

~~Amendments to part 8 of the act will equip authorised officers with a greater continuum of powers to investigate, monitor and enforce compliance with the act. These will cover cases where my department is dealing with the most cooperative of business to instances where a business is refusing to cooperate with our investigation.~~

~~So, all in all, the review has been a meaningful exercise, and I would like to acknowledge and thank the review panel members for their passion and commitment, as well as my departmental officers for the work undertaken to get this act to where it is. The review has generated great outcomes for people with disability and the sector. The introduction of this bill is the next step in making these outcomes a reality. I commend the bill to the House.~~

First Reading

~~Hon. CJ O'ROURKE (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (5.00 pm): I move~~

~~That the bill be now read a first time.~~

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

~~Motion agreed to.~~


~~Bill read a first time.~~

Referral to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee

~~Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee.→~~

<STATE DEVELOPMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS ORGANISATION AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (5.00 pm): <I present a bill for an act to amend the Land Court Act 2000>, the Mineral Energy and Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 and the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015.

Tabled paper: State Development and Public Works Organisation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes.

I am pleased to introduce the State Development and Public Works Organisation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. The primary amendments in the bill deliver a key Queensland government election commitment to restore community objection rights in relation to mining projects. These rights were removed by the former government in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, which inserted a new section 47D into the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

Section 47D of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act commenced on 24 October 2014 and applies to all existing and newly declared coordinated projects. It has the effect of preventing any objections to the Land Court being made about an environmental authority application for a proposed mining activity that has been subject to the Coordinator-General's assessment.

This government made an election commitment to restore community objection rights relating to mining developments as soon as possible not only to the local landholders and the community but also more widely to Indigenous groups and those concerned about environmental issues such as water pollution and land degradation. The proposed amendments will support sustainable and appropriate developments—importantly along with the jobs and infrastructure they bring—while also ensuring the community is aware of and has appropriate input to them. The changes will set the scene for a productive relationship with resource companies by helping to lessen anxiety towards resource development among landholders and agricultural stakeholders.

There has been media coverage of stakeholder groups seeking urgent action from this government to restore mining objection rights. The repeal of section 47D of the State Development and

Public Works Organisation Act will importantly restore community objection rights relating to environmental authority applications for certain mining proposals that have been evaluated by the Coordinator-General by restoring the status quo prior to the commencement of section 47D on 24 October 2014. Urgent consideration of the amendments by parliament in the current sitting week will respond to the call for urgent action from concerned stakeholder groups.

I acknowledge the petition received on Monday by the Speaker of this House from over 4,000 Darling Downs residents urging the government to reinstate the mining objection rights that were stripped away from them last year by the former LNP government. Well, we are listening. This government committed to restoring these community objection rights, and this bill is the first step. I understand that residents of the Darling Downs are concerned about the New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 Project. Landholders and community members deserve the right to be heard and to object to this mine expansion project if they so wish. It is their right for this objection to be heard in the Land Court.

The immediate urgency for the repeal of section 47D of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act in this bill is the restoration of community objection rights in time for these to apply to the New Acland Coal Mine Stage 3 Project. This project is currently in the environmental authority process and would have been the first coordinated project for which section 47D of the State Development Act would apply. Section 47D, if not repealed, may also apply to other projects in the short term.

During the preparation of this bill, my department investigated whether retrospective provisions were required in relation to the New Acland project. The department concluded that retrospective amendment would not be required, if the relevant amendments in the bill are enacted prior to a decision being made on the New Acland project environmental authority application. To date, no decision has been made. Further changes are needed to address the remaining uncommenced provisions in the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act, and these are being considered to ensure the government's commitment is fully met.

Consultation was undertaken with key stakeholder groups to outline and discuss the government's election commitment to introduce legislative changes related to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act, including the repeal of section 47D of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. Stakeholders included environmental and community groups such as Lock the Gate, the Environmental Defenders Office, the Basin Sustainability Alliance and the Wilderness Society; resource sector peak bodies such as the Queensland Resources Council and the Australian Petroleum Production and Exploration Association; and rural groups such as AgForce Queensland and the Queensland Farmers' Federation.

The bill also amends the Land Court Act 2000 to address issues arising from the Supreme Court decision in BHP Billiton Mitsui Coal Pty Ltd v Isdale [2015] QSC 10. In that matter, the Supreme Court found that certain matters referred to the court under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 and the Environmental Protection Act 1994 were not 'proceedings' for the purposes of the Land Court Rules 2000 but, rather, in dealing with these matters, the Land Court was performing an administrative function. These matters related to objections to mining lease applications and associated environmental authorities.

The Supreme Court ruling has created some uncertainty about the scope of section 35 of the Land Court Act which provides protection and immunity for the Land Court members in presiding over 'proceedings'. Urgent amendments are necessary to put the statutory protection for the Land Court members in performing all their judicial and administrative functions, including dealing with referral matters under several pieces of legislation, beyond doubt. This reflects the legal position that was thought to have existed previously. The Supreme Court decision may also have implications for other provisions of the Land Court Act and the Land Court Rules which are currently expressed to apply to 'proceedings'.

The bill includes mechanisms to address this. A transitional regulation-making power has been inserted in the Land Court Act to enable the making of transitional regulations to apply specific provisions of the act to matters referred to the court under various statutes, as necessary, until more permanent measures can be put in place through amendment of the act. This will mean any limitations on the Land Court's ability to deal with these matters can be dealt with expeditiously, following appropriate stakeholder consultation.

The bill also includes amendments to ensure the existing rule-making power in the act enables the making of rules specifically applicable to the Land Court's administrative functions. The bill will also

019

correct a technical error in section 47B of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act identified by the Office of the Queensland Parliamentary Counsel during drafting of the bill.

This bill reinstates the community's objection rights relating to environmental authority applications for certain mining proposals that have been evaluated by the Coordinator-General by restoring the status quo prior to the commencement of section 47D on 24 October 2014. It is a critical step forward to supporting individuals and community groups to have a voice on mining activity and any potential impacts of this mining activity on local communities and the environment. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (5.08 pm): I move—


That the bill be now read a first time.

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


Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

Declared Urgent

 **Hon. AJ LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (5.08 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That, under the provisions of standing order 137, the State Development and Public Works Organisation and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 be declared an urgent bill to enable the bill to be passed through all remaining stages at this week's sitting.>

 **<Mr CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (5.09 pm): **<I must rise to speak against the motion >**moved by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. I stand to speak against the motion because the assertion he has put forward before the parliament is a misnomer. He suggests in his introduction of this bill into the House that the provisions of this bill will reintroduce the right of individuals or organisations to have a matter to which they object that has been considered by the Coordinator-General referred to the Land Court for adjudication. He asserts through his introduction of the bill that it will reintroduce the right for the Land Court to make a decision about matters which have been considered under an EIS or a coordinated proposal from the Coordinator-General and then referred to the Land Court.

Prior to the amendments that the former LNP government moved during the consideration of the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014, it was possible for an objector to have a matter referred to the Land Court, but the Land Court had no jurisdiction to amend conditions placed on a project by the Coordinator-General. The amendments that I put through the House as the former minister for natural resources and mines—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I understand the points that the shadow minister is making in his contribution, but I am concerned that they are outside the frame for the debate that is before the House. The debate before the House is the question of the urgency of the bill. He is going to the matter of the substance of the legislation. I was quite patient in giving him an opportunity to come to the point of where this was a matter of urgency. He continues to be addressing issues that might more properly be dealt with in the debate on the legislation, and I ask that you bring him back to the matter before the House.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Member for Hinchinbrook, I bring you back to the motion before the House.

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. Quite clearly, in giving—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have not given you the call yet. I give you the call now.

Mr STEVENS: Would you like to call the member for Mermaid Beach?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: I call the member for Mermaid Beach.

Mr STEVENS: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. In speaking about the undue haste with which this bill is being pushed through, the member is quite rightly backing up his argument which this House requires for decent debate to give substance to the reasons behind the member's objection to haste. Quite clearly, he is entitled to put a framework around the reasoning why it is not necessary for the bill

to be rushed through the House. I find the member is giving quite a proper and fit description as to why the urgency of the bill is not required.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Mr Deputy Speaker, I appreciate the Leader of Opposition Business referring to haste, and perhaps he might have a contribution to this debate that is before the House.

Mr Stevens: I will.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: They were the exact sorts of words that I had not heard from the member for Hinchinbrook. Perhaps he might make it clear that these issues that he is raising pertain to the question of urgency.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I am going to make a ruling on this. The member for Hinchinbrook will limit his scope in terms of the motion before the House and keep it precise to the urgency of this particular motion.

Mr CRIPPS: I would be delighted, Mr Deputy Speaker. If the Leader of the House had not been so trigger-happy, he would have heard me move directly to the matter to which he raised an objection. That is, because the minister was unable to articulate—and, quite frankly, articulated incorrectly—what the substance of the amendments that he is proposing to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 will achieve, it goes to the point about the complexity of the amendments and the issues at stake during the debate on this bill.

The point that the Leader of Opposition Business made is quite right: in considering those matters, the previous parliament had the benefit of a referral to the relevant portfolio committee, a report from that portfolio committee within a reasonable time frame and had the opportunity to consider that amendment following a full debate of the issues in that legislation.

The second point that I would make is that there is another matter contained in the amendment bill which relates to amendments to the jurisdiction of the Land Court. I grant that the minister has made the point that these uncertainties have arisen as a result of a Supreme Court decision. It is also legitimate that from time to time amendment bills are brought into this House which need urgent consideration as a result of decisions of courts, and urgent amendments are required.

I can confirm for your benefit, Mr Deputy Speaker, and for the benefit of all members of this House, that no approach has been made by the minister to the opposition in relation to this matter prior to the introduction of the bill. Yet the minister asks for the bill to be declared urgent, for there to be no robust or significant referral to the portfolio committee so that all the matters that need to be considered in relation to his amendment, first of all, to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act and also to the Land Court Act 2000 can be considered by this parliament and an informed decision can be made.

I cannot agree that this is an urgent bill. In fact, in introducing the amendment bill to the parliament today, the minister was forced to recognise and acknowledge the true motivation for the urgency of the bill, and that is the pressure that the government is feeling from green groups. It is the pressure that the government is feeling from green groups—people who this week have presented a petition to the member for Nicklin, who has had it tabled in the parliament. A petition from 4,000 people, whoever they may be and from wherever they may reside, is the true motivation for the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines coming into this parliament, moving the amendment bill and demanding that this parliament consider it an urgent bill. That is the true motivation. It is not the election commitment, as the explanatory notes accompanying the bill which we have in front of us tend to suggest, because the petition that was received by the member for Nicklin and tabled in the parliament this week is not mentioned in the explanatory notes. The true nature of the pandering that this government is undertaking to the member for Nicklin is now on parade for all to see. There can be a petition presented to the member for Nicklin and brought before this parliament, and the government will run cap in hand to introduce an amendment bill to satisfy the demands of those people who signed that petition. What sort of democratic process is it to demand that the normal processes of this parliament be curtailed in response to a petition that is given to a member on Monday, with some fanfare and media coverage, tabled in the House, and in walks the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines to satisfy the demands of a particular part of the community?

I wonder how the constituents of the member for Condamine will feel about this matter or the constituents of the member for Nanango, the constituents of the member for Toowoomba South or the constituents of the member for Toowoomba North—those communities which stand to benefit from the project which was named by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines in his introductory speech who will be directly affected if the passage of this bill goes forward

020

without proper scrutiny and the robust processes normally associated with the consideration of an amendment bill.

Mr Deputy Speaker—Mr Speaker, I apologise; I did not see you come to the chair. It is not acceptable to the opposition that this motion that the bill should be declared an urgent bill should be accepted by this parliament. I cannot recall the number of times that members of this parliament, including the member for Nicklin, have stood in this parliament and demanded when governments have moved urgency on certain bills that the bills be referred to the proper portfolio committees and go through the proper scrutiny processes that those bills deserve.

I cannot recall the number of times we heard that speech made by those members who are now sitting on the government benches. They accused the then government of arrogance and of not following due process, but now we have a situation here in this parliament where the relevant portfolio committee will not have more than two days to consider the provisions of this amendment bill.

Mrs Frecklington: Shame.

Mr CRIPPS: It is a shame because, as I acknowledged earlier, there is an amendment to the Land Court Act 2000 which the minister says is necessary to consider urgently because of a decision of the Supreme Court. But this bill is contaminated by the presence of politically motivated amendments as a sop to the petition that was presented to the member for Nicklin earlier this week and tabled in this parliament. That is a regrettable matter.

I can say, as I said earlier to the House, that no consultation occurred with the opposition prior to the introduction of this bill into the House and the demand from the minister that it be declared urgent—none. Under the proper processes and conventions that have been followed in this parliament for a long period of time, bills that need to be considered urgently as a result of court decisions to secure the certainty of decisions for people's rights and natural justice are often facilitated by both sides of the House as expeditiously as possible. But we face the invidious position in this parliament now of having an amendment bill put before us that contains not only that urgent amendment to clarify a matter after a Supreme Court decision but also an amendment that is very politically motivated and clearly motivated by events that occurred earlier this week in the public realm. Those events were named and nominated by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines as the motivation for the government bringing forward this amendment bill and requesting the parliament declare it an urgent bill.

This is unacceptable and it is totally in contrast to the hifalutin attitudes and appeals to democratic principles that were previously made by a number of Labor members who now sit on the government benches. They are running away from those things right now to give comfort and succour to the extreme green movement, and this continues to undermine opportunities for economic development in communities like the electorate of Nanango and Condamine and other communities that will benefit from the economic development that will come from the project that was specifically named as being impacted upon as a result of the potential passage of this amendment bill. I think it is a disgrace. I think we should call it for what it is. I urge all members to oppose the declaration of this bill as an urgent bill.>




<Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (5.22 pm): **<The member for Hinchinbrook has spoken>** very clearly about the background and the reasons as he knows the full content and the outcomes of what the minister is seeking. I do understand the newness of this particular minister into the House in terms of the processes this House certainly has tried to abide by in delivering good outcomes for the legislation of this parliament.

On numerous occasions, the words 'hubris' and 'arrogance' were mentioned by those members opposite when they sat on this side of the House, and that particularly occurred when the last government was in place. Quite clearly, the motion that the minister has put forward represents great arrogance and hubris in that it is a very quick-fire, mates decision to pre-empt a matter, and the reasoning behind the urgency of this bill has not even been properly espoused. If a matter has resulted out of the Supreme Court decision, it should go back to the relevant committee. Time and time again in the last parliament, those members opposite—and I think there were nine of them at the time, as I recall—said that due processes should be followed. However, that has been quite clearly abandoned under their newfound arrogance and hubris as they look after their green mates and get this through in a hurry without going through the proper political processes that they so readily recommended we should go through. They have not pointed out one reason as to why this should not go through the normal processes that this House has endorsed as being the proper processes for consideration of any changes.

There are many stakeholders who will be affected by the decisions that the minister proposes to rush through this House I believe on Friday. There is no valid reason to support the urgency of this motion—none whatsoever. There is no valid reason why the minister should, on his training wheels, try to push this thing through in the dead of night, if you like, without going through the proper process of referring this to the committees that are involved in this matter. There is no valid reason why he should be pursuing the political interests of one particular section of his community to endorse his popularity in this particular area.

I will not debate the bill, but the government is talking about getting jobs and if this affects jobs in Queensland then it should be properly investigated by the relevant committees. They should be able to weigh up and make recommendations to this parliament. There is no valid reason for this. The minister has not espoused one particular valid point as to why in budget week we should have this bill coming forward urgently, other than absolute political bias in the matter, and that is not enough to circumvent the proper political processes of this parliament. We will be opposing this motion. >

 **<Mr WATTS** (Toowoomba North—LNP) (5.26 pm): **<I rise to address the urgency motion >** and the manner in which this bill is being put forward. There are many people in my electorate who would like to know lots of things that go on in this place and they would like to be afforded the opportunity to be able to address those things through a proper and due process. This is a government that said it would be open and accountable. These are not the actions of an open and accountable government.


Dr McVeigh interjected.

Mr WATTS: I will take the interjection from the member for Toowoomba South about my electorate because there are many people in my electorate who would be concerned at the urgent manner in which we will be addressing this bill. They would be concerned about the sneaky and sleight of hand action that this government is using to try to pass legislation in this very busy budget week. The parliament has due processes to discuss things so that good legislation can come forward, evidence can be heard, legislation can be debated and the community can contribute. This process is clearly being rushed through because of pressure from certain groups. It is clearly payback for the vote of those groups at the election. The urgency of this is a complete shame on those who are abusing the position they have been given by the people of Queensland. They are abusing it in a sneaky and sleight of hand manner to try to pass something through—

Ms Jones interjected.

Mr WATTS: Say that again. Come on, I am happy to take your interjections. I am very happy to hear them, so please bring them forward because I think the people of Queensland would like to hear a debate on this. They would like to understand and they would like to make sure that this place operates correctly. That is what this government promised. This is not the first occasion that the government has not delivered on its commitments to be open and accountable. This is not the first time. I ask people to look back at the things that the Premier said. She said she would be open and accountable and she said she would do certain things with our committee structure, but here we find our committee structure being abused not for the first time by this government with a sneaky piece of legislation being slipped in during budget week hopefully under the cover of other debates that are going on out there in the community.

I think this government will be held to account by the people in the electorates that will be affected by this legislation. I urge the minister to make sure that this legislation goes through the due process. He should not join his colleagues in becoming a sneaky minister who is willing to change the processes of this parliament in order to slip things through. It is well and good that the member opposite points, but he stood here in this place and he said exactly these same things. So who is it who has the two faces? He is sitting there on the other side now, completely hypocritically. Someone who criticised exactly this now stands up and bluntly says, 'No, no, no, it was okay for me to criticise when I was in opposition, but in government I want to be sneaky. I will join the ranks of those sneaky people. I will join the ranks of the people who don't want to be open and accountable. I will join the ranks of the Premier in being sneaky and abusing the committee process and in not being open and accountable with the people of Queensland.' That is why I will be opposing this motion, because it is not open and accountable for the people of Queensland. The minister himself has said exactly the same, yet here he is sitting in this place as a hypocrite, rushing things through, making sure the people of Queensland do not get to hear about them in the correct manner. >

 **<Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.30 pm): **<In rising to oppose the urgency of this motion>**, I again reference the issues which were raised earlier by the Leader of Government Business, the shadow minister and also the member for Toowoomba North. This

government has not clearly made out its matter of urgency. Indeed, in my time in here I have seen certain things transition backwards and forwards. I see on the other side tonight a certain indication of hubris and creeping arrogance of which they accused another government not so very long ago.

I refer to a letter of undertaking, which was addressed to the member for Nicklin and was signed on 5 February this year. In the area of integrity and accountability it states—

Labor has made a commitment to principles of integrity and accountability and, in particular, has made a commitment to what have been referred to as the 'Fitzgerald Principles'. The use of urgency motions to force Bills through the Parliament, bypassing proper consideration in the committee system was a hallmark—

and I quote from the letter—

of the Newman LNP Government. Labor commits, as a principle, to not use urgency motions to bypass or truncate the committee system.

It goes on to say—

Any deviation from this commitment will be negotiated with the crossbench members of Parliament.

One can only assume—

Mr Bleijie: It is Labor's letter.

Mr SPRINGBORG: It is the letter; it is a matter of public record. I have not inaccurately—

A government member interjected.

Mr SPRINGBORG: I am happy for the member opposite to come and read it. Does the member for Nicklin object to the context of that?

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Leader of the Opposition. Member for Lockyer, the Leader of the Opposition does not need your support. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No, Deputy Premier, do not bait us. Members, we have a lot more work to do. I call the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr SPRINGBORG: That was on the first page of what was a four-page letter from the Premier to the member for Nicklin in the articles of undertaking in forming the government in Queensland. One can assume by that only that there has been full and proper consultation with members of the crossbench, and that may very well be the case. The thing that concerns me most is the implications that have been made by the now Premier in the letter of undertaking to the member for Nicklin. She implies all sorts of concerns about a process which seeks to truncate what is due and proper process of the parliament, and that is to use urgency motions to bypass the normal committee consideration of legislation. Indeed, I am most concerned that so early in this government's term in government as a minority government in a hung parliament it is displaying this sort of hubris and disregard for things that it previously repudiated. Again, we have not seen the demonstration of urgency, particularly in the context of that letter of undertaking by the Premier to the member for Nicklin. We do acknowledge the concern which existed in the electorate last year around this issue with regard to those proposed changes. Many of those were wrong in context and were wrong in inference, but certainly did contain and build some concern within the community. There was an element of misunderstanding around some of those things. There were issues of concern which have been raised.

Given those particular concerns and the fact that we saw that legislation, those opposite cannot seek to address those concerns without going back to a proper and due process of parliamentary committee consideration. If it is the argument on the government's side of the parliament that the balance was shifted far too far one way, surely the argument here is that the real risk of rushing this legislation is that the balance will be shifted far too far the other way, particularly against a backdrop in which a government is claiming that it is unashamedly focused on jobs and job creation in Queensland. I think that those communities that are affected by this proposal, which were specifically named tonight by the minister, would be very, very concerned about this. Let's look at not only the people who may be concerned about their view that certain rights have been suppressed or impeded in some way, but also the fact that only a few months ago almost 800 people marched through the township of Oakey in favour of this particular proposal. We are here talking about 700 jobs that could be immediately affected as a consequence of this and also what is a significant flow-on effect across many communities of the Darling Downs.

Whilst this government may make out urgency, if the government gets this wrong, the unforeseen consequences of this are going to be quite devastating for that community and will be quite devastating for sovereign risk and also certainty in investment. That is something which should be of major consideration to people. That is why there should be appropriate consideration through a full and proper committee hearing so that we can get the balance right, notwithstanding the fact that many of the concerns that were raised last year—and some of them may have been legitimate—were misrepresentations of the fact.

This is about making sure that the government does not rush this; that they do not just claim urgency and shift the balance on one side. I can say that for some people who will be celebrating this, there will be many people who are going to be affected directly by this; their livelihoods are going to be affected by this as well as the sovereign risk in investment. They are going to be most concerned about what this means around this investment and also certainty into the future.

Based on the undertaking which was indicated to the member for Nicklin by the now Premier in the letter of 5 February this year, I would argue that there should be some degree of reticence. Indeed, there should be a leg rope, a shackle, on just declaring this as a matter of urgency in this parliament without a proper and full discussion about why that should be the case. We certainly have not heard this here today. We certainly do know that there are major concerns around this. The implications are not just the appeasement of one side; it is about getting the balance right. The implications are not just directly surrounding the case of the project that the minister mentioned previously, but in getting the legislative criteria, the policies and the regulations around this right. It is absolutely critical for sovereign risk and also investment in other major projects around Queensland.

I indicate that the LNP would be somewhat open to considering what are proper amendments and considerations around these issues based on concerns which have been raised. However, we certainly cannot be a part of a due and proper consideration when members opposite have a chance to go through all of the factors and talk to all of the parties if they are going to introduce legislation here at around six o'clock on a Wednesday and then debate it and pass it through parliament, through all of its stages, by Friday.

It is wrong for this government, after it has been elected, to then say in budget week that it is going to turn over a new leaf, that it will be consultative and respect the will of the people—which was not clear at the last state election—and that it would be prepared to walk away from the things it was concerned about in the past, and yet come in here and replicate it so early in its term.

I think that there are a number of players in the parliament who should be concerned—not just members of the government and not just crossbenchers—about the principles enunciated in that letter of 5 February; therefore, I would argue against urgency. What is wrong with having proper committee deliberation so that we can make sure we get the balance right on this? If the argument is that the balance shifted too far one way, then let us get the balance right in the middle and not too far the other way. Therefore, urgency should be opposed.>



<Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Transport, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade) (5.40 pm): <If the Leader of the Opposition has proven anything >through that speech tonight, he has proven that he can speak for a long time on something about which he knows very little. Let me explain why this matter is urgent. As someone who sat on the previous Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee which looked into the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Bill—the vehicle by which section 47D was proposed to this parliament—let me speak to it. Section 47D never, ever went to the parliamentary committee. Section 47D was snuck in at 11 minutes to midnight—

Mr STEVENS: I rise to a point of order. Quite clearly the minister is going on about the bill itself. The Deputy Premier has just basically said that we know nothing about it and she is now going to explain the matter to us, which we do not need. The matter of urgency is what we need to hear about.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. I think that the Leader of Opposition Business is showing himself up to be in support of the points that I was making earlier about how important it is to speak to the urgency motion. It is very, very clear that the Deputy Premier is speaking to the urgency motion in reflecting on the way in which these urgent matters have been dealt with in the past. That was something that the Leader of the Opposition did uninterrupted and at great length.

Mrs Frecklington interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Nanango, will you stop interrupting, please, or I will ask you to leave the chamber under standing order 253A. This is notice of an official warning. I understand the Deputy Premier is speaking to the urgency of the motion. I call the Deputy Premier.

Ms TRAD: I am going to the issue of the urgency of the motion, because section 47D rescinded people's rights to object to environmental approvals given by the Coordinator-General.

Mr CRIPPS: I rise to a point of order. I was directed to speak to the urgency of the motion moved by the minister by the Deputy Speaker who sat in your chair previously. I was attempting to explain the context of the matter when I was interrupted by the Leader of the House, and now the Deputy Premier is speaking to the exact matter that I was trying to speak to before I was directed by the Deputy Speaker who sat in the chair immediately prior to you resuming your seat. I ask only for consistency in rulings from the chair.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, there are many members in this chamber. I am happy to allow any member to speak on this matter if they choose. If you believe you have been unable to articulate your case on this motion, perhaps another member will be able to pick up where you were unable to articulate. I am happy to listen to the Deputy Premier put her case on the reason for urgency. If any other member wants to speak to the reason for urgency, I invite you to get on the speaking list and let me know you that want to speak before I call the minister. I call the Deputy Premier.

Ms TRAD: The urgency in this matter is that there are matters before the Coordinator-General which go to the heart of environmental approvals that will be issued by the Coordinator-General. Under the old regime before the LNP changed the legislation, people had a right to object to issues contained within the environmental authority issued by the Coordinator-General. These rights were taken away without any consultation at 11 minutes to midnight by those opposite. The urgency here is that there is a public expectation out there that Queenslanders can have a say on issues contained within environmental approvals which are due to be released by the Coordinator-General. There is urgency in giving rights back to Queenslanders absolutely, and we stand by that urgency.

The other matter is that the Land Court has come to the government and said that they need security and immunity for Land Court members. There is a necessity for this parliament to be responsive and to be respectful of the issues raised by the Land Court. Of course these matters are urgent because we took a pledge to the people of Queensland that we would reinstate their rights, which were taken away at 11 minutes to midnight without any consultation by those members opposite. We stand by our commitment to the people of Queensland. Of course this is urgent, and we are giving this parliament and those members opposite a whole lot more time than they gave the parliament—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, I warn you under standing order 253A for your disorderly conduct. Your interjections are not being taken. That is the first warning. I call the Deputy Premier.

Ms TRAD: We stand by our commitment to the people of Queensland. It was out there in the public domain for months and month. We will reinstate the rights of Queenslanders to have a say in the environmental authorities issued by the Coordinator-General. We stand by that and this bill will enact it.>

Mr SPEAKER: I call the member for Burleigh. I understand the member for Kawana wants to speak. If any other member wants to speak, I urge you to let me know before I call the minister to close the debate.



<Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (5.47 pm): <My apologies: I have only come into the chamber >as this debate started and I have not had time to read the bill. None of us have; it has been fostered on us at one minute to midnight on a very busy week, as we have heard from other members.

I want to talk about the urgency of this bill. I was on the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee in the last parliament, and there were numerous times when, during the Regional Planning Interests Bill, we discussed those sorts of issues about the rights of people to appeal and the rights of people to have their say in court decisions and Coordinator-General decisions about mining approvals. We just heard the Deputy Premier say that the people of Queensland have a right to be heard. Where is their right to be heard if this is pushed through in this sitting of parliament rather than going out into the regional areas and giving people the opportunity to have their say.


This government has been elected since 31 January. They have had plenty of opportunity to bring this bill forward and put it out there for discussion so that people can voice their opinions. The government has had six months to bring this forward, put it out there and give people time to consider

023

it. The previous committee spent months touring around Queensland talking to people. We went to Toowoomba, and we sat down with people in that area and gave them the opportunity to have their say. All we are saying here, Mr Speaker, is that people from all areas of Queensland, environmentalists, mining companies—everybody deserves the opportunity to have input into this.

During the previous committee's investigation into these things we heard there were vexatious attempts made to hold up the process of mining approvals, and those things add years and years to the development approval of mines. I do not know how many times we heard today that this government is about jobs. The resource sector in this state provides a lot of jobs. Those opposite would have to admit that. What is it that those opposite want to do? They want to rush this through and take away those opportunities from those people. They are not really serious about jobs at all; they are there to kow-tow, as other members have said, to the extreme green movement. That is what they are doing here. They are coming into this chamber and trying to push this through at one minute to midnight in budget week.

Over the past three years in parliament, on numerous occasions, the crossbenchers and the members of the then opposition complained that maybe the people of Queensland were not getting their say. Where do those people stand on this issue now? All we are saying is that the people of Queensland should have the opportunity to have their say. Is that really wrong? Do the majority of the members opposite think the people of Queensland should not have a right to be heard on this matter? The previous government felt that they should. Do those opposite think they should not? If those opposite want the people of Queensland to have their say and be heard on issues, they should not support this motion. >

 **<Mr BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (5.51 pm): <I have a little experience in urgency motions > before the House. I recall that we passed the criminal gang law reforms through the House after an urgency motion. Before all of the new members interject, they should know that the Labor Party actually voted for that urgency motion and voted for those bills that night. Before they all interject and say how terrible it was, they should check the voting record because the Labor Party actually supported the criminal gang laws in Queensland. An urgency motion was moved at the beginning of the week and the bills were passed before the end of that week.

Many members on this side of the House have been in parliament a lot longer than I have. I have been here for six years. We have seen many urgency motions, most notably under the regime of Anna Bligh, particularly with the green schemes and the agriculture sector, where they were pandering to the Greens. You only have to search *Hansard* very quickly to find debate and dissension from Labor members about urgency motions in the past three years. In one debate they were crying out loud that it was against democracy, that it was antidemocratic. 'How dare you come in here and move an urgency motion to pass legislation!' They also used to guillotine debate. Andrew Fraser was the biggest for guillotining debate. I remember that in fact he guillotined the asset sales debate.

Today the honourable member for Hinchinbrook has, in a very thorough way, pointed out the elements of the legislation and highlighted what is at stake here. I point out to the honourable minister in terms of the urgency motion that I am advised by the honourable member for Hinchinbrook that the legislation he introduced was to clarify that the Land Court actually did not have jurisdiction for that particular matter. The Land Court never had jurisdiction for that matter, and the legislation clarified that the Land Court did not have jurisdiction. Now the minister says today that this bill takes things back to the position as it was. You cannot give a court jurisdiction over something it does not have jurisdiction for. And you cannot send matters back there when the legislation says it does not have jurisdiction over them.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Deputy Premier. I am not sure—it is more likely than not—whether the Deputy Premier had a little something to do with a letter of 5 February that Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk signed to the Independent member for Nicklin. I am sure the Deputy Premier had a little something to do with that letter, signed off by the Premier. The letter clearly stated how much they were against urgency motions and that if there were to be urgency motions then consultation would occur with the crossbenchers. Mr Speaker, I am not sure whether consultation took place with you as the member for Nicklin, but there are other crossbenchers. Was appropriate consultation undertaken with the crossbench? I am not getting any indication from the minister. I suspect that is a half no from the minister. I have given him 30 seconds to confirm or deny and he has not done it, so I will take it as a denial. That letter from the Premier was the basis on which Labor formed government in Queensland after the 31 January election. That letter from the Premier set out how opposed Labor is to urgency

motions on principle and that an urgency motion would be moved in only the most extreme situation. I do not think we are dealing with the most extreme situation here.

Let me deal with the hypocrisy of the matter. As I said, there are a lot of new Labor members in this place. I raise this issue because those members, including the minister, the member for Stafford, and the Attorney-General, had a lot to say about when Campbell Newman and the LNP government moved urgency motions. We fought our case for the urgency motions and those opposite opposed them all the time because it was 'antidemocratic'. 'How dare you come in here!' I recall that they used really strong language: 'arrogance', 'hubris'. I remember all of those words. To use the same words to the Deputy Premier, how is this not arrogant? How is this not hubris? Why is it arrogance and hubris for the LNP to move an urgency motion but it is not arrogance and hubris for the Labor Party to move a similar motion?

An opposition member: Hypocrites.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. It is hypocritical. How can you have one rule for one side of parliament and one rule for the other side of parliament?

Mrs Frecklington: This is the Labor Party.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. It is the Labor Party. As I indicated, Anna Bligh and Andrew Fraser were some of the biggest users of not only urgency motions but also guillotine motions.

The other issue I have with respect to this urgency motion is that the minister has moved that this bill be passed by the end of the week. There is to be no committee deliberation. The other thing Labor Party members talk about a lot, now and over the previous three years in opposition, is the committee process: 'If bills do not go to committee, the public do not know what is going on. How can the public have a say?' I remember the Premier saying, 'How dare you deny the public the opportunity to have a say on this legislation?' I remember it. Now look at the behaviour from the Deputy Premier.

A government member interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I called her the Deputy Premier. I am happy to call her 'member for South Brisbane'. That is fine. The reason she is acting the way she is is that she knows I am right.

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection. She always does. She knows I am right. I note the silence from a lot of members who were not in parliament for the past three years and prior. They will not know the process in relation to urgency motions or how the committee system was set up—in a bipartisan way, I might add. The committee system was set up in a bipartisan way such that legislation could go off to committees—

Mrs D'Ath interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the Attorney-General with respect to bipartisanship. She was not in this parliament—she was in the federal parliament but she got voted out of office—when a bipartisan committee formed the new committee system. The idea of that new committee system—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, member for Kawana. Deputy Premier, Leader of the Opposition and member for Hinchinbrook: if you want to have a conversation I invite you to go outside. We are about to start the private members' motion debate. Actually, I ask the member for Kawana to adjourn this debate so we can commence the private member's motion debate. >

Debate, on motion of Mr Bleijie, adjourned.

~~MOTION~~

~~<Ipswich Police Communications Centre~~



~~**Mr SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs LNP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.59 pm): I move>~~

~~That this parliament supports the Ipswich police communications centre located at Yamanto and calls on the Queensland government to retain the Ipswich communications centre at its current location.~~