancel or suspend a licence.

In the interests of workplace health and safety, I am entirely comfortable with this bill and I commend the minister for putting it forward.

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (10.45 pm), in reply: I thank all members who have risen to contribute to tonight's debate. The consideration of every piece of law that is placed before this parliament is an important matter, and for this bill that is especially the case.

Tonight this parliament can take action to address a new problem: the threat of cheap, substandard and often imported building products finding their way onto our building sites and being incorporated into our built environment. This issue must be addressed because these products are a risk to Queenslanders when they gather at events, whether they gather at public places, when they go to work in a modern office tower, when they visit a shopping centre, or even when they return to their homes at the end of a busy day.

As well as representing a risk to safety, these products are harmful to our economy. They can reduce the value, the performance and the service life of any building into which they are incorporated. They are costly to rectify and they are extraordinarily costly to remove or replace. The exposure to these costs is currently falling on the people at the end of the supply chain, as was pointed out during the debate: the builder, the tradie, the certifier and the unwitting building or unit owner. This bill deals with a new risk to our community's safety and economic wellbeing. It deals with the risk in a novel way, significantly modernising Queensland's building laws to adopt a chain of responsibility for nonconforming building products.

The bill will also allow the state's building industry watchdog to make use of best practice regulatory tools and strategies. The chain of responsibility is about ensuring that everyone in the supply chain for building products must, for the first time, take reasonable steps to deal with the problem of nonconforming building products. These laws will appropriately share responsibility and lighten the unfair burden that is currently placed on our builders, tradies and certifiers.

Alongside this reform, the bill refreshes the Queensland Building and Construction Commission, giving it the powers to undertake new kinds of inspections and audits, to provide clearer direction and, where necessary, to deliver new sanctions and controls on those doing the wrong thing. It will allow the

QBCC to target real risks and deliver a pro-active approach to compliance. The QBCC will cover the spectrum—education, inspection, auditing and enforcement—using new offence provisions that will actually make a difference.

In Queensland we have a proud history of leading the nation with our building laws. For example, our state is unique in imposing a mandatory requirement that any large, significant or multi-residential building must be independently inspected by Queensland Fire and Emergency Services before it can proceed towards certification and occupation. This bill continues that tradition of leadership in this state. This bill is a product of a national plan sponsored by Queensland and led by officers from Queensland's Department of Housing and Public Works. The Prime minister has acknowledged Queensland for its work and acknowledged that Queensland's work will be a model for other jurisdictions that are looking to improve their own laws.

The other important reform delivered by this bill will strengthen our protection of workplace health and safety in Queensland, and that has already been canvassed in the debate tonight. The QBCC will now play a stronger role in ensuring safety on sites through the licensing systems. Under these laws, the commission will take into account the conduct of a company, including their safety record, when considering the suspension or cancellation of a licence. Put simply, these laws mean that if you fail to properly protect your workers you should not have the privilege of holding a construction industry licence in this state.

The laws also require QBCC licensees to notify the regulator of activities on a building site that might present a work health and safety issue. Of critical importance, this bill—reinforced by the finetuning amendments that I will shortly move—will ensure that the QBCC will be able to share information with Queensland safety regulators. All regulators will be able to be informed of, and respond to, safety issues discovered by their colleagues.

In 2012, 20-year-old Jason Garrels died of an electrocution that should never have been able to happen. Critical safety information that was known to the regulator was trapped in a silo—a legal silo unable to be shared, unable to be acted upon, and that must never, ever happen again. A number of members have made comments with regard to the content and objects of this bill, and I want to address those points briefly in my reply. Members of the opposition sought clarification regarding the scope and the operation of the chain of responsibility. They asked whether the chain can be used across borders and, in legal terms, whether it has extraterritoriality. I can advise that the bill as drafted is capable of being applied and enforced across borders. That means that, yes, it will be possible for the commission to compel individuals and companies from outside Queensland to provide information. Similarly, orders to cease an activity can be placed against a party located outside of Queensland. I am further advised that comparable regulators with similar chain-of-responsibility powers have used their laws in exactly this manner. Amendments circulated in my name will further strengthen these existing provisions.

I was asked why declared parties in the chain do not include architects, designers and so forth. The law was focused on the products and the flow of those products rather than the attributes of a building's design. I was also asked whether a party can make definitive reliance on the actions or assurances of a party above them in the chain. These questions will always be matters of fact. Investigators will uncover statements that parties have made and it will be a matter for the regulator to focus their attention on the party that is most culpable in that case.

This is an appropriate moment for me to again thank the staff of the Department of Housing and Public Works and the officers of the Queensland Building and Construction Commission for their extraordinarily hard work in preparing this bill. This is the first bill to be delivered as part of the Queensland Building Plan. I also wish very specifically to once again acknowledge Michael and Lee Garrels. Michael and Lee, you have fought tirelessly for this reform on behalf of all workers in Queensland. On behalf of the Palaszczuk government and all Queenslanders, I want to thank you for your determined campaigning. On your behalf and on behalf of the government, I commend the bill to the House.

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 34—



Mr de BRENNI (10.52 pm): I seek leave to move the following amendments en bloc.

Leave granted.

Mr de BRENNI: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ss 28A and 28B)

Page 12, lines 28 and 29—

omit, insert—

commission's functions; or

Note—

For the commission's functions, see section 7.

2 Clause 11 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 16, after line 15—

insert—

code of practice means a code of practice in force under section 74ADA.

3 Clause 11 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 18, line 17, before 'practicable'—

insert—

reasonably

4 Clause 11 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 19, after line 5—

insert—

74ABA Extraterritorial application of part

- (1) This part applies both within and outside Queensland.
- (2) This part applies outside Queensland to the full extent of the extraterritorial legislative power of the Parliament.

5 Clause 11 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 20, after line 24—

insert—

74ADA Code of practice about discharging duties

- (1) The Minister may make a code of practice that states a way of discharging a duty a person has under this division.
- (2) A code of practice, or an instrument amending or repealing a code of practice, has no effect unless the Minister gives notice of its making.
- (3) A notice under subsection (2) is subordinate legislation.
- (4) A code of practice, or an instrument amending or repealing a code of practice, commences on the later of the following—
 - (a) the day the notice under subsection (2) commences;
 - (b) the day the code or instrument provides that it commences.
- (5) A code of practice expires 10 years after its commencement.
- (6) The Minister must ensure a copy of each code of practice as in force from time to time, and any document applied, adopted or incorporated by the code of practice, is made available on the department's website.

74ADB Use of code of practice in proceedings

- (1) This section applies in a proceeding for an offence against this part.
- (2) A code of practice is admissible in the proceeding as evidence of whether or not a duty under this division has been complied with.
- (3) Nothing in this section prevents a person from introducing evidence of compliance with the duty in a way that is different from the code.

6 Clause 11 (Insertion of new pt 6AA)

Page 25, lines 7 to 31 and page 26, lines 1 to 13—

omit, insert—

74AK Duty about representations about building products

- (1) This section applies if a person in the chain of responsibility for a building product knows, or ought reasonably to know, that the association of the product with a building for an intended use does not, or will not, comply with the relevant regulatory provisions.

- (2) The person must not make a representation, or permit a representation to be made, that the association of the product with a building for the use complies, or will comply, with the relevant regulatory provisions.

Maximum penalty—1,000 penalty units.

7 Clause 29 (Amendment of s 114 (Protection))

Page 86, lines 32 and 33 and page 87, lines 1 to 28—

omit, insert—

29 Amendment of s 114 (Protection)

- (1) Section 114(1), 'publication act'—

omit, insert—

public interest act

- (2) Section 114(3)—

omit, insert—

- (3) Neither the State, the Minister, the commission nor a relevant officer of the commission incurs any liability for a public interest act.

- (3) Section 114(5), definition *publication act*—

omit, insert—

public interest act means—

- (a) a disclosure or publication made by or for the commissioner in issuing a warning under section 20J(1)(i), or publishing information under section 20J(1)(k), about—
- (i) building work; or
 - (ii) the commercial or business reputation of any person associated with building work; or
 - (iii) the quality or standard of building work performed by any person; or
 - (iv) a building product being a non-conforming building product for a particular use; or
 - (v) the commercial or business reputation of a person in the chain of responsibility for a building product; or
 - (vi) a contravention or alleged contravention of this Act or the operation or enforcement of this Act; or
- (b) a disclosure or publication made by or for the Minister in publishing a warning statement under section 74AZC; or
- (c) an act done by or for the Minister in relation to a recall order under section 74AW.

8 Clause 31 (Amendment of sch 2 (Dictionary))

Page 90, after line 24—

insert—

code of practice, for part 6AA, see section 74AA.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.


Tabled paper: Building and Construction Legislation (Non-conforming Building Products-Chain of Responsibility and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2017, explanatory notes to Hon. Mick de Brenni's amendments [\[1471\]](#).

Amendments agreed to.

Clauses 1 to 34, as amended, agreed to.

Schedule 1, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

 **Hon. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (10.53 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. MC de BRENNI** (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works and Minister for Sport) (10.53 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.

SPECIAL ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.54 pm): I move—

That the House, at its rising, do adjourn until 9.30 am on Tuesday, 5 September 2017.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.


Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (10.54 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Gold Coast Light Rail

 **Mr HART** (Burleigh—LNP) (10.55 pm): The second stage of the light rail on the Gold Coast is well underway, as we all know. Unfortunately, those on the other side of the House claim credit for it. I can tell members on that side of the House that when we were in government we had that well and truly planned. This was sitting in the filing cabinet of one of our ministers' offices waiting for those opposite to find it and drag it out. Now we move to the third stage of the light rail and it is the Gold Coast—

Mr BAILEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This is the adjournment debate, not stand-up comedy.


Mr SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

Mr HART: It is late at night and the member right up the back of the chamber is feeling a bit of relevance deprivation, I think.

The Gold Coast City Council has led the planning charge on the third stage of the light rail, and I commend it for that. The third stage of the light rail is now slated to come from Broadbeach to my electorate in Burleigh and then beyond towards the airport. I support light rail to the airport. It needs to be at our major transport hub on the Gold Coast which is the Gold Coast airport. It needs to link up with heavy rail. It needs to make sense to people. It needs to take people from where they are to where they want to get to. However, I do not support light rail going down the highway through Palm Beach. Palm Beach is way too narrow for light rail. There will be far too many resumptions of properties and disruption to the people of Palm Beach, and it will mean no on-street parking through Palm Beach. That is just not acceptable to the people of Palm Beach. I commend Karen Rolls, who has been running the campaign in Palm Beach against light rail coming through Palm Beach. Originally the council had a plan to take light rail down the esplanade through Burleigh. We managed to stop that, and Sue Macrossan was involved in that process. The Gold Coast City Council came up with a bright scheme to do that.

The council has now gone through a consultation process and it has identified where the final stop of the light rail might be when it gets to Burleigh. The consultation process was completely flawed. There were only two options, with the third option being 'I did not care which one of the first two options it was', and the second option not being viable. Therefore, the people chose the first option, which was the only choice they had.

Burnett Electorate

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (10.58 pm): I have been very fortunate to represent the electorate of Burnett for the last 5½ years. It is a huge honour to work for the people of Burnett every day, because we need to make our communities and our electorates better places. When I look back to when I was first elected in 2012, I feel incredibly proud to represent the great people of the Burnett. Those who know me know the hard work and dedication that I have committed to our great region in the best interests of the Burnett.

Whether in government or in opposition, I have a proud track record of delivering for the Bundaberg and Burnett regions and fighting for the things that matter in our community. I have worked hard for the Burnett by bringing the decision-makers to the region. This has allowed quality, fully funded policies and projects to be developed. Our region now enjoys improved front-line services to keep our communities safe. We have built roads, schools and infrastructure that our kids need to get the best start in life.


Millions of dollars in funding has been secured for various local sporting and community groups which has delivered countless projects. The Burnett has benefited from improved emergency services resources including the delivery of new ambulance stations, fire stations and vehicles, such as the Miriam Vale Ambulance Station, new vehicles for Bargara and Woodgate, and new stations and vehicles in Childers.

We have delivered major road upgrades and flood mitigation measures and played an active role in securing critical infrastructure such as the gas pipeline and port development. We have ensured the delivery of significant tourism investments to enhance local iconic attractions like the Mon Repos Conservation Park and other attractions like the Childers Festival and the Captain Cook 1770 Festival. I was also pleased to secure additional funding to address urgent school maintenance backlogs and help improve the safety of a number of local schools by ensuring the installation of 40-kilometre-an-hour flashing light zones. I have stood up for local farmers in their fight against the Labor Party's land-clearing laws.

The people of Burnett and I have achieved a great deal together to make sure our region is a better place to live, work and raise a family. If the good people of Burnett put their faith in me once again, I will continue to be a strong voice for local families, small business, agriculture and industries. I will ensure real, progressive change to our community and help keep our neighbourhoods safe, continue to fix our roads, improve front-line services, ensure our local schools and health services are fully and aptly resourced, and build better roads and infrastructure because we need a stronger economy and a clean environment.

I am proud to have provided a permanent traffic solution for the people of Childers around the Lucketts Road intersection. The Apple Tree Creek upgrade has not gone unnoticed. We fixed that blackspot in consultation with the federal government. The Isis Highway has had plenty of safety upgrades and the Elliott Heads Road safety upgrade has been a welcome addition. A total of \$3.1 million has been spent to improve Bucca Road's flood resilience during extreme weather events. The Mon Repos visitor centre, which I have already mentioned, received a boost of \$210,000 for turtles and for a digital experience. The Friends of Parks have also been a beneficiary. I want to commit to the people of Burnett for another term in government. I look forward to making Burnett a better place.

Marriage

 **Hon. G GRACE** (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11.01 pm): I too am fortunate to represent a fantastic electorate—that of Brisbane Central, soon to be named McConnel. Brisbane Central is made up of a number and variety of people who live in a fantastic inner-city suburb, many of whom are members of the LGBTIQ community. It pains me that that community will soon be forced to undertake a postal vote to give them marriage equality. It pains me because I am hoping that this path that the federal government wants to go down does not become a divisive and horrible one in Australia.


In my electorate there are not too many people whom I speak to who do not support marriage equality. I want to put on the record that I will be voting yes should we be forced into a postal vote. I suggest that we save the \$122 million, but if the federal government wants to spend it then let us give it to some of those LGBTIQ communities that do great work—for example, the services that Open Doors provide for young people struggling with their sexuality; the services that the Queensland AIDS Council provide; and the services that the LGBTI Legal Service provide for people from the LGBTIQ community.

The Palaszczuk government gets on with the job. We do not need a postal vote. We restored civil partnerships. We removed the defence of provocation known as the gay panic defence. We standardised the age of consent, removing any inequality. We issued an apology to people punished under historical gay sex laws, and we have a bill which will soon be debated to expunge historical homosexual gay convictions. We get on with the job. I plead with the federal government: get on with the job. Just do it. No government should be able to tell somebody who they can love or who they should be marrying. It should be done right now. It can be done at any time, yet we are being forced

into this unnecessary, costly and possibly damaging postal vote—to do what? To do what all of us know: that someone who is a member of the LGBTIQ community should have the same rights as anybody else.

We do not ask if I should be able to marry my husband and neither should my daughter have to ask who she should marry if she finds somebody that she wants to spend the rest of her life with. She should be able to do that like anybody else in society. What I say is: vote 'yes'. I will be marching at the Brisbane Pride Festival Fair Day Rally on 23 September with my LGBTIQ community. We will be advocating the 'yes' vote for marriage equality. I urge everybody else, particularly in Brisbane Central, to do likewise.

Youth Unemployment


 **Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (11.04 pm): The Palaszczuk government is always carrying on about its so-called efforts to create jobs in Queensland. Labor's policies have failed to reduce unemployment rates, particularly youth unemployment rates in Townsville and North Queensland. During the debate of the budget in early June I mentioned that I had written to the Minister for Training and Skills about the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program failing to support the Ultimate Rural Training Centre at Alice River, near Townsville, operated by well-respected rural trainers Geoff and Vicki Toombys.

Geoff and Vicki get excellent outcomes for the people they train, primarily young Indigenous kids, many with problematic and disadvantaged backgrounds. We were told that the Toombys' program was too costly per participant, but this response ignored the fact that they achieve upwards of 80 per cent employment placement in real jobs for students who complete their courses. They are real outcomes that make a huge difference to the people who get this training.

I was appalled to learn recently that the Palaszczuk government has significantly cut funding to RTOs for the purpose of delivering certain training programs covered by the certificate III guarantee. The certificate III guarantee is a fantastic vocational training initiative of the previous LNP government. The Ultimate Rural Training Centre delivers a Certificate III in Rural Operations on behalf of its RTO partner, LD Training. The Department of Education and Training provides funding for training programs through the certificate III guarantee on a priority basis, with demand for the skills influencing the size of the government investment or subsidy to the cost of delivering that training. Funding levels also depend on factors such as skills being in demand from what are called disadvantaged learners and people from rural and regional areas.

Certificate III guarantee funding for a Certificate III in Rural Operations has been slashed by the Palaszczuk government in the last six months for non-concessional students by more than \$1,000, from \$4,656 to \$3,576; for concessional students by more than \$1,300, from \$5,328 to \$4,023; and for year 12 students in the fee-free category by a whopping \$1,350, from \$5,820 to \$4,470. This is a huge funding decrease for this training program when the costs of delivery have not changed. The Toombys insist that demand for employees in the rural sector with these skills is still strong. To their knowledge, this funding cut was unannounced. If the changes are not reversed, the student contribution fee will have to increase and, given the size of the cuts, the training will be out of reach for most of the participants. The Toombys regularly take students referred from youth justice programs, the department of corrective services and the department of communities. The government has made a mistake here. The Ultimate Rural Training Centre needs more support, not less.


Baker, Ms N; Mackay, Kanaka Graves

 **Mr WILLIAMS** (Pumicestone—ALP) (11.07 pm): I rise to talk about a volunteer in my electorate—Nell Baker. Nell is the manager of the Bribie Island Hospice Op Shop. Nell is a remarkable woman and an inspiring person, having done this job for 13 years managing 36 staff. Some of those people are as old as 80 years old. On her way to being this not-so-meagre storekeeper, Nell was born in Newcastle, lived in Dalby and lived in Sandgate. In 1963 she did her nursing training at the Royal Brisbane Hospital and midwifery at the Mater Misericordia Hospital before she did the Australian dream and went and worked in England. Nell returned from the UK to become a surgical nurse, a charge nurse, got a graduate diploma in counselling providing psychological support for trauma patients, worked with alcohol and drug rehab, worked in palliative care at Mount Olivet and worked at the psychiatric ward at the Prince Charles Hospital. After 50 years of nursing she retired in 2003. Nell is part of the Bribie Island Hospice that has been going for 20 years. The hospice provides respite for carers and a free palliative

care service for people of the area. Nell is a wonderful person in the community working at the hospice. This year she was the award winner of the Longman Volunteer of the Year awarded by Susan Lamb. She was a very worthy winner of this award given the way she has served the community throughout her life.

Just briefly on another subject, last weekend I was in Mackay with the member for Mackay and the member for Whitsunday—the member for Pine Rivers and the member for Southern Downs were mentioned—to unveil headstones of 160 Kanakas. These people were in unmarked graves outside the cemetery and people walk their dogs and ride their motorbikes over the area where these people are buried. This was a great thing by the Mackay Regional Council and members of this House contributed money, as did the community. These people were always laid to rest in sack bags. They were not allowed to be buried in the Christian cemetery. They now have been given some dignity.

Wilsonton State High School, Comments by Member for Ashgrove

 **Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (11.10 pm): I rise to respond to the outrageous and nonsensical claims by the member for Ashgrove about the Wilsonton State High School. The member for Ashgrove and part-time Minister for Education is wrong and this is just another Labor con job on the people of Toowoomba North. Labor's tired old tactics are as obvious as they are disgraceful. Here is the proof, and I challenge the member for Ashgrove and the Labor candidate for Toowoomba North: if she thinks I am not telling the truth now, she should refer me to the Ethics Committee. In November 2014 the LNP promised to build a hall at the Wilsonton State High School. On 12 January 2015 I stood next to the member for Surfers Paradise, the then minister for education, and publicly committed to building the hall. I table my press release committing to this dated 12 January.

The member for Ashgrove has said in this House that a promise was unfunded. The member for Ashgrove is wrong—W-R-O-N-G, wrong. It is a con and that is what she is trying to do. The LNP's 2015 election costings included a fund of money to pay for a number of school infrastructure projects. The pool of funds was the Better Schools Boost and \$40 million was set aside for the projects. The Wilsonton State High School was one of those projects fully funded from the Better Schools Boost. I table the page of the LNP election costing document detailing the Better Schools Boost.

As these documents clearly show, the Wilsonton State High School was a commitment by the LNP and was included in the election costings and therefore was fully funded. The member for Ashgrove has said in this House that the last LNP government CBRC did not consider this project. Again, the member for Ashgrove and part-time Minister for Education is talking out of her hat and trying to con the people of my electorate. I am proud of my service to the people of Toowoomba North. I know that they have a bright future under a Nicholls LNP government. I also know that the people of Toowoomba North see through the con job by the member for Ashgrove and the Labor candidate. I call on the Labor Party to get out of the gutter and campaign on its poor record rather than lying about my record. Again, I table a document that shows clearly the minister had no intention—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. The member for Toowoomba North used unparliamentary language and I ask that you call him to order.

Mr SPEAKER: I think you are referring to the word 'lying'. Would you withdraw the word please, member for Toowoomba North?

Mr WATTS: I withdraw 'lying' and say 'untruth'. I also table a document that shows quite clearly that the minister intended to not open that facility until term 2 of 2018 but after pressure from myself in fact changed the date and moved forward the opening of the school hall.

Tabled paper: Bundle of documents relating to the Wilsonton State High School [\[1472\]](#).


Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. I realise that the clock says time is up, but unfortunately I think he had a few more moments left on the clock.

Mr WATTS: When the part-time education minister wants to criticise me for the advocacy of my community, she better make sure she is telling the truth because I have the documents to prove her wrong.

Mr SPEAKER: All right; thank you. We get the message.

Algester Electorate


 **Hon. LM ENOCH** (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (11.14 pm): I have the great privilege of representing the people of Algester in this place and I have enjoyed working with many individuals and community groups over the past 2½ years. I have particularly enjoyed representing and working with the fantastic schools across the Algester electorate, their teachers, support staff, parents and students.

During this month I have had the honour of hosting four of my schools in Parliament House. I would like to acknowledge the teachers and students who took the time to visit. Deputy Principal Robern Hinchliffe from St John's Anglican College in Forest Lake, which is a school with an incredibly strong commitment to STEM, accompanied students Kelsey Matuschka, Shihaab Azam, Olivia Hutley and Hamza Khan. Principal Tony Maksoud, a passionate and future oriented school leader from Grand Avenue State School, also in Forest Lake, accompanied students Ella Bradshaw, Pietro Marin, Maeve Fray and Rahil Mehta. Principal Phil Manitta, from St Stephen's Catholic School in Algester, who is an incredibly energetic and driven leader, accompanied students Rocco Manitta and Zoe Stephens. Deputy Principal Christine Roseneder, from Algester State School, where coding and robotics is really growing, accompanied students Charlotte White, Jackson Rose, Eva Wilde and Orihah Jessop.

I have a fundamental belief in the power of a sound education. As a former teacher I know firsthand how important our education system, our schools and our teachers are for the future of our children and, more broadly, our society. As the mother of two wonderful sons, like parents across the Algester electorate and all parents for that matter, I want my children to inherit a world that will allow them to prosper and grow no matter their religion, their race or whom they love. Of course, a sound education supports the development of key skills and knowledge to help prepare our young people for the jobs of their future. It also lays a foundation for the continued progression of our society.

In recent weeks we have witnessed some incredibly disturbing scenes across the globe and, disgracefully, in our own country's federal parliament. When division, hatred and fearmongering go unchecked, we are all affected. When flat-out bigotry is minimised as humorous or held up as some kind of right, we are all affected. When culture, religion, who you love or the colour of your skin is mocked, demonised or used to create an argument of superiority, we are all affected. When I spend time with students from my electorate of Algester, students from varying cultures and backgrounds, with dreams and hopes that are still to be realised, I feel even more driven to strive for a state and a country that values difference and believes in equality.

Krauss Locomotive


 **Mr DICKSON** (Buderim—PHON) (11.17 pm): I rise to speak about the sad fate of an historic locomotive at the hands of the Sunshine Coast Council and, in particular, Sunshine Coast councillor Ted Hungerford. The Krauss locomotive ran between Buderim and Palmwoods between 1914 and 1935 and played an important part in the development of the town of Buderim and the surrounding district. The remains of the Krauss locomotive were located and purchased by the local Buderim-Palmwoods Heritage Tramway Association in 2004. Over six years of restoration work on the locomotive was carried out by Buderim volunteers, led by an engineer of world standing, Garth Fraser. Since then it has been languishing for seven years under a tarpaulin in an open-sided shed on a farm at Buderim. I want to pay tribute to Garth Fraser, who passed away recently. He had served our country as an engineer in the Royal Australian Navy before serving our local community on the Krauss project.

Regrettably, Councillor Ted Hungerford and council officers have managed to come up with every reason imaginable as to why the Krauss locomotive cannot be displayed in Buderim, totally ignoring the wishes of the people of Buderim expressed in a petition signed by nearly 1,000 residents and a council survey in which 93 per cent of respondents voted in favour of it. Councillor Hungerford even refused to present the petition to the council, which was his duty as a councillor. Councillor Hungerford wants to see the locomotive sent to the Nambour Museum as a stop-gap measure in case some other option might arise in the future. However, the Nambour Museum will not accept it unless it goes there permanently.

Last week the project was further derailed by council when a negative report was presented to the council and supported by a majority of councillors, including Councillor Hungerford, without the tramway group being given the opportunity to respond. The tramway group is adamant that the locomotive belongs to the people of Buderim as an important part of their heritage and will not agree to it being displayed anywhere other than in Buderim. They have not spent all those years restoring it and maintaining it to give it away.

Finally, I wish to advise that, as the Queensland leader of One Nation, I give an undertaking that, if elected to government or if we hold the balance of power, we will commit to providing \$500,000 towards funding the construction of a display structure, including a new public toilet facility with disability access, so that the Krauss locomotive can be on show in its rightful home in the centre of Buderim. Many people have put much time, effort and energy into this project. They are the heart and soul of our town, as is this train, which should be located exactly where the station used to be: right in the heart of Buderim.

The Great White Campaign

 **Mr JANETZKI** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (11.20 pm): Tonight I rise to speak about a campaign near to the hearts of many in Toowoomba. The campaign is called the Great White Campaign and it is named in honour of Braydon 'The Great White' Smith, a young Toowoomba boxer whose life was tragically cut short in March 2015 after completing a title bout. Braydon was a young man with extraordinary promise. He was a beloved son, brother, grandson and boyfriend, a law student and an exemplary community role model. He came from a legendary Darling Downs family. His grandfather claimed 140 wins in 144 amateur fights. His dad, Brendon, is a renowned trainer and operates Smithy's Gym in Toowoomba. It is a world-class boxing and fitness facility that is frequented by many of our city's fittest men and women.


Toowoomba is the health services hub for South-West Queensland, extending to the New South Wales and territory borders. However, there are gaps in that service delivery, a part of which the Great White Campaign seeks to reduce. Their unwavering goal is to bring a neurosurgical unit to Toowoomba. At the moment, the only Queensland neurological centres are located in Townsville, the Gold Coast and Brisbane. This leaves vast areas west of the Great Dividing Range without specialist neurosurgical services. In the case of head trauma, that leaves patients hours away from urgent and potentially life-saving specialist medical intervention.

The Great White Campaign team, chaired by Councillor James O'Shea, understands that it will be a long journey to achieve their goal. However, like the Smith family, the campaign team and the member for Toowoomba North, Trevor Watts, I believe that Toowoomba deserves the finest health facilities, including a neurosurgical unit. We will all be fighting to achieve it, no matter how long it may take.

The Great White Campaign continues to quietly build momentum. It is now aligned with the Rural Doctors Association of Queensland Foundation and Rotary Edge, which is part of the Rotary Club of Toowoomba South of which Braydon's aunty Tressa Lindenberg is a member. The Chairman of the Darling Downs Hospital and Health Services Board, Mike Horan; his CEO, Dr Peter Gillies; and their staff continue to deliver a world-class health service and continue to push for ever-more resources so that they can provide even broader health services on the Darling Downs.

We need to continue to reduce the gap in health outcomes between rural and regional and metropolitan Queensland. We need to continue to grow the capacity of health services for the men, women and children who live on the Darling Downs. We need to continue to honour the legacy of a fine young man, Braydon 'The Great White' Smith, taken far too soon from his loved ones and from his community.

Logan, Dental Health Services

 **Hon. CR DICK** (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (11.28 pm): The Palaszczuk Labor government is a government of achievement and delivery, particularly in the area of public health care. That is why, as Minister for Health, I was delighted to once again deliver for the Woodridge electorate by officially opening the \$4.3 million upgrade of the Logan Central Dental Clinic on Friday, 21 July 2017. In May this year, I cemented my commitment to improving health care in the Woodridge electorate and the City of Logan with the launch of the Community Health Action Plan for Logan. The plan came out of a local health symposium that agreed to develop an action plan to help narrow the significant gap in health outcomes between Logan City and other areas of the state.

Dental is one of the plan's six priorities, with a strong focus on children. As a father and as a resident of the Woodridge electorate, I am passionate about improving the health care of our kids. The Logan Central Dental Clinic has expanded from five dental chairs to 15 dental chairs. The clinic's capacity will increase by 15,000 new dental appointments each year. One of the new dental chairs is for bariatric clients, that is, patients who are overweight or obese. That will allow more clients to access

dental treatment closer to home, instead of having to travel to the QEII Hospital clinic at Coopers Plains. A three-dimensional dental X-ray machine is also now available. This means patients can have their X-rays done in Logan Central during their appointment, saving them a trip to another clinic.

However, the expansion is not the only cause for celebration. For the first time, the Logan Central Oral Health Centre has opened its doors to children after providing dental care to adults for many years. Adults and children can now receive care at the same clinic and even during the same appointment, making it easier and more convenient for families to improve dental health. However, to make a real difference we cannot simply treat tooth decay; we must prevent it.

The Palaszczuk Labor government has also funded the expansion of the school toothbrushing program for children in prep and year 1 in Logan. I had the privilege of seeing the program in action when I brushed my teeth with Woodridge State School prep students last Friday. This program has already had an impact, with a 10 per cent reduction in cavities recorded at schools participating in the toothbrushing program, compared to those that are not. This program will be rolled out to all schools in Logan.

Another new program, the Healthy Mouth Day program, is now in place at all Logan schools. It involves screening children for decay, education, fluoride application and a free toothbrush and toothpaste. Children with decay are referred for further treatment. So far this year, more than 2,400 children have been screened in the Metro South region.

Another successful collaboration being funded is the Lift the Lip program, which aims to reduce tooth decay in our youngest community members. Child health nurses have been trained to identify dental disease in children during their health checks and can refer children directly for dental treatment. To date, more than 3,700 children have been referred for free dental treatment by child health nurses in the Metro South health region. I am confident that these programs, together with the expanded Logan Central Oral Health Centre and the hard work of our oral health nurses and clinicians, will make a real difference to the health of our Logan community.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.26 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams