



RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FOURTH PARLIAMENT

Tuesday, 25 November 2014

Subject	Page
ASSENT TO BILLS	3841
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letter, dated 7 November 2014, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 7 November 2014.....	3841
REPORTS	3841
Auditor-General	3841
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 4: 2014-15— Results of audit: state public sector entities for 2013-14.	3842
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 5: 2014-15— Results of audit: hospital and health service entities 2013-14.	3842
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 6: 2014-15— Results of audit: public non-financial corporations.	3842
SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS	3842
Answers to Questions on Notice; Ministerial Responses to Petitions	3842
G20 Leaders Retreat	3842
MOTION	3842
Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders	3842
MOTION OF CONDOLENCE	3843
Goss, Mr WK	3843
PETITIONS	3855
TABLED PAPERS	3856
MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS	3861
G20 Leaders Summit	3861
Galilee Basin	3862
Overseas Trade Mission	3863
White Ribbon Day	3863
Elective Surgery, Waiting Times	3864

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 25 November 2014

G20 Leaders Summit.....	3865
G20 Leaders Summit.....	3865
ABSENCE OF MINISTER.....	3866
NOTICE OF MOTION	3866
Newman Government, Performance	3866
SPEAKER'S STATEMENT.....	3866
School Group Tours.....	3866
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3866
Government Advertising.....	3866
Member for Mermaid Beach.....	3867
G20 Leaders Summit, Small Business.....	3868
Overseas Trade Mission	3868
Galilee Basin.....	3869
Register of Lobbyists.....	3869
<i>Tabled paper: Treasurer's ministerial diary of 1 August 2013-30 August 2013, extract of</i>	
<i>Treasurer's diary of 19 August 2013 and Lobbyist Register entry for Singapore Power.....</i>	3869
Employment.....	3870
Galilee Basin.....	3871
<i>Tabled paper: Executive Council minute of 16 May 2002 regarding Treasury department</i>	
<i>investment to assist Australian Premium Coals Pty Ltd.....</i>	3871
<i>Tabled paper: Executive Council minute of 5 September 2002 regarding Department of State</i>	
<i>Development expenditure for infrastructure south of the Coppabella coal mine.....</i>	3871
Health Services.....	3871
<i>Tabled paper: Briefing paper from the Director-General, Queensland Health of 26 February 2007</i>	
<i>regarding strategic risks and opportunities—specialist outpatient services.....</i>	3872
Gladstone Hospital.....	3872
G20 Leaders Summit, Education.....	3873
Strong Choices.....	3874
G20 Leaders Summit, Tourism Industry	3874
Coal Prices.....	3875
G20 Leaders Summit, Agriculture	3875
Metro North Hospital and Health Service.....	3876
PRIVILEGE.....	3877
Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member	3877
QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE	3877
G20 Leaders Summit, Cultural Precinct.....	3877
MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST	3878
Government Advertising; Newman Government, Performance	3878
Newman, Mr C.....	3879
Liberal Party of Australia, 70th Anniversary.....	3880
Queensland Economy.....	3881
Environmental Pollution	3882
Rockhampton Hospital, Tender.....	3883
Lockyer Electorate	3884
Campbell's Camp, Brigalow.....	3885
<i>Tabled paper: Photographs depicting black residue on property at Campbell's Camp, Brigalow.</i>	3886
Garrahy, Mr M; Ted Malone Rural Skills Centre.....	3886
ABC, Funding	3887
Murrumba Electorate.....	3888
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL	3889
Message from Governor	3889
Introduction	3889
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Development Bill 2014.</i>	3889
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Development Bill 2014, explanatory notes.</i>	3889
First Reading	3892
Referral to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee	3893
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (CONSEQUENTIAL) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3893
Introduction	3893
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2014.</i>	3893
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation</i>	
<i>Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes.</i>	3893
First Reading	3893
Referral to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee	3893
PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COURT BILL	3894
Introduction	3894
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Environment Court Bill 2014.</i>	3894
<i>Tabled paper: Planning and Environment Court Bill 2014, explanatory notes.....</i>	3894
First Reading	3894
Referral to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee	3894

Table of Contents – Tuesday, 25 November 2014

PORTS BILL	3895
Introduction	3895
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ports Bill 2014	3895
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Ports Bill 2014, explanatory notes	3895
First Reading	3896
Referral to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee	3896
RETAIL SHOP LEASES AMENDMENT BILL	3896
Introduction	3896
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014	3896
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes	3896
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Government, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, <i>Report on statutory review of the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994</i>	3897
First Reading	3898
Referral to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee	3898
RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL	3898
Second Reading	3898
Consideration in Detail	3917
Clauses 1 to 34, as read, agreed to	3917
Third Reading	3917
Long Title	3917
COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY	3917
Auditor-General's Reports, Referral to Portfolio Committees	3917
Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates	3918
MOTION	3918
Newman Government, Performance	3918
Division: Question put—That the amendment be agreed to	3928
Resolved in the affirmative	3928
Division: Question put—That the motion, as amended, be agreed to	3929
Resolved in the affirmative	3929
WATER REFORM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL	3929
Second Reading	3929
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 52—Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response	3929
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Department of Natural Resources and Mines document titled 'Major water infrastructure projects—proposed changes to the approval and assessment process'	3934
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Cripps's amendments	3938
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Draft Water and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation	3938
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Queensland Government, <i>Great Barrier Reef Coastal Zone Strategic Assessment 2014: program report</i> , July 2014	3939
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Document, dated 22 November 2014, by George Houen, Landholder Services Pty Ltd, titled 'Water Reform etc. Amendment Bill'	3946
Division: Question put—That the bill be now read a second time	3965
Resolved in the affirmative	3965
ADJOURNMENT	3965
White Ribbon Day	3966
Brisbane West Wellcamp Airport; Agriculture	3966
Aspley Electorate	3967
Brown, Mr K	3967
LNP Government, Achievements	3968
Mudgeeraba Electorate, Public Transport	3969
Travel Compensation Fund; Anti-Poverty Week	3970
ABC, Funding	3970
<i>Tabled paper:</i> ABC News media article, dated 25 November 2014, titled 'ABC cuts: Managing director Mark Scott announces more than 400 jobs to go'	3970
Ipswich West Electorate, Events; White Ribbon Day	3971
Electrical Trades Union	3972
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Comments made by the member for Kallangur, Mr Trevor Ruthenberg MP, on his Facebook account	3972
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Letters, dated 20 October and 21 October 2014, to the member for Kallangur, Mr Trevor Ruthenberg MP, from the Electrical Trades Union and Hall Payne Lawyers regarding his Facebook comments	3972
<i>Tabled paper:</i> Article from the <i>Brisbane Times</i> , dated 6 March 2014, titled 'The ETU is nobody's friend'	3972
ATTENDANCE	3972


TUESDAY, 25 NOVEMBER 2014

 The Legislative Assembly met at 9.30 am.

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

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

ASSENT TO BILLS

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

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

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

Date of Assent: 7 November 2014

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Biological Control Act 1987, the Coastal Protection and Management Act 1995, the Environmental Offsets Act 2014, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Nature Conservation Act 1992, the Sustainable Planning Act 2009, the Waste Reduction and Recycling Act 2011 and the Wet Tropics World Heritage Protection and Management Act 1993 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the Acts mentioned in schedule 1"

"A Bill for An Act to provide for the holding of major events, the safety of visitors and spectators at major events, to allow visiting health practitioners to provide health care services for major events without becoming registered under State law, to protect the rights of event organisers and sponsors at major events and for related purposes, to amend this Act, the Commonwealth Games Arrangements Act 2011, the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000 and the Tobacco and Other Smoking Products Act 1998, and the Acts mentioned in schedule 1, for particular purposes, and to repeal the Motor Racing Events Act 1990 and the Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 and the Sustainable Planning Act 2009 for particular purposes, and to make consequential amendments of other Acts as stated in schedule 1 for purposes related to those particular purposes"

"A Bill for An Act to amend the Education (Accreditation of Non-State Schools) Act 2001, the Education and Care Services Act 2013, the Education (Capital Assistance) Act 1993, the Education (General Provisions) Act 2006, the Education (Queensland College of Teachers) Act 2005, the Further Education and Training Act 2014, the Industrial Relations Act 1999 and the Property Occupations Act 2014 for particular purposes, and to make minor and consequential amendments of the Acts as stated in schedule 1 for purposes related to those particular purposes"

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

Yours sincerely


Governor

7 November 2014

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 7 November 2014, from His Excellency the Governor to the Speaker advising of assent to certain bills on 7 November 2014 [[6477](#)].

REPORTS

Auditor-General

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General three reports titled *Report 4 for 2014-15, Results of audit: state public sector entities for 2013-14; Report 5 for 2014-15, Results of audit: hospital and health service entities 2013-14;* and

Report 6 for 2014-15, Results of audit: public non-financial corporations. I table the reports for the information of members.


Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 4: 2014-15—Results of audit: state public sector entities for 2013-14 [6478].

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 5: 2014-15—Results of audit: hospital and health service entities 2013-14 [6479].

Tabled paper: Auditor-General of Queensland: Report to Parliament No. 6: 2014-15—Results of audit: public non-financial corporations [6480].


SPEAKER'S STATEMENTS

Answers to Questions on Notice; Ministerial Responses to Petitions

 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, standing order 114 requires that answers to questions on notice shall be supplied to the Table Office within 30 calendar days. Where the 30th day is not a working day, the longstanding practice that has been adopted is that the answers should be provided by the next working day. An answer is deemed to be tabled when it is received by the Table Office and its receipt is noted by the Clerk or their nominee.

I wish to advise honourable members that, due to the intervening Christmas-New Year closure period, answers to questions on notice asked this sitting week are required to be supplied to the Table Office by Monday, 5 January 2015. Additionally, ministerial responses to any petitions tabled this sitting week are also required to be supplied to the Table Office by 5 pm on Monday, 5 January 2015.

G20 Leaders Retreat


 **Madam SPEAKER:** Honourable members, it seems only right that we formally note that our beautiful parliament served as the venue for the G20 Leaders Retreat on the morning of Saturday, 15 November 2014. Their arrival into the members reading room, followed by a private retreat in the red chamber, and a great Australian barbecue lunch of fine Queensland fare on the Speaker's Green was an historic occasion and the footage and photos of the House were stunning.

The parliament's guest book from the occasion bears signatures and messages from every leader present and will be a record of this visit for generations to come. It can be viewed this week in my office. This successful event was made possible by the diligent efforts of many, and I extend my thanks today to the Queensland Police Service, the Australian Defence Force, the federal G20 task force and our own Parliamentary Service. I particularly wish to acknowledge the incredible efforts of Michael Watkin, our Sergeant-at-Arms, and Darryl McCarthy, our Property Services Manager. I would also like to thank my Chief of Staff, Ruth Limkin, who did a power of work coordinating the project for parliament on my behalf.

The event was an outstanding success thanks to the hard work of everyone involved. As the QPS had requested that we keep the preparations for this event confidential, I also want to thank the parliamentary media gallery for their cooperation and discretion. The world came to meet here—that is incredibly historic—and as a state we can be proud that Queensland and Queenslanders shone.

MOTION

Suspension of Standing and Sessional Orders

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (9.35 am), by leave, without notice: I move—

That sessional order 4(2) be suspended for today's sitting to enable the motion of condolence to be moved by the Premier to be debated for more than one hour.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

MOTION OF CONDOLENCE

Goss, Mr WK



Hon. CKT NEWMAN (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (9.35 am): I move—

1. That this House desires to place on record its appreciation of the services rendered to this state by the late Wayne Keith Goss, a former member of the Parliament of Queensland, Premier of Queensland and Minister of the Crown.
2. That Madam Speaker be requested to convey to the family of the deceased gentleman the above resolution, together with an expression of the sympathy and sorrow of the members of the Parliament of Queensland, in the loss they have sustained.

Wayne Keith Goss was born in Mundubbera on 26 February 1951 and after his family moved to Brisbane he was educated at the Inala state and high schools. Following his secondary education, Wayne studied at the University of Queensland and attained a law degree. In 1968, Wayne commenced work as a solicitor in private practice and in 1974 joined the Aboriginal Legal Service. He later became a partner in his own legal firm and was also involved with the Labor Lawyers Association, serving for a time as the association's president.

I note that Wayne's father was politically active in the Australian Labor Party, having founded the party's Inala branch. So perhaps it was inevitable that Wayne would seek to enter parliament one day. In 1983 Wayne was preselected by the ALP to contest the seat of Salisbury in this place. The member for Salisbury at that time was Rosemary Kyburz, who had held the seat for the Liberal Party since 1974. At the state election of October 1983 Wayne defeated Mrs Kyburz, and he took his place in this chamber as the new member for Salisbury. Upon entering the parliament, Wayne was immediately elevated to the opposition front bench, serving as opposition spokesman on lands, forestry and police. In May 1985 he became opposition spokesman on justice. I also note for the record that Wayne served as a member of the parliament's Privileges Committee from 1983 to 1987 and was a member of the Standing Orders Committee from 1988 to 1995.

Following an electoral redistribution in 1986, Wayne decided to contest the recreated seat of Logan, instead of Salisbury, at the 1986 state election. He was successfully elected to the seat of Logan at that state election and continued to serve in that seat until he decided to retire at the state election of June 1998, after having continually served for almost 15 years as a member of this House.

In March 1988, Wayne took over the leadership of the ALP from the then member for Sandgate, Nev Warburton, and also became Leader of the Opposition. Any student of Queensland's political history will know that these were interesting and dynamic times. Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen's long run of almost 20 years as Premier had not long come to an end, a new Premier, Mike Ahern, was in office and the Fitzgerald commission of inquiry was running.

In September 1989, Russell Cooper took over from Mike Ahern as Premier and on 2 November Premier Cooper visited the Governor to seek a dissolution of the Legislative Assembly for an election to be held on 2 December. After a hard-fought election campaign and under the strong leadership of Wayne the ALP was swept into office for the first time in 32 years. This, of course, must have been a particularly proud moment for Wayne and I am sure he relished the challenges ahead.

On 7 December 1989, Wayne was formally sworn in as Queensland's 34th Premier. He also took on the portfolios of minister for economic and trade development and minister for the arts. The Goss government was returned to office at the state elections of 1992 and 1995, albeit with only a one-seat majority in 1995.

Following a decision by the judge of the Court of Disputed Returns in December 1995, a new election for the electoral district of Mundingburra was ordered. The election was held on 3 February 1996, and the seat was won by Frank Tanti of the Liberal Party. This put the Goss government into minority and, following a decision by the then, and still current, member for Gladstone, a change of government took place, with Wayne resigning the premiership of Queensland on 19 February 1996. Rob Borbidge was sworn in as Premier, and on the following day the parliament voted its confidence in the new Borbidge government.

While changes of government can take place in Westminster systems without a general election, when one now looks back, that this was able to happen in Queensland in such a relatively smooth way is testament to Wayne Goss and the other political leaders of the time. I think that the

words Rob Borbidge used about Wayne during that February 1996 confidence motion debate are quite instructive. When it comes to Wayne Goss, they point to the mark of the man. Rob Borbidge said of Wayne Goss—

At the outset, I would congratulate and personally thank the member for Logan for the manner in which he has conducted the ongoing processes of the transition of Government. Over recent days, he has fulfilled what are clearly unhappy duties with considerable dignity and considerable courtesy. I fully appreciate there are some within the member's own party who regret that he has not been politically more aggressive. I say to them that I share the member for Logan's view that both the office he has vacated, and the Parliament which underpinned his authority, has been better served by his statesmanlike approach. For that I thank him and wish him well in the future.


Wayne Goss was a true leader who guided Queensland through turbulent times not only upon taking office in 1989 but upon leaving office in 1996. He was—and I wholeheartedly believe this—a true statesman. In government he drove much needed reform in many aspects of Queensland's public life including social policy, electoral laws and reform of the Police Service and the broader Public Service. He did so with tenacity, determination and steely courage. These attributes were also very much at the forefront as he battled cancer so bravely over recent years.

After leaving the parliament, Wayne Goss carved out a highly successful business career. He also served for many years as Chairman of the Queensland Art Gallery Board of Trustees. Wayne's contribution to the arts in Queensland was immense.

Wayne's place in Queensland's history is assured. His contribution will never be forgotten. For the record, I firmly agree with his statement, or question, in 1996—Wayne Goss did leave Queensland a better place.

Wayne Keith Goss passed away on 10 November 2014 at the very young age of 63, and a public memorial service to celebrate his life was held at the Gallery of Modern Art, South Brisbane, on 21 November 2014. It was a fitting memorial service to celebrate Wayne's life, and it was my singular honour to have been in attendance.

I place on record the government's thanks for the years of service Wayne gave to the institutions of our democracy and to the Queensland community. On behalf of Queensland, I take this opportunity to extend my sympathy and that of this House to Wayne's wife, Roisin, their children, Ryan and Caitlin, and his other family and friends.

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (9.43 am): Madam Speaker, it is an honour and a privilege to be the leader of the parliamentary Labor Party and stand here today to pay tribute to one of Queensland's great Labor premiers, Wayne Goss.

Last Friday I attended the public memorial service for Wayne Goss. That service, organised by the Goss family, touched on the many aspects of Wayne's life. It was a fitting and loving tribute from friends, family and associates that gave us insights into his three careers—the law, politics and business—as well as his life dedicated to his family. It says a lot about Wayne, his talents and application that he was able to build three careers and to leave a record of achievement in each.

Wayne Goss was born in Mundubbera in 1951 where his parents, Allan and Norma, had moved to from Brisbane to run a barber's shop they had bought. The family spent 18 months there before moving to Maryborough and then back to Brisbane. Allan opened a barber shop on the Gold Coast and later one at Annerley. The family secured a housing commission home at Inala and moved there at the end of 1955. Allan later opened a barber shop in the local Inala Civic Centre.

For many reasons Wayne Goss became an inspiration to me as he was to many others who grew up in Inala and Durack or nearby. As the member for Inala, I have often told local children of Wayne's life in our community and the things he went on to achieve. Wayne grew up there in vastly different times, with vastly different services and opportunities—more correctly, a lack of services and opportunities. His story is truly inspirational and many locals look to it as an example for themselves and their children. The idea of a young boy growing up in Inala, going to local state primary and high schools and later studying and practising law then sitting in state parliament and leading our state holds lessons for all Queenslanders.

Wayne became an articled clerk after high school with a Brisbane law firm and began studying law part-time at the University of Queensland. This was the start of his first career—the law. He went on to work for other firms and to become a partner in his own firm. He helped form the Aboriginal Legal Service and regularly gave free advice to its clients. His legal career and devotion to social justice set him on a collision course with the autocratic governments of Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen. Sir Joh's attacks on civil liberties, trade unions, Indigenous Australians and even churches marked and marred our state's reputation on the national and international stage during the 1970s and 1980s.

For someone with such a well-developed social conscience, Wayne's progression from lawyer to politician was a logical step. At Inala, Wayne's father had been involved in the Labor Party and that interest naturally coloured Wayne's outlook as a child growing up in a community with few government services. In his book *Goss: A Political Biography*, journalist Jamie Walker quotes Wayne as saying, 'Inala was Labor and we were Labor and that was it.'

Wayne grew up in a family that lived and breathed Labor values. Central to that was the dignity of work. In a 1994 interview with the ABC he stated that in the area that he grew up there was nothing more important to working people than the dignity of having a job and being able to support yourself and your own family. He added that having a job was 'a very important form of social justice'. That was a view that helped shape him as a youth and helped shape the government that he led. His outlook was one of self-reliance and hard work, but it was also one that recognised the need for a helping hand when people needed it.

His father worked hard to build a business to support his large family and to widen the opportunities available to them. Jamie Walker's book notes that when the Goss children came home from school their mother, Norma, would point them to their bedrooms and direct them to do their homework before playing. That attitude was clearly reflected in Wayne's own approach to life. Those who knew Wayne knew he could play hard, but he worked even harder.

At the 1983 state election he worked hard to be elected as the member for Salisbury—a seat then held by the Liberal Party. Despite that election being fought in the wake of the coalition split, the result in Salisbury was close and the count was not finalised for several weeks. But once he arrived in this House his talent was recognised and he went straight to the opposition front bench as shadow minister for police. In that role he used his legal knowledge and contacts within and outside the profession to maintain constant pressure on the Bjelke-Petersen government and various ministers.

In this House in opposition, just as in government, Wayne Goss showed a respect for standards of accountability that were then missing from the government in this state. His attacks on certain ministers often revolved around pecuniary interests, shady deals, favoured treatment for cronies and other forms of injustice. When he set out to pursue a particular minister he mounted logical, well-researched and evidence based arguments. It was those standards that he applied to his work in opposition and later in government.

In this House Wayne Goss showed the same hard work and dedication that was evident in his other careers. He also demonstrated as both opposition leader and Premier a mastery of the theatre of parliament, helped along by his youthful interest and involvement in amateur dramatics. Just as a maestro conducts an orchestra, Wayne conducted this parliament. He had an unmistakable presence and commanded this place, both inside this chamber and in the corridors outside.

At the 1986 election Wayne ran for the seat of Logan and in March 1988, fewer than five years after arriving here, was elected opposition leader. When Wayne took over as leader, Labor was far from certain to win the election due in 1989. While the Fitzgerald inquiry played a role in turning people off the ruling party, nothing was certain and Wayne took nothing for granted. Daily replays of the sordid evidence presented to Commissioner Tony Fitzgerald alarmed Queenslanders but could have only so much political impact. Labor still had to get its own house in order to present itself as a viable alternative government. It also faced the handicap of a rorted electoral system.

It is difficult for those who were not there to understand the political climate at the time. In Sir Joh Bjelke-Petersen, the Labor Party had for many years been up against a government and a Premier who had grown arrogant from their lengthy time in office, aided and abetted by a warped electoral system. We had a government that was constantly on the attack—attacking those who disagreed with it, attacking unions for standing up for their members, attacking Canberra, attacking environmentalists, civil libertarians and even religious leaders.

Labor's victory in 1989 was largely the result of the hard work of Wayne Goss and the team he put together. For that victory alone he has every right to be regarded as a genuine Labor hero. Those of us who were there will always remember that historic win. We will always recall the elation that victory caused across the Queensland community, not just in Labor ranks. Queenslanders recognised change was needed and they trusted Wayne to deliver that change.

Labor's win under Wayne Goss represented a new start for our state, with the sweeping away of the complacency, corruption, low standards, and shoddy practices that had become the norm for government in our state. That victory was due in large part to Wayne's leadership that was built on innovative policies, hard work and the thoughtful yet disciplined approach to everything he did. Wayne took Labor into government after our party had spent 32 years on the opposition benches. He did it by

inspiring a coalition of voters broad enough to overcome the handicap of the rorted electoral boundaries that had previously held Labor back. As he himself put it that night, Labor's victory meant 'the end of the Bjelke-Petersen era'.

His governments set about implementing a wide range of reforms and changed Queensland to become a state that was vibrant, productive, and respected throughout Australia and overseas. But leading our party out of the wilderness at the 1989 election after 32 years on the opposition benches is just part of his political legacy. His governments were marked by a dedication to fairness and to helping those who needed a hand.

Wayne's own experience at school in Inala shaped his dedication to improving our state's education system and delivering more and better resources. At Inala State High School, he joined the basketball team. Last Friday his daughter, Caitlin, related a story to me of how Wayne's team had once won a major game. In any other school that would not have been remarked upon, except that at Inala State High School in those days there was no basketball hoop let alone a basketball court. This no doubt led to his desire to improve the facilities at state schools across our state, and not just academic facilities. He believed that what young Queenslanders learned on the sports field played an important part in shaping their lives just as much as what they learned in the classroom. Indeed, as Premier he scuttled a plan for a new government office block. If there were spare dollars to spend, he said, they should be spent on junior sport.

Wayne was well known for his love of rugby league, the Broncos and the Queensland Maroons. He was often seen at Lang Park for the big clashes, sitting in the outer and barracking along with other Queenslanders. Many of his government's achievements in education as well as health, the arts, and the environment were ground breaking. In addition to reforms and initiatives in a range of portfolio areas, Wayne Goss also had an unwavering commitment to accountability and transparency in the dealings of government. This was a refreshing change after decades of maladministration.

After taking Labor into office by winning 24 seats to hold 54 of 89 in this House, Wayne said Labor's message to voters had been a simple one: 'We basically said that we can as a community build a better society, one that is based on a commitment to honest standards and higher integrity in public life.' Those are the basic, simple standards all of us in this House should, and must, abide by.

Wayne Goss himself acknowledged the blueprint for reform delivered by the Fitzgerald inquiry. But it is easy to implement structures or empty gestures to give the impression of accountability. It is another thing altogether to demand and adhere to strict standards—standards imposed for one reason: that they are the right thing to do. Wayne Goss enjoyed two full terms in office as Premier, but in that time he helped change our state forever and for the better. At his farewell news conference as Premier, Wayne said he hoped he had left Queensland a better place. His record in office answers that question.

Wayne Goss left behind a long list of achievements. Other members in the House will mention some of those, but I want to mention his concern for our state's natural environment. Goss governments implemented a raft of protections to safeguard our environment including the creation of many national parks, increased heritage protections and stronger antipollution laws. He also played a role in establishing the Wet Tropics Management Authority in the Far North. Wayne once told a friend that one of his proudest achievements had been to end logging on Fraser Island and to see it listed on the World Heritage register.

At last Friday's memorial service we heard from people who were both his friends and political colleagues: people such as QUT Vice-Chancellor Peter Coaldrake, University of Melbourne Vice-Chancellor Glyn Davis and former minister Matt Foley. Business colleague Giam Swiegers reminded us of Wayne's third career in the business world—as national chair of Deloitte, chair of engineering firm Ausenco, chair of Free TV Australia and other directorships. It was very fitting for the service to be held at the Gallery of Modern Art given Wayne's role in its development as chair of the Queensland Art Gallery Board of Trustees.


In the time I have occupied this seat in this chamber there are many times I have drawn inspiration from Wayne and the governments he led and from his time as opposition leader. I was very pleased Wayne made time after the 2012 election to meet me and discuss the way forward for our party after such a shattering defeat. As always, his mind was on the future and was not dwelling on the past. As always, he had very clear ideas and expressed them simply and directly. As always, he wanted to help others and sought no recognition or return for himself.

My meeting with Wayne as party leader in 2012 was a far cry from one of my first encounters back in 1990, six months after he became Premier. Then as President of Queensland Young Labor I attended a barbecue here on level 7 of the Annexe. Wayne was hosting the event, and as we waited in the foyer we were amazed to see him jog past in his running gear and into the lift. It was not something we had expected to see and certainly something we would never have seen from previous premiers like Russell Cooper or Mike Ahern, let alone Sir Joh.

With the passing of Wayne Goss, the Labor Party has lost a true hero and Queensland has lost one of its truly great leaders. Next week on 2 December Labor Party supporters will mark the 25th anniversary of the election of the Goss government. We will also mark the anniversary of the election of the Whitlam government in 1972. Gough Whitlam and Wayne Goss were elected to lead their governments 17 years apart. It is sad to note that both died this year within weeks of each other. While Gough almost made a century, tragically, Wayne's life was cut short at just 63.

Those who knew him are in no doubt that in other circumstances he would have had much more to do and much more to give to our community, our state and our nation. But what he did for us was to lift the standards of government and to lift the standards Queenslanders expect of their governments. He set benchmarks that endure and by which subsequent governments have been, and will continue to be, measured. As former Deputy Prime Minister Wayne Swan has remarked, Wayne Goss was a breakthrough political leader who dragged Queensland into the sunlight after 32 years in the darkness. Wayne Goss and the governments he led changed our state forever and for the better. Current and future generations of Queenslanders will reap the rewards.

As we walk the halls of Parliament House, let us remember those who walked them before us. Let us remember those like Wayne Goss, who gave us hope, opportunity, and inspiration, who returned sunshine to the moonlight state and who built a modern and confident Queensland. Today is our chance to answer Wayne's own question and to thank him for leaving Queensland a better place. On behalf of all members of the House, the Queensland parliamentary Labor Party, the broader Labor movement and all Queenslanders, Wayne Goss, we thank you. We thank you for your legacy. We thank you for what you have provided to our state. Our thoughts and condolences are to Roisin, Ryan, Caitlin, Wayne's mother, Norma, and their families.

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (9.59 am): Often the passing of a family member, a friend or a colleague is time for sombre reflection. We celebrate the life that was and the joy shared with the departed over a rich and full life. I have no doubt that Mrs Goss and the entire Goss family are left with the cherished memory of their loved and lost. Behind every member of parliament is a strong family supporting them every step of the way. It is something that is indistinguishable between political allegiances. The love and support we receive from our families is what gives us strength as we serve the people of our community. So as we pay tribute to this man, I take a moment to pay my respects to his wife, Roisin; his son, Ryan; and his daughter, Caitlin. I am sure that your love and support throughout Mr Goss's career and his life was valuable to him in ways we can only imagine.


My honourable colleagues have paid tribute to Mr Goss's time as Premier. Despite holding high office, like Premier Newman, Mr Goss was a tireless advocate for the needs and concerns of those from his own electorate. Putting the people of Logan first, Mr Goss always found time to stay connected with the people from our neighbourhood. I know all too well the great feeling Mr Goss would have felt during his time in parliament. The honour of representing the great electorate of Logan and being immersed in our vibrant and diverse community is a privilege that few have been able to experience. Mr Goss would be very proud of how far Logan has come and the potential that currently lies before us.

Over the past two years, when meeting with community groups and organisations that are the bedrock of our greater Logan community, it has been apparent that Mr Goss's legacy is still favourably remembered by many Logan residents. Many of Mr Goss's achievements whilst in office are seen throughout Logan every day. While our community continues to grow, the contribution he made to our community will never be forgotten.

It is said that Mr Goss turned Queensland into the sunshine state, but he did more than that. He gave later generations, our generations and those to come the ability to turn Queensland into a great state. In my maiden speech I quoted Mr Goss when he said, 'I think anybody who has the opportunity to get into government finds that if you apply yourself in a positive and diligent way there is much that can be achieved to transform a community or make changes that affect people.' Those

words sum up the ethos of Mr Goss's commitment to the people of his electorate and the people of Queensland. With the same passion that saw him serve the people of Logan for several years, his hardworking attitude would extend well into his post parliamentary career.

His impact in Logan and throughout Queensland will always be remembered. On behalf of the people of Logan, I pass on our sincerest condolences to the family. Thank you and God bless.

 **Hon. TS MULHERIN** (Mackay—ALP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (10.02 am): Quite simply, Wayne Goss was one of the great political leaders of our time: a man of integrity, a man of vision, a true servant of the people who put the interests of Queensland before his own interests and a man whose legacy benefits every single one of us in this House and in every corner of our state. The tributes from political allies and political foes alike are a testament to his impact and influence. It is clear to all that he was a man for his time, and what a time it was! Queensland needed an intelligent, honourable, fair, honest, hardworking and trustworthy leader to deliver it from the darkest period of political scandal, and in Wayne Goss it found the human embodiment of those virtues.

In paying respects and delivering my tribute to one of our greatest Premiers, I would like to share some personal recollections to illustrate his character and sacrifice. I first met Wayne Goss in 1986 in Mackay where I had organised a seminar on social justice and corruption. One of the guests was Father Brian Gore, a Columban missionary from the Philippines. Wayne was passionate about the need to reform public administration. It was one of his reasons for devoting his life to public service, and I believe no-one could have done more to rebuild the public trust in the workings of our democracy.

I remember when we went to reform the Proserpine branch of the Labor Party in 1988, because Whitsunday was a vital seat for us to win government in 1989. The meeting was held on Father's Day and that troubled the local matriarch of the Labor Party, the late Vera McLennan. Vera told Wayne that he should be at home with his family celebrating Father's Day and Wayne said something to the effect of, 'Vera, I'd love to do that. I would love to be at home with my family, but we have an election to win.' In order to deliver a better Queensland for all Queenslanders there was no personal sacrifice he would not make, and we won Whitsunday with Lorraine Bird winning by 12 votes.

Wayne also had a profound impact on my personal conduct. We were having a beer one day and he told me that when he entered parliament he had a small share portfolio, which he immediately divested so there could be no reason for a perceived conflict of interest in any of the decisions he made. Throughout his political career he had no shareholdings. So in 1995 when I became a member of parliament, I followed his example. Neither I nor my wife has owned shares for the nearly 20 years that I have been a member of this House.


Throughout my political career I have had the benefit of his guidance and wise counsel and, perhaps even more importantly, his example. Twice a year he would give me a call and say, 'Brother Wayne here.' He would continue to take an interest in the ups and downs of his former parliamentary colleagues and to offer his support and advice when it was sought. As a regional MP, I believe one of his greatest achievements while in power was to introduce a standard to guide minimum levels of service in all the various and far-flung regions of our state. After decades of centralisation it was Wayne Goss who told regional communities that they were entitled to the health and education and community services that we now expect and take for granted. Before he was Premier, people who lived in regional Queensland were poor second cousins to those in Brisbane. His reforms allowed successive governments to build on the regional services established by his administration. Of course, his reforms touched every aspect of public administration to repair a state damaged by corruption. But the reforms would not have been so effective if he himself had failed to set the very high standards of integrity.

His achievements in so many areas have stood the test of time. They are with us today. His overhaul of relationships between those who hold political power and those who administer justice was vital. I am proud to say that it was the Goss government that introduced the Criminal Justice Commission. There have been many iterations of it since and it remains a fundamental principle of Queensland democracy to have an independent crime-fighting body to ensure the parliament and the executive behave appropriately.

He did not falter. He gave Queensland a marvellous gift, the gift of finally being able to believe in itself. I will always remember Wayne Goss as a politician without equal in the standards he set, a politician without equal in the integrity he displayed, a politician without equal in the sacrifices he

made. I will also remember a man with a great sense of humour. An example of that was when he was recalling his time in office after 20 years. In an interview with the ABC he referred to the Labor opposition having had 32 successful years in opposition. So he had that sort of wicked sense of humour. He was a man who loved rock and roll—the Rolling Stones in particular—he was a man who loved rugby league and he was a man who cared more about other people than himself. Wayne Goss commanded the love of his family, friends, community, colleagues, the ALP and the broader Labor movement. I know how much he will be missed by his wife, Roisin; his children, Ryan and his partner and Caitlin and her partner; his mother, Norma; his sisters and brother. My thoughts and prayers are with them at this time of great loss. They know that they can take comfort that the man they loved so dearly was so deeply appreciated by so many Queenslanders. The respect has been on display throughout Queensland in recent weeks.

Wayne Goss took a broken Queensland, a disgraced political system and made our state a far better place for us all. For all of those reasons, and as the last Labor member in this House who was a member of the Goss government, I would like to place on record my appreciation for his life and his legacy to Queensland.

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (10.10 am): Today we celebrate the life of a remarkable Queenslanders who was a member of this parliament and Queensland Premier who lost his life decades too early. I will not stand here today and pretend that I agreed with Wayne Goss and his government on all occasions. That would be a feeble attempt to rewrite history and disingenuous to the official record of this place. I do stand here, though, as someone who was privileged to serve in this place with Wayne Goss from the moment that he was elected Premier on 2 December 1989 until his graceful, exemplary and dignified voluntary retirement from this place on 13 June 1998.

Witnessing Wayne Goss galvanised in my mind that not all of the good players are on your team. To know Wayne Goss was to respect him. In my quarter of a century in this place his extraordinary intellect has been unparalleled. His grasp of policy, assimilation and attention to detail were second to none. The melding together of these outstanding personal traits with his strengths as a clear and powerful orator made him a most formidable parliamentarian and Premier. To this day many of his former cabinet colleagues will attest to the terror which pervaded them as they presented their proposals to cabinet. His standards were such that he had a low tolerance level of mediocrity and lack of preparation. He generally knew more about what was proposed in detail than the sponsoring minister.


Wayne Goss was a true conviction parliamentarian. I doubt that he made too many, if any, public policy decisions which he did not believe in or because its only trait was public popularity. His government was formidable, hungry, and enthusiastic, motivated by 32 years in opposition, jousting it out with a diminished yet solid opposition which was reluctantly adjusting to the reality of opposition wilderness after a similar time in government. The debates were fascinating, the characters colourful and the passions strident. It was a clash of political greats' minds and souls unlike anything I have witnessed since.

His government was one that departed from the traditional mould of Labor with a strong level of fiscal discipline. Many a time I would encounter Wayne in the lift cooling down after a long run. He was a fitness fanatic, a svelte and trim figure—a runner—a rare sight amongst MPs at the time. He was a dedicated reformer with views and determinations which were honed through his involvement in the passionate political cauldron that existed at the time: the civil liberties debates, the social reform battles, the electoral reform debates and the accountability reform debates.

Another mark of his character was that in his 15 years in this place I cannot recollect one occasion where there was a serious matter of his conduct or lack of probity which was levelled personally against him. He was a cleanskin when he came into this place and he was a cleanskin when he left this place, which is an accolade that very few can claim. No government that has ever governed has pleased everyone or, for that matter, made decisions which benefited everyone. Similarly, no government has ever made decisions which have not adversely affected someone. No government is infallible and, like all, his government suffered from the adverse consequences of controversial policy decisions which alienated significant portions of the Queensland population.

Wayne Goss was a decent and dignified person. He maintained a level of decorum and discretion which few former leaders display after he gracefully exited the Queensland parliament. His conduct and tenor did the office of Premier proud. He was a great Queenslanders who leaves a positive legacy for our great state. He exemplified the best of our democratic institutions. I express my

personal sympathies and condolences to Wayne's family and friends. They can be comforted in their grief knowing with great pride that his exemplary service is recognised and appreciated by Queenslanders from all walks of life.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (10.15 am): Madam Speaker, just as so many were, I was shocked to hear the news of the passing of Wayne Goss. So, too, were my mother and father. Wayne achieved some terrific reforms during his time as Premier. He was a true friend to the Pitt family. My father, Warren Pitt, had the honour of serving with Wayne Goss in his cabinet as minister for business, industry and regional development and later in the Beattie and Bligh cabinets also. Dad was proud to serve as a minister in his government because he believed Wayne Goss was a man of integrity, a man of compassion and a man of fairness. He said that Wayne was a hard taskmaster, but he never asked anyone to do anything that he would not do himself. During dad's long battle with cancer Wayne Goss was a frequent visitor who was ever ready to boast of the virtues of the Brisbane Broncos as they beat dad's team St George. Dad was proud to attend the memorial service that was held last week for Wayne.

Members of this House would know that in politics not everyone will always agree with you, but Wayne Goss listened, he consulted and he won the respect of those around him and of Queenslanders in general. Wayne Goss was a true Queensland great, and he has earned his place as a Labor icon. He did so much to modernise the state of Queensland, bringing Labor back into office after 32 years of conservative rule. He put an end to a period in which Queensland was often the butt of cruel jokes. He put an end to decades of corruption and a belief by other Australians that the state was firmly stuck in the past.

Under his leadership Wayne Goss saw a renaissance in the arts, in governance and in education and social equality. Wayne Goss delivered Queensland from the gerrymander when not all votes were equal. In my electorate of Mulgrave his legacy still has impacts today and many constituents, even those who are welded-on conservatives, freely admit that Wayne Goss did leave Queensland a better place for his time in office. Wayne Goss emerged to take our state to the forefront of reform, and he set a new standard in ethical behaviour. He was, as his election ad said, 'A new force for the good of Queensland.'

Wayne Goss rose to the top of his profession but never once forgot his roots and the people who helped him achieve so much. From his working class background in Inala he forged a strong career in the law before reaching the highest office in Queensland as Premier in 1989. He wasted no time in changing Queensland forever: the imperial honours system became a relic of the past; he restored fairness to our electoral system by ending the gerrymander; he implemented the recommendations of the Fitzgerald inquiry; he abolished the infamous Special Branch; he decriminalised homosexuality; and he later lifted the ban on free association to allow street marches. Wayne Goss tightened gun laws during comprehensive licensing well before the Port Arthur massacre prompted others into action.

When it comes to the environment, he stopped logging in our state forests and safeguarded our natural environment, including creating many national parks. Protections for heritage buildings were increased. In Far North Queensland Wayne Goss established the Wet Tropics Management Authority and his government introduced a state version of Aboriginal land rights. Every region in Queensland shared in his concept of decentralisation as he oversaw a massive public works program: schools, hospitals, police stations and courthouses. He introduced freedom of information laws, the precursor to our right to information laws, as well as laws about employment equality, antidiscrimination provisions and judicial review for administrative decisions.

From an economic standpoint, as Premier, Wayne Goss—in partnership with the then member for Cairns and Treasurer Keith De Lacy—oversaw six budgets that provided major increases in areas like health and education and addressed historic inequalities in pay for police, teachers and nurses. Having a Premier like Wayne Goss and a Treasurer from Far North Queensland meant that my part of the state enjoyed unprecedented attention, and the capital works program was a reflection of this. He reformed the Public Service to ensure that appointments were based on merit, not cronyism.

From a personal standpoint I have a couple of vivid memories of Wayne Goss. When I was 12 years old I attended my first ever State of Origin game at Lang Park, which was a big deal for a kid from Gordonvale in Far North Queensland. At this particular game my dad and I sat next to Wayne Goss in the stands. We were later to feature on an ALP campaign TV ad.

What happened was Queensland had scored and, clearly, obviously the post-try celebration made for great pictures, with fist-pumping and crowd cheering. It was a magic moment, but I am not sure what was more exciting at the time: the Maroons scoring a big try or sitting next to the future Premier of the state. I think I was going for the Maroons at that time.


A friend of mine reminded me of another time, when Wayne Goss visited our primary school. At that time, in around 1988, I understand that he was not actually allowed to visit our school, such was the regime at the time. Wayne smiled as he showed us a clearly aged book that was still in the library. It said, 'One day, man will walk on the moon.' Two years later there were computers and new books. That says everything about Queensland before and after Wayne Goss.

On another personal note, I got to spend some time with Wayne prior to the 1995 state election, at that time doing some work on the then proposed Cape York wilderness zone policy. I recall that David Barbagallo, the now CEO of Endeavour Foundation, was an ALP organiser at the time and he was providing us great company on the road. But when night came there was time to sit and enjoy some quiet conversation. It was during this time that Wayne Goss gave me some great life advice. He said, 'You never want to be pigeonholed into one career. In your life you will have many careers.' In his case he was right, being in the law, politics and later achieving in the business world after attaining his MBA. In my life thus far it has meant working in radio, in the cinema and film industry and in the Public Service before entering parliament. I do plan on having other careers besides political life but, hopefully, much to the disappointment of those opposite I am sure, those other careers will be many years down the track.

This time next week will be 2 December, marking the 25th anniversary of Labor being returned to government in Queensland. This is a feat that would not have been possible if it were not for Wayne Goss and his drive. He was a man defined by the values that he lived by and he inspired those values in others. Wayne was certainly a breath of fresh air and certainly a man of energy and integrity. He took Queensland from a parochial backwater to a powerhouse. Wayne Goss has inspired a generation of politicians, me included, to strive for the highest standards of accountability in government, to aspire to achieve reform and the ideal of public service as its own reward.

But for all of his achievements in life and in politics, above all Wayne Goss was a devoted family man. In return, his family was devoted to him. His wife, Roisin, captivated the hearts of all who met her as she travelled around the state supporting her husband and his work, for which she shared an equal dedication.


After a long battle with ill health, Wayne Goss passed away on 10 November 2014 at the age of 63. I know that I speak on behalf of my entire family when I say that our thoughts are with Wayne's mother, with Roisin and with their children, Ryan and Caitlin. We cannot fully grasp the magnitude of their loss but in some small way we understand, and our thoughts are with them at this very sad time.

 **Mr JOHNSON** (Gregory—LNP) (10.22 am): I rise today to offer my condolences to Mrs Roisin Goss, her son, Ryan, and daughter, Caitlin. Wayne Keith Goss was a shy, witty man for those who knew him. While I did not agree with all of his policy initiatives, Wayne Goss was a hard-line leader. He was a man who was decisive, who stood by what he believed in and who drove his party the way he wanted it to be driven.

Wayne Goss was a masterpiece to watch as he and Rob Borbidge went toe to toe in this place in many a debate. In my life I have never witnessed two better orators and two better debaters than Wayne Goss and Rob Borbidge in this chamber. It was an honour to sit in this chamber and watch Wayne Goss in his early days as he took his beloved Labor Party forward for the six years he was Premier. There was one thing I always respected about Wayne Goss. He was a man who made some unfortunate mistakes—haven't we all?—but he was an intelligent, articulate man. As the Premier said this morning in his speech on this condolence motion, Wayne Goss as Premier was a statesman.

Whilst a lot of us did not agree with Mr Goss's policy initiatives and what his party did, it was his and his government's prerogative, as part of the free democratic society we live in, to go forward under the weight of votes that he got in 1989 to implement his policies. That is what the democratic system is all about. It was very informative and a very fruitful part of my life to be able to witness men of the calibre of Wayne Goss as he performed his duties not only as Premier but also as the leader of Queensland.

Whilst Wayne might have portrayed a hard and direct line at times, his beautiful wife, Roisin, portrayed that soft, sweet face of the beautiful woman that she is. I say to Roisin, Ryan and Caitlin at this sad time: on behalf of myself and the people of my electorate, my thoughts and prayers are with you.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (10.25 am): It is with much sadness but a sense of intense honour that I rise in this House as a Labor member to contribute to this condolence motion and pay tribute to a man who changed our state for the better: Wayne Goss. May I at the outset express my deep condolences to Roisin, Caitlin, Ryan, Norma, and Wayne's siblings, who on 10 November lost a husband, a father, a son and a brother.

Last Friday's memorial service was in equal parts a dignified and loving goodbye for family and friends and an uplifting and inspirational tribute to a man who, with great courage and discipline, challenged a government unbeaten in office for 32 years and won. No Queenslander of my vintage or older can ever forget this moment in our history. No Queenslander can deny or underestimate how significant and central Wayne Goss's leadership was to that Labor election victory in 1989. And it would only be an ill-informed individual who would seek to diminish or downplay the critical role that Wayne Goss played in dragging Queensland into the modern age after more than three decades of corrupt, nonsensical and backward-looking National Party rule.

At the time, being very young, I readily admit that I lacked a full appreciation of Wayne's reformist agenda and its long-term implications for Queensland and everyday Queenslanders. However, over the last 2½ years as the member for South Brisbane I have been constantly reminded of Wayne's courage and his lasting legacy to our state and our city.

Only last year I attended the 40-year anniversary of Aboriginal controlled community organisations in Queensland. Aboriginal elders there spoke with great respect for the work done by Wayne and others, including Wayne's long-term close mate and former Attorney-General Matt Foley, in contributing to the establishment of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Legal Service in Queensland.

Wayne was a passionate advocate against discrimination, and in his first speech in this House, when railing against the continued enactment of the notoriously discriminatory Aborigines Act and Torres Strait Islanders Act, Wayne said—

No single group has been more discriminated against by this Government than the Aboriginal and Islander people.

...

There is a manifest need to end this paternalistic administration and to replace it with legislation that allows for secure land rights, effective community participation and local government by Aboriginal and Islander communities. All citizens, be they migrants or indigenous people, should be protected by legislation from discrimination on the basis of race.

He went on further to say—

The majority sector of our community is women. Discrimination against women is similarly untouched by Queensland law, yet there is abundant evidence that Queensland women do not enjoy full equality of opportunity in regard to matters of employment, superannuation and even access to credit.


Wayne did not take a step backwards after his 1989 election victory in delivering antidiscrimination and equal opportunity laws and enacting the legal framework to enable the realisation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander land rights in Queensland. He also went on to establish the Office for the Status of Women. As one of the first acts of his government, Wayne decriminalised homosexuality and, shockingly, released from prison those who still remained incarcerated for their sexuality in 1989.

In my advocacy for my local community, which has been fighting against the unfettered and uncivilised overdevelopment of the Kurilpa precinct, I have been reminded repeatedly that our much celebrated and much loved South Bank would never have existed had it not been for Wayne Goss. The plans for the old Expo site were much the same as the plans for Kurilpa, but Wayne delivered to our city a massive expanse of public parkland that plays a central role in representing our identity as a modern, cosmopolitan and subtropical metropolis. Labor members have already paid tribute to the enormous amount done by Goss and his government to give Queensland's environment modern, effective environmental protection laws, including the Environmental Protection Act which we, as legislators, still rely on today; an end to logging on Fraser Island and its eventual World Heritage listing; Wet Tropics World Heritage management; heritage protection; nature conservation; the enlargement of our national park estate; and, importantly, delivering balance between developers and community litigants in the Planning and Environment Court. Wayne's achievements and contributions to our built and natural environment are the foundation of modern, sustainable environmental management in Queensland.

In the area of the arts, Wayne's passion and achievements are second to none. That his memorial service was held in the Gallery of Modern Art is fitting not only because of his long tenure and hard work on the Art Gallery Board of Trustees but also because GoMA would never have been built had his government not bought the land on which our popular and iconic gallery is built. With regard to the successful 20-year Asia Pacific triennial arts program, the regional touring arts program and the wonderful and successful exhibitions that Queenslanders have enjoyed at South Bank and throughout Queensland, they all have Wayne Goss's fingerprints all over them. It was Abraham Lincoln, the 16th President of the United States, who said—


Nearly all men can stand adversity, but if you want to test a man's character give him power.

When Wayne Goss won power in 1989 he did great things, he did good things, he did things that have lasted more than the 2½ terms of his leadership and his premiership of this state. They have lasted more than two generations in Queensland. I express again my condolences to his family, his wife, his children and his siblings and place on the record my great appreciation for all of the work that Wayne Goss did in making Queensland a better place.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (10.31 am): I rise to speak in support of the motion. Unlike many of my colleagues, I never met Wayne Goss in the entire time that I have been in the Labor Party. In fact, for his entire premiership I was in the regular Army. But like any Queenslanders with a sense of Queensland politics, I knew full well the contributions that he had made to this state, and they have been well reflected on by many in this House today. I was privileged to attend his memorial service last Friday. It was a service that would move even the most cold blooded of us. In particular, the contributions made by his family towards the end were moments that certainly brought a lump to my throat. It was a revelation of who he was when they played a video with the title *I Did It My Way*, and some in this House would have seen it. It says much about the character of a man who, after the ebb and flow of his political life, can look back and make that sort of video about his role in Queensland politics, and a substantive role that it was, as has been reflected on.

He was a bloke from humble beginnings. He made his own way. He reshaped this state and he certainly reshaped the Labor Party, perhaps the latter being a more difficult task in some ways than the former. But he is a fellow who through all of that, as everyone has acknowledged in this House, could lie straight in bed every evening. He was a better man than many of us in this House, and many have reflected on that—a man who had virtually no blemishes of character that could be discerned. His passing at 63 just proves a couple of things. There is the old saying that only the good die young, and Wayne Goss is perhaps an example of that. There are probably some in this House who are relatively immortal if that has any truth to it.


The one thing that has not been reflected on is his failings, and I note in 2008 when he spoke about his decision to introduce Labor policy on poker machines. We have talked about all of his achievements, but I think it is interesting to notice the balance that he brought to looking back on his own decisions and the various things that occurred. He said at that time, 'I wish I'd never brought in poker machines. I think that they're a scourge.' But it was Labor policy at the time, as most know, and he chose to do it. He was on the record as saying, 'There's a problem with poker machines in my view. The problem is that people who usually mainly play them are people who can least afford to do so. I wish I hadn't done it.' That again is evidence of a man who is honest at all points in his engagement and relationship with Queenslanders. He stuck with the policy, but in reflection he was man enough to say that perhaps he had made an error of judgement. So for all of the things that we have heard about Wayne Goss today, he is honest even in things where he thinks he made a mistake. He is a man who may never be repeated in kind in this state again and we are poorer for his passing.

 **Mrs SCOTT** (Woodridge—ALP) (10.35 am): Wayne Goss was a man for his times—a man of high intellect, high integrity and with the personal discipline and rigor prepared to lead a party which had languished on the sidelines for several decades, aware of grave evidence of corruption in high places and a single-minded intent on bringing down the ruling government. I entered the political scene early in 1984 as an electorate officer and between that time and the 1989 election momentum was building. I recall helping to arrange a shadow cabinet meeting in Logan. The shadow ministers held meetings with key people in the area. Expectations grew and the night of that final election was one of unbelievable celebration and joy. With every minister a complete rookie, Wayne Goss set about changing the face of Queensland and bringing back integrity and accountability.

Those who spoke at Wayne's memorial service, which I was privileged to attend, outlined so much of the many aspects of this man's life and the wonderful legacy he has left for the state he loved. When I walk along our beautiful South Bank Parklands, I am reminded that it was Wayne Goss who made the decision to convert the previous Expo 88 site to our stunning parklands. I recall being in Singapore and seeing a derelict site where its former World Expo was held, and possibly ours is the most outstanding site transformation in the world. His contribution to the arts was one which continued far beyond his political career. We attribute the planning of the Gallery of Modern Art to his foresight, and he continued his leadership as Chairman of the Queensland Art Gallery Board of Trustees. He was an outstanding leader and, of such keen intellect and work ethic, he was certainly the leader required for the vast task ahead.

Following my election and possibly at the 10th anniversary celebration of the Beattie government, I recall Wayne walking up to me with hand outstretched to say, 'Congratulations! I didn't think you had it in you.' Puzzled, I said, 'You mean becoming a member of parliament?' His answer was, 'No, getting up on stage and singing.' You see, Liddy Clark, the former member for Clayfield, had revealed she had always wished to front a rock band. So with such audacity Gary Fenlon gathered a band together and Liddy, backed by the 'doo-wop girls' of Barb Stone, Bonny Barry and myself, gave this outrageous rendition of a couple of songs, including a song about Queensland. It was really a 'don't give up your day job' sort of performance, but I know Wayne enjoyed it.

Only those who have experienced the diagnosis of a brain tumour can understand what that can mean. In 1975 my husband had a serious operation of 10 hours duration to remove a serious brain tumour and I sat by his bedside in ICU for four weeks before we knew he would survive. So when I heard Wayne had just had his fourth operation, it caused me to reflect and to think of Roisin and Wayne and their family and the tragedy of losing a man who, at such an early age, had so much more to give. To Roisin, Caitlin, Ryan and their extended family members, we grieve for Queensland and for their and our tragic loss.

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (10.39 am): I rise to speak in memory of Wayne Goss, simply one of our greatest Premiers. Specifically, I want to speak about his reforms to education in Queensland. These reforms opened education to all Queenslanders and allowed fair and equitable access to education. Each school was resourced on need, providing enough opportunity for all to succeed. As we have heard today, Wayne's own education was through the state school system in a very disadvantaged area—disadvantaged not only socially but also through physical educational resources. Despite that, and like many others from Inala State High School, Wayne Goss succeeded on ability and hard work. University beckoned Wayne and, by only holding down a full-time job, he managed to successfully complete his law degree. That was prior to the days of open university access.


Wayne was burdened by a strong social conscience and this conscience led him to practising law for the underprivileged and to the Australian Labor Party. In opposition, he was a champion for education and knew that that was the only opportunity for many in our society to rise above disadvantage. In government, Wayne was an educational reformer. He replaced the unfair TE score system with the OP scores that we still have today. He addressed the historic and significant pay inequalities for teachers. Within the education department, he appointed people not on political status but on merit. Wayne reintroduced the TJ Ryan scholarships, helping many to achieve their ambitions and goals.

In Wayne's six budgets education was not forgotten. In fact, it was the focus of his economic platform. He understood that investment in that area would be repaid in spades in future years. That initial deposit on education by Wayne Goss matured in later years. Some may say that it was this early investment that allowed the smart state to grow and thrive.

There is no doubt that Wayne Goss was one of our greatest Premiers. There is no doubt that the focus of Wayne Goss's government was soundly towards education. There is no doubt that, personally, Wayne Goss's passion was for education: education of the mind and of the body through sport. Wayne championed junior sport and sport within our education system. He believed in a holistic education. He believed in a fair education for all Queenslanders.

It was a privilege to attend the memorial service last Friday. My personal views of this great man were reinforced by the tributes and reflections of those who were at that memorial service. Reform, opportunity and fairness: this is what Wayne gave to education. Hope, opportunity and inspiration: this is what Wayne Goss gave to all of Queensland. Simply, Wayne Goss was a great man, a great Premier and a hero to education here in Queensland.

I extend my deepest sympathy to Roisin, Ryan, Caitlin and their families. We are so very pleased that they shared Wayne with all of Queensland. On behalf of Queensland, thank you Wayne Goss.

 **Mrs D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (10.42 am): I rise to speak also to this condolence motion on the passing of the Hon. Wayne Goss and to pass on my condolences to his wife, Roisin, and their children, Caitlin and Ryan, and their broader family. Today, we have heard many define the character of this great man, but I think those words are best said by the person who knew him best, his wife, Roisin, who said at his memorial service that her late husband had 'utter dignity, grace and tenacity'. During his 17-year on-and-off battle with brain tumours, Wayne showed extraordinary courage, strength and determination. He never asked, 'Why me?' He was always extremely positive in his attitude, making the very best of his situation and enjoying the present. That is the worth of this man. That is his true character.

We all know, and we have heard again today, that Wayne had achieved so much as Premier of this state. We know that, for women, he did so much to break down barriers by introducing equal employment laws and antidiscrimination provisions. He also provided a judicial review for administrative decisions; introduced Queensland's first comprehensive gun licencing laws; abolished the imperial honours system; appointed Queensland's first female Governor, Leneen Forde; restored fairness to the electoral system by ending the gerrymander; and provided a fair, democratic electoral system that we still enjoy today. Those are just some of the very few achievements that Wayne left behind as his great legacy.

We know that Wayne Goss was a man who was driven by social justice and a strong social conscience. He believed that a modern legal system was necessary for our state and the system that we have today is part of that legacy. It is unrecognisable from some of the unjust and corrupt practices that were institutionalised during the Joh years. Wayne dedicated his legal training skills and experience to helping those most vulnerable, including those who were bullied and attacked by an unjust legal system.

Wayne brought that commitment and highly skilled legal mind into the parliament. In government he forged a new Public Service, a new legal system and a new police force that modern Queensland can be proud of. As my colleagues in their contributions to this condolence motion have pointed out, Wayne's contribution stretches across portfolios. His legacy is clear and lasting.

On a personal note, I also want to mention his family, Roisin, Ryan and Caitlin. Roisin also made a contribution to public life. She was committed to social justice in her own career and helped to reshape a modern Queensland. She contributed to many community organisations and charities. Those of us in politics who have our own families know how difficult it can be to balance work and family life. In addition to Wayne and Roisin's enormous contribution to public life, it should also be noted that one of their achievements was to raise two great children. As anyone who knows the family or those who were at the memorial will know, they are two articulate, generous, giving adults who are another important part of the legacy that Wayne Goss leaves behind.

Wayne Goss was a true leader who inspired many and his legacy will go on to inspire many more. Good people who want to act in the name of fairness and social justice. Labor members are so proud of the fact that they belong to a party where a man from such humble beginnings can end up holding the highest office in this state. He never let the trappings of high office change him. He did not join politics or go into politics for self-gratification; he did it for the greater good.

Just as Wayne Goss was inspired and spurred on to join the Labor Party because of Gough Whitlam's dismissal, his win in 1989 spurred many to get active in the Labor Party. Wayne was a true statesman. He has left Queensland a better place and he did do it his way. Queenslanders say thank you to the Goss family for sharing the Hon. Wayne Goss with us. He will be sadly missed.

Whereupon honourable members stood in silence.

Madam SPEAKER: I advise the House that question time will begin at 11.19 am.

PETITIONS

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

Legal Profession Act, Amendment

From 31 petitioners, requesting the House to amend the Legal Profession Act to provide individuals holding legal qualifications and unemployed lawyers who possess a restricted practising certificate to perform basic legal services for fee or reward. [\[6481\]](#)

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

Upper Ross, Riverway Drive, Traffic Congestion

From 1,766 petitioners, requesting the House to implement measures to address the traffic congestion for Upper Ross residents on Riverway Drive as a matter of priority [\[6482\]](#) [\[6483\]](#).

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

Lake Kurwongbah, Closure

Mr Pitt, from 893 petitioners, requesting the House to not close Lake Kurwongbah to water skiing and to allow shared use of the lake [\[6484\]](#).

Smoking Products, Personal Vaporisers

Mr Bennett, from 72 petitioners, requesting the House to review the Health Legislation Amendment Bill and not regulate personal vaporisers as smoking products under the Tobacco Act [\[6485\]](#).

Queensland Pest and Game Management Authority, Establishment

Mr Choat, from 2,587 petitioners, requesting the House to establish a Queensland Pest and Game Management Authority to manage licensed conservation hunting of game and pest animals on public land and to assist with an effective integrated pest management program [\[6486\]](#).

Gold Coast Light Rail Connection

Mr Molhoek, from 10,379 petitioners, requesting the House to deliver the Gold Coast Light Rail connection with heavy rail at Parkwood or Helensvale in time for the 2018 Commonwealth Games and the connections to Burleigh and Gold Coast Airport be funded and completed as priority infrastructure projects this decade [\[6487\]](#).

Toowoomba, Bridge Street, Zoning

Mr Watts, from 104 petitioners, requesting the House to change the traffic zoning on Bridge Street Toowoomba, just east of Fairholme Street intersection through to Simla Street intersection, from 60 km/h to a school zoned 40 km/h [\[6488\]](#).

Australian Volunteer Coast Guard

Mr Gibson, from 201 petitioners, requesting the House to engage with Queensland's Australian Volunteer Coast Guard to formulate a sustainable funding model that reflects the valuable work undertaken by volunteers of this organisation [\[6489\]](#).

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

Cleveland-Redland Bay Road, Upgrade

From 104 petitioners, requesting the House to consider as a matter of urgency the upgrading to dual lanes on Cleveland-Redland Bay Road from German Church Road north to South Street, Cleveland [\[6490\]](#).

Acacia Ridge Hotel, Adult Entertainment Permit Application

From 361 petitioners, requesting the House to protect the family nature of the suburb of Acacia Ridge and say no to the application for an adult entertainment permit to introduce sexually explicit entertainment by the Acacia Ridge Hotel [\[6491\]](#).

Petitions received.

TABLED PAPERS

PAPERS TABLED DURING THE RECESS

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

31 October 2014—

[6424](#) QSuper Annual Report—2013-14

[6425](#) Report pursuant to Section 76R of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1974, titled 'Baralaba Expansion Project—Declared to be a prescribed project by the Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, the Honourable Jeff Seeney MP, on 31 July 2013'

[6426](#) Report: Release of Images to the Queensland Police Service during the financial period 2013-14

[6427](#) Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 50—Subordinate legislation tabled between 6—26 August 2014

[6428](#) Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 51—Annual Report 2013-14

3 November 2014—

[6429](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to a paper petition (2319-14) and an ePetition (2249-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3) and 119(4), from 1,248 and 727 petitioners respectively requesting the House to repeal all laws and amend any regulations that prevent local governments from having the authority to approve or restrict the location of adult entertainment permits

[6430](#) Professional Standards Councils—Annual Report 2013-14

[6431](#) Professional Standards Councils—Financial Statements 2013-14

[6432](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 79—Subordinate legislation tabled between 26 August 2014 and 8 September 2014

4 November 2014—

[6433](#) Criminal Public Interest Monitor Annual Report 2013-14

[6434](#) Water Act 2000: Water Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 151, Erratum to explanatory notes

[6435](#) Response from the Deputy-Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) to an ePetition (2302-14) sponsored by Ms Trad, from 1,104 petitioners, requesting the House to extend the consultation period for the Kurilpa Riverfront Renewal Draft Master Plan to the end of June 2015 to allow equal consideration by the people of Brisbane and to publicly release all of the planning studies, information and documentation provided to developers

5 November 2014—

[6436](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 37—Review of Auditor-General's Report 16: 2013-14 Results of audit: Education sector entities 2013

6 November 2014—

[6437](#) Letter, dated 6 November, from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) reporting on the outcomes of the review of the Transport Security (Counter-Terrorism) Act 2008

7 November 2014—

[6438](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 80—Weapons (Digital 3D and Printed Firearms) Amendment Bill 2014

[6439](#) Letter, dated 27 October 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding Commonwealth joint Standing Committee on Treaties Arrangements for notification of the tabling of new treaties

[6440](#) Letter, dated 28 October 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding a treaty tabled on 28 October 2014

[6441](#) Letter, dated 27 October 2014, from the Chair of the Joint Standing Committee on Treaties to the Speaker, regarding a treaty tabled on 14 July 2014

[6442](#) Parliament of the Commonwealth of Australia—Joint Standing Committee on Treaties—Report No. 144: Treaty tabled 14 July 2014

11 November 2014—

[6443](#) Report to the Legislative Assembly from the Minister for Police and Community Safety (Mr Dempsey) pursuant to section 56A(4) of the Statutory Instruments Act 1992, regarding the Police Service Administration Regulation 1990, Police Service Administration (Review of Decisions) Regulation 1990, Police Service (Discipline) Regulations 1990, Police Service (Ranks) Regulation 1991; and Weapons Regulation 1996

[6444](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 57—Annual Report 2013-2014

[6445](#) Queensland Independent Remuneration Tribunal: Review of the Allowances System, Determination 6/2014, 11 November 2014

[6446](#) Response from the Deputy-Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning (Mr Seeney) to a paper petition (2323-14) and an ePetition (2304-14) sponsored by Mrs D'Ath, from 317 petitioners and 559 petitioners respectively, requesting the House to require the Moreton Bay Regional Council to release the new draft planning scheme to the public and undertake wide ranging and proper consultation with all affected residents and the broader community and businesses for a minimum of six weeks

[6447](#) President of the Industrial Court of Queensland (in respect of the Industrial Court of Queensland, Queensland Industrial Relations Commission and the Queensland Industrial Registry)—Annual Report 2013-14

12 November 2014—

[6448](#) Report on Operations of the Land Tribunal established under the Aboriginal Land Act 1991—Annual Report 2013-14

[6449](#) Electoral Commission of Queensland—Annual Report 2013-14

[6450](#) Legal Services Commission of Queensland Annual Report 2013-14

[6451](#) Land Court of Queensland Annual Report 2013-14

[6452](#) Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 47—Consideration of Queensland Treasury and Trade Annual Report 2012-13—government response

13 November 2014—

- [6453](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 58—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6454](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2322-14) sponsored by the Clerk of the Parliament in accordance with Standing Order 119(3), from 103 petitioners, requesting the House to allow the public access for recreational fishing on the William Gunn Jetty in Manly and other jetties in Queensland
- [6455](#) Declaration of additional security area made by the Commissioner of the Queensland Police Service pursuant to section 12(2) of the G20 (Safety and Security) Act 2013

17 November 2014—

- [6456](#) Response from the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice (Mr Bleijie) to a paper petition (2324-14) presented by Mr Wellington, from 134 petitioners, requesting the House to implement measures to remove the claim limit that is currently set at the Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal
- [6457](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 59—Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [6458](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 59—Health Legislation Amendment Bill 2014—submissions received in relation to the inquiry
- [6459](#) Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 52—Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [6460](#) Overseas Travel Report: Report on an overseas visit by the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to Japan, Vietnam and Indonesia, 4—17 October 2014

19 November 2014—

- [6461](#) Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Bill 2014: Erratum to explanatory notes
- [6462](#) Education and Innovation Committee: Report No. 42—Review of state school attendance rates
- [6463](#) Response from the Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services (Mr Dempsey) to an ePetition (2280-14) sponsored by Dr Douglas, from 666 petitioners, requesting the House to provide a police station in the estate of Pacific Pines to ensure safety and security for the residents in the surrounding area, to improve response time to incidents and relieve pressure on the stations at Coomera and Nerang

20 November 2014—

- [6464](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2325-14) and an ePetition (2278-14) presented by Mrs Trad from 296 and 52 petitioners respectively requesting the House to prioritise funding for a feasibility study to determine the most effective way to provide for better parking options around the Cannon Hill Train Station for Cannon Hill commuters
- [6465](#) Magistrates Courts of Queensland—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6466](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 60—Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014
- [6467](#) Health and Community Services Committee: Report No. 60—Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014—submissions received in relation to the inquiry

21 November 2014—

- [6468](#) Transport, Housing and Local Government Committee: Report No. 58—Review of the Auditor-General's Report to Parliament 14: 2013-14 Results of audit: Local government entities 2012-13
- [6469](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 81—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014
- [6470](#) Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee: Report No. 81—Domestic and Family Violence Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014—submissions received in relation to the inquiry

24 November 2014—

- [6471](#) Response from the Minister for Education, Training and Employment (Mr Langbroek) to a paper petition (2336-14) presented by Mr Sorensen, from 750 petitioners, requesting the House to build a safer fence around the perimeter of the Torquay State School grounds
- [6472](#) Australian Agricultural College Corporation—Annual Report 2013-14
- [6473](#) Finance and Administration Committee: Report No. 48—Inquiry into Auditor-General's Reports on Internal Control Systems and Fraud Risk Management—government response
- [6474](#) Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014: Erratum to explanatory notes
- [6475](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2331-14) presented by Mr Costigan, from 2,183 petitioners, requesting the House to seal the gravel section of the Mt Ossa Seaforth Road, linking the Calen district to the Hibiscus Coast
- [6476](#) Response from the Minister for Transport and Main Roads (Mr Emerson) to a paper petition (2333-14) presented by Ms Bates, from 1,023 petitioners, requesting the House to restore bus route number 750 so it terminates in Mudgeeraba and to increase bus route number 748 to a half hourly service during peak times

STATUTORY INSTRUMENTS

The following statutory instruments were tabled by the Clerk—

Land Sales Act 1984—

[6492](#) Land Sales Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 242

[6493](#) Land Sales Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 242, explanatory notes

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014—

[6494](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 243

[6495](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 243, explanatory notes

Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Act 2014—

[6496](#) Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Regulation 2014, No. 244

[6497](#) Debt Collectors (Field Agents and Collection Agents) Regulation 2014, No. 244, explanatory notes

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014—

[6498](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 245

[6499](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 245, explanatory notes

Agents Financial Administration Act 2014—

[6500](#) Agents Financial Administration Regulation 2014, No. 246

[6501](#) Agents Financial Administration Regulation 2014, No. 246, explanatory notes

Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014—

[6502](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 247

[6503](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 247, explanatory notes

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014—

[6504](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 248

[6505](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 248, explanatory notes

Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Act 2014—

[6506](#) Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Regulation 2014, No. 249

[6507](#) Motor Dealers and Chattel Auctioneers Regulation 2014, No. 249, explanatory notes

Property Occupations Act 2014—

[6508](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 250

[6509](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 250, explanatory notes

Chemical Usage (Agricultural and Veterinary) Control Act 1988, Legal Profession Act 2007, Police Powers and Responsibilities Act 2000, Property Occupations Act 2014, Queensland Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2009, Stock Act 1915—

[6510](#) Property Occupations Regulation 2014, No. 251

[6511](#) Property Occupations Regulation 2014, No. 251, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment Act (No. 2) 2013—

[6512](#) Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 252

[6513](#) Nature Conservation and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2014, No. 252, explanatory notes

Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004—

[6514](#) Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 253

[6515](#) Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 253, explanatory notes

Professional Engineers and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

[6516](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 254

[6517](#) Proclamation commencing remaining provisions, No. 254, explanatory notes

Building Act 1975, Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002, State Penalties Enforcement Act 1999—

[6518](#) Building and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 255

[6519](#) Building and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 255, explanatory notes

Building Act 1975—

[6520](#) Building (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 256

[6521](#) Building (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 256, explanatory notes

Plumbing and Drainage Act 2002—

[6522](#) Plumbing and Drainage (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 257

[6523](#) Plumbing and Drainage (Transitional) Regulation 2014, No. 257, explanatory notes

Queensland Building and Construction Commission Act 1991—

[6524](#) Queensland Building and Construction Commission (Transfer) Regulation 2014, No. 258

[6525](#) Queensland Building and Construction Commission (Transfer) Regulation 2014, No. 258, explanatory notes

State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971—

[6526](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 259

[6527](#) State Development and Public Works Organisation (State Development Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 259, explanatory notes

Health Practitioners (Special Events Exemption) Act 1998, Hospital and Health Boards Act 2011 Public Health (Infection Control for Personal Appearance Services) Act 2003—

[6528](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 260

[6529](#) Health Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 260, explanatory notes

Liquor Act 1992—

[6530](#) Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 261

[6531](#) Liquor Amendment Regulation (No. 4) 2014, No. 261, explanatory notes

Transport Operations (Marine Safety) Act 1994—

[6532](#) Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Examining and Training Program Approvals (Recreational Ships and Personal Watercraft)) Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2014, No. 262

[6533](#) Transport Operations (Marine Safety—Examining and Training Program Approvals (Recreational Ships and Personal Watercraft)) Amendment Standard (No. 1) 2014, No. 262, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

[6534](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 263

[6535](#) Nature Conservation Legislation Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 263, explanatory notes

Forestry Act 1959—

[6536](#) Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 264

[6537](#) Forestry (State Forests) Amendment Regulation (No. 2) 2014, No. 264, explanatory notes

Justice and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2013—

[6538](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 265

[6539](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 265, explanatory notes

Criminal Code Act 1899—

[6540](#) Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 266

[6541](#) Criminal Code (Criminal Organisations) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 266, explanatory notes

Fisheries Act 1994—

[6542](#) Fisheries (East Coast Trawl) Amendment Management Plan (No. 1) 2014, No. 267

[6543](#) Fisheries (East Coast Trawl) Amendment Management Plan (No. 1) 2014, No. 267, explanatory notes

Nature Conservation Act 1992—

[6544](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 268

[6545](#) Nature Conservation (Protected Areas) Amendment Regulation (No. 3) 2014, No. 268, explanatory notes

Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014—

[6546](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 269

[6547](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 269, explanatory notes

Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Land (Providing Freehold) and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

[6548](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 270

[6549](#) Proclamation commencing certain provisions, No. 270, explanatory notes

Land Act 1994—

[6550](#) Land Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 271

[6551](#) Land Amendment Regulation (No. 1) 2014, No. 271, explanatory notes

MEMBER'S PAPER TABLED BY THE CLERK

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

Member for Nanango (Mrs Frecklington)—

[6552](#) Non-conforming petition relating to improved parking in Drayton Street, Nanango.

REPORT TABLED BY THE CLERK

The following report was tabled by the Clerk—

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

Major Events Bill 2014

Amendment made to Bill

Clause 100 (Amendment of schedule 1)—

Page 64, line 8, 'schedule 1—'

Omit, Insert—

sch 1 (Acts not affected by this Act)

Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014

Amendment made to Bill

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


Page 80, line 5, 'should not be taken: and'—

Omit, Insert—

* The clause, page and line number references relate to the bill, after amendments made in consideration in detail unless stated otherwise.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

G20 Leaders Summit

 **Hon. CKT NEWMAN** (Ashgrove—LNP) (Premier) (10.52 am): Hosting the G20 Leaders Summit presented Brisbane and Queensland with an unprecedented opportunity to build on our global reputation as an exciting business and tourism destination. In order to maximise the benefits, the Queensland government hosted or participated in a series of key events. I held bilateral meetings with the Prime Minister of New Zealand, John Key; the Prime Minister of Singapore, Mr Lee Hsien Loong; the President of China, His Excellency Mr Xi Jinping; and the Prime Minister of India, Mr Narendra Modi. Other key Queensland government G20 events included a G20 business luncheon, Indonesian and Indian community receptions and an Indian business breakfast.


Already we are seeing the benefits of these meetings. In recent days, Indian Prime Minister Modi has issued me with a personal invitation to attend the seventh Vibrant Gujarat Summit from 11 to 13 January 2015 in Gujarat, India. The Vibrant Gujarat Summit began as an investors summit and has now evolved into an ideal platform for knowledge sharing, social and business transformation. Today I am announcing that I plan to accept this invitation and will lead a trade mission to India to participate in the summit and visit other key cities. It provides an opportunity for the Queensland government and leading Queensland businesses to showcase our strengths and highlight business and investment opportunities.

The G20 summit was one of the most significant achievements ever for our state. It has also set a new benchmark for a successful and safe gathering of world leaders. This success could not have happened without the hard work of so many, many people and I would like to thank some of them. The Queensland Police Service has been working for two years to plan and deliver the largest security operation this country has ever seen. I express my gratitude to each and every officer who worked in oppressive heat over the G20 weekend. I express my gratitude to Commissioner Ian Stewart and to all the hardworking senior officers. There has been widespread praise for the efforts of the Queensland Police Service for their courtesy, kindness, professionalism and sound judgement. I want to congratulate as well members of the Australian Federal Police, other state police services who supported us, the intelligence agencies and members of the Australian Defence Force. I want to

congratulate again members of the Parliamentary Service. You, Madam Speaker, quite fulsomely expressed your appreciation today, but I add my support to those comments. There was involvement in the G20 from across the Queensland and federal governments and the wider community, including some amazing G20 volunteers and Brisbane airport volunteers and we thank them for their efforts.

The G20 cultural celebrations were also an outstanding success and, as announced last week, due to overwhelming demand the 'Brisbane' sign at South Bank is here to stay. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank you as well for your agreement to host some of the leaders' activities in the parliament. Finally I would like to thank the people of Queensland. As the 'capital of the world' for the duration of the G20, Brisbane received unparalleled positive international exposure. Leaders at the summit resolved that raising global growth to deliver better living standards and more jobs is their highest priority. Equally, the Queensland government will continue to focus on supercharging the Queensland economy and creating jobs. Rest assured we will work diligently to secure the trade, investment and tourism legacy of the G20 to grow the next wave of jobs and prosperity for Queenslanders.

Galilee Basin

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (10.56 am): The G20 Leaders Summit was a great success on a number of fronts for our state and for Queenslanders. Not only did the G20 shine the spotlight on Brisbane and Queensland as a great place to visit, it also highlighted our state as a great place to do business. One of the highlights was an opportunity for me to meet the Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, and to strengthen business ties with the country that, alongside China, will continue to grow as a critically important market for what Queensland has to offer.

A stronger relationship with India will grow Queensland jobs and grow the Queensland economy. I led a trade mission to India last year and visited Minister Modi, as he was then, in Gujarat. I am pleased that the Premier, who has been to India before on a trade mission, will also take a trade mission back to Gujarat early next year. India will be a key market for the Galilee Basin development. The next wave of Queensland resource sector jobs will be in the Galilee Basin. Our government is determined to put in place strategies to make sure that these 28,000 jobs are created to supply energy to India and to China.


Since we came to government we have tackled a raft of challenges left to us by the previous government that have threatened to stifle development of the Galilee Basin, to exacerbate impacts on rural landholders and to damage the environment. First we began the significant task of unwinding Labor's mess by reducing the planned dredging program from 38 million tonnes to just three million tonnes. Next we cleaned up the spaghetti of six proposed rail lines crisscrossing the basin to provide greater certainty to proponents and to significantly minimise the impact on rural landholders. In the past few months we have finalised a solution to the emotive issue of port development at Abbot Point. Our Abbot Point Port and Wetlands Strategy will beneficially re-use dredge material on land rather than dumping it at sea and we will restore the environmental values of the nearby wetlands.

The next piece in the challenge to unlock the Galilee Basin is infrastructure. Our government's role in meeting the challenge will be to make short-term strategic investments to help build the rail line, ports and other infrastructure that will be needed to get the Galilee coal to market. We do not propose to invest any more money than we need to or to hold a stake in this infrastructure for any longer than we have to. Our intention is to facilitate the development. We are prepared to be a short-term minority investor in projects where proponents can demonstrate that they have the financial capacity to contribute the majority of the money required to build common user rail, port or airport infrastructure.

This is in stark contrast to the past when state governments built all the infrastructure and maintained ownership of the assets in the longer term. It is also in stark contrast to the previous Labor government's policy of handing out big grants to attract companies to invest in Queensland. Our assistance will not be grant funding. Our short-term minority investment will mean tens of thousands of Queensland families will benefit from the jobs and opportunities that the resources sector offers, but we will recover the money. We will recover any money we invest when the projects mature and our interests are able to be on sold. We have begun to negotiate with the Indian company Adani to make a potential contribution to the rail line that will link the Galilee Basin to the port of Abbot Point. That project could deliver almost 6,500 jobs and inject \$3 billion into the Queensland economy. Last week letters were sent offering similar opportunities to all Galilee proponents and we will work with all proponents to ensure that we deliver efficient infrastructure for the Galilee Basin.

Our government is determined to make intelligent investment decisions that will deliver results and real returns for Queensland taxpayers. Just as our state continues to move towards more renewable energy sources, we also understand that coal will form an important part of the world's energy equation for many decades to come. It makes economic and environmental sense to ensure that Queensland's high-quality coal reserves are used to provide much needed electricity to the 400 million Indians who currently suffer for the want of light and power. At the same time, we will be underwriting the future of this generation of Queenslanders and future generations of Queenslanders to come.

Overseas Trade Mission


 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (11.01 am): The successful staging of the G20 leaders meeting in Brisbane 10 days ago and the finance ministers meeting in September have opened up endless opportunities for our state. Our cities and our regions have been on show to the world and we have had a rare opportunity to promote all they offer to thousands of international delegates and media representatives. However, the task of ensuring that we turn those opportunities into jobs and investments for Queensland is far from over. Building on the achievements of the G20 meetings, next month I will lead a trade and investment mission to Singapore and Indonesia. In those markets, I will be building on the work of Trade and Investment Queensland in promoting the state's advantages as an investment destination and a place for getting business done.

In Singapore, there will be opportunities to engage with significant investors interested in agribusiness and infrastructure projects, as well as education and training. Following on from our meeting in Cairns, I will also be meeting Singapore's Deputy Prime Minister and finance minister, Mr Tharman Shanmugaratnam. I met Mr Tharman at the G20 Leaders Summit only 10 days ago. The meeting will be another step in developing the existing trade between Queensland and Singapore. Singapore is the fifth largest source of foreign investment in Queensland, while our annual export of goods to Singapore is worth more than \$600 million—that is, goods being produced by Queenslanders. In Indonesia, I will take great pleasure in officially opening the new Trade and Investment Queensland office in Jakarta. The office is an initiative of this LNP government because we recognise the huge potential to create jobs for Queenslanders if we can get better access to Indonesian markets and their rising middle classes. Merchandise exports to Indonesia are already worth around \$800 million a year.

On this mission I will be accompanied by approximately 30 business delegates who are mainly focused on growing food and agribusiness, and education and trade relationships. Some of our activities will include a beef industry capabilities round table, workshops on vocational education and training and higher education in Queensland, and meetings with bankers and financiers. I will also be holding talks with the Indonesian trade minister to assure the government of Queensland's intention to have a long-term trade relationship with Indonesia and, more broadly, the ASEAN nations. I will be doing my best to ensure continuity for our beef trade with Indonesia, a trade that supports dozens of Queensland beef producers, their staff and the communities where they spend their money. The ASEAN nations represent an increasingly important trade bloc of over 600 million people who can provide Queensland exporters with opportunities to expand their markets.

The G20 meetings have provided the opportunity for Queensland to renew friendships and to create new trade relationships that can help the endless opportunities that our state offers. I look forward to being able to table the report to the House on the success of the trade mission in the new year.

White Ribbon Day

 **Hon. TE DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (11.04 am): Today members of this House wear a white ribbon to mark White Ribbon Day and the International Day for the Elimination of Violence Against Women. The White Ribbon Day message is particularly strong because it is led by men. This week, as part of White Ribbon Day, I have had the opportunity to attend a number of breakfasts, including one yesterday with the Attorney-General that was hosted by the Women's Legal Service and one this morning hosted by Dame Quentin Bryce at QUT. A number of my colleagues were in attendance at the breakfast this morning.


Domestic and family violence is a heinous crime and this government takes the issue very seriously. Unlike those opposite, we have a strong plan to make Queensland the safest place in Australia to live, work and raise a family. This government has strengthened Queensland's laws and

has put more police on the beat. As a result, statistics in crime are down right across the state. Sadly, one area that has bucked that trend is domestic and family violence. In 2012, 58,000 incidents were reported to police and last year that number rose to 64,000—that is, 175 incidents of domestic and family violence every day. Those statistics are incredibly alarming.

This government is taking action to tackle the issue head on. Headed by Dame Quentin Bryce, in August the Premier established the Special Taskforce on Domestic and Family Violence as part of our strong plan to build a stronger Queensland. The task force has travelled right across the state, meeting with people and hearing their stories and ideas. It has held two summits, one in Townsville and one in Brisbane last week. The task force is due to report to government in February outlining its recommendations for a domestic and family violence strategy.

Since the Premier announced the task force, community awareness of this issue has increased. As a result, more and more women have gained the confidence to make the call to Queensland's front-line telephone counselling service, DVConnect. To help DVConnect address the increased traffic, today I announced that the Queensland government will provide additional funding of \$100,000 to the Womensline so that more women can access support and counselling. This funding will make a difference to so many people affected by domestic and family violence. Our strong team is working hard to make our state a safer place, giving families a brighter future and a stronger Queensland.

Elective Surgery, Waiting Times

 **Hon. LJ SPRINGBORG** (Southern Downs—LNP) (Minister for Health) (11.07 am): In line with the commitment I gave in this House in February, the Newman government has prepared and will implement Australia's first elective non-emergency surgery wait time guarantee. It is based on a Scandinavian system that has been extremely successful, that is very patient focused and that puts first the needs of the patient and their outcomes.

From 1 February, patients on our public hospital waiting lists will receive their elective surgery within the medically recommended time. Since March 2012, this government's strong plan has reduced elective surgery waiting lists, empowering doctors and nurses and allied professionals to design and implement better plans for patient management and treatment. In that time, the number of patients waiting longer than the medically recommended time for elective surgery has fallen from 6,485 to 531, and it is lower today. In every reporting period the backlog left by Labor is reduced and by year's end the number waiting longer than recommended will be approaching zero. Already, hard work by our staff has cleared the backlog of patients waiting for cochlear implants. A deficit of more than 60,000 long-wait dental patients has been reduced to zero and continues to be zero, and our focus has turned to more than 8,000 patients with debilitating eye conditions. Their list will be next and will be clear by 30 June 2015.


It is a big change from the Labor years when elective surgery and waiting lists just got longer and longer and longer in Queensland. It is a guarantee of surgery within the medically recommended time or the next available appointment in a public or private hospital at no cost to the patient. For urgent or category 1 patients this is a guarantee of treatment within 30 days. For semiurgent or category 2 patients it is guaranteed surgery within 90 days. Non-urgent or category 3 patients are also guaranteed treatment within the clinically recommended time of 365 days.

Appropriate waiting times for categories of surgery are determined by specialists based on a patient's condition and symptoms. This government takes the needs of patients and the advice of treating clinicians very seriously. A nationwide tradition of governments failing to provide surgery on time is no excuse. Advances under this government extend to every area of surgery and across the patient journey. Even on the infamous waiting list for the waiting list—the outpatients queue kept hidden by Labor—this government has increased throughput by up to 27 per cent for initial appointments and 400,000 additional outpatient appointments have been offered and conducted each year. Implementing the guarantee is a matter of patient choice. If it is necessary for the patient to travel more than 50 kilometres from the hospital where they are registered for surgery, the full cost of travel and accommodation will be covered and also recovered for their carer if deemed necessary.

A letter of explanation to patients whose names are on the elective surgery wait list will be distributed early next month. This unique wait time guarantee will deliver a better elective surgery experience and better outcomes for Queensland patients who are our primary focus. It means that the medical assessment of our specialist clinicians will be respected and their treatment

recommendations will be honoured. It guarantees a better use of valuable taxpayer resources. By protecting our commitment to better health care it will help build a brighter future for a better Queensland.

G20 Leaders Summit

 **Hon. JM DEMPSEY** (Bundaberg—LNP) (Minister for Police, Fire and Emergency Services) (11.11 am): Over two years ago our great state of Queensland and the city of Brisbane was tasked with hosting the world's largest and most important economic forum—the G20 Leaders Summit. This was no easy task and I am immensely proud of the people of Queensland for putting on such a magnificent event. Ten days ago the world was watching, and Queensland's security effort has won praise from all corners of the globe—setting a new benchmark for future international events.

The team of people in my portfolio, the many men and women of the Queensland Police Service, the Queensland Fire and Emergency Services, the Public Safety Business Agency and our State Emergency Service volunteers, played a major role in ensuring a safe and secure event both on the ground in Brisbane and in continuing to get the job done in stations right across Queensland.

Operation Southern Cross—the largest this country has ever seen—included 6,400 police officers, 1,600 of whom were from interstate and New Zealand. There was a magnificent range of equipment on the water, on the ground and in the sky—equipment that Labor refused to provide to front-line officers and something which the LNP prioritised to revitalise and which we achieved. Our two police helicopters patrolled the sky above us, keeping an eye on the many motorcades. Vessels cruised the Brisbane River forming mobile command posts. Our officers were on the ground on bicycles, motorbikes, horses, segways and foot—always with a smile on their faces.

I walked alongside many of our police and fire officers and volunteers over those three days and never have I been more proud. The camaraderie and commitment shown by those involved shone through on the streets of Brisbane. This is an experience that officers will take back with them to their regional Queensland, interstate and international stations. It has remarkably—and rightly so—grown the reputation of our Queensland Police Service.


What many did not get to see was the precision and technology behind the scenes from our new multimillion dollar Police Operations Centre where our best commanders coordinated the safety and security effort. At the police hub at Woolloongabba more than 6,000 officers moved through each day to be briefed, fed, given their equipment and sent out for their respective duties.

Earlier this year here in parliament we passed special legislation to protect Queensland families and international delegates. Its success was evident by the very few times it had to be used. There were only 16 arrests, and none of them were violent. There were only 14 charges laid. That is a credit to the welcoming, well-spirited people of Queensland. They had a voice on this world stage and they used it passionately but peacefully. It is a credit to the manner in which our police had engaged with protest groups over the past two years.

Operation Southern Cross was such a success I am confident our Police Commissioner, Deputy Commissioner Ross Barnett and Assistant Commissioner Katarina Carroll will be fielding international requests for advice and assistance for other global events for many years to come. To all the officers and volunteers who assisted during G20 events or continued to hold post in their communities throughout Queensland, congratulations and—I say two simple words—thank you. Thank you for your dedication and professionalism, allowing our great state to shine on the global stage.

We have a strong plan with a strong team to make Queensland an even safer state. We will continue to keep on course to provide a brighter and safer future for all Queenslanders and its visitors.

G20 Leaders Summit

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (11.15 am): What a coup the G20 was for Brisbane and for Queensland! We have once again shown the international community what a world-class city Brisbane has become and showcased the remarkable diversity of our Queensland landscape. Our state, and its capital, has a proud history of attracting, planning and staging world-class events—from the 1982 Commonwealth Games, the 1988 World Expo to now the G20 Leaders Summit.

While the benefits, legacies and friendships from these events will be felt far and wide and for many years to come, there has already been a noticeable boost to our local economy. During the G20 weekend and in the days leading into it, the no-vacancy sign was up across the Brisbane CBD and surrounds as thousands of delegates, media and support crews flocked to our city. They also flocked to the Sunshine Coast, the Gold Coast and the Darling Downs with bumper bookings.

However, it is the magnificent images—both planned and spontaneous—of our amazing city and state that will live on in the memories of all those who see them. I had the pleasure of opening 'Tourism's new frontiers' as part of the Brisbane Global Cafe. This was broadcast across the globe cementing Queensland as a world leader on tourism policy. And who will forget the images on Twitter of the German Chancellor, Angela Merkel, who paused for a selfie with a local while out for a beer in Brisbane ahead of the G20 or Indian Prime Minister, Narendra Modi, stopping to chat with locals and students. These images have a very powerful effect and reach into new markets that will drive tourism to our state. The ongoing legacy of this summit will see benefits flow to our tourism industry for years to come.


While those opposite had no plan for tourism, the Newman government is working in partnership with industry to grow a prosperous and sustainable future. We have a strong team and a strong plan for a bright future in Queensland.

ABSENCE OF MINISTER

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.17 am): I wish to advise the House that the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection will be absent from the House today and tomorrow due to a family health issue.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Newman Government, Performance

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.18 am): I give notice that I shall move—

That this House:

- notes the Newman government has made substantial cuts to government jobs and services since the March 2012 election;
- acknowledges that these cuts have had significant detrimental impacts on Queensland's social fabric, and state and regional economies;
- notes that the LNP's Contract with Queensland, which is signed by the Premier himself, states that if the LNP does not perform Queenslanders can 'hold us to account at the next election';
- further notes that Premier Newman told his cabinet members, in relation to ministerial responsibility, that 'If they don't sort out problems within two years, at that stage it's not the Labor Party's fault. It's their fault'; and
- condemns the Newman government for failing to deliver during its term in office.


SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

School Group Tours

Madam SPEAKER: Before commencing question time, I wish to acknowledge the schools visiting today: Clayfield College from the electorate of Clayfield and Holy Trinity from New South Wales.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Government Advertising

 **Ms PALASZCZUK** (11.19 am): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier today confirm the total taxpayer funded expenditure, including money spent on consultants, for his Strong Choices, Queensland Health and so-called 'greater every day' advertising is at least \$40 million?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. In relation to government advertising, I just again make the point that I have made on a number of occasions that we are spending millions of dollars less each year than those opposite ever spent. In fact, we are spending—

Opposition members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Order, members!

Mr NEWMAN: Madam Speaker, I am very happy to answer their questions. I make the point that we have spent 20 per cent less. We are on track to do that. To give you a feel for that, over the past 31 months the current administration that I proudly lead has spent \$67.37 million. That is compared to \$99.14 million spent by the previous administration in the first 31 months of its parliamentary term. I also point out the expenditure of the Bligh government in the first three months of 2012: in January 2012—remember an election had been called—\$4.942 million, in one month; in February 2012, \$2.59 million—the spending did not stop; then in March 2012, \$1.645 million. I say again: we have cut expenditure on advertising by 20 per cent. That was our commitment. That is what we delivered. In addition, we undertake expenditure that is fully compliant with the guidelines.

It is important that we talk to Queenslanders, for example, about the strong choices—the strong choices that we have to take as a society to deal with Labor's \$80,000 million worth of debt but, most importantly, how we can create up to 33,600 jobs through the \$8.6 billion infrastructure spend that we plan to undertake should we be re-elected. On the issue of the health campaign, what an exciting initiative that only this government, with its strong team and its strong plan, could deliver—a better health system for Queenslanders, a stronger health system for Queenslanders, a health system that does not treat people as numbers in a queue but treats them as real people with problems and issues that deserve quality health care. We are telling them about that and we make no apologies for informing them that they are going to get real soon the very best health system in the nation.

Member for Mermaid Beach

Ms PALASZCZUK: My question is to the Premier. I note the member for Mudgeeraba tabled advice she received from the Integrity Commissioner. Will the Premier instruct the member for Mermaid Beach to release today the advice he received from the Integrity Commissioner relating to his involvement in Skyride?

Mr NEWMAN: I believe I have already been asked about this in at least one forum, and my answer is that it is a matter for the assistant minister. But can I say that the project concerned is something that has the potential, if it goes through appropriate approvals, to generate many jobs and bring tourists to the Gold Coast. I reiterate today that the assistant minister will have nothing to do with the approvals for that matter. I also confirm that I have sighted the advice, and the Integrity Commissioner provides a clearance.

Let us though focus today on the big issues. This government believes in jobs for Queenslanders. It believes in economic development. That is what we are working on with this strong team. Over the last 2½ years our agenda has always been about creating the best-performing state economy in the nation. If we go back three years ago we were in second last place in terms of the economic battle between the states. The exciting thing is that we are now catching up to New South Wales and we will be the lead state in terms of economic growth in the next financial year.

Also, next financial year we will have a balanced budget, not just a balanced budget but a fiscal surplus—not just an operational surplus but a fiscal surplus. So for the first time in a decade this state will not have to borrow more money. That feeds into another issue that is important to this side of politics. When you spend money wisely the people have a burden lifted off them. Families, hardworking men and women trying to raise their kids, do not get hit with ever-increasing government taxes and charges.

We know what would happen if those opposite were re-elected because they have been debt and deficit deniers for the past 2½ years. They have never acknowledged their poor and reckless financial management. We on the other hand have had to deal with it and deal with it we have. We have the economy turning around. We have dealt with the financial situation. We have taken the cost-of-living pressure off Queensland families and we are revitalising front-line services. We have turned Health around. There is more to be done but we are on the way to creating the best free public health system in the nation. We are also making sure that our schools are giving our kids every opportunity to get the best possible job and a great career and future in this world. Finally, in terms of law and order, because of strong laws that those opposite would overturn, because of more police on the beat, we have seen crime rates drop across this state across-the-board. We are a strong team with a strong plan and we are creating a stronger Queensland.

G20 Leaders Summit, Small Business

Mr GULLEY: My question without notice is to the Premier. Can the Premier outline to the House the benefits that the G20 brought and will continue to bring to small businesses in Queensland?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question because the recent visiting G20 leaders and media received this message loud and clear from this government: Queensland is open for business. We are open for business because we want jobs and opportunity for Queenslanders. We have proven to the world that we are not only a place to do business but also a place that can host exceptional events, a place that you can invest in with confidence and a great place to visit, a safe place to visit.

Ultimately for this state the G20 was all about creating jobs and growing the economy. On this side of the chamber, we recognise that small business is the engine room of the economy driving innovation, employment and economic progress. It was therefore no surprise to see our small business sector embrace the G20 opportunity with its trademark ingenuity. Look at Dello Mano, who were selected to provide the official welcome treat at the Queensland stand at the G20 media centre. Over 5,000 international visitors were given the opportunity to enjoy Queensland made brownies by an innovative Queensland owned company.

There is Cocoa Elf, within my own electorate of Ashgrove, who provided their selection of mouth-watering brownies to world leaders with the gifts we provided to the leaders themselves. The company had their product translated into 14 different languages and now sell their signature brownies across the world. I am glad to hear that they are receiving strong orders for the G20 sampler pack. What about Atomic Coffee & Catering in the CBD, who designed special G20 chocolate hearts which were supplied to many hotels across the city. Some world leaders and delegates were provided Atomic's chocolates as part of a hotel turndown service. That is just another example of small business ingenuity in this state. I was also clearly pleased to get feedback from Mr Michael Gambaro about the huge increase in interest in their new hotel as a result of its use during the G20 summit by the German delegation and the German Chancellor.

The G20 communique to create a conducive environment for business to invest and create jobs complements our strong plan for a brighter future and for a prosperous small business sector. While those opposite suffocated business in red tape and regulation, we are getting out of their way and out of the hip pocket of small businesses in this state. Our red-tape-reduction initiatives, which they have opposed, have streamlined processes, reduced duplication and removed costly and unnecessary fees and charges which are now saving businesses in the community \$425 million a year. We have a strong plan for Queensland's small business, one which will help grow rather than hinder this important sector.

Overseas Trade Mission

Mr MULHERIN: My question without notice is directed to the Treasurer. I refer to the Treasurer's media statement on 18 November announcing a trade mission to Singapore and Indonesia. Will the Treasurer advise if he or any Treasury officials will be meeting with Singapore Power or any other potential buyers of Queensland assets as part of his trade mission?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the honourable member for the question. As members of the House know, I have reported on what I will be doing and the trade mission I will be leading to Singapore and Indonesia. I will be talking to the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore, who is also the finance minister of Singapore. So I will be talking about things related to finance. What else would you expect? Because, unlike those opposite, we have a strong team with a strong plan for a stronger Queensland. That means getting out and talking to our trading partners. That means getting out and talking to the rest of the world, not the myopic, inwardly-looking, narrow vision of the Labor Party, always looking to the brothers from the ETU to bail them out. That is the way of the Labor Party: pull down the shutters, have a good, hard look in the mirror and say things are all right when obviously they need a lot more work.

We have a job to do: rebuilding the economy. But we also have a job to do in terms of expanding our trade opportunities. I am particularly pleased to be leading a strong contingent from the food and agricultural sector. Why is that important? Why is it important we go out to Indonesia and talk about it? Because of the value of the beef export market. When it comes to the beef export market, we certainly will not be taking advice from the ALP. The last time the ALP had anything to do with the live beef export market they nearly killed it. They took it out the back, put it in the

slaughterhouse and they took the knife to it. It was only with a change of federal government with the strong support of governments like those here in Queensland and the Northern Territory, to pay tribute to them, that we have managed to re-establish a valuable export market.

In central Java I will be talking all things food and agribusiness with the representatives of that state with whom we have a longstanding sister state arrangement. I will also be talking about vocational and educational training as we will take a group of people from the education sector along, particularly around aviation training and establishing Brisbane as an aviation training hub—something of particular importance to me, as I hold the seat of Clayfield which has Brisbane International Airport in it. It is also equally important to places like Townsville and Cairns. I simply say this to the member for Mackay: I encourage you to come back next year and read my report and learn how it is done.

Galilee Basin

Mr JOHNSON: My question without notice is to the honourable Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning. Can the Deputy Premier detail the Queensland government's strong plan for the development of the Galilee Basin?

Mr SEENEY: I thank the member for Gregory for the question. Twelve months ago in November 2013 we released this document—the *Galilee Basin Development Strategy*. The Galilee Basin for us is all about jobs. In this document we looked at the range of options available to governments to facilitate the sort of development that will create those jobs. We started by looking at what the previous government had done in relation to its industry assistance programs. The previous government had an industry assistance program that handed out \$1.5 billion to various companies in an attempt to facilitate business development in Queensland. As you would expect, we had a look at the effectiveness of that. We found that one-third of the companies which received those grants—and they were grants, gifts or giveaways totalling \$1.5 billion—no longer operate in Queensland.

We decided when we came to government not to give any more grants. There is one particular list here that I am tempted to table, but I will not because the companies that received this money did so in good faith. This is a list of some \$200 million that was given away under one particular business assistance program. There are eight grants at the end that were approved but not paid. Do you know why? Because we won government and we did not pay those grants. One grant is for \$8 million to a mining company. When the opposition criticises our strategy for the Galilee Basin, it is well to remember the background against which it is doing it. They handed out grants. We are not handing out grants.

What we have said to the Galilee Basin proponents is that we will invest in the common user infrastructure. It is a continuation of the approach we have taken with priority development infrastructure programs for local government where there are no grants to be had from this government. It is about a co-investment model that facilitates the development; that shares the development cost but also shares the returns. The investments that we will make in the Galilee Basin hopefully will be on commercial terms and will develop interests in assets that the people of Queensland will own. Where is the interest from the \$1½ billion that the former government gave away? It got nothing for it. It gave \$26 million to a major airline company and never got any shares in that company. It gave \$5 billion to a major computing company and never got any shares in the company. Our industry assistance will be about developing an asset for the people of Queensland in the future.

(Time expired)

Register of Lobbyists

Mr PITT: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. I table the Treasurer's published diary for August 2013, his diary accessed under right to information and lobbyist contact declarations from former Howard government minister Alexander Downer, and I ask: why did the Treasurer fail to disclose a meeting with Singapore Power on 19 August last year, a company that is a potential purchaser of electricity assets in Queensland?

Tabled paper: Treasurer's ministerial diary of 1 August 2013-30 August 2013, extract of Treasurer's diary of 19 August 2013 and Lobbyist Register entry for Singapore Power [6554].

Mr NICHOLLS: I am very happy to inspect those documents. I always find it is important to have a look at them and see what they say and make sure that the allegation that is made by those over there is accurate. So I will do that and check the details of it. Let me say this, though: this government is open for business. This government makes it a point to be accessible, whether that is

in my Clayfield electorate office or whether that is seeing people who represent all walks of business and in my role as Treasurer and Minister for Trade. For example, I meet many people from the social services sector who want to have a chat with me and discuss opportunities in terms of providing better clarity around our investment in the social services sector. That is a result of the great work that we have been doing in the social services reform group, previously led by the assistant minister to the Premier and now my assistant minister where we are providing greater clarity around the provision of grants and funding to the social services sector. That is something they have been crying out for for many years.

Of course I meet people in the business and finance world. As I say, I met with the Deputy Prime Minister of Singapore. Would anyone seriously suggest that I should not do that? I met with the financial secretary of Hong Kong. Is someone saying that I should not do that? I meet with the chairs and the members of the board of Queensland government owned corporations. Is someone suggesting that I should not do that? I meet with people who are making presentations who want to invest in this state. Why do they want to invest in this state? Because we are getting rid of red tape, keeping the cost of living down and keeping business taxes down. We are addressing the issues that people want to talk to us about and that were holding this state back under the Labor Party for so many years.

In terms of being able to talk to people, I am very pleased to be able to say that this government is open for business. Yes, we talk to people who want to invest in this state. We want to talk to people who want to invest in this state, who want to see the state grow and who want to employ more Queenslanders. Ultimately, that is what we are about: providing opportunities for economic growth to employ more Queenslanders.

Let me say this: do I meet with representatives of business? Yes, I do. Of course I do; I am the Treasurer and I am the Minister for Trade. Members opposite would expect me to meet with those people. Are my diaries disclosed? Yes, they are. Is this the most open and accountable government in Australia in terms of providing that information? Of course it is. Of course, we are still waiting to see what position the opposition take on this. These are the people who failed to produce their documents, who covered up in terms of the Health payroll system and who continue to do so. We are open, accountable and open for business and are happy to do so.

Employment

Ms BATES: My question without notice is to the Treasurer and Minister for Trade. Can the Treasurer outline what impact the government's proposed Strong Choices final plan will have on stimulating employment and economic growth in communities across the state, including my electorate of Mudgeeraba?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Mudgeeraba, who is always keen to ensure that there are jobs and opportunities for jobs growth in her electorate. In fact, the member for Mudgeeraba has been working well to ensure that the average unemployment rate in her electorate dropped in the last period of time down to 4.1 per cent. The member's question is good because it goes to the very heart of what this government is about and the fact that we have a plan. Unlike those opposite, we have a plan and that plan—

Ms Palaszczuk: Secret plan.

Mr NICHOLLS: I heard the words 'secret plan'. It is a 'secret plan' that has been published in a 40-page book, a 'secret plan' that, if I recall correctly, those opposite have been complaining that we are advertising. It is so secret that the first question they asked the Premier today was in relation to advertising our 'secret plan'.

I have to let Queenslanders know: the secret is out. The LNP government has a plan. What is that plan? It is to pay down Labor's \$80,000 million worth of debt. It is a plan to put \$8.6 billion into job-creating infrastructure. In answer to the question of the member for Mudgeeraba, 25,000 jobs are being created out of the infrastructure plan that we are putting forward, together with another 8,000 jobs as a result of the cost-of-living relief we are offering, and there is \$3.4 billion to secure the solar feed-in tariff for Queenslanders to relieve Queenslanders of the burden of higher power bills. In terms of the member for Mudgeeraba and her question, we understand that there is a lot of work to be done. This job is not yet done. We have spent 2½ years addressing the problems that we found when we came to office. We will continue to address those in a thorough, disciplined, planned and methodical way. We will do it by taking the people of Queensland into our confidence, telling them what the problem is, asking them what they think the solution ought to be and working with them to

implement that solution. Only in that way will we be able to deal with the mess that Labor left us. Only in that way will we be able to provide the jobs and economic growth that Queenslanders rightly expect. As I have said, we are a strong, united team with a strong, clear plan, building a stronger Queensland for Queenslanders.

Galilee Basin

Dr LYNHAM: My question without notice is to the Premier. Will the Premier stop the secrecy and reveal how many hundreds of millions of dollars in taxpayer funds will be spent on the Galilee Basin rail line?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the member for Stafford. I warned the member earlier about being set up by those experienced ALP operatives and, once again, that has happened. In relation to what we will be doing, we will be investing at Abbot Point in some common user infrastructure that all parties who wish to use the Galilee will be able to use. It is about facilitating a range of projects and getting the thing going. We are being upfront about that announcement. When we have worked out the amount of infrastructure we are building in rail and port hardware, if you like, we will be letting Queenslanders know. I would say that we are talking about in the range of \$100 million to \$300 million. As I said, it is for everybody, and the Deputy Premier has talked about how we will exit that investment after a period of time.

For the information of the member for Stafford, I refer to a deal that was done for the Coppabella mine. The Coppabella mine was given \$28.8 million by the Beattie government. I have here for the benefit of honourable members—it has actually been tabled in this House before—two Executive Council minutes from 2002 which show the then Beattie government approving this deal. When was it made public? Was it made public in 2002 in May or September when those Executive Council minutes went through? Was it made public then? No, honourable members. Was it made public later that year? No, honourable members. Was it made public in 2003, 2004, 2005 or 2006? No, no. It took until 2007—five years—for the people of Queensland to learn that this money had gone into what? That is right: an infrastructure package.

Tabled paper: Executive Council minute of 16 May 2002 regarding Treasury department investment to assist Australian Premium Coals Pty Ltd [\[6555\]](#).

Tabled paper: Executive Council minute of 5 September 2002 regarding Department of State Development expenditure for infrastructure south of the Coppabella coal mine [\[6556\]](#).

I have here an article from the *Australian* dated 30 January 2008 stating—

FORMER Queensland premier Peter Beattie told a court yesterday there was “nothing untoward” about a \$28 million infrastructure package his government provided for a mine run by Ken Talbot, the coal magnate charged with making corrupt payments to former state minister Gordon Nuttall.

Mr Beattie was unrepentant. Later on the article states—

“If I was still premier and it came up today, I’d do it again,” said Mr Beattie.

This took half a decade to surface. I go back to the honourable member’s question. This side of politics, this side of the House, tells Queenslanders what we intend to do.

Ms Palaszczuk: Tell us how much.

Mr NEWMAN: I take the interjection from the Leader of the Opposition. When we have more details, they will be revealed immediately. What did the former government do? It kept it secret for half a decade. Those opposite have no plan, they have no policies and they certainly have no team.

(Time expired)

Health Services

Ms MILLARD: My question without notice is to the Minister for Health. I refer to the can-do LNP government’s strong plan to revitalise front-line health services, and I ask: in contrast, is the minister aware of any new unearthed documents from the previous Labor government that showed that it never planned to deliver specialist outpatient appointments to thousands of Queenslanders?

Mr SPRINGBORG: As everyone knows, the Newman government has a very strong plan for a brighter future for all Queenslanders, particularly our patients. We have already seen a complete elimination of dental long waits in Queensland. We have seen an almost virtual elimination of surgical long waits in Queensland. We have seen a complete elimination of cochlear long waits in Queensland and we are moving to do the same sort of thing with ophthalmology or eye surgery. Also as part of our

Strong Plan for Queensland, one of the really challenging things is to keep the opposition opposite, to keep the opposition over there in the opposite place in this parliament and also to keep them very, very honest. They seem to have collective amnesia as no-one has a memory going back prior to 24 March 2012. Fortunately, ancient peoples invented a process of painting on caves, which was then replaced by parchment, vellum paper and, in more recent times, electronic sources. I have been digging around to try to help them collectively understand where they have come from to assist them with their collective amnesia. My attention was drawn to a briefing note from 26 February 2007 to the Premier of the day at a time when the member for Bundamba was the assistant minister for health in Queensland. This is what it says. It states—

- An informal audit undertaken at the Gold Coast Hospital in June 2006 indicated that there was no prospect of patients in lower priority clinical categories ever being seen in the Specialist Outpatient Department ...

On these patient referrals was written 'predicted time for SOPD appointment: NEVER'—

- This informal audit at the Gold Coast Hospital showed that as of May 2006 there were 7497 patients awaiting SOPD appointments, with 2373 (approximately 32%) being in categories classified on the predicted waiting times as 'Never'.

Never—never, ever, ever to receive their outpatient appointments. It goes on—

- It is unclear whether similar practices occur at other facilities in Queensland.

I certainly look forward to those members opposite inquiring as to their past during the course of this week, because we will be able to assist them with regard to how they managed the health system in Queensland. I table that for the benefit of all members of parliament.

Tabled paper: Briefing paper from the Director-General, Queensland Health of 26 February 2007 regarding strategic risks and opportunities—specialist outpatient services [\[6557\]](#).

(Time expired)

Gladstone Hospital

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. In relation to the proposed long-term lease of the Gladstone Ports Corporation and the resultant funds available to the government if it is re-elected, will the Treasurer give an assurance to Gladstone residents that their greatest concern is addressed in that process—that is, a rebuilt hospital for Gladstone so as to provide better health services to all local residents?

Mr NICHOLLS: I thank the member for Gladstone for her question. The member for Gladstone sits on an organisation which I think is funded through Rio called the Here for Health program. That involves elected representatives including Ken O'Dowd, the LNP member in that part of the world, Mayor Gail Sellers and various doctors and others who have been working constructively with their community to address a number of issues in relation to the delivery of health services to that part of the world. I congratulate the people for doing that because it is important that there is local buy-in. One of the policies of this government has been to ensure that local people have a say in their area in terms of the delivery of health, because we all remember what happens when people take their eye off the ball and they think that all wisdom resides in Charlotte Street. What happens is that you get people like Dr Jayant Patel and the debacle that occurred in the Queensland health system which the health minister has been working so hard to fix over the last 2½ years by delivering services such as the eradication of the cochlear implant waiting list, addressing ophthalmology services and addressing the waiting list problem so successfully.

The Strong Choices program proposes a series of funds, one of which is a community health fund, into which \$300 million is being put aside to assist rebuilding and renewing hospitals predominantly throughout rural and regional Queensland. That is over and above the funding that would already be put there by the Health department as part of their renewal and planning program.

In terms of funding being made available, I simply say to the member for Gladstone that, if the submission from the Gladstone area, including the Gladstone area development board, the Gladstone council and from the member herself, identifies Gladstone's requirement or need for a hospital that will be considered. We will, of course, speak with the relevant departments, as we do with all of the over 430 submissions that we have received, and we will assess them in terms of the anticipated cost. We will assess them in terms of the need that is being demonstrated, whether that is the need for additional road services, additional public transport services or additional health services and then the government, as is always the case, will take a collective decision about those projects that are to be funded as a result of that money.

I can say that the Strong Choices program, our leases—not sales—program, will address the legacy of debt that was left to us by the Labor Party. It will address the \$80,000 million, it will free up \$8.6 billion over and above our normal capital spending to invest in job-creating infrastructure to address community needs wherever they might be throughout the state and it will provide \$3.4 billion to enable us to reduce the cost of living for Queenslanders through their electricity bills.

The member for Gladstone does ask a very reasonable question, and I would simply say that the best thing for the member for Gladstone and her area to do is to put some weight behind the submission into the Strong Choices program. I will take it on board. I am happy to receive correspondence in relation to it. We will take it up with the health minister with a view to proper, thorough and methodical planning for the implementation of our plan. I can assure all Queenslanders that, unlike the Labor Party opposite, who continues to refuse to display any sense of policy integrity whatsoever—unlike Wayne Goss, who would have had a policy by now, I might say—we have a plan. We are having a sensible conversation with Queenslanders. We will continue to have that conversation, and we will take it to the people of Queensland at the next election in a very careful, thorough and planned way. I would say to those opposite that having the ETU in bed with you is not a plan—

(Time expired)

G20 Leaders Summit, Education

Mr GRANT: My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Employment. Can the minister please inform the House about how the Newman government is capitalising on the G20 to promote Queensland as an international education destination of choice?

Mr LANGBROEK: I thank the honourable member for his question and commend him for his ongoing commitment to education in his electorate. I am delighted to inform the House of my involvement in a number of high-level trade discussions with various delegates during the G20.

The message that I gave those delegates is that as an international education destination Queensland is open for business. Whether it is school-age dependants, university students or young people from neighbouring developing economies who are looking to upskill to meet challenging workforce demands, through a world renowned tertiary sector offering research partnerships and degrees Queensland stands ready to offer a first-class education.

On the Friday before G20 it was my pleasure to go with Vice-Chancellor Peter Coaldrake and Prime Minister Narendra Modi of India to tour the wonderful research facilities at QUT, where Prime Minister Modi expressed great interest in further collaboration with organisations and institutions in India. He followed up last Monday at a breakfast which many of us attended, including high-level representatives from institutes in Bangalore and other places in India, and I have also subsequently followed up.

The government recognises that international education is the state's second-largest service export. Unlike those opposite, who left the sector to its own devices, punting training providers, universities and schools from bureaucratic pillar to post if they were interested in international engagement, we established an International Education and Training Advisory Committee to examine closely how best we can capitalise on this industry. A group of experts from all facets of the international education sector presented me with a report to which the government will respond after carefully considering their recommendations. The response will ensure that we get rid of the red tape where possible to provide potential students with a straightforward path to get here so that they can enjoy the benefits of a world's-best education in the best state in Australia.

That is because this government does not leave things to chance. We have a strong, decisive plan to allow Queenslanders to share in the benefits that flow from a strong international education sector. Every \$1 that an international student invests in our economy reaps a \$1.91 dividend, and that equates to more than \$2 billion which is pumped into this state. So they are very important customers, and we should ensure that the experience of studying in Queensland is one they want to repeatedly write home about so that more students are encouraged to come here.

The young Queenslanders who this week left grade 12 and headed for the coast or elsewhere in Queensland are standing on the edge of a great opportunity in an increasingly globalised world. This government is making sure that relationships are strong and conditions are right so that they are able to join in the international economy and the prosperity that it will bring. I am pleased to report that

several international delegates have already made contact. We want to make sure we see investors and partners right into our marketplace so we are the best international education destination in Australia.

(Time expired)

Strong Choices

Mr KNUTH: My question without notice is to the Treasurer. As the Treasurer now admits that the capital expenditure spent during the proposed 50-plus-49-year lease by the lessee of the disposed Queensland asset would result in the lessee becoming the de facto owner of the asset, will the Treasurer openly communicate this message in the government's multimillion dollar Strong Choices advertising campaign?

Mr NICHOLLS: It is indeed a pleasure to know that the fine art of verballing has not been lost on the member for Dalrymple. I made no such comment. I think the member for Dalrymple must be picking up on the verballing game from the member for Mulgrave, because he made the same comment in a press release that I saw distributed around the place, putting words into my mouth—always, as usual, distorting the truth, seeking every advantage that they can from rewriting history. Let me make it abundantly clear: the claim made by the member for Dalrymple in his question is false. It is a false claim.

What have we said? We have said that we have a big problem. What did the Commission of Audit say? It said that we have a big problem. What did the independent Commission of Audit say? It said that we have a big problem. We also have—

Mr Mulherin interjected.

Mr Pitt interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: I hear the member for Mackay and the member for Mulgrave trying to impugn the Commission of Audit. So what they are effectively saying is that Peter Costello, Professor Sandra Harding and Dr Doug McTaggart have deliberately set about misleading the people of Queensland. That is effectively what the member for Mulgrave says. He says the report was not independent and he impugns the motives of Peter Costello, Sandra Harding and Doug McTaggart—an unbelievable claim about three of the most widely respected people who deal with public finance and who each run their businesses better than the Labor Party ever ran Queensland.

What have we said? We have an \$80,000 million debt problem handed to us by the Labor Party. In order to build the roads, the infrastructure, the schools and the hospitals that we are going to need into the future, with a growing population, we have to reduce debt. We went out and spoke to the people of Queensland, unlike the 'mythbusters' opposite. Some 55,000 people completed the People's Budget tool and sent it in. We travelled over 20,000 kilometres. We had town hall meetings and public meetings throughout the state. I noted the member for Mulgrave listening in to my town hall meeting last week. We came to the decision not to sell assets but to lease assets, to invest the money in infrastructure and to provide cost-of-living relief. That will apply to the constituents of the member for Dalrymple as much as it applies to anyone else throughout the state. Ultimately, if this program is supported by the people of Queensland at an election, those assets will come back to the people of Queensland.

(Time expired)

G20 Leaders Summit, Tourism Industry

Mr SHORTEN: My question without notice is to the Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games. Can the minister please outline to the House how the G20 will benefit Queensland's tourism industry?

Mrs STUCKEY: I thank the honourable member for Algeester. I know that he attended a number of activities related to the G20. I want to thank him for making so many of our visitors and delegates feel welcome. Without doubt, the G20 put Queensland on the global stage. As you said earlier, Madam Speaker, the world came to meet here in Brisbane, Queensland. They met for the leaders summit in our fair city and for the finance ministers meeting in Cairns. The G20 was a huge success, promoting our Queensland as a safe and secure destination.

Earlier I outlined to honourable members just how a significant event such as this can provide a real boost to tourism through a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to showcase images throughout the world. This government worked very hard throughout the weekend to ensure our tourism destinations were kept top of mind. Through our partnership with Thomson Reuters, my team at TQ developed specialised video news releases that featured images of Queensland's breathtaking destinations. These videos featured IMF chief Christine Lagarde and attractions such as South Bank, the Wheel of Brisbane, GoMA and the paddleboarders on the river. Several overseas journalists commented that they did not intend to use promotional footage as part of their reporting, but they were so impressed by the high-quality productions the state had produced and they used it anyhow. So our content was broadcast via 170,000 journalists in over 116 countries, generating around \$8 million in marketing value. This totalled over 20 hours of promotional broadcast. That is not bad for a deal done with Thomson Reuters for news that is important across the world.

Our Welcome to Brisbane stand in the International Media Centre connected thousands of media from around the world with images, vision and stories about our destinations. Some 2½ thousand media kits and many more of the Dello Mano brownies were handed out. And, of course, our native flora and fauna were on display, too. Many journalists importantly spoke about their plans to stay on and travel throughout the state after the summit. A Spanish journalist advised that he was going to spend two weeks in Cairns and visit the Great Barrier Reef, while a Mexican journalist planned to travel to Lady Elliot Island to see the manta rays and the turtles. While Labor neglected tourism, the LNP has recognised it as one of the four pillars of our economy, and we are working hand in hand to ensure a prosperous tourism industry.

Coal Prices

Mr WELLINGTON: My question is to the Premier, and I ask: what is the minimum price coal needs to be sold for to make the proposed government investment in the development of the Galilee coal reserves viable?

Mr NEWMAN: I thank the honourable member for the question. It allows me to talk about the quite strategic position that has been taken by the Indian energy interests who wish to secure these coal supplies for not just two, three, 10 or 20 years but for 60 years and beyond. The first thing we need to reflect on, though, is that the Indian Prime Minister, Mr Modi, has been elected with a very clear mandate to bring prosperity to hundreds of millions of people in India. He has to lift them out of poverty. In the speech that I heard him give at the business breakfast that I referred to earlier, he made it very clear that he needed this coal. He needed coal for electricity, he needed coal to power industry and he needed coal to power businesses and homes, to lift people out of poverty.

There are a couple of different Indian groups that are interested in the Galilee. Their approach has been to create an integrated supply chain. These people are not interested in the coal price today, tomorrow or next week; they are interested in a long-term reliable supply, a very cost-effective supply chain and efficiency throughout that entire chain. They need coal of suitable quality to turn up day in and day out for, as I said earlier, about 60 years. Frankly, the coal price is not the issue; the issue is creating that efficient supply chain.

Mr Adani and the Adani Group have a vision of the coalmine, the railway line, the port facilities, the ships that carry it, the port at the other end, the conveyor belt to the power station, the transmission lines throughout the hinterland of India, the distribution system to the homes and businesses I referred to earlier and the billing systems. They are providing a complete solution. That is what their business is all about.

I say to honourable members that the issue is not the coal price; the issue is about how we appropriately support all interests that wish to get the Galilee Basin going. The concept that the Deputy Premier has enunciated is common user infrastructure—power, rail, elements of port facilities, the acquisition of land at the port—to allow all parties to open up the Galilee Basin and in the main supply coal to the Indian subcontinent to lift hundreds of millions of people out of poverty.

G20 Leaders Summit, Agriculture

Mr RICKUSS: My question without notice is to the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry. Can the minister outline how agriculture will benefit from the G20?

Dr McVEIGH: I thank the member for his question. His passionate continued representation of the seat of Lockyer is even more significant given that it is an iconic agricultural production region so important to Queensland and Australia, and the member's question is quite relevant because

Queensland agriculture was a very big focus of the recent G20 event in Brisbane. For Queensland to realise its potential for increased agricultural production, of course we need to secure export markets and higher farm gate returns for our producers. Despite the ongoing drought and recent floods, agriculture has certainly come a long way under the Newman LNP government. If we compare and contrast, those opposite did their absolute best to demonise farmers and tie them up in red tape and green tape and, in so doing, destroy their farm businesses and destroy jobs in the bush. That was Labor's legacy—destroying jobs in the bush. We on this side of the House do prioritise agriculture. Under the LNP government, it is a key pillar of our economy.

Both China and Indonesia are set to become even stronger trading partners and markets for Queensland farmers as a result of the G20. This is the reason that I met with new Indonesian President Joko Widodo and was part of a delegation to meet the President of China, Xi Jinping, during the G20, and Queensland's agricultural production and trade was a key focus of those discussions. At the meeting with President Widodo I outlined Queensland's readiness to supply some of our high-quality food products, including beef and live cattle, and we also toured the export facilities at the Port of Brisbane with Minister Emerson. I look forward to working with the new Indonesian government to further build our two-way trade relationship, as the Minister for Trade has outlined. I first undertook a trip in May 2012 to visit Jakarta to work on the live cattle trade which needed attention.

During the meeting with President Xi Jinping, the Premier outlined Queensland's capacity to deliver a wide range of agricultural products to China and its consumers, who are increasingly demanding safe and nutritious food. It was tremendous to meet both presidents and their business advisers in Brisbane during the G20. The LNP government supports Queensland farmers and we are making sure agriculture is well positioned to take advantage of the growing demand for our produce in the Asian region, hence the work by the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and by me as state agriculture minister linking in with other agencies right across the region. It presents a very strong plan from the LNP government for the future of agriculture in our state, dependent as it is on export market development as achieved at the G20.

Metro North Hospital and Health Service

Mrs D'ATH: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier stop the secrecy and advise how many senior executives have left the Metro North Hospital and Health Service since the Newman government was elected and why?

Mr NEWMAN: I do not think there is much secrecy about the issue; I have been reading about it in the newspaper. What I can tell members though is that we are seeing a better performing health service in Metro North, we are seeing a better performing health service across metropolitan Brisbane as a whole and we are seeing a better performing health service across the entire state of Queensland, and that is no secret either. Those opposite and their aligned unions are busy trying to tell people all sorts of quite outrageous things about the performance of the health service, and do members know why that upsets me the most? It upsets me because ultimately it is a slur—a slur on hardworking nurses, doctors and administrators who have turned—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr NEWMAN: I hear those opposite interjecting, but the facts speak for themselves. With regard to the independent health statistics, that is the national statistics agreed framework that is reported openly by this government—so much for secrecy—did they report those statistics? No, they did not. As usual, the hypocrisy just flows down the aisles of this place when they start going on. We are reporting the performance of the hospital service, so if you come into this place and then question the performance of our health system you are clearly saying something untoward about the men and women who work in the system, and I think that that is outrageous. We have given them \$2 billion a year more—an 18.6 per cent increase in the budget—and they are performing like never before. Are there more things to be done? Yes, there are, and we will not rest and we will not slow down until we have created the best free public health system in the nation. That is what we are about. What do we want? We want the best possible standard and quality of care for Queenslanders. Those opposite used to treat patients as numbers—numbers in a queue—and they allowed those queues to explode. On the other hand, we treat those patients as people. They are the most important people in the health system.

What about the outrageous comments from the member for Bundamba the other day when the minister announced this fantastic guarantee on waiting times? What was it all about? Suddenly it was all sorts of arguments that the health system was somehow a full employment program for people. It is not; it is about patients. What about the other outrageous assertions about new taxes and charges when this government has a clear track record over the last 2½ years of keeping the cost-of-living pressures off Queenslanders? That is what we are about—a better health system, a stronger health system. This is a strong team with a strong plan and we are creating a stronger Queensland.

Interruption.

PRIVILEGE

Alleged Deliberate Misleading of the House by a Member

Hon. TJ NICHOLLS (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (12.16 pm): I rise on a matter of privilege suddenly arising in relation to the question asked by the member for Mulgrave. The member for Mulgrave's question was—

I table the Treasurer's published diary for August 2013, his diary access under right to information and lobbyist contact declarations from former Howard government minister Alexander Downer, and I ask: why did the Treasurer fail to disclose a meeting with Singapore Power on 19 August last year, a company that is a potential purchaser ...

As always, it pays to check the documents. My published diary—the released diary—for 19 August states—

Alexander Downer

Andrew Park, Head of

External Affairs, QIC

My published diary has the facts of a meeting that I had with Alexander Downer on that day published on it—widely available and disclosed at the end of each month. Then we also have my RTI diary. Remember, this is not assessed by my office or anyone in the government but by the independent RTI officers and they produced a document and they redacted the information from that. So what this government does is release information and what the RTI office has said is that it was unnecessary but we did it anyway. Madam Speaker, this shows either gross recklessness or a deliberate attempt to mislead the House and I will be writing to you in relation to this matter.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Resumed.

G20 Leaders Summit, Cultural Precinct

Mr SYMES: My question without notice is to the Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts. Can the minister please update the House on the cultural precinct's valuable role during the G20 Leaders Summit?


Madam SPEAKER: Minister, you have one minute.

Mr WALKER: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a pity to have only one minute to talk about the central role that our fantastic cultural precinct played in the G20 meeting in Brisbane. All of our precinct organisations took part and all performed spectacularly. 15 November was really the high point for them when GoMA hosted a reception at the gallery. Surrounded by fantastic artworks, three dinners occurred at the gallery—a leaders' dinner in the Queensland Art Gallery, a spouses' dinner at GoMA and then a dinner hosted by federal Treasurer Joe Hockey. All events went off without a hitch, showcasing our fantastic facilities to the rest of the world. I am pleased to announce that those whose culinary delights normally may only extend to the pea and ham soup here at the parliamentary cafe will in fact be able to replicate that dinner with a special Dine Like a World Leader public event at GoMA on 3 December when people can have the same dinner that they did, and I would encourage people to do so.

Madam SPEAKER: The time for questions has expired.

MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST

Government Advertising; Newman Government, Performance

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (12.19 pm): Today, I want to touch on something that is very close to my heart and I think very close to the hearts of some of the other members of this House, which is the fundamental issue of integrity and accountability in government. Time and time again we have asked this government to reveal the amount of money that mums and dads are paying towards blatant political advertising. In the lead-up to the March 2015 election—fewer than four months away—households are being bombarded with endless amounts of political advertising. Clearly, when it comes to advertising there is a code of conduct. That code of conduct says that there must be no political advertising six months out from the election campaign. I have written to the Auditor-General about this matter. I believe that it is a misuse of public money to be blatantly advertising within the excluded time frame for political advertising and it must stop. The ads must stop and they must stop today. Every time a family is sitting at home and they see these ads come on their television screens, every time they hear these ads being played on the radio, they must know that Campbell Newman is spending their hard-earned money trying to get the LNP re-elected at the next election. Who should be paying for these ads? The LNP should be paying for these ads, not the taxpayers. It is about time there were some high standards in this government, which this Premier said that he would live up to when he was elected over 2½ years ago.

We have seen a diminution of standards in this House and within this government. There is no clearer example of that lowering of standards than the actions of the member for Mermaid Beach. The member for Mermaid Beach has an interest in a proposal that this government is going to consider in the near future. That project is Skyride on the Gold Coast. If it is good enough for the member for Mudgeeraba to table the two pages of advice that she received from the Integrity Commissioner, why is it not good enough for this man over here to table the advice from the Integrity Commissioner? That man is the member for Mermaid Beach, who asked questions of the Integrity Commissioner. How do we know the questions he asked? He is an assistant minister in this government and there is clearly a conflict of interest. If there is no conflict of interest, he should show us the advice. The Premier has said that he has sighted the advice. That is not good enough for me and that is not good enough for Queenslanders. We want to see that advice and we want to see it today.

The question that the member for Stafford asked the Premier was very clear: how much money has been given? How much secret money has been given in relation to the development of the Galilee Basin? What a simple, fundamental question going to the heart of the integrity of this government. We heard the Premier say 'somewhere between \$100 million and \$300 million'. Queenslanders want to know how much money is being given and they want to know it today. The Premier also said in an answer to a question, 'Well, when we know, we will tell you.' So do they know or do they not know? Has the deal been done or has the deal not been done? This issue goes to the heart of how a government runs. Queenslanders deserve to know the answers to these questions.

As I look back over the past 2½ years and as this could be the last parliamentary session before a general election, I want to thank my Labor opposition team for holding this government to account each and every day we sit in this place. When we entered those doors after the last general election, we came in here and took our seats proudly to serve as honourable members on behalf of our constituents who elected us. For the past 2½ years we have lived and breathed the results of that election. We have listened to Queenslanders. What did Queenslanders tell us after the last election? It was a very clear message: Queenslanders do not want their assets sold. That is exactly what Queenslanders told the Labor Party and that is exactly what we have listened to the people of Queensland about. Now, we see a dramatic turnaround from that mob over there, who are not listening and are going down the path of asset sales. They can dress it up as leases—they can dress it up any way they want—but Queenslanders are smarter than they think they are. They know exactly what they are on about. They know that a lease is a sale no matter what they say, no matter how they say it and no matter how much they spend on saying it.

Over the past 2½ years I have travelled the length and breadth of Queensland. I have listened to Queenslanders from all parts of this state who have told me that this government is arrogant and that this government is simply not listening. I have heard the cries of people, of families who are telling me that their health system has been gutted by this LNP. There have been 4½ thousand jobs ripped out of our health system, yet they put ads on TV trying to guarantee things that we know they cannot be held to account for.


Last week I was at the graduation ceremony for Inala State High School—the school that Wayne Goss went to, which I mentioned earlier. When I have been to past graduation ceremonies, as the kids walk across the stage there is a sign that says what they want to do when they leave school. Usually, it is things like electrician, or go to university, or become a mechanic, or work in retail, or be a hairdresser. When I sat there and I looked at the board during that graduation ceremony, as the students walked past on the stage what did the sign say that those kids wanted to do? It said that those kids wanted to get a job. For goodness' sake, what has Queensland become under the LNP? It has taken Queensland backwards. Kids leaving high school do not even have the enthusiasm or ambition to achieve what they deserve to achieve. This government is pushing them down. It is saying, 'You just need to get out there and try to find whatever job you can get.' It has dismantled the TAFE system in this state and axed jobs.

The other day I was in Townsville and I was talking to a man who worked in TAFE. He said, 'Annastacia, remember the last time you spoke to me up here in Townsville? Do you remember the last conversation we had? We were talking about the TAFE system and the benefits that it was giving the young people in my region.' I said, 'Of course I remember you.' And he said to me, 'I've been sacked. I've lost my job.' This was just a couple of months ago. In this state 24,000 people have lost their job as a result of this government. Services have been axed. The economy has been slowed right down. The unemployment rate is nowhere near the four per cent rate that this Premier promised. He promised an unemployment rate of four per cent and it is up at seven per cent. In the regions I travelled to, youth unemployment is as high as 20 per cent. The government axed Skilling Queenslanders for Work. There is no hope, there is no opportunity for these young people to gain a job.

There must be a better way. We owe it to the people who have been sacked in this state. We owe it to the families who have lost services in this state. There must be a better way. I will hold true the Labor Party values that I have been brought up with, that I learned from Wayne Goss, that I learned from Gough Whitlam—values of equality, opportunity and fairness. These are the values that I will fight for every single day of the week. As I lead the Labor Party into the next state election, we will remind every Queensland, every family, every household of the damage that this government and this Premier have inflicted across the state.

There are no high standards of government being held by this government. It is an absolute disgrace. They are more concerned about themselves than they are about governing Queensland. I know that there is a better way and I am going to find that better way for all Queenslanders.

Newman, Mr C

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (12.30 pm): Being in this House for almost the last three years in government has given me a wonderful close perspective of a bloke I really did not know that well before I entered the 54th Parliament. I knew he was the former Lord Mayor of Brisbane. I knew he had a reputation for being a no-nonsense, get-things-done type, military trained, grain industry executive. And I knew he did have a lovely wife and family. I knew one of the teachers at his girls' school who told me what a great dad and family man he was. So I had reasonably high expectations of this bloke they were touting as 'Can-do' Campbell Newman. I did not know if he could transpose from local government to state government seamlessly, as for my own part I had found the adversarial nature of state parliament quite juxtaposed to my local government role where everyone was heading in the same direction with the same information only with different views on how to get there. How amazed have I been! Not only was Premier Campbell Newman prepared for state politics, he has far, far exceeded any performer that I have seen in this House, and that includes the twisting, back-flipping, toothy grinned, self-proclaimed media tart, Peter Beattie, who laid unenviable failed financial foundations for Anna Bligh's spectacular demise in a record defeat at the 2012 election.


To me, and what should be important to all Queenslanders, he is no longer just the Can-do Campbell Newman, which suggests sentiment of promise and expectations. Over the last almost three years he has shown Queenslanders, and particularly my Gold Coasters, he is now the Can-did Campbell Newman of Queensland politics. 'Candid' is defined in the dictionary as truthful, straightforward and frank, and just ask any of the cabinet ministers who have slackened at their task throughout the term if that is not the case. He is a man who has achieved very many positives for the Queensland people in a relatively short space of time of the 54th parliament.

'Can-did' Campbell did fix the ailing health system to an enormous degree, with an 18 per cent increase in budget spending, dental waiting lists drastically reduced, ambulance ramping consigned to a thing of the past, operation waiting lists spectacularly reduced and fairness and equity restored to

doctors and nurses pay with a great lift in nurses' remuneration which is now paid on time. Local hospital boards act locally and respond with local knowledge, giving better outcomes for local health issues. Can-did Campbell did fix the education system, with schools receiving an 11 per cent increase in funding, with much of that going to school building improvements, upgrading school facilities, more teacher aides and an extremely sought-after private public school innovation which delivered responsibility, accountability and relevancy to the direction of school principals who are best placed to understand the nuances of individual schools from all the areas across Queensland. Can-did Campbell did fix the criminal outlaw bikie gang problem, which was particularly evident on the Gold Coast, and his overall commitment to law and order through 800 new police, tougher sentencing laws for demonstrably outcast criminals in our society and serious penalties and correction for youth crime have been overwhelmingly endorsed by all I have spoken to who want a better Queensland. Who cares what scraps individual members of the judiciary are fighting over, just as who cares what scraps of entitlement individual politicians might fight over, as long as Queenslanders can have faith in the Queensland judicial and crime fighting systems—and they can. Can-did Campbell did cut the red tape and green tape across Queensland so that Queensland businesses can get on with work and create more jobs for Queenslanders, with new resource industry approvals for mining jobs, new construction industry approvals for the building industry, new tourism industry approvals and red-tape reduction for new tourism jobs and new agricultural jobs in a sector that badly needed support and green-tape reduction.

A new man and a new government have kick-started Queensland business again and Can-did Campbell has led from the front. I cannot tell members how proud I am to have served in this Can-did Campbell Newman LNP government and how much I believe we have achieved for Queenslanders in what has been a relatively short space of time. As Mermaid Beach residents and Queenslanders head towards Christmas, I am delighted to say that we have delivered on many of our promises. I wish everyone a merry Christmas.

Liberal Party of Australia, 70th Anniversary

 **Mr MINNIKIN** (Chatsworth—LNP) (12.35 pm): I rise today to pay tribute to Australia's pre-eminent political movement and to the life of its founder, a leading figure of our political landscape. Seventy years ago in October 1944 Sir Robert Gordon Menzies convened the Canberra Conference to bring together 80 men and women from 18 separate political parties. Outlining his view for a united force to defeat the rising threat of centralism and socialism, Menzies told the conference—

What we must look for, and it is a matter of desperate importance to our society, is a true revival of liberal thought which will work for social justice and security, for national power and national progress, and for the full development of the individual citizen, though not through the dull and deadening process of socialism.

Menzies' Liberal Party stands for the citizen over the official, the community over the state and the family over everything, and it is the enemy of privilege, sectional interests and narrow prejudice. As Menzies said—

We took the name 'Liberal' because we were determined to be a progressive party, willing to make experiments, in no sense reactionary, but believing in the individual, his rights and enterprise, and rejecting the Socialist panacea.

The Liberal Party believes in the innate worth of the individual and the right to be independent, to own property and to achieve and in the need to encourage initiative and personal responsibility. Our philosophy of individual liberty finds its footings in the writings of John Stuart Mill who famously denounced excessive government intervention by saying—

... the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others. His own good, either physical or moral, is not a sufficient warrant.

Mill called for freedom that allows the pursuit of our own good in our own way so long as we do not attempt to deprive others of theirs or impede their efforts to obtain it. It seems clear to me that the Liberal Party is not a party of unfettered individualism, but a party that recognises the responsibility of individuals to their community. The rights of any individual are limited and constrained by the equal rights of other individuals.

As founder of this Liberal Party of Australia, Menzies would go on to lead Australia for 17 years until his resignation from politics in 1966. In a gross misunderstanding of Australian political history, Julia Gillard once labelled Gough Whitlam's government as the transforming moment for Australia. However, in his book *The Menzies Era*, John Howard set straight Australia's postwar narrative.

According to Howard, it is the 1949 election, rather than Whitlam's election in 1972, that defines postwar Australia. Challenging the misconception that the fifties and sixties were a joyless ultra conservative decade when time stood still, Howard writes—


We can find fault with all of the decades that have gone before us, but to endorse that description of the 1950s is to divert attention from the remarkable economic and social progress that period spawned.

Indeed, Menzies oversaw a golden era of Australian progress. Menzies put an end to Australia's Asian isolation by instituting military, trade, diplomatic, educational and cultural links with the region—Australia's true pivot to Asia. Menzies invested heavily in universities, transforming the funding and the reach of higher education. Immigration was expanded and diversified allowing Menzies' successor, Harold Holt, to abolish the White Australia Policy in 1966. Many of the building blocks of the modern Australian economy were put in place in the fifties and sixties.

It is the middle class that defines Menzies' Australia—mainstream Australians whose goals, needs and aspirations had been ignored by government. They were the forgotten people who represented the backbone of this country. There is perhaps no better example of this middle class than those I am fortunate enough to represent in this parliament. From the tradesperson at Carina, the family at Wakerley, the small business owner from Tingalpa, the retailer at Carindale to the professional at Belmont it seems to me that these are Menzies' mainstream Australians. People who are envied by those whose benefits are largely obtained by taxing them, but are not rich enough to have individual power, are the backbone of the nation. These lifters of Chatsworth live the virtues of thrift, hard work and risk taking. They are the people up at 5 am each day in order to carve out a better future for both themselves and their families.

Seventy years ago Sir Robert Menzies hoped the Liberal Party would change the current of Australian politics and it is on the 70th anniversary that we reflect on the triumphs of Australia's longest serving Prime Minister and on Australia's most successful postwar political party. It is our responsibility as the government to be an enabler of opportunity and not a provider of assumed entitlement. We have to take responsibility in this state for our own actions, develop resilience and accept risk. I congratulate the Liberal Party on its 70th anniversary.

Queensland Economy

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (12.39 pm): On the weekend we saw more misleading spin from the Premier when he pledged a return to surplus. That return to surplus was already locked in by Labor for 2014-15, on the back of more than half a billion dollars in LNG royalties facilitated by the former Labor government. Labor had chartered a return to an operating surplus without sacking more than 24,000 people, nearly halving economic growth and making Queensland the unemployment capital of Australia, as the LNP has done. In Queensland, we now have an unemployment rate of seven per cent seasonally adjusted and 6.7 per cent trend. On either measure, it is the highest level of unemployment in 11 years. On either measure, tens of thousands of full-time jobs have been destroyed by the Newman government. In October, there were 18,600 fewer full-time jobs trend and 20,200 fewer full-time jobs seasonally adjusted than at the election. Compare that with the previous Labor government, which supported the creation of more than 53,000 full-time jobs over our last term in office, which is at a time when the now Treasurer was calling the economy a 'basket case'.

On the weekend, the Premier also said that he would deliver the first surplus in a decade. That is more dishonest and deceptive spin from the government. We need look only as far as the investor booklet that the Treasurer will take with him overseas to see that this is false. That booklet—the one he will take overseas when apparently he is not meeting with Singapore Power—clearly sets out that Labor recorded seven operating surpluses over the last 11 years in office, with deficits coinciding with the year of the September 11 terrorist attacks, the global financial crisis and the two years following the historic summer of natural disasters. That is a fiscal balance used by the Premier that is not referred to by any other state or territory Treasurer in Australia. Ironically, on the LNP's preferred measure, the budget position has deteriorated by \$884 million from 2011-12 to 2014-15 compared with Labor's forecasts. The Premier also falsely claimed that Labor left the state \$8 billion in the red. Last time I checked, Labor was not in government in the 2012-13 financial year when the state recorded a \$7.7 billion fiscal deficit. That year, under the LNP, Queensland recorded the largest fiscal and operating deficits in our state's history. That was the same year in which Queensland recorded the worst result for jobs growth in more than two decades.


This government continues to blame Labor for its own mistakes, but Queenslanders are not buying it anymore. The LNP blames Labor for increasing total state debt from \$62 billion to \$80 billion, while cutting ribbons at the projects funded by those borrowings. It blames Labor for its plan to pay for its increase in debt through asset sales. The ABS National Accounts released on Friday confirmed that Queensland's economy has slowed from growth of four per cent under Labor to 2.3 per cent last financial year under the LNP. That growth is below the national average and below the historical average in Queensland. The economy is not 'back on track'; it is well and truly off track. The fact remains that the economy is growing more slowly and unemployment is higher under the LNP than under Labor.

However, it may come as a surprise that I do agree with the Premier in terms of the outlook for Queensland's economy. Next financial year we are set to be the fastest growing economy alongside New South Wales, but make no mistake: that is on the back of a game-changing 22½ per cent increase in exports from the ramp up of the new LNG export industry established under Labor. When factoring in the recovery of the global economy, stronger growth in trading partners, significantly lower interest rates and a lower Australian dollar, the Queensland economy should be in a much better position than it is currently. That is despite the economic hatchet job by the LNP, and certainly not because of it. Our economic growth should be leading, not falling behind, the national average.

Today I can flag some of what the Treasurer and the Premier are likely to announce in the final budget update prior to the election. They are likely to announce a rise in stamp duty revenue caused by a fall in interest rates, from a cash rate of 4.25 per cent in March 2012 to 2.5 per cent by August 2013. Historically, low interests are generating activity with the number of owner-occupier housing commitments increasing by 516 in September, compared with the same time last year, or by more than five per cent. The LNP has already tried to take credit for this improvement in borrowing conditions flowing through to the housing market and claim it as their own, while insisting on a record asset sell-off.

Unlike this arrogant LNP government, Labor will not be taking Queenslanders for mugs. The people in the community to whom I talk understand that the LNP's record \$37 billion asset privatisation will rob the state of \$2 billion in annual returns or \$60 billion over the next 30 years. Queenslanders will be taxed twice under the LNP's mass asset privatisation plan, through both a higher cost of living and also lost returns to taxpayers from the businesses sold. Queenslanders know that there is another way. Queenslanders understand that the best way to manage our state's finances and our economy is to keep income-producing assets in public hands, for a responsible and measured pay down of debt. At the next election, only a vote for Labor will keep essential income-producing assets in public hands. That is the only way, but it is not the LNP way.

Environmental Pollution

 **Mrs OSTAPOVITCH** (Stretton—LNP) (12.44 pm): Forever in history Brisbane will be noted as the 2014 city of the G20. In the months leading up to the meeting, there was such an air of excitement, starting with the lighting of the city and the amazing 'Brisbane' sign on our riverfront, which was constructed by men's sheds and many community organisations. Meeting the very popular Prime Minister Modi of India and President Xi Jinping of China with the Premier was an extraordinary honour. For me, one of the highlights was attending the I-20, which stood for the Innovation-20. Scientists, brain surgeons and educators came from all over the world to talk about innovation and science and the potential of our planet into the future. It was a credit to Mario Penisi and Life Sciences Queensland, which held that fascinating and eye-opening forum. Do members know that, according to the scientists and statisticians, 2014 is the year when the number of births will peak. Apparently, we are not reproducing like we used to. The good news is that we will live on and on through the genius of science. Of course, that means that we have to get smarter about how we are going to feed everyone.

During the G20, a few leaders paid much attention to the threat of global warming and climate change. What about pollution? We seem to have stopped talking about the pollution of our air and waterways. The whole world is using the term 'climate change' instead of calling pollution 'pollution'. As I see it, the problem with this terminology is that we are changing our focus from the very obvious problems that any person can see with their own eyes. If you go to any big world city, especially those in China and the United States, the air ranges in colour from grey to blue-black. Really, we are not supposed to be able to see our air. However, I have noticed that grey and black air usually hangs over cities and not over coal fired power stations. Therefore, while burning coal may well generate pollution, I think it is the cars that we all drive that create the most.


Of course, it is always much easier to point the finger at somebody else instead of looking at the three fingers pointing back at you. Since the earth was formed, there have been climate changes. We have always had droughts, floods, cyclones, hot seasons and cold seasons. Yes, climate certainly does change and there is no doubt about that. However, the jury is still out on whether mankind's pollution has any significant impact on it. It is certain that polluted air has an impact on human health and physiology. People die from the continued breathing in of polluted air. They give birth to deformed babies and have significantly higher rates of disease and illness. Please, let us put the focus back on reducing pollution for the sake of a cleaner environment and better health, which will also have the desired outcome on climate control.

Global warming, climate change, a hole in the ozone layer—by the way, what did happen to that hole? It was not that long ago that the end of the world was going to come because of that hole, yet we never hear about it anymore. The way I see it, all of these popular catchphrases take the focus away from the real problem: we human beings are grubs. All over the world, humans throw rubbish into the gutters and onto the beaches, and it ends up in our waterways. Food wrappers, bottles, plastic bags, cigarette butts: you name it, we chuck it. I lived on the Logan River for a while, and we had a stormwater drain that stopped short of the river. The amount of rubbish that I used to pull out of that gully was extraordinary. Rivers are supposed to be for fish, crabs and platypus, not food wrappers and plastic bags. I suggest that the impact of the garbage in our waterways and oceans has a more significant impact on this planet than burning coal to generate electricity.

This all takes me back to when I was a child and I used to read fairy tales. They were the kind that always ended with, 'The moral of the story is ...'. There is one called *The Emperor's New Clothes*. It was about a con artist who sold a gullible emperor a garment that was supposed to be so fine that only intelligent people could see it. However, the garment was a figment of his imagination. The con man made sure that the whole city heard that the garment could be seen only by those with superior intelligence. Of course, when the emperor walked down the street everybody saw a naked man, but nobody said anything for fear of being called an idiot. People started to doubt their own common sense. No-one wanted to go against the crowd who were obviously smarter than them because they could see the garment. Until one day a little boy cried out, 'The emperor has no clothes on.'

There are two morals to that story. Firstly, it is not always the majority who are right. The next is to never let anyone intimidate or ridicule you into silence. I like to give thought-provoking matters of public interest speeches. I think this one will stimulate conversation too.

Rockhampton Hospital, Tender

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (12.49 pm): This morning we have already had discussion and matters raised in this House regarding integrity and the reputation of the government and secrecy. Nothing goes more to the reputation of government than the way in which it operates in a commercial environment, regardless of one's political persuasion.

I am raising today a potentially very serious matter that has recently been brought to my attention. I will give the accountable minister the benefit of the doubt and suggest that he is completely unaware of the events within his portfolio. I am referring to the Health portfolio. My comments are informed by this fundamental principle: that a minister is accountable to this House on all matters within his portfolio and, just the same as responsibility within the military services, ignorance is no excuse but rather part of a subsequent mitigation plea.

The matter I raise has occurred in recent weeks under the minister's watch and involves one of the health boards and its bureaucrats. I am specifically referring to the contract to fit out the ICU in Rockhampton being awarded to a Western Australian firm that has little hospital construction experience and at a cost of \$400,000 more than a Queensland builder that has been building public and private hospitals since 1965. The minister, and particularly the CQHHS, has been happy to rabbit on about savings. Will he now claim credit for wasting \$400,000 of these valuable health dollars?

The Queensland company is JM Kelly. I have verified that its price was \$400,000 cheaper than the Western Australian company's price. I will make no further comment on that, but I understand the Western Australian firm won on the non-price criteria, which was apparently 40 per cent of the tender score. Having sat on many Commonwealth defence tender boards, I am very familiar with such issues. That experience is what now informs my concerns.

Clearly, the government and the invisible Minister for Public Works have changed the non-price criteria. What other explanation could there be? I can inform the House that JM Kelly met the sort of non-price criteria that existed under Labor. JM Kelly has 75 apprentices, 300 full-time employees, pays Queensland taxes and is innovative in areas like recycling and construction methodology.

It is hard to see what form of non-price criteria, worth \$400,000, would disqualify JM Kelly from winning the job, especially when it has already, either as the head contractor or a subcontractor, been working on the site for years. It simply does not add up even under the banner of encouraging competition, particularly given the state of the Central Queensland economy, due nearly entirely to this government's decisions.

I have heard rumours that one of the health department construction managers and a Queensland senior executive of the winning company are well known to each other, as they have both worked for the same tier 1 builder here in Queensland. These are rumours so I am not naming names out of fairness to those involved. However, these are serious allegations that I am unable to investigate. They definitely should be investigated.


If I get to hear these things, then it is common knowledge in the industry. I call on the minister to investigate it. Given the highly questionable tender practices of this government that have been raised already in this House, it behoves the minister to put a fulsome explanation before the House.

I hope that there are no other possibilities here, like the fact that this company had donated to Labor candidates. That would not be possible, would it? Because we all know that there is no correlation between successful tenderers and the LNP's coffers. We all know that, don't we? JM Kelly, for example, won the Joh Bjelke-Petersen Premier's Award.

This situation looks suss to me. How can a tier 2 company that has extensive experience in health construction, has a turnover of \$130 million, that is located within eyesight of the site, is a regionally based Queensland company be thrown over for an interstate company with none of those advantages and is \$400,000 more expensive? So much for the intent of the Queensland Plan. It has fallen at the first hurdle.

My view is that JM Kelly has been robbed. It makes a mockery of the Queensland Plan. I suggest the minister try telling the Rockhampton tradespeople who will lose their jobs because \$400,000 could do a lot for my constituents. As their representative, I insist that the minister provide full transparency on this matter. He can start by tabling the non-commercial elements of the non-price criteria for the tender evaluation, as well as the names of those who were on the tender panel. Were there any conflicts of interest, real or perceived, declared? He should at least initially explain why this government would so willingly disadvantage local industry providers. Even John Howard in his first term refused to do that. He specifically recognised and advantaged LIPs. The minister needs to stand in the House and explain the outcome.

Lockyer Electorate

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (12.54 pm): I rise to discuss two issues concerning the Lockyer electorate. The first is that the timber railway bridges in Laidley are set for an upgrade. I thank the transport minister for that. This is important for Laidley. The railway line does appear to hold up some of the water which creates some of the flooding. Part of the upgrade of the timber railway bridges will be an extension of the bridges to deal with the hydrology of the area. They should be able to cope with more water. What really needs to be done just outside town where there is one of these timber bridges is the culverts need to be extended to ensure there is enough capacity to get the water away from the town. I call on the minister to look at this. I have written to him about this.

The upgrade should lessen flooding in Laidley. The hydrology reports done by SKM for the Lockyer Valley Regional Council have not shown that the culverts have a great impediment on the flood water because the railway line runs parallel to the creek. But there is an enormous volume of water that comes through that area.

I acknowledge Alan Brimblecombe, Tony Semph, Peter Hooper and Russell Kirk, local businessmen and residents, for assisting me with trying to get this project through. Glen Doyle, Michael Ryan and Graham Brown from QR have also been of great assistance to me with regard to trying to improve railway infrastructure through the Lockyer. Railway infrastructure virtually runs the full length of the Lockyer electorate, finishing at Murphys Creek, Ballard, Spring Bluff and some of those magnificent areas.

The second issue I would like to raise in parliament is the acquisition of some 6,000 acres of land adjoining Glen Rock State Forest. Glen Rock park came about under ROSS—the regional open space scheme—implemented by the Labor government. Unfortunately, they struggled to know what to do with Glen Rock park. It comprises 17,000 acres of land about 40 kilometres south of Gatton. We have purchased another 6,000 acres as part of our koala habitat commitment. I think it was an election commitment. This is a great initiative. It is about protecting the environment. This is action occurring on the ground.

I congratulate one of the graziers in that area, Trevor Hutton. He is a great environmentalist. He has managed the property extremely well. There are very few noxious weeds in the area. He has always had a fire regime in place to manage the area appropriately. He works out a lot of the issues.

He is one of those old laconic bush characters. He is well into his 60s now. We purchased some of the lease and freehold title from him. While I was talking to him he used an iconic Australian statement that I had not heard before. I said something to him and he came back to me saying, 'Look, you are going to have to speak a bit louder. I'm going a bit deaf. I'm that deaf I can't hear the plovers at night anymore.' I had never heard that statement before, but I thought it was a classic. He cannot hear the plovers at night.


He has done a great job of managing the area. He will be there for a bit longer to ensure a smooth transition. Black cockatoos, spotted-tail quolls and brush-tailed rock wallabies reside in these areas. Some of the area is nearly as high as Toowoomba. It is 400, 500 or 600 metres above sea level. Trevor was there during the floods of 2013 and 2011 when enormous volumes of water gushed down the gullies and down the creeks. They were cut off for weeks.

This will be a great addition to the Glen Rock State Forest south of Gatton. It will be a great asset for the whole of South-East Queensland. There are thousands of acres within less than a two-hour drive from Brisbane. I encourage members who are looking for some good country and good forest reserve to visit the area. There are some good camping spots up there. If members go on to the EPA website and look at the guide for Scenic Rim parks they will find it. They are well maintained.

I had some Vietnam veterans spend some time up there this year as part of their camps. This is the sort of thing the people of Queensland need when they are under stress and need a break. I encourage people to go to places like Glen Rock State Forest.

Sitting suspended from 1.00 pm to 2.30 pm.

Campbell's Camp, Brigalow

 **Mr HOPPER** (Condamine—KAP) (2.30 pm): I would like to speak about some friends of mine, Bill and Lyn Dahlheimer, who own Campbell's Camp at Brigalow. Campbell's Camp has been owned by Bill and Lyn for almost 28 years. It is a prime location on the Condamine River with good soils, water security and access. It is a cattle-grazing property and it has been developed and improved over the years to produce top-quality grey Brahman breeding stock, characterised by excellent weight gains and quiet temperament.

Lyn has worked by Bill's side in all of their farming activities while also dedicating much love and care to their 109-year-old home and establishing the surrounding gardens. They love their property, but they are also realistic. It had always been their plan to develop an attractive and valuable enterprise to sell when the time was right and then enjoy a few years of retirement together. Originally an offer of around \$1.8 million was accepted, but the buyer withdrew the offer once he realised the closeness of the Kogan Creek Power Station and mine, which was situated on their immediate doorstep just across the river. Bill has never smoked but now suffers with asthma and bronchitis. Lyn has developed skin irritations that sting and itch so much that she is not able to sleep.

The National Pollutant Inventory 2012-13 report, publicly available, shows the tonnes of heavy metal and other emissions from Kogan Creek Power Station to range from five to 28 times the amounts of heavy metals and other components when compared to the emissions of the same heavy metals and compounds from Stanwell Power Station. Guttering, fences and other metal structures have advanced rusting due to the chemicals which settle on them. Bill and Lyn have both been tested and shown to have very high levels of heavy metals and other compounds in their bodies.

In August 2013, following requests from the Dahlheimers, CS Energy conducted independent tests on their drinking water and the black residue which covers the outside and inside surfaces of their home. CS Energy have refused to make those test results available to Bill and Lyn. What are they trying to hide? I ask the minister today to make CS Energy come forward with the results of those tests so that we can see the effects that this has had on Bill and Lyn's lives. It is as simple as that. Water filters clog up within three days; they should last at least six months. The property has been devalued by 20 per cent. The Valuer-General's department states in a letter that this is due to the 'effects of flooding from earthworks upstream associated with the Kogan coalmine and the increase in weeds and pests from this land'. They can no longer farm the best land due to erosion from the diversion of the watercourse caused by the ash disposal site. Roads and dam banks have been washed away due also to this diversion.


Blasting causes a great deal of extra work and stress as cattle have to be moved each time. The mine lets them know each time they blast, so Bill has to go and shift his Brahman bulls and his cattle to get them away from the blast and sometimes the blasting is put off. It is always on weekends and in the case of a severe blast there are massive problems with the cattle. Two days after one blast all the leaves fell off the large pepperina tree.

The property has been listed for sale for four to five years with up to eight real estate agents. They have a letter from an agent stating that proximity to the power station led to heavy discounting of the property but it is still not appealing to any buyers or their financiers. For the past five years Bill and Lyn should have been enjoying their retirement. They are now looking at having to walk off their once beautiful property penniless and with nowhere to call home. CS Energy need to acknowledge the impact the mining activities are having on this property. It is the last property in that district that is not owned by them. They need to get in there and buy this property from Bill and Lyn at the value it was worth before that power station went in and show Bill and Lyn the respect that they deserve for so many years of hard work and dedication to this farm and their future. I would like to table some photographs.

Tabled paper: Photographs depicting black residue on property at Campbell's Camp, Brigalow [\[6558\]](#).

You can see a white rag on the side of the wall of the house that is turning black. You can see the devastation to the gutter. CS Energy is now worth \$5 billion—\$5 billion. It is the newest and most efficient energy provider we have in this state. For a company that is worth that much money to let these two old people suffer like they are, I hang my head in shame to be an elected member of parliament and for not being able to get parliament to move on CS Energy to make them buy that property to give Bill and Lyn the enjoyment of life that they both deserve.

Garrahy, Mr M; Ted Malone Rural Skills Centre

 **Mr MALONE** (Mirani—LNP) (2.35 pm): The emergency service volunteers throughout Queensland have lost a fearless and passionate advocate for their cause with the recent passing of Mike Garrahy. His funeral was held last Saturday at Crows Nest, attended by hundreds of emergency service volunteers from throughout Queensland who provided a wonderful guard of honour. I give my very sincere condolences to his two wonderful sons, Billy and Glen, and to his beautiful wife, Jean.

Mike was highly regarded as a no-nonsense straight shooter. In his more recent roles as president of the Rural Fire Brigades Association of Queensland and as a highly valued member of the Malone Review into Rural Fire Services in Queensland and the SES, he infused a level of compassion and understanding that will be greatly missed. Mike spent 20 or more years as a highly decorated member of the police force in Queensland. Previously, and among many other responsibilities, Mike had spent many years in various roles in emergency services, particularly the SES, where he made major contributions to training and emergency management.


As a friend, I will miss his crooked grin and outlandish humour, whilst knowing full well he was softening you up for something more serious. I could always rely on Mike to give me good common-sense advice with no BS and a good dose of reality thrown in for free. They say a person can be judged by the path they travel and the footprints they leave behind. Mike's footprints are firmly embedded in many people's hearts throughout Queensland. Mike was a very special person who will be sorely missed, particularly amongst our emergency service volunteers throughout Queensland.

I have a few minutes, so I would like to speak again about the Ted Malone Rural Skills Centre at Sarina and another great breakthrough in the last six months or so. There were seven young people who were totally disengaged from school and they were creating quite an amount of difficulty throughout the township. They were failing in their classes and creating general havoc throughout the community. Bendigo Bank and Rio Tinto donated some money towards buying steel and some components and so we got these boys in for two days a week and they built a tandem trailer with a cattle float and ultimately a set of yards that fitted into that float over a period of about six months. It turned out that they spent more time than they were allocated doing that work—they would come in early and leave late. I was also looking at the work they were doing over that period of time. They were doing their English and mathematics at the skills centre rather than at the high school. Amazingly, for the teachers, their class averages went up to Bs and even As in terms of their education.

When speaking to the media—they got good coverage in the *Rural Weekly*, which covers most of Central Queensland—these young people spoke very forcefully about the fact that they believe they now have a future. One of the young students has been offered an apprenticeship. There has been a complete turnaround in their attitude. It is a marvellous alternative way of treating some of our kids who disengage from school.

The skills centre is currently working with a number of other kids in the youth justice system. Jarrod can tell everybody that the cost of having a child in the youth justice system is very expensive. We have seen great results from a similar project with our youth justice kids. They are stripping down and rebuilding three large windmills which they will stand up over a period of time. We are seeing the same attitude change with those young people. They were absolutely terrorising the community at Hay Point in an urban situation. I think there are real opportunities to turn a lot of our young people around by taking control and encouraging them to use their hands to get a proper education.

ABC, Funding

 **Mr WELLINGTON** (Nicklin—Ind) (2.40 pm): The matter of public importance I will speak about today is another broken promise by the LNP—the promise Tony Abbott made before the last election when he said there would be no cuts to the ABC or the SBS. This was a considered statement made by the federal Leader of the Liberal National Party intended to directly influence how people voted at the election, and it did affect how people voted. After making this promise, the LNP slashed millions from the ABC's budget, forcing it to sack or retrench one in 10 employees resulting in about 400 staff being made redundant. This will directly impact on programs including *Lateline*, *Four Corners*, *Landline* and *Australian Story* to mention a few. Let us never forget the dynamic influence of the ABC on the downfall of the corrupt Queensland Bjelke-Petersen government by Chris Masters—a brilliant *Four Corners* program. Without a properly funded ABC, this could never have happened. Threats and bribes did not work, and the good old ABC has been out there investigating and reporting stories when no-one else would go. The ABC has been telling it how it was to thousands of loyal listeners and viewers which was often picked up by other media. The LNP's think tank came up with this disgraceful solution to try to muzzle the ABC by cutting its funding after its investigation into allegations of bias were shown to be groundless. Never before has a government of any political persuasion so brazenly conspired to muzzle the ABC. It just shows the depth that the LNP, both state and federal, will descend to try to destroy independent reporting and scrutiny of government decisions.

The LNP does not want independent media scrutiny of its actions. The LNP will do whatever it takes to retain government. When money cannot buy it, when threats and coercion do not work, it slashes ABC funding. There is no doubt that the Murdoch owned media helped the Abbott government win last year's election. Now with Murdoch press haemorrhaging money, it is payback time. The ABC had to be muted and the LNP is doing exactly that: trying to choke the broadband to eliminate any view that competes with or questions the Murdochs' right wing rants. The fact that Abbott gave a hand-on-heart promise to Australian voters prior to last year's election not to cut funding to the ABC or the SBS has gone the same way as the rest of his promises—down the gurgler. 'Don't you worry about that,' he says. 'We're not cutting funding. These are efficiency dividends,' and the band played believe it if you like.

The LNP has form in breaking pre-election promises. It is in their DNA. It reminds me of when Campbell Newman was spruiking the benefits of voting LNP before the last state election. And, guess what, he was supported by the Murdoch press. 'We will not cut jobs,' he promised, and then threw thousands of Queenslanders on the dole queues, and many of them are still there. Australians are not fools, and we will not sit by and allow the LNP to destroy our national broadcaster because it dares to say it how it is without buckling to pressure from the government or advertisers.


The ABC's tough and fearless reporters dare to question, dare to investigate without fear or favour and present programs which uncover sometimes inconvenient truths that upset and embarrass governments, even threatening their hold on power. Murdoch knows people are turning off and boycotting his extremist, right wing, pro-LNP government media in droves, and he knows his influence over the election of governments across Australia is waning. As a result, he cannot stop the emerging social media but with the LNP support together they think they can undermine the influence of the ABC.

Abbott's LNP government is furious with the ABC, which it hates for reporting its failures—the budget rejection, the paid parental leave farce, the Medicare co-payment debacle, the Gonski backflips and most recently the G20 embarrassments, all of which have made the Abbott government

the worst-polling, first-term government in our history. I repeat: it is the worst-polling, first-term government in our history. This is also true of the Newman government, which has a massive war chest brimming over and the best money can buy PRs already flooding the media with political spin dressed up as state government information in the run-up to next year's election.

The commercial media are drooling at the thought of the untold millions of money to be spent by the LNP and are falling over themselves to hail the fictional successes of this Newman government. But how frustrating it must be that the LNP cannot crack the most highly respected, best loved media organisation—our ABC. With millions slashed from the ABC's budget and Queensland's 7.30 history, champagne corks may be popping at LNP headquarters. But we should worry because it is abundantly clear that the LNP government's cuts will seriously impact on the quality of the ABC programs despite assurances to the contrary by the minister. God save the ABC because the LNP certainly won't.

Murrumba Electorate

 **Mr GULLEY** (Murrumba—LNP) (2.45 pm): I rise to speak on behalf of Murrumba. As members have heard before, Murrumba is the Aboriginal word for 'good place'. May I add to this morning's condolence motion for the late Wayne Goss and convey my sympathy to his family for their loss. He is a man whom I never met but a man whom I admired and respected.

Each morning I ask myself this question: what is my role in guiding Murrumba to being a great place? When out and about listening to my residents I am often asked what are the issues in Murrumba. One word that comes to mind is growing pains. Murrumba is the third largest enrolment in Queensland. Growth is exciting. Growth brings jobs, houses, new schools and infrastructure, but they do not all turn up at the same time, hence the growing pains analogy.

When I turned up for my new MP briefings, I discovered there were no plans to upgrade the Rothwell roundabout or Boundary Road intersection, Griffin school was little more than a thought bubble, and Redcliffe Hospital and North Lakes health precinct were struggling under the weight of local growth. But with a strong new government there is light at the end of the tunnel. The Rothwell intersection is being planned. The surveyors were out last week. The Boundary Road intersection has been upgraded with another stage to be completed. Metro North health stats are a credit to the new minister, and we have a new school already gazetted for the growth suburb of Griffin.

In more good news for my electorate, on 1 November I had the great privilege to take more than 650 of my local residents from Murrumba on a historic tour along the Moreton Bay rail line construction site from Mango Hill to Kippa-Ring. This tour gave my constituents a chance to view the normally off-limits construction site from the safety of a minibus. I ran as a Liberal in 2006 in Murrumba with the railway as my signature policy and note that it has been conservative policy for over a decade at all levels of conservative candidates or members. Though the railway line is the largest infrastructure project in the area, we are planning for intersections and roundabouts. We have removed the T2 lanes from Anzac Avenue and built bikeways along Anzac Avenue. This is not to mention health improvements such as the North Lakes Ambulance Station and the opening of the Redcliffe GP Super Clinic after years of ALP delays.

In terms of growth, there is not much stronger growth than that seen at Bounty Boulevard State School. Opened only in 2008, it now educates over 1,100 students. I would like to confirm for that community that I am fighting hard for it to get its fair share of buildings and resources to keep up with those enrolments. The good news for Bounty Boulevard State School is that it will also benefit from becoming one of the recently announced independent public schools. Parents and teachers in my electorate have already seen the great advantages of IPSs and this school will also benefit from that. Growth has already brought two much needed, long overdue kindergartens for my electorate in the suburb of Mango Hill opened this year, both in the Catholic system and by JP Langbroek at Mango Hill State School.

Talking of analogies, I often liken life and society to sitting on a three-legged stool. As Murrumba grows, I need to be conscious of those three. One leg, being the economy, provides jobs, food, houses to live in, taxes to fund schools, hospitals and other government sources. Another leg is the environment that we live in. I note the great people from Friends of the Deception Bay Conservation Park and the great volunteers of Osprey House and Redcliffe Environment Forum who keep a watchful eye on Hays Inlet Conservation Park.


Most of all I am proud of the third leg, the community. With over 250 formal and informal community groups in my electorate, there are too many to boast about today. As Murrumba grows we need all three to be strong, we need all three to grow in step and we need all three to be considered

in balance with the other two. If any get out of balance Murrumba, although a good place, will not be the great place that I am working hard towards. Murrumba is a great place. Managing the pressures of growth is a challenge and I undertake that challenge with a sense of responsibility and excitement.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! The time for matters of public interest has expired.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL

Message from Governor

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (2.50 pm): I present a message from His Excellency the Governor.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: The message from His Excellency the Governor recommends the Planning and Development Bill. The contents of the message will be incorporated in the records of the parliament. I table the message for the information of members.

MESSAGE

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT BILL 2014

Constitution of Queensland 2001, section 68

I, PAUL de JERSEY AC, Governor, recommend to the Legislative Assembly a Bill intituled—

A Bill for an Act to facilitate Queensland's prosperity by providing for an efficient, effective, transparent, integrated and accountable system of land use planning and development assessment

(Sgd)

GOVERNOR

Date: 25 NOV 2014

Tabled paper: Message, dated 25 November 2014, from His Excellency the Governor, recommending the Planning and Development Bill 2014 [\[6559\]](#).

Introduction

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (2.50 pm): I present a bill for an act to facilitate Queensland's prosperity by providing for an efficient, effective, transparent, integrated and accountable system of land use planning and development assessment. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Planning and Development Bill 2014 [\[6560\]](#).

Tabled paper: Planning and Development Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[6561\]](#).

It does indeed give me great pleasure to introduce this bill to the House today. The Planning and Development Bill 2014 is one of three bills that are the culmination of our government's planning reform agenda that we set out to achieve in our first term. This bill and the two subsequent bills that I will introduce represent three years of hard work that were all about delivering on the promises that we made to the people of Queensland. I think the fact that we have been able to achieve so much in our first term is something of which our government can be very justifiably proud.

Many would say that the planning reform agenda that we embarked upon was many years overdue. While the bills before the House today can be seen to represent three years of hard work, they are probably five to 10 years overdue. However, they represent the biggest reform in planning in Queensland's history. They represent the culmination of a whole range of planning reforms that we set ourselves a target to achieve in the first term of our government. With the passage of these bills early in the new year, that promise will be fully delivered and that planning reform agenda will be complete for the first term of our government.

Our government was elected on a platform of driving economic growth. In fact, my department, the Department of State Development, Infrastructure and Planning, was created very deliberately to drive economic growth in Queensland after so many years of Labor government. We recognised that planning was an essential part of creating economic growth. Having the country's best planning system was the target that we set ourselves. Achieving that target of creating the country's best planning system was an essential part of achieving the government's target of driving economic growth at the same time as my colleague the Treasurer was confronting the overwhelming problem of bringing the state's finances under control after inheriting \$85 billion worth of Labor debt.

I believe the bills before the House today, which will pass through the processes of this House before the election, represent a promise that was made to the people of Queensland and a promise that has been kept. Our planning reform agenda started on a whole range of fronts. In terms of the issues that we have dealt with in getting to this stage, I think the State Planning Policy is the first one that we recognised needed to be addressed. Under the former government there were 14 different state planning policies, which were contradictory, confusing and ad hoc to say the least. In close consultation with our stakeholders we developed a single State Planning Policy that now sets out very clearly the state's interests in planning. We put in place the State Assessment and Referral Agency, fondly known as SARA, as a single point of assessment for state issues and a single point of concentration for all of the state's planning activities. SARA is well recognised in the planning world, has won awards and is something that is being looked at by other states. At the same time we undertook a comprehensive regional planning process across regional Queensland to provide some land use plans to deal with the community disaffection and the confrontation that was threatening the development of both our resources industry and our agricultural industry. We reformed things such as the Queensland planning provisions. We reformed the MALPI, as it is commonly known, Making and Amending Local Planning Instruments. We reformed all of the processes that are involved in those documents that provide guidance to local governments.

We took the Urban Land Development Authority, the ULDA, the body that the former government had set up, and we brought it back within the sphere of government operations. We passed the EDQ bill and set up the EDQ. The provisions contained within the EDQ that allow for the declaration of priority development areas have been well recognised and welcomed by councils. A number of PDAs have been declared and are progressing to providing that priority development that that bill was designed to facilitate. Of course, we have announced the co-funding model of priority development infrastructure to address that vexed issue of infrastructure charges and how the state might play a role in meeting the infrastructure requirements that are necessary for development to occur.

When we came to power not quite three years ago, planning in Queensland was all about how to say no. The culture of planning within the Queensland government was all about being difficult. It was all about presenting proponents with problems, presenting proponents with hurdles to which they had to try to find a solution. We changed a lot of the legislation, and the legislation that is in the House today is the culmination of that change. We changed a lot of the regulation. We changed a lot of the processes. But the biggest change we made in planning over the last three years in Queensland was to change the culture of planning and to ensure that the culture within the planning processes within the planning agencies of government reflected what planning should be about, and that is helping people—helping Queenslanders—achieve their aspirations. The words that have been used in the purpose of this bill have been very carefully chosen. This bill is to facilitate Queensland's prosperity. That is what planning is about: to facilitate Queensland's prosperity by providing for an efficient, effective, transparent, integrated and accountable system of land use planning and development assessment. That I think encapsulates the cultural change that we have been able to bring to the planning reform task.

The three bills that I will introduce to the House this afternoon are the culmination of an enormous amount of work. They are the culmination of a reform vision that was shared by many people when we began this task a little over three years ago. I want to congratulate all of the people who have been involved in that, all the people in my department, especially led by Greg Chemello and James Coutts. I congratulate a whole range of other people within the department who have led a team that has consulted with local government and interest groups right across Queensland. They consulted more than any other consultation exercise of which I have ever been aware. They have achieved planning reform and they have brought these bills to a culmination without dislocation, without confrontation and with a very high degree of cooperation from all of those stakeholders.

The bill will repeal the Sustainable Planning Act and establish a new planning act that will simplify plan-making arrangements, streamline the development assessment system and restructure planning legislation to remove superfluous procedures, detail and redundant provisions. This bill demonstrates the government's commitment to reduce the regulatory burden for Queenslanders and to create clear and concise legislation.

The reform of the planning system has gone through a rigorous and extensive consultation process since 2012 to deliver a more efficient, effective and streamlined planning and development assessment system. If enacted, the proposed bill will incorporate the changes that have been proven through consultation, analysis and engagement to offer substantive improvements. The proposed bill

defines the legislative framework as a new, clear, effective and 'real' planning and development system. It will drive shorter, clearer and more realistic planning schemes and drive faster, easier and more realistic development assessment by local government.

The new framework is intended to establish the climate of predictability and improved performance needed to facilitate appropriate development activity. The bill responds to a key driver: the imperative to create a simple and effective planning system that reduces time and costs and stops poor behaviours, reduces red tape and sensibly adjusts the balance of responsibilities between state and local governments. The Planning and Development Bill aims to simplify plan-making arrangements to reduce the complexity of state instruments and establish more suitable processes for plan making and infrastructure designation. It seeks to streamline the development assessment system by simplifying the categories of development, public notification requirements, decision rules and appeal rights. It seeks to ensure that appropriate dispute resolution mechanisms are available that are affordable, timely and fit for purpose, it seeks to remove procedural and prescriptive detail and obsolete and redundant provisions and it changes the structure the act to ensure its ease of use.

The proposed new framework builds on the fundamental elements of the current system that are not in dispute—it contains no fundamental changes to those—but it is the logical next step after key reforms to establish the State Assessment and Referral Agency and the single State Planning Policy. Reforms are based on extensive and ongoing consultation with councils, industry, practitioners, state agencies and other users over the last two years, and I expect and I encourage that consultation to continue as the bill passes through the committee stages before it comes back to this parliament early in the new year.

The bill proposes to repeal the Sustainable Planning Act and the associated regulation, replacing them with a new act and regulation. Only a small number of the SPA provisions that are required to transition some older arrangements will transfer across to the proposed new legislation. Under the bill the state will continue to have an integrated planning and development assessment system dealing with state, regional and local matters. The more effective aspects of the current framework will continue, with adjustments to enable operational improvements and behavioural change.

Consistent with the intention to remove the barriers to efficient and effective plan making and development assessment practices, it is proposed that the legislation's purpose be focussed on the characteristics of the system it establishes and not the outcomes the system is intended to achieve at any given time. The outcomes to which the system is directed are already clearly expressed through the State Planning Policy, regional plans and planning schemes. This clear distinction between the system and its outcomes means the legislation is much simpler and concentrates on the central and salient features of the system. This provides for a more navigable and effective piece of legislation. Generally, process and detail is removed from the legislation and placed either in the regulation or other instruments or provided as guidance. More concise legislation does not come at the expense of an expanded suite of statutory instruments. The level of prescription is reduced, and there is an emphasis on providing more guidance material to support good practice rather than the state mandating what that practice must be. I intend to release illustrative drafts of the regulation and other related instruments for plan making and development assessment so that the scope of change and the framework as a whole can easily be seen and understood.

The policy behind the bill and the bill's key elements are sound, solid, straightforward and simple. The purpose of the proposed bill promotes the term 'prosperity', the achievement of which entails the balancing of community wellbeing, economic growth and environmental protection. This balancing is a fundamental principle of the system provided for in this bill, and achieving this sense of balance is what planning should be all about. The bill reshapes the state's requirements for planning by removing two instruments: the State Planning Regulatory Provisions, or SPRPs, and the standard planning scheme provisions, known as QPP, substantially improving on the currently complex and potentially conflicting hierarchy of state instruments. Some matters in these documents will still require some regulation by the state to ensure that state interests are still protected. These will not be lost but will transition as appropriate into the planning and development regulation that is being developed.

The bill also improves the local government plan-making arrangements by offering greater flexibility and more pathways for making and amending their planning schemes. Removing the need to meet all of the detailed requirements of the QPP adds significant flexibility for local governments to guide their plans to meet the needs of their communities.

Perhaps the most significant change offered in the bill is the reshaping and renaming of categories of assessment. These are simplified into three categories: accepted development, assessable development and prohibited development, with categories for assessable development divided into standard assessment and merit assessment. Coupled with simpler, more straightforward decision rules based on policies, not documents, this is intended to have far-reaching positive effects, giving confidence to local governments to reduce levels of assessment, providing more predictability of development outcomes and appropriately managing risk.

This is supported by other improvements to the system that enable more predictability and appropriate handling of the development assessment, like better enabling the consideration of changes to applications and approvals, moving owner's consent from a prelodgement requirement to a preapproval requirement, restructuring and consolidating ministerial powers and increasing the currency period for a material change of use approval to six years to accommodate the dynamic fiscal environment in which we are operating. Appropriate options and forums to resolve disputes remain a key part of the reformed system.

A significant change in the legislative arrangements is the removal of the Planning and Environment Court's establishment to its own specialist act. Matters relating to the establishment and work of the Building and Development Dispute Resolution Committees have been improved through the bill and are renamed as the Development Tribunal to re-raise the profile and understanding of this forum to resolve certain disputes as a speedy and productive alternative to court action. The bill also deals with a range of miscellaneous matters and provides for clear transitional arrangements to ensure that matters that were valid at the repeal of the Sustainable Planning Act will remain valid under the new legislation.

Extensive consultation has been undertaken since the announcement of the review with peak bodies, local governments, legal and planning practitioners and a range of organisations, companies and others through a range of forums, work groups, briefings and meetings. The bill was particularly informed by an open consultation period of eight weeks where the government engaged with more than 1,700 people across the state through over 42 departmental briefings and presentations for industry, local government and community groups to drive a broad understanding of the main elements of the draft bills and their intent. Every mayor in Queensland has received a copy of the bills and all councils were invited to attend regional sessions, along with local practitioners and regional chapters of peak bodies. Even more people were reached via the filmed briefings made available on the department's website.

Practical implementation of the new framework has been a key consideration in shaping the bill. Considerable effort is being dedicated to understanding how ideas will work on the ground and assisting the smooth transitioning of councils, practitioners and industry to the new framework with an emphasis on strong training and guidance—and potentially fast-tracked processes—to drive changed practices and behavioural approaches within councils. This work has already commenced, and it will continue until commencement of the legislation proposed to be made by proclamation to allow for substantial lead time for a smooth transition to occur.

Scenario testing on the processes related to the bill like development assessment, infrastructure designation and modifying planning schemes will continue over the next six to 12 months to support the smooth and successful implementation of the bill.

This bill has been developed through extensive consultation, analysis and engagement to offer substantive improvements and deliver a new clear, effective and, above all, real planning and development system for Queensland. This bill, as well as the Planning and Environment Court Bill and the Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, which I will shortly introduce, aims to deliver the best planning system in Australia—a planning system that stimulates positive development, a planning system that drives economic growth, a planning system that provides opportunities for Queenslanders today and far into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.10 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 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee.

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT (CONSEQUENTIAL) AND OTHER
LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL****Introduction**

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.10 pm): I present a bill for an act to make consequential amendments to the legislation stated in this act for the purposes of the Planning and Development Act 2014, and to amend other legislation stated in this act for particular purposes. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 [6562].

Tabled paper: Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [6563].

I am pleased to introduce the Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, the second of the three bills I referred to when I introduced the previous bill. This bill makes amendments required for the proposed enactment of the Planning and Development Bill and the Planning and Environment Court Bill and the repeal of the Sustainable Planning Act 2009.

The Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill is one of the three bills making amendments required as a result of our reform of the planning legislation. This bill concentrates on updating Sustainable Planning Act terminology and references in other acts and reflecting the consolidation of planning functions within the planning portfolio.

Other amendments in this bill are being made to the Environmental Protection Act and the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. The amendments will facilitate projects within a state development area and streamline the environmental authority process for all coordinated projects evaluated by the Coordinator-General.

Following the declaration of the Galilee Basin state development area, proponents approached the Coordinator-General about facilitating the undertaking of temporary works on land within the Galilee Basin state development area. Amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act will facilitate projects within a state development area to clarify the application of the existing powers of the Coordinator-General to grant access for the purposes of works within that area.

Amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will contribute to the government's objective of streamlining the environmental authority process for all coordinated projects evaluated by the Coordinator-General. The amendments complement changes already made by the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 and proposed in the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 to enable a streamlined environmental authority process for coordinated projects evaluated by an environmental impact statement.

This bill, as well as the Planning and Development Bill, which I have just introduced, and the Planning and Environment Court Bill, which I will shortly introduce, aims to deliver the best planning system in Australia that stimulates positive development and provides opportunities for all Queenslanders now and into the future. I commend the bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.13 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 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee.

PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENT COURT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.13 pm): I present a bill for an act about the Planning and Environment Court. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Planning and Environment Court Bill 2014 [\[6564\]](#).

Tabled paper: Planning and Environment Court Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[6565\]](#).

I am pleased to introduce the Planning and Environment Court Bill, the last of the three bills that are the culmination of the reform of Queensland's planning legislation that I will introduce into the House this afternoon. Queensland's dispute resolution system is very well regarded nationally and internationally, but this bill proposed some improvements. As a separate and stand-alone act, it recognises the Planning and Environment Court as a specialist court whose jurisdiction extends well past the scope of the current Sustainable Planning Act.

The Planning and Environment Court currently has jurisdiction from approximately 29 different acts. This bill continues the establishment and function of the court, along with its jurisdiction and powers. Many reforms are of a fine-tune, technical nature, with some of the more significant reforms focused on providing an overriding philosophy for the court, and a complete redrafting of the alternative dispute resolution provisions and strengthening and expanding the powers of the ADR Registrar, including clarification of costs provisions as they relate to ADR powers. Other reforms include the introduction of security for costs to remove doubt about whether it can apply to the court; the refinement of the rules, orders and directions powers of the court; and expanding the court's excusatory powers to prevent development being defeated by legal technicality.

Many of the reforms are made in response to stakeholder feedback about providing certainty or at the request of the Chief Judge of the District Court and aim to provide sensible changes, with appropriate checks and balances, to ensure expeditious, low-cost proceedings and save time for judges and demand on the court's resources.

Extensive consultation has occurred in relation to these reforms including with the Bar Association of Queensland, the Queensland Law Society, the Queensland Environmental Lawyers Association and the Planning Institute of Australia, with strong support expressed across-the-board.

It is anticipated that, on commencement, following collaboration with the Chief Judge of the District Court, the Planning and Environment Court Act will be supported by the new attendant rules to replace the Planning and Environment Court Rules 2010.

This bill, as well as the Planning and Development Bill and the Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, aims to deliver the best planning system in Australia that stimulates positive development and provides opportunities for all Queenslanders now and into the future.

First Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.17 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 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee.

PORTS BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JW SEENEY** (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.17 pm): I present a bill for an act to provide for the development of ports through long-term planning while protecting and managing environmental assets, to amend the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 for particular purposes, and to make consequential or minor amendments of this act and other legislation mentioned in schedule 2. I table the bill and the explanatory notes. I nominate the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Ports Bill 2014 [\[6566\]](#).

Tabled paper: Ports Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[6567\]](#).

The bill I present will provide greater certainty for the development of our major ports through a rigorous approach to planning, will amend the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act and the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994 and will make consequential or minor amendments to other legislation that is mentioned in schedule 2.

This bill delivers on the government's commitment in the Queensland Ports Strategy to drive Queensland's economic growth while protecting and managing the state's outstanding environmental assets. The significant reforms proposed in the bill will deliver greater certainty for industry about the future development of our ports by providing for detailed upfront consideration of port planning needs and potential impacts in line with the long-term economic goals of a port. It will also provide certainty for other stakeholders of the government's intention to properly manage the potential impacts of port development.

The bill coordinates and integrates port planning in line with the government's objective to create the best planning system in Australia. In doing this, it recognises the importance and contribution of good port planning to supercharging the Queensland economy. If enacted, the bill will establish priority port development areas, or PPDAs, upon the making of a master plan at the ports of Abbot Point, Gladstone, Hay Point/Mackay and Townsville. The government will facilitate staged, incremental expansion of port and terminal capacity to meet emerging demand in line with the long-term plans at each port within the defined priority port development area. The bill will improve the state-wide port planning framework for ports through regulatory streamlining. It will restrict any significant port development within and adjoining the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area to within existing port limits until the end of 2022. The bill will also prohibit dredging within and adjoining the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area for the development of new or the expansion of existing port facilities outside the areas declared as priority port development areas until the end of 2024. This prohibition addresses the UNESCO World Heritage Committee recommendations regarding the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and will ensure that the most pristine areas of the Great Barrier Reef are protected while concentrating sustainable port development at Queensland's long established major ports.

The bill also proposes planning reform for Queensland ports that will not have a priority port development area declared. These reforms will lift the standard of port planning and increase the transparency and consistency of port planning across the state. The new planning processes provided for in this bill will strengthen the protection of Queensland's land and marine based environmental values, including the Great Barrier Reef, from unacceptable or unsustainable impacts. While regulation of port planning in Queensland has historically focused on land use planning within port boundaries, the bill proposes that port planning will require consideration of issues beyond the traditional port boundaries—taking into consideration factors such as surrounding infrastructure and supply chain connections, transport corridors, environmental and community values, and surrounding land use activities that may in the future impact on the activities of the port. The proposed new planning process will require identification of land and marine based environmental values, including outstanding universal value, matters of national environmental significance, matters of state environmental significance and matters of local environmental significance. The bill also proposes that plans articulate strategies to manage any impacts on these values according to the 'avoid, mitigate, offset' hierarchy of principles.

A draft priority port development area planning guideline has been developed to both Queensland and Commonwealth assessment and approval standards and to assist in the PPDA planning process. I will make this guideline available and announce the commencement of public

consultation on these draft guidelines. The bill also includes minor amendments to part 4A of the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. These amendments would allow the Coordinator-General to assess and approve development activities within the PPDAs that impact on Commonwealth environmental matters once an approval bilateral agreement made under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999 has been finalised. These amendments will contribute to reducing duplication between the Queensland and Australian government environmental assessment and approval processes and result in streamlining benefits under an approval bilateral agreement.

It is the government's intention to include the Port of Brisbane in the legislation. However, due to the complex nature of the port's current lease arrangements and obligations under the Transport Infrastructure Act 1994, it was not possible to include the Port of Brisbane as a PPDA at this time. The Port of Brisbane has been a strong supporter of the Queensland Ports Strategy and is working with the government to transition at its earliest opportunity. In the interim, the Port of Brisbane continues to operate under the Transport Infrastructure Act.

The Ports Bill before the House today is one that has been drawn up with extensive consultation with all stakeholders following the release of the Queensland Ports Strategy almost 12 months ago. There has been extensive consultation not only with port users but port authorities and more especially with the Commonwealth government in relation to the application of this bill to the shared goal that both we as a state government and the federal government have of ensuring that this sort of essential infrastructure can be provided in an area where the sensitivities of the Great Barrier Reef are always front of mind. The bill before the House today seeks to protect the identified ports that are essential to Queensland's future economic growth and future economic wellbeing and that are therefore critically important to the futures of every Queenslanders while at the same time ensure that the values of the Great Barrier Reef that are also recognised and held dear by every Queenslanders are protected into the future.

First Reading

Hon. JW SEENEY (Callide—LNP) (Deputy Premier and Minister for State Development, Infrastructure and Planning) (3.24 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 State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee.

RETAIL SHOP LEASES AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction

 **Hon. JP BLEIJIE** (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.25 pm): I present a bill for an act to amend the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 for particular purposes. I table the bill and explanatory notes. I nominate the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee to consider the bill.

Tabled paper: Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014 [\[6568\]](#).

Tabled paper: Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes [\[6569\]](#).

It is with pleasure that I introduce the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill 2014. The bill amends the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994 which provides a framework for addressing imbalance in negotiating power and access to information between major shopping centre landlords and small retail tenants. The act provides for mandatory minimum standards for retail shop leases and a low-cost dispute resolution process for retail tenancy disputes. The main purpose of the bill is to give effect to the results of the statutory review of the act. It also fits in well with the government's agenda to reduce red tape and get out of the way of business and industry in this state. Contrary to previous

assertions that governments and politicians create jobs, we know that it is our role to create an economic environment to which industry can create jobs and opportunities for all Queenslanders whilst maintaining some core consumer protections and balance.

The review has indicated considerable stakeholder consultation through the release of a discussion paper in late 2011 and a comprehensive options paper that I released in May 2013 setting out 127 options based on responses to the discussion paper. Over 33 submissions were received in response to the discussion paper and 25 for the options paper. Submissions were received from key retail sector and professional stakeholders and from individual landlords, tenants and legal and valuation professionals. I take this opportunity to thank all those who took the time to make submissions to the review. I also want to thank Jane Flower in my department who was responsible for overseeing the review during that time. A reference group of key retail sector and professional stakeholders was formed to review the outcomes of consultation on the options paper and make recommendations to government. The reference group included representatives from the National Retail Association, the Australian Retailers Association, the Australian Property Institute, Lease 1, the Property Council of Australia Queensland, the Shopping Centre Council of Australia, the Queensland Newsagents Federation, the Pharmacy Guild of Australia Queensland division, the Queensland Law Society, the Large Law Firm Group and the Chamber of Commerce and Industry Queensland.

Under its terms of reference, the reference group was tasked with identifying areas of stakeholder consensus, difference and compromise. The reference group also provided industry and technical input, including from the perspective of retail businesses operating in Queensland and nationally. Formal submissions from stakeholders on the options paper, to the extent that they were within the scope of the review, were considered as part of the reference group process. Key guiding considerations for the reference group were the need for balance between safeguarding retail tenant interests and ensuring government regulation does not unnecessarily interfere with commercial dealings/relationships and opportunities for reducing the regulatory and compliance burden on the Queensland retail sector. The reference group also had regard to key findings and recommendations of the Productivity Commission in its 2008 report, *The market for retail tenancy leases in Australia*. These recommendations included that states and territories should introduce greater self-regulation in the retail tenancies market, remove unnecessarily prescriptive elements of retail tenancy legislation that unduly restrict commercial negotiations and move towards a more consistent national framework for regulation of retail tenancies.

The reference group delivered its final report detailing the recommendations and outcomes from the reference group process in December 2013. The reference group concluded that the act was generally working well. However, there was a relatively high level of reference group consensus as to the legislative amendments which would be appropriate and also on matters where legislative amendment was considered not necessary or appropriate. The government has now considered the reference group report and has generally been guided by its findings in deciding the outcomes of the statutory review of the act. On the government's behalf, I thank members of the reference group for their valuable contribution to this review. For the benefit of the members of the House, I table a copy of the statutory review as required by section 122 of the act.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government, Department of Justice and Attorney-General, *Report on statutory review of the Retail Shop Leases Act 1994* [\[6570\]](#).

This report attaches the reference group report. Submissions to the review will be published on the Department of Justice and Attorney-General website following the introduction of the bill.

I will mention some specifics of the bill very quickly. A number of amendments are directed to reducing red tape for the Queensland retail sector. The bill excludes from the operation of the act non-retail leases in certain non-retail precincts of a retail shopping centre, such as commercial or professional offices in an office tower located above a retail shopping centre. The bill excludes retail shop leases with a floor area greater than 1,000 square metres because tenants of such areas are generally sophisticated business entities not requiring protection under the legislation.

The bill exempts landlords from liability to compensate tenants for trading losses in the event of emergency shopping centre closure, for example, due to flooding. There are also measures to enhance the protection for small to medium enterprise retail tenants, for instance, requiring landlords to give disclosure on lease renewal when a retail business is being sold; requiring the seller or assignor to give disclosure to the incoming tenant; ensuring that appropriate disclosure is given to franchisees and sublessees; and additional disclosure to tenants in relation to landlords' centre management fees, refurbishment requirements and shopping centre marketing expenditures.

The bill also includes amendments to clarify and improve the operational efficiency and effectiveness of the act. The bill removes the requirement for statutory review every seven years. This will facilitate a more flexible and effective policy and legislative response to emerging issues impacting the Queensland retail sector.

Given the opposing interests of landlord and tenants, there were issues on which the reference group was divided and for which no change is provided in the bill. The statutory report acknowledges that, for some of these issues, a watching brief will be kept, including for developments in other key eastern seaboard jurisdictions and the outcome of a current Senate committee inquiry into the need for a national approach to retail shop leasing legislation.

I will, of course, be open to receiving further submissions from stakeholders following the introduction of the bill and stakeholders will also be able to make submissions to the relevant parliamentary committee during its consideration of the bill. I thank the reference group for the great work that they have done in continuing the government's agenda with a strong plan, a strong team, building a stronger Queensland. As I said, we want Queensland to be stronger. The best way we can do that is to make sure that people have jobs, particularly in the retail sector. We can support the retail sector by reducing regulation and red tape. It is my pleasure that a lot of the bills that I have introduced into this House in the last 2½ years—which, I think, add up to about 50—deal with regulation and red tape, particularly in the retail industry. I am very pleased to commend this bill to the House.

First Reading

Hon. JP BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice) (3.32 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 Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mrs Cunningham): Order! In accordance with standing order 131, the bill is now referred to the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee.

RECREATION AREAS MANAGEMENT AND ANOTHER ACT AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 14 October (see p. 3319).

Second Reading

 **Hon. SL DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (3.33 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

Firstly, I would like to thank the Health and Community Services Committee for its prompt consideration of the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014. I note that the committee tabled its report on 20 November 2014 and that its only recommendation was simply that the bill be passed.

This bill contributes to the Queensland government's commitment to cut red tape and streamline legislation to improve access to Queensland's protected estate. As I mentioned in my introductory speech, the bill relates to two initiatives. The first is the streamlining initiative, which involves amendments to the Recreation Areas Management Act 2007. These amendments will provide a consistent and streamlined process that allows a single combined permit to be granted to commercial operators wanting to operate a tour across marine parks and recreation areas. The second initiative involves amendments to the Recreation Areas Management Act 2007 and the Forestry Act 1959 to cut red tape for low-impact and non-commercial group activities on recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves.

Only two submissions were received during the committee's public consultation period. I believe that that strongly demonstrates the sensible and non-contentious nature of these amendments. The first submission made by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority fully

supports the streamlining initiative and acknowledges the ongoing work and cooperation between them and Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service to support the tourism industry. For over 30 years, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service have successfully operated a joint permit system for tourism activities carried out in state and Commonwealth marine parks. This system has been supported by complementary legislation and it operates so successfully that tourism businesses are now often unaware that their single permit instrument is, in fact, two discrete permits and that their application was processed by two government agencies. This initiative will build upon the successful joint permitting process by facilitating a single joint permit and application process for tourism businesses that operate across adjacent marine parks, island national parks and recreation areas.

Recent amendments to the Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation allow commercial activity permits for national parks to be combined with relevant state or Commonwealth marine park permission. These amendments mirror those recently made to the nature conservation legislation and those permissions that have long existed between Commonwealth and Queensland marine parks legislation. These amendments will also allow an applicant currently conducting or wanting to conduct commercial activities across recreation areas and state and Commonwealth marine parks to lodge a single application form, pay a single application fee, have a single point of contact throughout the assessment process and receive a single permit document.

To prevent disjointed management of the different approvals, a number of complementary amendments will be made to the Recreation Areas Management Act to allow the benefits that apply to the related marine park permission to apply also to the commercial activity permits. These amendments include allowing the permit to be transferred if the business is sold; removing the maximum term so that it can align with the term of the marine park permission, which can be up to 15 years for accredited operators; and aligning the statutory time frames associated with applications, decisions and reviews. Although there are clear benefits to holding a single joint permit, the amendments do not force an applicant to do so. An applicant is still able to apply for and hold separate approvals for the various aspects of their operations.


The second submission made by the Tamborine Mountain Progress Association indicates support for the streamlining initiative. However, the association's submission raised concerns in relation to the red-tape-reduction initiative. I would like to take this opportunity to address those concerns. As previously mentioned, this initiative involves removing the group activity permit classification, which has historically been used to manage a wide range of low- and high-impact non-commercial organised group activities. But it also involves introducing an alternative process that will continue to manage high-impact activities that will now be referred to as organised events. High-impact activities have been occurring on our protected estate for some time and this initiative will continue to support the risk based approach and administrative actions that are already in place. It is important to note that high-impact activities will continue to be regulated under the new organised event framework. This bill does not amend the matters to which the chief executive must have regard when making a decision about whether to grant or refuse a permit application.

The conservation of the area's cultural and natural resources is one of those matters. If the assessment of the application indicates that an organised event is likely to have a detrimental impact on those values, that would provide grounds for the chief executive to refuse the application.


The amendments are about reducing red tape for low-impact activities while providing for the continued regulation of those that are likely to have a high impact or affect the use of the area by other persons. It also supports the Queensland government's commitment to improve access to public lands by reducing the unnecessary regulation of low-impact, non-commercial group activities on recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves.

The committee made one recommendation and that is simply that the bill be passed. I would like to thank the committee again for its report and recommendation. This bill supports the Queensland government's commitment to increase access to our protected estate while ensuring that the natural values are protected now and into the future. It also supports tourism throughout the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park. Our government will continue to get behind the tourism industry to make sure that it continues to grow over the years to come. Since being elected to government we have done a lot of work, but it is far from finished. There is so much more work to be done. We want to make sure that the Great Barrier Reef is protected in perpetuity. We are working hard as a government to deliver that outcome. I look forward to visiting the Great Barrier Reef in the not-too-distant future because it is one of the best places one could ever go. I urge those who visit to tell their friends about it. Tourism is on the up and up. The tourism minister will talk about the activities

available on the Great Barrier Reef and about the people whose lives we will make a lot easier by passing this bill today. This bill is about cutting red tape, delivering great outcomes and keeping our commitments to the people of Queensland.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (3.41 pm): The Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014 contains two changes to regulation which are minor and non-controversial. It will enable operators who conduct commercial activities across recreation areas and marine parks to apply and operate under a single permitting instrument. The bill will also replace the existing framework for group activity permits in recreational areas with a new permit to be known as an organised event permit.

The opposition considers this to be a very small change that does not substantially affect the activities which currently take place in such areas. The opposition has no objection to this legislation and I do not propose to waste the parliament's valuable time by making a lengthy speech. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JA STUCKEY** (Currumbin—LNP) (Minister for Tourism, Major Events, Small Business and the Commonwealth Games) (3.42 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014 introduced to the House by the honourable Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing on 14 October 2014. As the minister outlined, during the 2012 election campaign the Newman government committed to re-invigorating the Queensland tourism industry by adopting a whole-of-government approach that included reducing the suffocating level of red tape and regulation inflicted upon operators by successive Labor governments. We, unlike Labor, recognised that copious layers of red tape did not stimulate businesses or help them to grow and create jobs, yet Labor just kept piling more and more onto our small businesses, many of whom are mum and dad operations. I suppose it surprises me a little to hear the opposition say that this bill makes very few changes. It just goes to show that those opposite have no idea of the impact that they had on so many of our small businesses.

This bill is clear evidence of our combined efforts across departments. Through the provisions it contains, the cumbersome and duplicative tourism permit system in Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service managed areas will be simplified. The bill focuses primarily on two objectives: firstly, to streamline the processes and requirements for operators seeking approvals to conduct commercial activities that cross marine park and recreation areas, including in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area; secondly, the bill will cut red tape and reduce unnecessary regulation for low-impact, non-commercial activities being conducted on recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves managed by Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service. It will also remove the group activity permit, or GAP, classification.

I applaud the minister for bringing forward this piece of legislation as it will provide consistency across areas managed under the Marine Parks Regulation 2006, the Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006 and the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 by allowing commercial activity plans for both protected areas and recreation areas to be combined into one single instrument. These amendments will apply when a commercial activity in a recreation area is also carried out across a marine park in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and/or a state marine park.


Roughly one-quarter of the 600 vessel based commercial tourism operators within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area include activities on national park islands. In addition to their marine park permissions, most of these operators would need to hold a separate commercial activity permit from the Queensland government. One permit would be required to offer snorkelling in the Great Barrier Reef in the morning and a second permit to go ashore on Green Island for a picnic lunch on the beach. Two permits means two application forms and two application fees which, in reality, is simply time and money wasted and sounds like typical Labor policy.

Labor does not get small business or tourism. It did not when it was in power and it does not now. Labor does not care whether Queensland's 400,000 small businesses sink or swim. It wrenches as much money out of small businesses as it can. The LNP understands the challenges faced by small businesses and tourism operators because many of us came from those backgrounds. Under these new arrangements, tourism operators will now be able to lodge one application form, pay one application fee, have one point of contact during assessment and receive one permit document. It is important to note that these changes do not in any way risk the conservation of the Great Barrier Reef with the amendments endorsed by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority.

In June 2013 the Great Barrier Reef Strategy Group, consisting of senior executives of the authority, the Department of Premier and Cabinet and Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service, endorsed agencies to consolidate permit systems into a single joint Great Barrier Reef tourism permit. We want people to be able to enjoy the wonders of our reef for many generations to come, but we also recognise the need to protect it. In addition, this bill will amend both the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 and the Forestry Act 1959 to reduce unnecessary regulation around small scale, low-impact non-commercial activities in Queensland Parks and Wildlife Service managed areas. This means that tourists and families will be able to enjoy low-impact recreational activities such as bushwalking and birdwatching without the need or cost of a permit.


I am proud to be part of a government that is determined to restore Queensland to its rightful position as a world-leading ecotourism destination. We are blessed with more than 1,300 national parks, marine parks and other reserves conserving a diverse array of species and ecosystems, our rich Indigenous cultural heritage and five World Heritage listed areas—more than any other state or territory. For many years we were recognised globally as pioneers of ecotourism—in fact, we may well have coined the phrase. But under almost 20 years of Labor the lure of the green vote sacrificed Queensland's ecotourism opportunities significantly. Our magnificent natural assets were locked up and those that were not locked up may as well have been as they were strangled in red tape so that access was near impossible.

Our key visitor markets continue to rank our world-class natural assets as one of the key factors in selecting a holiday destination and it is no surprise that some of our G20 visitors decided to stay on and discover some of them. At our annual DestinationQ tourism forums, it was clear that the industry is keen to see our national parks and other ecotourism assets opened up to Queenslanders and tourists alike, a challenge that has been embraced by Minister Dickson and his team. We are seeing significant interest across Queensland in new and innovative tourism experiences across our national park facilities. Amendments to the Nature Conservation Act 1992 last year have created many new ecotourism opportunities. Guided by our Destination Success plan and the development of the Queensland Ecotourism Plan 2013-22, the Newman government is steadfast in its commitment to make national parks more accessible and more available to all. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr RUTHENBERG** (Kallangur—LNP) (3.49 pm): It is on days such as today that I enjoy being a member of parliament: a minister has a common-sense bill; the department works with the minister to bring some really good legislation and explanatory notes to the House; it comes to the committee; we issue to the community a request for feedback; we receive submissions from two groups, neither of which are really interested in attending any sort of hearing; the committee's response is unanimous and we write a report in which we make a single recommendation that the bill be passed. Can members imagine how much of our natural environment will be opened up to everyday Queenslanders as a consequence of this bill? Those people include members of small photography clubs and people who enjoy nature and low-impact activities. This legislation will allow Queenslanders to walk into much of our natural environment without having to go through red tape and rigmarole. Hallelujah! Finally, we are starting to see some real common-sense legislation come through this House. This legislation builds on other initiatives introduced by this minister and passed by the House to open up our natural environment to Queenslanders.

The Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014 was introduced into the parliament by the minister on 14 October and we tabled our report on 20 November. The department gave our committee a briefing on 29 October. We directly invited over 261 stakeholders to submit to us their thoughts on the bill. The committee received and accepted only two submissions, one from the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority and the other from the Tamborine Mountain Progress Association.

There is not a lot to say other than that this is a common-sense bill. It brings in common sense around single-use permits and common sense around giving to the people of Queensland access to more of the environment. Well done, Minister! If people are interested in this debate, I ask them to please read the minister's speech, because it says it all and the speech of the Minister for Tourism adds to it. This is a good, common-sense bill. I do not know how to pad this one out any further. It is just a good bill and I am glad to support it.

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (3.52 pm): I echo the words of the member for Kallangur: it is on days such as today that I love to be a member of this House. In actual fact, I love each and every single day that I have the great honour to be the member for Nanango. We have a wonderful opportunity to be part of the Newman LNP government and that is so important because

we have ministers such as the Hon. Steve Dickson who has introduced this common-sense legislation. We have also just heard the Minister for Tourism speak. We have two common-sense ministers sitting in the House, supporting the development of national parks, recreation and tourism—

Mr Bleijie interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take that interjection from the Attorney-General: we have a common-sense Attorney-General. We also have the Hon. Glen Elmes, the minister responsible for Indigenous affairs. It is just fantastic.

I will get to the point: this is a common-sense bill. I was keen to speak today because when I was the assistant minister for regulatory reform one of the first meetings I held—and the minister knows this story quite well—was with a group of photographers who told me about the number of permits that they needed for all the different national parks and recreation areas across the state. It was very complicated because you needed one permit to take a photo of a wedding group and you needed a different permit to take a photo of a group of schoolchildren. Naturally, you needed a different permit again to do a feature film, and I can understand that one. Different areas around the state required different forms. Since that day I worked with the minister, who fixed the problem quite soon thereafter.

This bill is an extension of that type of issue. It stems from years and years of built-up regulation. When legislation comes before the House, quite often its impacts on the end user are not considered or realised. The legislation that is before the House today cuts back on all of that. In particular, it allows tourism businesses to operate tours across marine national parks and recreation areas. Now, tourism operators will be able to apply for a single permit. That might sound really simple and some may have trouble extending upon that. For smaller operators—and I should not limit my comments to smaller operators—every minute of time spent filling in permit forms means money. They could be doing something else. They could be working on their businesses. Importantly for this World Heritage area, it would be more pertinent for them to work on their businesses by promoting that amazing resource that we have in our great state of Queensland.

I am really pleased that we have been able to get this to a single form and a single application fee. I congratulate the minister and his department on that. It means that a person has to fill in only one form and that there is consistency on that one form across different areas. To me, this is absolute common sense.

I want to touch on the part of the legislation that refers to low-impact activities. Picking up on the example of the photographers, if I was organising a wedding I would not need a permit to enter a recreation area. Under the legislation, what I was doing would be considered a low-impact activity. That is quite a good example, because in this great state we are fortunate in the national parks and recreation areas that we have.

I also want to touch on something just mentioned by the Minister for Tourism, the Hon. Jann Stuckey, relating to the visitors who came to our great state for the G20. I was very fortunate to be the assistant minister to the Premier for the G20. It enabled me to spend some time in the international media centre, where I had the wonderful opportunity of talking to delegates from all around the world, as I know the minister did. It really was wonderful to showcase our state and the Great Barrier Reef and to explain the fantastic work that our government is doing to promote and protect that amazing resource. The bill adds to those sorts of things. Enjoying a great weekend at the G20 were visitors from all over the world. There were delegates and international media. I think we had around 7,668 visitors. They all received an information pack about our wonderful tourism areas and all of the natural resources that we have in this state. A lot of those people want to come back and visit at a later time and that information will help tourism businesses.

Mrs Stuckey: Some of them stayed on, unintended.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I take the interjection of the honourable Minister for Tourism. They did stay on. After seeing what went on here and being able to look at the documentation and wonderful images that the tourism department had incorporated to promote this great state, people decided to stay on here and changed their flights home. How wonderful is that? We cannot get a bigger tick than that—that is, having visitors who come for a conference deciding to stay on. It was spontaneous. It was lovely to hear some of those stories. I know that our marine parks featured heavily in their onward journeys.


I would like to think that a few of them decided to make the trip out to the great electorate of Nanango. I did try to encourage them to do so. We have some wonderful national parks in my electorate. We have Bunya Mountains which is absolutely beautiful.

This is a great opportunity to speak about one other point. At the moment it is extremely hot west of Brisbane. It is hot in Brisbane as well. In my electorate over the last couple of weeks we have seen the driest weather we have seen for many years. The temperatures are unseasonably high. I would encourage people to take a trip up to Bunya Mountains. The temperature completely drops up there. You feel like you are on holidays. It really only costs the fuel to get up there. People should go for a walk through the national park. It is absolutely beautiful. The temperature is a lot cooler. I would encourage anyone in this House or listening to me to take a trip up to Bunya Mountains.

Mr Bleijie: Or you could come to the Sunshine Coast where it is always good weather.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I encourage people to take that trip. The other wonderful part of the world—and the Attorney-General would know about this—is Jimna State Forest, which has the beautiful Peach Trees camping ground. I was very pleased after the last state budget to be able to announce the upgrading of the toilets at the Peach Trees camping ground. That was much needed for that beautiful part of the world. It is above Kilcoy. It is a beautiful drive up there. The electorate of Nanango is a beautiful part of the world.

The tourism businesses that operate tours across marine parks, national parks and recreational areas will all benefit from this legislation. I again congratulate the minister. Thank you for bringing this common-sense bill before the House. I support the passage of this bill.

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (4.02 pm): I rise to speak on the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014. This bill demonstrates how this government is seeking to expand ecotourism opportunities throughout our state and ensure that Queenslanders can experience all that our beautiful natural assets have to offer.

As members are aware, since 2012 I have been working very closely with the Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing to ensure that responsible ecotourism opportunities are encouraged throughout Queensland and particularly—

Mr Gibson interjected.

Ms BATES: Yes, irresponsible ones. I take that interjection from the member for Gympie. We have been working to ensure that responsible ecotourism opportunities are encouraged throughout Queensland and particularly in the wonderful hinterland area of my electorate such as Springbrook National Park. This is a responsible bill that reduces red tape. It is a practical bill that considers the needs of both the environmental and ecotourism operators, making it easier for the public to experience all that the Queensland environment has to offer.

This bill simplifies legislative processes to allow a single combined authority to be issued for commercial activities in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and other state marine parks. It replaces the burdensome requirement for tourism businesses to obtain two permissions, both the commercial activity permit for recreation areas as well as the marine park permission, with a single combined permit. This will streamline administrative processes for tourism businesses and enable them to lodge a single submission, saving time and money.

This bill will also remove the maximum term for commercial activity permits that form part of a joint permission. This will ensure that under the new streamlined system commercial activity permits that form part of a joint permission have the same term as the marine park permission. This will again reduce red tape and result in savings for ecotourism operators who can reduce the amount of times they have to pay application fees. As it stands, however, marine park permissions are transferable from one person to another if a business is sold. This is not the case for a commercial activity permit. That is why with this bill we will allow commercial activity permits that form part of a joint permission to be transferred, reducing administrative burdens on business and the need to apply for a new permit if the business is sold. This will provide even more clarity and certainty to business operators.

This bill will also enhance the ability of the public and groups of people to actually enjoy our protected areas, recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves by putting an alternative process in place for managing organised events. Until now, groups of local residents who were having an organised activity in these areas were forced to apply for a group activity permit just to enjoy the wonderful environmental attractions of our state.

The minister knows very well that up in Springbrook people could not even have an organised game of cricket on the oval prior to us being elected. The minister certainly unravelled all that red and green tape. I look forward to the day when we have Springbrook Mountain versus Numinbah Valley cricket games, which we used to have many years ago. I looked forward to that, Minister. I thank you for your efforts.


In the 2011-12 financial year as many as 442 permits were granted for group activities, the majority of which were issued for low-impact activities. This is not in line with our commitment to ensuring the public can have improved access to national parks and other public lands. That is why we are making things easier by removing the need for low-impact activities in recreation areas to have a group activity permit, while high-impact activities will still require permits and not automatically receive them. Through this bill we are reducing regulation by allowing the public to more easily access our environment, while simultaneously protecting it from high-impact activities.

In my electorate of Mudgeeraba this will be a welcome change and will allow groups of people wanting to get married in national parks, for instance, or go birdwatching in our state forests to do so with ease and without the burdensome regulation which has previously restricted them. It will encourage local community groups to explore our national parks and forests and educate themselves and future generations about all that they have to offer.

Springbrook National Park, in my electorate, is a wonderful tourism destination that is home to some of the world's most spectacular rainforest views and walking trails. Under this government we have recently opened up Twin Falls circuit which has been closed for a very long time and Warrie circuit which has been closed for as long as I can remember being the member. We have spent almost \$1 million putting in a suspension bridge over Purling Brook Falls and completing the walking track through there which will be a fantastic tourism opportunity for people in this state.

We are making things easier by removing all of the red tape. It will encourage local community groups. The bill will ensure that groups of visitors seeking to explore its natural beauty can do so freely and without having to contact a government department to request the appropriate regulatory approvals. The public should be able to enjoy all that our environment has to offer and where appropriate and should be able to explore it freely without having to answer to bureaucrats in Brisbane.

This is a bill that makes life easier. It is a bill that means businesses can get on with the job of contributing to the economy and providing great services to the public. It is a bill that means that nature lovers can get out into the environment and explore all that it has to offer more freely, without all these burdens. I applaud the minister on his efforts to encourage responsible ecotourism and public enjoyment of the environment in our state. I look forward to working with him to achieve more great things for the national park in my electorate. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KRAUSE** (Beaudesert—LNP) (4.08 pm): I commend the minister for bringing another common-sense bill to the House. It seems to be a theme that has run through the debate today. I back up many of the comments of the member for Mudgeeraba and the member for Kallangur, as the chairman of the Health and Community Services Committee.

At the outset, I would like to thank the committee staff—Ms Sue Cawcutt, the research director; Mr Karl Holden, the acting research director at the time of the inquiry into this bill; Ms Kathleen Dalladay; and Ms Stephanie Cash—and the staff of the Technical Scrutiny Secretariat for all of their work in analysing this bill and preparing the report but also more generally for all the support that they have provided to this committee throughout this term of parliament and this year in particular. It has been a busy year. We have looked at many different bills on different topics across the portfolios—Health, national parks and other parts of the community services sector, such as the portfolio of Minister Tracy Davis. They have always provided us with terrific support. We thank them very much for that.

In line with what the member for Mudgeeraba just spoke about—the national parks that are in her electorate—I neighbour the member for Mudgeeraba with many of those national parks around the Tamborine Mountain area, Beechmont, Binna Burra, part of the Springbrook National Park as well as the Main Range National Park along the New South Wales-Queensland border and various others. I can certainly relate in our electorate to the burden of red tape and regulation which has been applied to some activities within the national park estate, particularly around the area of Tamborine Mountain where there is a lot of recreational activity in the national park estate. Those users would welcome any reduction in regulation and red tape of a common-sense nature.

This bill, as I said, really continues the common-sense approach of this government to reduce red tape and regulation across all sectors. I make reference in that vein to the removal in the early days of our government of the sustainability declaration when people are buying a home—removing the need for the completion of a declaration which really had no intrinsic value—and to the removal of the requirement for an environmental licence to be issued each year and the payment of an associated fee, which was really just another charge on small business and on people for no particular value. I refer also to the reform of the PAMD Act, the Land Sales Act and other property law issues to simplify the contractual process and to get rid of anomalies in that legislation which made it more difficult for people to do business. In the past couple of sitting weeks there have been a number of acts that have done similar things to this bill in reducing needless regulation—forms and processes which are outdated, redundant or just simply not necessary. So it is great to see that, in terms of this bill, that is being continued.

Group activity permits for managed areas are used to manage a range of commercial activities and non-commercial organised group activities. The committee heard about these. They can include weddings, concerts, vehicle rallies, sporting events, public meetings, religious activities, defence exercises, charity events and club based cycling, horse riding, bushwalking and birdwatching activities. I think each of those particular activities is relevant for the national parks and other managed areas in my electorate and in many other parts around the state. To be able to simplify and clarify the process for the issuing of permits in that space is a good thing. As we have heard, the present process has allowed for permits to be given for low-impact activities and there was some inconsistency across regions and areas about the threshold for the granting of a permit, whether it was needed in certain circumstances or not. So changes have been made to ensure that permits are required only for higher impact events, and they will still be required due to the possibility that there will be a greater impact on the national park or other managed areas through higher impact events. They include defence exercises, car rallies and things like that which have a greater impact than, say, a group that is there undertaking a photography activity.

One other thing that I wanted to focus on was the possibility of issuing a joint permission permit for a commercial activity permit and also permissions granted under various other acts—in particular, the ability for those joint permission permits to be transferred between different users. As people understand, businesses change over time. Sometimes businesses are bought and sold. Sometimes unfortunately businesses go out of business and another operator or another entity comes in to take over that operation. It just makes sense that the permits that are in place for a particular activity should be able to be transferred to another operator, another businessperson or whatever the case may be, whether it is a non-profit organisation or a community organisation or even a local government. The bill inserts a new division 5A into the Recreation Areas Management Act to provide for that transfer subject to certain conditions which the chief executive must consider in making a decision about whether that transfer should take place, including whether the transferee is a suitable person, has the insurance in place and all of the other common-sense and normal run-of-the-mill issues that need to be addressed by the person taking over that operation.

The committee received only two submissions. We did not hold a public hearing on this bill because the number of submissions and the level of interest from those interested parties or people who were made aware of the bill were not sufficient to justify that. The committee has made only one recommendation—that is, that the bill be passed. I am confident it will be this afternoon. But, before I close, I reiterate that the changes made in this bill are of a common-sense nature to reduce regulation and red tape, to simplify redundant processes and to make the process of utilising our wonderful natural assets in this state easier for all parties concerned.

It takes some work to be able to achieve this. When the government does not apply itself to constantly improving its processes to try to make things happen rather than simply sit back and allow the regulation and red tape to build up over time, as it inevitably does, and as things change, requirements and provisions become redundant. We need to have a constant watching brief on the regulations that are in place not just across this portfolio but across the whole of government to get out of people's way so that if there are things that need to be done we start from a position of saying, 'Yes, we want to help you do whatever you want to do,' rather than putting barriers up in the way of people who want to contribute to our society and enjoy our natural assets or maybe even create some wealth in our economy through growing their businesses, not just in this sector but in all sectors.

I thank the minister. I know he does have a constant watching brief on the regulations across our national park estate and the other sectors that he manages including sport and recreation. Recently there have been some fantastic funding decisions made by the minister and the department

for my electorate of Beaudesert regarding the Fassifern Horse and Pony Club, the Aratula Community Sports Centre and the Jimboomba Thunder Junior Rugby League Club. They got \$100,000, Minister, to upgrade their facilities. We are truly grateful for that sort of injection of funds into the community through your department and through the steady hand that you have across your whole portfolio.

I would like to get you down to the electorate again shortly, Minister, to have a look at Wyaralong Dam, which is a fantastic asset constructed during the time of the last government. It has not yet been connected to the SEQ water supply because that would require several hundred million dollars more in funding being made available—in fact, at this time we do not need the water. Rowing Queensland has recently identified this particular asset as a top place with great potential to become a world-class rowing facility. I would like to invite you to come to the dam to view it and to consider how this government might be able to contribute to making this into a world-class facility, Minister. They had a trial meet out there about three weeks ago, and from all reports it went fantastically well. Rowing Queensland, as the peak body, the Queensland Academy of Sport and a lot of schools and other clubs that have been out there say it is fantastic. It is the best place we have around the whole of Queensland to do rowing. It is better than Lake Kawana. It is better than Wivenhoe. It is definitely better than Hinze Dam.


Mr Dempsey: It's not as good as Bucca.

Mr KRAUSE: I don't know where you are talking about, Minister, but I bet it is better than that. It is world-class. It has the potential to be world-class. Through the Get Playing Plus program, I am sure that we will be able to assist them. So I invite you, Minister, to come out and see that dam.

Can I also make mention of Jimboomba Thunder? I said they got \$100,000 to upgrade their grounds but it is part of a bigger plan for that whole community. I know also that there is much more work to be done in that neighbourhood to make that into a real neighbourhood sports precinct. So when you come down to Wyaralong Dam, perhaps we could stop at Jimboomba on the way to look at the potential for funding opportunities into the future. I have digressed a little from the bill.

Mr Hobbs: It is a wide-ranging debate.

Mr KRAUSE: It is a wide-ranging debate. Thank you, member for Warrego. It is a common-sense bill. I thank the minister for bringing it before the House. I look forward to supporting it this evening.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (4.19 pm): I rise to speak to the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill. We are really blessed to live in Queensland. We live in a beautiful area that has a great wealth of national parks and, as the minister said, the Great Barrier Reef. We have so many areas of natural beauty for our community and visitors to enjoy and appreciate. I think one of the things that as families we need to get back to—and I guess I am showing my age—is that simple pleasure of going somewhere beautiful and relaxing together as a family. One of the things I think we need to protect is the ability to do that without it costing an arm and a leg. Accessing recreational areas should be at little cost to the community. Albeit recognising that there is a cost to the state to look after these areas, it really is a cost to the community as they are paying the taxes. Freeing up access to our national parks in terms of the forms that have to be filled in for non-intrusive access to national parks is certainly welcome. I cannot think of a better backdrop for family photos or other photographs to be taken, let alone taking photos of what is naturally beautiful and occurring there. I commend the minister for what is common sense in application in this legislation.

The bill also allows for the transfer of permits. This cannot be done without some constraint. It would be irresponsible if there were wholesale ability to transfer a permit from one person approved perhaps some years ago who is managing that responsibility or privilege well to some entity or individual who is an unknown quantity without some review before that approval is given. A transfer will require consideration by an authorised person—I believe the director-general—before such a transfer can occur. Some would say that is red tape. I do not believe it is. I think it is responsibility in action. That is important because in this parliament we are temporary custodians of our state, our community and our children's heritage.

It is also important that in carrying out the reduction in red and green tape, which is something this government has talked about regularly, there needs to be retained authority and resources to deal with those who abuse the privileges. For people who abuse the opportunity and privilege of going into our national parks and other protected areas and who do damage, I think the bill still allows those people who are required to look after those areas, in particular the minister's department, to take those people to task.

I cannot go without putting on the record a lot of the wonderful areas that are available in my electorate of Gladstone. It is very easy for people to carry with them the view that Gladstone is all about heavy industry. Indeed, there is a lot of industry in Gladstone. I am pleased that some of the large smelters such as Boyne and QAL have incorporated the tourism industry into their business model in that they allow tours for people who want to come through, albeit they are closely managed given the type of business they are.

We also have in the electorate some absolutely stunning areas for people to visit which are under the control of the minister and which will be covered by this legislative amendment. We have Kroombit Tops. We have a very important area at the crash site of one of the World War II planes. That is an important area and people who visit must respect the solemnity of that site. Kroombit Tops is a very beautiful area for visitors to go to and take photographs of. It has within its confines some obvious dangers in terms of its terrain, but I think that adds to the beauty and the splendour of the place that it is.

We have the Tablelands. I know the minister is well across the Tablelands for a number of reasons at the moment. It is equally a very beautiful area of the state. In one of the minister's other portfolios it is important to remember that the management of those areas is critically important. Without being harsh, the former government put a lot of land into national parks without the accompanying ability to properly manage things like fire management and allowing community access, because that in itself is a form of management. When it took the grazing and the horse riding out of national parks, it took away regular human contact with those areas which in its own way was a way of managing and monitoring what was going on in national park areas. It is critically important that, where areas are set aside for protection because of their biodiversity, their interest and their value because of something that occurred on that site, we also have to resource properly the department to manage and be custodians of that area on behalf of the people of Queensland.

We also have Heron Island, a very beautiful area. If you go at the right time of the year you can see hundreds of birds and their nests, or else you can go when they are not about and it is equally beautiful but quieter. We also have a number of beaches that are beautiful, although they do not have national parks attached to them. I know in the member for Burnett's electorate he has some national parks that are very close to the beach and I am sure people access those national parks. He may still talk about it yet.

Mr Bennett interjected.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Perhaps you will. They are excellent areas and if you visit them you will be equally impressed, as I am, after visiting them. Mount Larcom is another beautiful area.

Mr Dempsey: I have been up there.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Have you been up there, Minister for Police? It takes huff and puff to be able to get to the top of Mount Larcom.

A government member interjected.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: Not for the Minister for Police. It is a 360-degree view when you get up there, if you are still conscious and can see.


A government member: He choppered in.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: I am not going to comment on that. I am sure that the Minister for Police took the trek up and used the rope for the last couple of metres. It is a good spot. It is a great area.

Mr Dempsey interjected.

Mrs CUNNINGHAM: That is it. There have been plenty of people in the electorate of Gladstone who have worked hard to maintain contact and access to the top of Mount Larcom. In particular, some of our community clubs such as Lions and Rotary have acted to maintain that access track.

The recreation areas management bill is an important bill in terms of reducing red tape or green tape, however you want to describe it. However, it is also an opportunity to remember the beautiful areas that we have in Queensland and the obvious recreational opportunities that are available for all of us. It is important as individuals and families to be able to quietly access these national parks, to treat them with the respect that they deserve but to have our hearts and our souls renewed by the quietness, the beauty and the tranquillity that is within our national parks. I thank the minister for his work in maintaining those areas for now and for the future.

 **Mr SHUTTLEWORTH** (Ferny Grove—LNP) (4.28 pm): I rise in the House today to speak in support of the Recreation Areas Management and Another Amendment Bill 2014. The main objective of this bill is to make amendments to the manner in which commercial activities are authorised to

occur when they are conducted within recreational areas and marine parks including the Great Barrier Reef. As has so often been the case since this government came to power, it has been evident that the existing legislation creates situations where duplication of effort occurs between state and Commonwealth departments or, on occasions, contradictions occur between different pieces of legislation.

This legislation will ensure that, through the issuing of one single instrument for operations across recreational areas and marine parks, many of our roughly 600 vessel based commercial tourism operators will now have the option to combine their marine park permissions and their commercial activity permit into a single combined permit for the commercial activities operating across both the marine park and the recreational area. This will significantly reduce the burden of compliance and ensure that operators will have increased certainty in future operations. The regulators will also realise significant reductions in the administrative overhead in the management of permits across the state. The combination will also ensure that operators will now make a single lodgement, pay a single fee and receive a single permit. It will also ensure that the risk of having one of the existing permits expiring at a time different to the other and, therefore, placing the operation at risk is to become a thing of the past.


Additionally, this legislation will ensure that the combined permits into a single joint permission will have the same term of operation as a marine park permission, which will provide for a term of six years for existing applicants or 15 years for accredited high-standard operators. Not only will this result in a saving due to the reduced number of applications required but also it will no doubt provide surety and security in operations that may well improve an operator's standings with their own financiers, which could provide savings in a lower risk assessment of potential borrowings. Additionally, this bill will ensure that, should the business owner offer the business for sale and as part of that operation the business holds a joint permission for commercial activities within the recreational area and marine park, the joint permission will be able to form part of the sale. This move also provides greater certainty to that business operation.

Another area where there has been, to this point, an unnecessarily large effort to ensure compliance in administration has been in the issuing of group activity permits. There are a large number of low- or no-impact non-commercial undertakings such as weddings, scouting operations, birdwatchers, trail hikers or any of a number of other things that members have mentioned here this afternoon where there is a need currently to apply for permits within that protected area. This bill will ensure that these types of activities will no longer require permits, and the renaming of the permit to an organised event permit will reflect this objective, which is to ensure that events that may impact the general use of a protected area will still require a permit to be undertaken. Events where this is likely to be required may be such things as motorised rallies or competitive sporting events such as downhill mountain bikes, defence operations or concerts and the like. It is also important to note that applications for these organised event permits will not automatically translate into an approval.

Consideration that the chief executive will take into account in the application process is whether the activity will impact the use of the part within the application and may take regard to the location of the part within the application—as in where the activity is actually occurring—the size of the event, the types of activity, the timing of the activity, the likely disturbance or effect that this activity will have on that part and the implications for access for the wider public in these public spaces. Other areas where the chief executive may not approve the application could be where the event may have a detrimental effect or impact on areas such as cultural or natural resources.

At the end of the day, this bill has been outlined by many members as having gone through the committee system rather seamlessly with very few public submissions. This bill does continue the very well-established mantra of this government, and that is to remove unnecessary red tape and compliance overheads to ensure that Queensland once again is the nation's powerhouse for business to drive our economy forward.

Our government with our strong team and strong plans will continue to remove unnecessary red and green tape to ensure that we have a strong and bright future in Queensland. So with this rather short submission, I would like to congratulate the minister and his department on the creation of this bill and the secretariat and my fellow members of the committee in the consideration of the bill. I support its passage through the House.

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (4.34 pm): This legislation is quite straightforward. It is a better structured approach to the process of facilitating those groups who need access to our national parks and state forests for reasons of organised recreational access. It is a very sound approach. If there is

no hidden agenda, which does seem absent, then this legislation is proportional and is a value add. I am on the committee that reviewed the legislation along with others. Very few had any disagreement with it externally in the submissions to us and there were none on the committee. This is a good sign. It is a rather well-written piece of legislation but it heavily emphasises acronyms, which is one of the modern phenomena that we see. The validity of such an approach can sometimes lead to confusion for reasons other than WYSIWYG, which stands for what you see is what you get. It can lead to confusion when none is intended. That said, the use of acronyms in the legislation is rather quirky and makes it rather readable.

I support the legislation. The use of such permits in my electorate as described within the legislation will facilitate mountain bike events at the 2018 Commonwealth Games. Critically, that event is to be held in the Nerang State Forest, which is in the centre of my electorate, and there will be a lot of lead-up events prior to that. There is also the Kokoda Challenge event, which has a revamped format. Last year it used the Nerang forest topography to its best, although they started and finished at the Nerang velodrome. They did go out of the forest temporarily, but they came back into it.

With regard to all those other groups that are using a variety of parks and forests surrounding my electorate—and I have heard from the member for Beaudesert and Mudgeeraba today—I believe this legislation, just as they said, will improve the systems over and above that which now operates in those areas. This is a big deal for those areas, which include some of the most beautiful parks in the world. The Lamington National Park now rates very closely to the top 10 walking tracks in the world and is one of the most spectacular rainforests that one can see presently in the world that has major historic value. The bird life is prolific and the air is like champagne: uplifting and revitalising. I actually heard some of this when I was at the I-20. The head of BIO USA, Jim Greenwood, came out with his wife and a group. He said that he wanted to do the walk from O'Reilly's to Binna Burra, which was mentioned here earlier, because it is nearly in the top 10 and he, like others, wants to do all these walks.

Mr Dempsey: It is beautiful. It is very scenic.


Dr DOUGLAS: It is very scenic. It is interesting. This is from a fellow who is a former Republican congressman and is the head of one of the major organisations in Washington. Here he is coming out with a group of people to go on that walk which timed in with the I-20. Of course, they did the cross coordination; they did it all online—getting the guide and getting the bus to pick them up at Binna Burra and take them back to O'Reilly's to all the lodges. If you do these things well and you look after these areas and maintain them, you will get thousands and thousands of people wanting to come to do it. He said that Cradle Mountain is in the top 10. It has huts. This one does not have huts. He was saying to us, 'If you think about huts in the long term, you are going to get a lot more people.'

Having said that, I know there are many keen bushwalkers amongst honourable members. There are certainly many keen bushwalkers in my electorate and there are certainly many throughout the state and throughout Australia. I speak particularly of the wonderful tracks in the Lamington National Park. For those who do not know, it will celebrate its centenary in 2015. Next year that national park will be 100 years old. It started off small and they gradually built onto it. There are some arguments about the government's plans to release the Green Mountain National Park campgrounds near O'Reilly's Rainforest Retreat to the private sector. It will increase costs for campers and negatively impact on the environment and wildlife. I also understand the government is subsidising the development of the site to the tune of \$750,000.

The greatest tragedy of this is that it is occurring at a time when the two-step regulation changes in this legislation are being delivered and when we are rediscovering the beauty of this particular forest, which is of great national significance. It is in the McPherson Range group and is extremely close to most of the major urban areas. As was clearly explained to me by Jim, it is within 1.5 hours driving time by simple bus transport from the airport. For major bushwalkers these sorts of things are significant because most of them are getting older and they have a variety of issues like knee problems. For those who do not know, the major problem for those on the Cradle Mountain walk—which is one of the top 10 in the world—is that you do have to have a very good level of fitness, and a high percentage of people—one in 10—get knee problems. For those who have to be evacuated by air, the average waiting time for a simple injury is three days. These people are looking at these walks and are rating all of those things. If you do the O'Reilly to Binna Burra walk, the incidence of knee injuries is thought to be very low. If we extend them to these longer walks, including the old Green Mountains area, the injury rate would certainly be higher. But you can be evacuated by helicopter effectively within one hour, and in the majority of cases you do not need a satellite phone to

facilitate a rescue—you can do it with a mobile phone if you are running on the Telstra network. I only mention these things because they were raised with me by the Americans. To tell you the truth, they really sound like they have given it a lot of thought because they do all of the walks.

We need to realise that this is a very key piece of heritage special significance rainforest which is extremely close to our city. We need to value it possibly even more highly than people have in the past, and we need to apply simple legislation like this in such a way so as to ensure that we preserve it because it is going to draw in a lot of people. I say that the legislation is practical and simple. I raise the issue of the Green Mountains campground because I feel that it is at odds with improving access for all, whilst ensuring that we value one of the greatest state assets that we maybe have not valued previously because we see it all the time and we tend to take it for granted. But we manage these areas as stewards for all.

 **Mr SORENSEN** (Hervey Bay—LNP) (4.42 pm): I rise to support the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014. Currently, tourism operators who conduct their businesses across marine parks, national parks and some recreational areas require separate commercial activity permits to access these areas. The Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2006 does not allow a commercial activity permit to be combined with a marine park permit, and the amendments to this bill will change all of that. At the end of the day I think that that is a fantastic idea because we have been waiting for this for some time.

These amendments will allow a single combined authority to be issued for commercial activities that include a state marine park, for instance, and island based commercial activities. This is extremely important for electorates such as Hervey Bay, which contains the World Heritage listed Fraser Island—a huge drawcard and tourist attraction. We also have places like Lady Elliot Island—which we say is the beginning of the Great Barrier Reef, although some people say it is the bottom end of the Great Barrier Reef—and Platypus Bay where whales migrate, and they must all have activity agreements because Hervey Bay is a marine park.

In our area we have an extremely diverse number of tourist operators who operate via boat and land based tours to ensure that they create great memories for the people who visit so that when they return, they can tell others what a unique place this is. Our tourist industry is especially important for Hervey Bay as it is one of our biggest industries. In the past operators have been burdened with mountains of paperwork and red tape. These new amendments will put things back into step with the Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006 and the Queensland and Commonwealth marine park legislation, which allow marine park permissions and commercial activity permits for protected areas to be combined. That will be especially good in the Great Barrier Reef area and different places like that where the Commonwealth takes control of some those marine parks as well.

When you unburden business it will always open up more business opportunity, and I look forward to that in the Fraser Coast region. I know that some operators have numerous permits, and when they have these numerous permits, due dates for the renewals come out at different times. In one instance the operator forgot to renew it, and he had to go back and put in an application for the activity again and go through all of the paperwork again. The department does not send out renewal reminders for these types of activities, and these changes will make some of those businesses very happy.

There is so much to do in Hervey Bay. There are other attractions like the Woody Island lighthouse. The Department of Environment and Heritage Protection has given us approximately \$150,000 to maintain that lighthouse on Fraser Island. If you really want to go for a good steep walk, walk up to the lighthouse on Woody Island. It really tries you out, especially early in the morning. It is different things like that that make the tourist industry so diverse with all of the different types of activity permits that you can get. If we can make sure that the operators can have all of those under one permit, I think that is a fantastic idea and it is really about time, because a lot of these small businesses that have different permits for different operations need this type of permission to be able to go out and add things or whatever.

Also, the maximum term for a permit was only three years, and that will be extended to six years for existing applicants and 15 years for accredited high-standard operators. This will also result in savings in administration costs and, better still, the permits are transferrable when the businesses are sold. I think it has been a real bugbear for some time that when somebody bought a business, you could not transfer those permits. It was really ridiculous because if the business contains boats, vehicles and all sorts of things, in the past you could not transfer the permit of that activity over. This bill gives them the ability to do that, and I think that is one of the most important parts of this legislation. I would like to thank the minister for that because it really makes a lot of sense in my area.

I would also like to thank the minister for the two artificial reefs that are going into Hervey Bay. That is going to be a fantastic attraction as well, and I guess there will be people who will want permits to conduct activities like diving on those reefs. It is a fantastic idea and it is a great idea for the recreational fishermen. There is a little bit of a war between recs and commercial fishing, but I think if we put a bit more emphasis on artificial reefs in these areas it certainly will take the pressure off that debate at the end of the day, so I would like to thank the minister for that as well.


While the marine park permissions were always transferred, the commercial activity permits for protected areas and recreational areas were not. That is what we were just talking about. I still think that is the best thing we have done in this piece of legislation.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: I will take up my 10 minutes, too! Low-impact activities on the island should not require permits. Some of these changes will be great, especially for the schoolchildren who go over on a day trip. We should not require them to get a permit to do that. It is those types of activities that will open up the area as well. In the past, the requirement for schools to enter into activity agreements meant that a lot of them did not go to Fraser Island anymore, which was a real shame. Hopefully this will make a difference. That is all good news. The changes will also impact on the ability to conduct weddings in the marine park, at places like Pelican Bank. People will be able to go up in their own boats and get married. That is fantastic news as well.

I congratulate the minister on bringing this common-sense legislation into the House. Without this sort of legislation, people are faced with red tape all the time. Small business people had to fill out forms every time they renewed their activities. I congratulate the minister for bringing this legislation to the House.

The tourism industry is very important. It is one of the Newman government's four economic pillars. I again congratulate the minister on bringing in some legislation to support the tourism industry right across Queensland. The tourism industry brings new money into our areas, especially from overseas. It is an export industry that brings money into this country, into this state and into our regions. That money then hangs around our towns. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr MALONE** (Mirani—LNP) (4.52 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill and to talk about some of the areas in my electorate: Eungella National Park, the gorge and Cape Palmerston National Park. Twenty years ago or more, before I became a member in this parliament, Eungella National Park was an area that was well visited by people and families, particularly at holiday times of the year such as Christmas and Easter. I would say up to a thousand people would camp in Eungella National Park. After we lost government, slowly but surely people were locked out of Eungella National Park.

Eungella National Park and Broken River are highly valued for platypus viewing. People come from all over the world to view the platypus. The area that was most significant for platypus viewing was actually closed off. Basically, if you wanted to camp there you had to carry your barbecues and your tent 200 or 300 metres in, set up and then walk out with them when you left. Beforehand, you could actually drive to the site and set up and everything was fine. I think Kate Jones had a bit to do with closing down the parks, if I remember correctly. Right across Queensland, national parks were in decline. Pests and woody weeds et cetera were going through our national parks.


Recently I have been to the area twice with the minister. The first time was to dedicate a beautiful walkway, valued at \$600,000, to this particular area to view the platypus. He and his colleagues were really amazed at the ability to see platypus in the water early in the day and late in the afternoon. I then talked to the minister about the fact that there was an area in which we used to camp. I have photos from some years ago when I camped there with my children and I was able to actually scratch the ears of a very friendly kangaroo at that park. That area was overgrown as people had been locked out for 10 or 15 years and could not use it. We got some local contractors to go in there and clean up the area. It is now called Eungella bush camp. I understand from the minister that it is one of the most popular sites across Queensland in terms of being viewed on the internet. It has been open for probably only two months and shows great promise. The camping area is right on the edge of Broken River. People can actually camp on the edge of the creek and watch the platypus in the water.

As others have said, it is common sense to get people to come to our national parks. Eungella National Park is right at the end of the Pioneer Valley, so people who are travelling in and out stop to have a pie, a drink or whatever as they travel through the Pioneer Valley and up into the small

township of Eungella. This gives the locals an opportunity to have a reasonably prosperous small business. As I said, people come from all over the world. It is a very significant area in which to see platypus in their natural habitat. It is wonderful that we have been able to do that.

I would also like to talk about national parks in general. We have done a lot of work, but there is still a long way to go. In my role as the Assistant Minister for Emergency Volunteers I have some real concerns that over the years we have developed a lot of our national parks on grazing land. There is a lot of grassland adjacent to or in our national parks. It is not a fault of the administration, but we regularly have fires in the national parks. Because they are overgrown and we have problems getting enough of the land burnt, I think it is important that we look at some alternatives such as leasing some of the areas that are not significant—those areas that are not pristine national park type areas—to local graziers so that the extra feed can be eaten down and the fuel load can be reduced so that we do not get those huge fires through the national parks. Those big fires obviously kill all of the animals and wreak havoc on the fauna of the area. Maybe that is something we need to look at in the future.

I also thank the department for the most recent round of Get Playing grants. Two projects were funded in Dysart, which has never received any funding in all the years I have been a member of parliament. There was \$90,000 each for the BMX Club and for a dressage arena. That will be magnificent for Dysart. There was also about \$80,000 given for a new netball complex in Sarina. With those few words, I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr HATHAWAY** (Townsville—LNP) (4.58 pm): I rise today as a member of the Health and Community Services Committee to make a short contribution to the debate of the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014. As we have heard already, this bill proposes amendments to the Recreation Areas Management Act 2006 and the Forestry Act 1959.

There was very strong consensus on this bill at the committee. I think it was realised very early in the piece that that consensus was due to the fact that the bill is common sense. Quite frankly, it is a no-brainer. The amendments to the act will support the government's commitment to cut red tape and streamline our permit system for tourism and recreation in national parks and wildlife service managed areas.

The bill will do this through the provision of granting a single instrument to authorised commercial activities that are operating across our recreational areas and indeed our marine parks and it provides an alternative mechanism to regulate access to those recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves for higher impact non-commercial community, sports and recreation events that are currently regulated on what is known as a GAP, or a group activity permit, classification and the bill's amendments will remove that GAP classification. Through a single permit for commercial activities, the act requires a permit to be issued for commercial activities in a recreation area and the act as it currently stands also does not allow a commercial activity permit to be combined with a marine park permission. This is out of step with the Nature Conservation (Administration) Regulation 2006 and also the Queensland and Commonwealth marine parks legislation, which allows marine park permissions and commercial activity permits for protected areas such as national parks to be combined.

As we know, as a government one of our key focuses is on tourism. It is one of our four pillars and trying to promote that tourism into nature areas with ecotourism and even Indigenous tourism in those areas and trying to harvest—pardon that turn of phrase—marine environmental tourism is a very admirable aim, because largely with these protected areas we find that use equals ownership. It is through that use the public and through tourism the visitors who come to those areas seek ownership and that ownership translates into guardianship for those areas. They want those areas protected so that they can come back and visit again or so that their children can come and visit again or so that their children's children can come and visit again. We now are in the very fortunate space of having a number of new tourism businesses that are operating tours across marine parks, national parks and recreation areas—and the member for Gympie will like this—in what is known in the military sense as the littoral environment. Currently, as it stands, operations in that littoral environment—and this is coming from an amphibious operations guru—require separate permits.

Mr Gibson: How do you spell 'littoral'?

Mr HATHAWAY: I am not sure, but hopefully I have spelt it right. I am sure Hansard will correct my spelling if it is wrong. This proposal will allow a single combined authority to be issued for commercial activities in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, and I inform members of the House, if it has not already been mentioned, that the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area covers some 348,000 square kilometres.

Mr Gibson: That's a lot of land.

Mr HATHAWAY: That is a lot of area, not land.

Mr Gibson: Sorry, area.

Mr HATHAWAY: This vast expanse would be bigger than the United Kingdom, Holland and Switzerland combined. It is about the size of the member for Gregory's electorate. This bill also covers the state marine parks—that is, the Great Barrier Reef Coast Marine Park, the Great Sandy Marine Park and the Moreton Bay Marine Park—outside the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area and it replaces the current requirement for tourism businesses to attain those two permissions as two separate pieces of paper to enable their commercial activity to occur in those recreation areas as well as in the marine park. When this is fully implemented the proposal will streamline those administrative processes—again, cutting that red tape—for tourism businesses to enable them to lodge a single application, pay a single combined application fee and receive a single document or permit document for all of their linked marine and also their island based commercial activities. This means that our businesses will save time and money by only having to complete and lodge a single application form. Again, this reduces burdensome red tape because not much value is gained by having the two-permit process. It will also enable the terms of the permit for some of those—what is the terminology for the high-grade tourism operators, the precise terminology? I am sure the member for Gympie will correct me.

Mr Gibson: Accredited high standard.

Mr HATHAWAY: It will enable accredited high-standard operators to get longer duration permits from three years to as long as 15 years. This is quite important because those operators require that security and surety to make that investment or indeed to take their case to their bank to make that investment go forward. This is another common-sense approach that we are seeing from the minister and his department—they are full of common sense—and we are starting to get the benefits of all of these fantastic changes within our national parks.

As part of the 2012 election we promised greater access to our national park areas. I think this is fantastic, Minister, so well done and keep it up. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, which is headquartered in my electorate of Townsville, as the member for Gympie would know, supported the amendments which provided for a single permit for these commercial activities across recreational areas within the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. The authority in fact stated that the amendments will, when combined with recent amendments to the Nature Conservation Act, support the growing tourism industry by streamlining current regulatory requirements.

Earlier I mentioned how this bill will remove the group activity permit classification. Permits are required for group activities undertaken in protected areas, recreation areas, state forests and timber reserves. Group activities, as is currently in legislation, include any activity involving organised use of an area in a way that may restrict access to the general public or perhaps affect the enjoyment of an area by the general public. The extent to which a group activity may restrict that access or affect the enjoyment of an area has been open to interpretation and obviously can include a wide range of things from low-impact activities such as birdwatching or even simply taking photographs of the sun rising up over the ocean or that marine park area—I am painting that very nice picture; that is why I live in paradise, because every day along the Strand in the morning it is fantastic—to obviously high-impact activities. The majority of the 442 permits received during the 2011-12 financial year were issued for low-impact activities such as small weddings, bushwalking, birdwatching and all of those sort of very low-impact—almost unobtrusive—activities. The activities that will continue to be regulated are of course the higher impact organised events such as—and I am quite experienced in this area—Australian Defence Force training exercises, vehicle rallies and competitive sporting events et cetera that may give cause or may have likely detrimental impacts or restrict access on other users to that area.

I now turn briefly to my experience with the Army. In fact, there has been any number of exercises over the last 20 or 30 years. My very first one of operating in that area was Exercise Kangaroo, even though I cannot recall the year. Anyway, it was part of the Kangaroo series and then we had the Exercise Crocodile series. I really started working in that littoral environment when I was at Headquarters 3 Brigade for Exercise Swift Eagle. Do you remember that, member for Ferny Grove?

Mr Shuttleworth interjected.

Mr Cripps: Was it still the AIF at the time?

Mr HATHAWAY: I will not take that interjection from the Minister for Mines. I was there for Swift Eagle and Exercise Tandem Thrust, which is now known as Talisman Sabre. On these exercises I remember doing an amphibious assault or what we call a helicopter assault a number of times across the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park World Heritage area to storm the 106 feature in Shoalwater Bay, which is now only about 104 metres after we bombarded it. There is often a misnomer—and this will be supported by the honourable member for Rockhampton—but ADF operations in both the littoral environment and on those coastal reaches are always done in tune with the environment.

In fact, the ADF has won awards for the environmental management of these critical areas, because the ADF wants to keep using them. The principle of this bill and the Nature Conservation Act is that the use of these areas creates a sense of ownership and guardianship. The ADF is a particularly good guardian of the environment in which it operates. We can expect the ADF to continue to exercise its obligations, if not increase them, because next year there will be the commissioning of the new landing helicopter dock ships, which are large amphibious support ships. In fact, they are the largest capital ships that the Australian Navy has ever owned. I do not know what their deadweight tonnage is, but it is significant.

Mr Shuttleworth: Twenty-seven and a half thousand.

Mr HATHAWAY: Twenty-seven and a half thousand tonnes. That carries an embark force of about 1,000 troops, including tanks. The deployment of those tanks and those troops will be through a combination of helicopter air assault and amphibious assault through the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park onto what is not only Defence land but also park area. Those troops are able to do that at night by stealth. They also do it sensitively by looking after the environment in which they operate while achieving their mission and destroying the enemy. I have been involved in these operations at headquarter level. I have also commanded the 10th Force Support Battalion—10FSB—and a lot of the amphibious elements through 35 Water Transport Squadron, which operates in this area every other day of the week. But I digress and apologise for that little sojourn down memory lane.

Mr Gibson interjected.

Mr HATHAWAY: Was it? I could tell members that I have been in some of the longest amphibious assaults. They just seem to take days.


Mr Gibson: They were waiting for the tide to come in.

Mr HATHAWAY: I do not know what we were waiting for. I think I had the world's longest amphibious assault on the beach. It took four days for the battalion to extract itself from Sabina Point.

An honourable member interjected.

Mr HATHAWAY: I am sorry, I will return to national parks. I think that the change in the name better reflects the nature of the high-impact activities that will continue to take place. These activities will continue to be regulated under the permit system, but this amendment removes the perception that any type of group activity, including those low-impact activities that I mentioned earlier such as birdwatching or weddings, parties and anything—in fact, that should be the name of a band: weddings, parties, anything—are intended to be regulated. These amendments will reduce the unnecessary regulation of those low-impact non-commercial activities in protected areas, recreation areas, state forest and timber reserves. This will enable groups of people who want to do something that is of low impact to go out into the marine environment, to go into the national park environment and enjoy themselves—take it all in—to ensure that they will want those areas protected and guarded.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to offer my thanks not only to our always very diligent committee secretariat but also to the minister and his departmental staff, who provided good information and briefings on the bill. I support all the work that the minister is doing in ensuring that our national park areas are utilised more often, are open for everybody to appreciate and that businesses are able to continue to operate in them.

 **Mr GIBSON** (Gympie—LNP) (5.13 pm): I rise to speak to the Recreation Areas Management and Another Act Amendment Bill 2014. In doing so I note that the policy objectives of the bill are as follows—

Provide for the granting of a single instrument that authorises commercial activities operating across recreation areas and State and/or Commonwealth Marine Parks, including in the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area—

and—

Provide for an alternative mechanism to regulate access to recreation areas, State forests and timber reserves for the subset of higher impact non-commercial community, sports and recreation events that are currently regulated under the group activity permit ... classification—

and—

to remove the group activity permit classification.

During this debate we have heard much about the amendments that relate to the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park, so I will not address them during my contribution. Instead, because the Gympie electorate encompasses both the Cooloola recreation area and the Inskip Peninsula recreation area, I will restrict my remarks to the second objective of the bill.

Nelson Mandela said—and I think quite importantly—

Money won't create success, the freedom to make it will.

For there to be freedom to make money, government needs to get out of the way. We need to remove unnecessary red tape. Red tape can be defined as a noun that means—

excessive bureaucracy or adherence to rigid conformity that is considered redundant and hinders or prevents action or decision making.

I would add to that definition that red tape also prevents business investment. This government has been unashamedly committed to reducing or removing unnecessary red tape. I note the vernacular of green tape that is now used along with the term 'red tape'. It is a term that is unique in our modern world in that it means that Labor-leaning and Greens-alliance governments have brought in another version of unnecessary regulation to wrap up and deter those from making investments in our state.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr GIBSON: I hear the chuckling from the members on the benches opposite. Let us be honest. We all know where the term 'red tape' came from. The bureaucrats would wrap up their various papers with that. But the term 'green tape' is a creature of the Labor Party and the Greens alliance that we have seen not only in Queensland and not only in Australia but also, unfortunately, across many parts of this world.

As a government, or as a parliament, we must not be frightened to critically review regulation, to critically review our processes of government to strip away those regulations that are unnecessary and hinder the investment of capital and activity in our area. By doing so we enable the powerhouse of our economy. I am talking about small business. I am talking about little tourism operators—mum-and-dad operations—a wedding photographer, someone who is invested in our community. When those people double their business they do that by employing one more person or two more people. Too often government is in the way. This government has shown a commitment to stripping away unnecessary regulation, thereby enabling small business to grow. We see the economic benefit that that provides in our communities through the creation of jobs.

I want to commend this minister—actually, I want to commend the whole cabinet but particularly this minister today, because we are looking at his bill—for his pragmatic focus on these reforms. I note that this is not the first time this minister has stepped up to remove unnecessary regulation and permits. Of course, I am referring to this minister's commitment—and, indeed, not only a commitment but also a following through with action—to remove vehicle access permits for Rainbow Beach residents within the Cooloola recreation area. That is something that I had been fighting for since Labor introduced them back in 2008 as part of a grubby deal with the Greens. We know how that was set up with the Noosa Parks Association. They put in place vehicle access permits without any understanding of how they would impact the residents of Rainbow Beach, tourism operators within the area and small businesses. This minister, without fear or favour, without deviating from the course, followed through on a commitment. On behalf of the people of my electorate, I thank the minister and thank his department, because it has been a long fight.

It is always a long fight to undo the damage that Labor governments do when they are in power. I could harp on about the Traveston Dam debacle, but I will save that for my valedictory, because there are a few choice things that I would like to share. We know that when the Labor Party is in government, it regulates without benefit. We know that when conservatives are in government, we remove unnecessary regulation. Although this issue does not relate directly to this bill, I refer to

how the Labor Party carried on about sustainability declarations and how wonderful they would be. They were a farce. One of the first things that this government did on coming to power was to strip them away. In doing so it removed another element of unnecessary regulation.

As we have heard from other members, through this piece of legislation this minister is stripping away unnecessary regulation for low-impact activities. We heard that in 2011-12 442 permits were granted for group activities and that the majority of these were low impact. Not being happy with that, the minister reformed the processes within his department and in 2013-14 the number of group activity permits reduced. I think it is important for all to be aware that it is not just about regulation, it is about cultural shifts within departments. That comes from leadership, leadership like we have seen from Minister Dickson. The number of group activity permits reduced from 442 in 2011-12 to 67 in 2013-14. Not being satisfied with that, we now see a bill that is removing these requirements for low-impact activities. We have heard the type of activities that we are removing these permits for.


Mr Hathaway: Birdwatching.

Mr GIBSON: Thank you very much, member for Townsville. I have heard that the member for Townsville is an avid birdwatcher out there on the Strand. Also bushwalking or even something as simple as a wedding ceremony in a day use area. There is no reason these activities should be required to have a permit.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mr GIBSON: I am not taking that interjection from the member for Gregory. In my time here there have been many interjections that I have enjoyed but that one I am going to let go through to the keeper. There is no reason these activities should be regulated. I want to pick up on something that the member for Townsville said. I think he made a very insightful observation, one that is worthy of repetition—that is, 'use equals ownership'. What this government is achieving here is opening up these areas for greater use for low-impact activities and in doing so is generating a greater sense of ownership. Labor was about locking areas up and preventing people from using them. Labor made it difficult through multiple regulations and permits and in doing so we found our national parks becoming havens for feral animals and our recreation areas being barred from tourist activities and as a result of that people walked away.

This is sensible reform. This is evidence of a government that is committed to ensuring that all Queenslanders have the opportunity to enjoy what they have. I would like us to return to a time when we trusted Queenslanders, when we recognised that they have the best interests of our community at heart and will do the right thing; when we do not regulate to the lowest common denominator but rather strip away those unnecessary regulations to encourage innovation, to encourage investment, but to retain those elements of regulation that are necessary as a deterrent to that small minority who may choose to do damage to our environment. It is time government got out of the way of business investment and the powerhouse of our economy, small businesses, to drive the investment in our community. I commend the minister for his leadership and the cultural change that he has achieved within his department and is continuing to drive with this piece of legislation. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. SL DICKSON** (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (5.23 pm), in reply: It has been a humbling experience to listen to so many members of the House speak highly of national parks. I talk about all members: opposition members, independent members and every LNP member on my side of politics. We have heard speeches about Nelson Mandela and we have been lobbied for sporting events to occur in particular regions. I will not mention that member in the House here today. He spoke well on his own behalf.

What really caught my ear was the contribution from the member for Mirani. He spoke about how important the natural environment is to him and about the Eungella National Park area where one can drive 90 kilometres inland from Mackay, drive up into a mountain range right beside the highway and go in and look at platypus in the wild. What a great place Australia is—and Queensland in particular—where you can do something like that. I commend him for the experience he has brought to this House and what he has delivered for his constituents. Like many other retiring members of this House, we will sadly lose that wealth of experience when they move on and do other things with their life.

The contributions today talked about a bill that is delivering one important thing, cutting red and green tape, making it so much easier for tourism operators. One member spoke about a family business with two operators that may now employ one more person. If every two-person operation did

that think of the employment generation that would occur right across this great state. I am sure that there is nobody in this House who wants to stifle employment. This bill is a simplistic bill that cuts red tape, allows operators to pay one single permit fee and delivers what I believe will be great outcomes for the people of Queensland now and into the future. I thank all members for their fantastic contributions today.

There is much more work to be done throughout our national parks. One of the members touched on some of the big things that we are up against, such as the impact of feral animals and weeds within our national parks and forests. I digress from the bill, but we all need to take this very seriously because there are so many challenges ahead of us.

Over the past 2½ years we have jointly delivered fantastic outcomes, whether it is in health, transport, education or the environment. This is a great outcome. Keep watching this space because some very exciting news will be put out to the people of Queensland within the week. I say to the other side of the House, 'keep listening'. Week after week, whether it is news from the Minister for Health, the Minister for Transport and Main Roads, the Minister for Science, Information Technology, Innovation and the Arts, the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry or the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, lots of good news is coming. Those opposite are going to need to be sitting down. I thank members for their input. What a great piece of legislation this is.

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, as read, agreed to.

Third Reading

Hon. SL DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (5.27 pm): I move—

That the bill be now read a third time.

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

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title

Hon. SL DICKSON (Buderim—LNP) (Minister for National Parks, Recreation, Sport and Racing) (5.28 pm): I move—


That the long title of the bill be agreed to.

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


Motion agreed to.

COMMITTEE OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Auditor-General's Reports, Referral to Portfolio Committees


 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (5.28 pm): I seek to advise the House of determinations made by the Committee of the Legislative Assembly at its meeting today. The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 194B, that the Auditor-General's report titled *Report to Parliament No. 4: 2014-15—results of audit: state public sector entities for 2013-14* be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration; the Auditor-General's report titled *Report to Parliament No. 5: 2014-15—results of audit: hospital and health service entities 2013-14* be referred to the Health and Community Services Committee for consideration; and the Auditor-General's report titled *Report to Parliament No. 6: 2014-15—results of audit: public non-financial corporations*, be referred to the Finance and Administration Committee for consideration.

Portfolio Committees, Reporting Dates

 **Mr STEVENS** (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (5.29 pm): The committee has resolved, pursuant to standing order 136, that the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Planning and Development Bill by 23 February 2015; the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Planning and Development (Consequential) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill by 23 February 2015; the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Planning and Environment Court Bill by 23 February 2015; the State Development, Infrastructure and Industry Committee report on the Ports Bill by 2 February 2015; and the Legal Affairs and Community Safety Committee report on the Retail Shop Leases Amendment Bill by 2 February 2015.

MOTION

Newman Government, Performance

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (5.30 pm): I move—

That this House:

- notes the Newman government has made substantial cuts to government jobs and services since the March 2012 election;
- acknowledges that these cuts have had significant detrimental impacts on Queensland's social fabric, and state and regional economies;
- notes that the LNP's Contract with Queensland, which is signed by the Premier himself, states that if the LNP does not perform Queenslanders can 'hold us to account at the next election';
- further notes that Premier Newman told his cabinet members, in relation to ministerial responsibility, that 'If they don't sort out problems within two years, at that stage it's not the Labor Party's fault. It's their fault'; and
- condemns the Newman government for failing to deliver during its term in office.

Where do we begin? The past 2½ years have been a great disappointment. This government was elected on a number of promises, but over the past 2½ years all we have seen are broken promises. This government promised to govern with humility, grace and dignity and, instead, we have seen nothing but arrogance and contempt. Over the past 2½ years this government picked fights with everyone, including itself. In the lead-up to the election no-one will forget—even though this government wants people to forget—the fights with the doctors, the lawyers, the teachers, the firefighters and the list goes on and on and on. When they had no-one else to fight with, they turned on themselves. They started fighting with themselves about who would get what seat and who would be thrown out. There are continual divisions between the LNP state headquarters and branch members on the ground. This has been an embarrassment to Queensland. As people have quite rightly said in the past, if the LNP cannot govern itself it definitely cannot govern Queensland.

Over the past 2½ years, newspaper article after newspaper article has described the legacy that is the Newman government's train wreck. Let us go through some of the more interesting headlines: '4,000 more face sack'; 'Razor gang sets sight on health'; 'Job cuts will gut regions'. That was from the *Toowoomba Chronicle*. 'Newman razor gang cuts heart of Downs'; 'Cuts will bring economy to the knees'; 'Families to suffer as health services axed'. That was from the *Townsville Bulletin*. From the Sunshine Coast we have 'Newman bumps women's health funding'.

A government member interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I hear an interjection, 'Who cares?' I can tell the member that Queenslanders care and people in her electorate care. They know that this government and its members are failing to listen. I know that in her electorate especially they are not listening to her.

I will continue with the headlines. The *Warwick Daily News* has, 'TAFE in the firing line: task force recommends closure of 38,000 campuses across Queensland'. From the *Australian*, 'Newman braces for job cuts backlash'. The *Sunday Mail* has, 'Axe falls on women's health service'; 'Cuts hit military graves: critics take up fight in battle over war history'. Who can forget this one from the *Townsville Bulletin*: 'Pensioners battle as concessions canned'. It was a gift of the Newman government to cut concessions to the hardest working people, the pensioners.

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: They do not like it. They had to back-pedal on that one. I will keep going. This is just a taste of what is to come: 'Newman job cuts hit state of slump'. I am glad the Treasurer is here because this is one of my favourites and it is from the *Courier-Mail*: 'Cut to the core'. That is one of the favourites because that is what this government has done: it has cut, it has cut, it has cut. From the *Courier-Mail*, 'Shock as LNP government winds up iconic state-wide cancer service BreastScreen'. That is a mere selection of the stories about the damage that this government has done right across the state over the past 2½ years.

I could go on, endlessly. The Premier's literary awards were axed; \$100,000 was axed from the Pyjama Foundation for its Pyjama Angels program that mentored foster children; and \$20,000 was cut from Volunteers for Isolated Students' Education, which provides assistance for families and students in rural Queensland. The government cut funding that the Heart Foundation provided to walking groups through a program that was aimed at keeping the elderly healthy and out of hospital. Who can forget the cuts to the travelling show school, which was one of the first cuts this government made? I remember that from the first year of this government's term. More recently, \$900,000 was cut from suicide prevention initiatives. Nearly \$500,000 has been cut from family planning initiatives in north Brisbane alone. A sum of \$1.9 million has been cut from the PCYCs, which are there to help young people and kids be active and stay off the streets. I have already mentioned the \$44 million cuts to the BreastScreen Queensland service.

Queenslanders have a right to feel utterly betrayed, because this is not the government they were promised. We have had three years of betrayal and three years of cut after cut after cut. That is what we have received from the LNP government. Within months of taking office, they talked about cutting 14,000 people from our workforce. However, we now know that that number is closer to 24,000—that is, 24,000 families cannot pay their bills and cannot pay their mortgages, because of this arrogant Newman government. Cut, cut, cut. The Premier and the Prime Minister are cut from the same cloth. They say one thing before an election campaign and they do the complete opposite when they gain power. Neither the Abbott nor Newman governments can be trusted.


How can we go beyond the Contract with Queensland? One of its core pledges was to restore accountability in government. Everyone is shaking their heads at that one. We all know the 'little mermaid', the member for Mermaid Beach, stands to benefit from the \$100 million skyride if it gets up. He is the '\$1 million Mermaid Beach man'. They said they would revitalise front-line services for families, but the health system is crumbling under this government.

Government members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Obviously they are not out there listening, because that is what families are telling me. They tell me they cannot get into hospitals. The nurses are telling me that they are overworked. It is a dire situation. How can we forget the appointment of their mates, such as Michael Caltabiano? We have had a series of issues with the member for Mudgeeraba, the member for Redlands and the member for Moggill, who has been in the headlines lately for all the wrong reasons, not for the right ones. The branch members want him. They love him. It is a pity that the LNP hierarchy does not.

The past three years have been a complete disappointment. Who can forget the government's broken promises on the cost of living? This government promised to lower the cost of living, but it has not been able to fulfil its promise to families of \$120 a year in relation to electricity. We know what this Treasurer has planned. We have seen it on his Christmas card. He wants to sell off the assets and pocket the cash, even though Queenslanders do not want that. Thank you very much, Tim, for that Christmas card! All I see is more political advertising. Has anyone else received a Christmas card yet? It is more political advertising. He is like the Grinch who stole Christmas. It would be more apt to say that he is the Grinch who sold Christmas.

There are less than four months until Queenslanders go to the polls—that is, in less than four months they will cast their vote on whether or not they believe that this government has led them down the garden path and not delivered. We have heard nothing but broken promises. It has cut jobs and services, and Queenslanders deserve better.

 **Mrs D'ATH** (Redcliffe—ALP) (5.40 pm): I rise to second this private member's motion this evening. Queenslanders are looking forward to the opportunity to take the Newman government up on the Premier's invitation to hold them to account at the next election. There has been a severe case of nervous Nellies on the other side over the last few weeks. We have continued to see and hear many speeches that sound a lot like valedictory speeches from quite a few members opposite over the past few weeks, and the official valedictories will be delivered this week.

The one thing that we have not seen from across the chamber is the call to accept responsibility for their portfolios by Newman government ministers. The Premier has made his declaration that 'If they do not sort out their problems within two years, at that stage it's not the Labor Party's fault. It's their fault.' The two-year mark has well and truly passed and ministers are still blaming the previous government. It is about time to stand up and be counted, because if they do not Queenslanders will do it for them. Ministers can no longer use the previous government as an excuse for the cuts to government jobs and services.

In the Justice and Attorney-General portfolio jobs have been cut, services have been slashed and specialist courts have been abolished. The slash-and-burn policy which saw government workers lose their jobs at a frightening rate from the very beginning of this government's term of office was a sign of things to come.

The Attorney-General abolished the special circumstances court without even bothering to go and have a look at how it operated. He ignored the advice of stakeholders and did not even take the time to undertake an evaluation of the court. He withdrew \$150,000 in funding to Sisters Inside in Townsville, leaving that service bereft in a city where their services are most needed. He has wasted millions of dollars on a sentenced boot camp for juvenile offenders, despite the warnings and the findings of all the research from around the world that they do work. He abolished the one proven effective method for reducing juvenile crime—the court order youth justice conferencing service.

Another great debacle overseen by this Attorney-General has been the outsourcing of the court transcription services. The cost to consumers has almost doubled. The cost for a day's transcript in the 2013-14 financial year under the State Reporting Bureau was \$1,267.90. In the same financial year the average cost of a day's transcript under Auscript was \$2,189.88. That is a massive increase of 73 per cent.

Not only was the cost to customers massively increased; the cost to government departments saw even greater rises. Under an RTI obtained by the opposition last week, the department wrote that the outsourcing of the recording and transcription services was anticipated to give rise to \$6 million in savings for the department. Instead, additional costs were experienced by the Magistrates Court and QCAT. During the implementation process it was anticipated that these would be \$2 million for the Magistrates Court and \$170,000 for QCAT. The Department of Justice and Attorney-General was directed to find the \$2 million in savings internally, but no steps were taken to do so.

The QCAT costs increased from the previously budgeted amount of \$60,000 for transcription services to a total cost of \$600,000 for recording and transcription. One of the key cost-saving initiatives that was highlighted in the Auscript implementation was the ability for the judiciary and court staff to access the recordings online through court FM. That, however, according to the department, is proving impractical.


The outsourcing did not go as planned. One of the staff took a phone call from the Attorney-General who was calling to ask how the outsourcer was going in May 2013. It only started in March. Apparently that call was sparked by a conversation with the DPP. The view from the Office of the DPP was that they were not too impressed by the Auscript service and were not inclined to send much more work their way until they sorted themselves out.

Back at the 2012 estimates hearing, when asked about the time frames for the provision of transcripts in criminal trials under the outsourced model, the Attorney-General said—

The government will put a time frame on it. We would expect that we would it more efficient and more reliable and faster than is currently the case offered by the State Reporting Bureau.

This has not been the case, however. There are significant delays. The Court of Appeal has particularly been affected. There are constant references to the delayed transcript issue.

The Court of Appeal in particular had to ask for specific turnaround times, which could not be provided because of Auscript delays. A meeting was held in August last year because 27 Court of Appeal matters were experiencing delays. The Attorney-General is the worst manager of government procurement processes in this parliament and all so he can give millions of dollars of government contracts to LNP donors.

 **Hon. TJ NICHOLLS** (Clayfield—LNP) (Treasurer and Minister for Trade) (5.45 pm): Madam Speaker, I must confess that I was not paying any attention whatsoever to the previous speaker because it was the usual litany of whinges, whines, complaints and grief peddling that we have come

to expect from the ALP in this place. We see the lack of any effective policy, the lack of any effective solution, the lack of any effective new ideas, the lack of any effective work they have done themselves to address the problems and the issues that they created in this state.

Here we have again the most well-funded, laziest opposition in the nation going about their usual task. There is not one new idea. They could not even come up with their own headlines; they had to recycle them from the *Courier-Mail*. We saw the Leader of the Opposition in some sort of shallow university humour attempt to try to make fun out of someone sending a Christmas card to someone. That is the extent of the Labor opposition's policy framework here in Queensland. That is the extent of the member for Inala's policy work. She gets paid a lot of money. She has a big staff. What can they do? They can only come in and whinge and complain.

Let us have a look at what the story in fact is. The story of course is this. The Labor government left Queensland in a parlous state. Their own final midyear economic and fiscal review predicted that by the end of this financial year Queensland would be \$85.5 billion in debt. Queensland is not going to be \$85.5 billion in debt. In fact it will be much closer to the \$80 billion that we have been talking about. It is still too much, but it is \$5 billion better than Labor were ever going to leave us in.

What did we promise? We promised that we would change things around. I will move an amendment to the motion now so that we can understand exactly what is happening. I move—

That all words after 'House' be deleted and the following words inserted:

'notes:

- that the previous Labor government's own estimates showed Queensland's debt increasing to \$85.4 billion;
- that the previous Labor government lost Queensland's AAA credit rating and had no credible plan to return the budget to surplus;
- that the Newman LNP government will deliver Queensland's first fiscal surplus in a decade next financial year; and
- that since coming to office the Newman LNP government has cut waste and inefficiency, revitalised front-line services and restored accountability in government.

Those were our core commitments to the people of Queensland: we would cut waste and inefficiency; we would revitalise front-line services; and we would restore accountability to government. We also said we would deal with cost-of-living pressures and attack a number of other areas, such as proper planning for proper infrastructure, so we do not do things like waste \$9 billion on a water grid that does not supply water, or do not spend \$1.2 million on a Health payroll system that does not pay people, pays them too much, pays them too little, pays dead people and costs us even more money to fix. We certainly would not be paying for a fake Tahitian prince to walk out the door with \$16 million.


Opposition members interjected.

Mr NICHOLLS: They groan because it is true. They have never addressed it. Did anyone ever hear someone from the Labor Party admit that they got it wrong when it comes to the Health payroll system? Did they ever do that? No, they did not. So what have we done? We have set about putting the state's finances on a more sustainable footing. We have implemented fiscal repair measures totalling \$7 billion and we have cut expenses. Under the Labor Party, growth in expenses was running out of control like a bushfire at nearly nine per cent a year. We have brought it back to 0.2 per cent a year. We have stopped waste and inefficiency and we have started investing in front-line services. Because of that, as I say, we have reduced the total debt by \$5 billion.

In terms of investment in front-line services, what have we done? We have increased education funding by seven per cent to \$11.8 billion in the 2014-15 budget. That was in addition to a 6.6 per cent increase in the 2013-14 budget. That is an additional 761 teachers and teacher aides and \$300 million to fix up the schools—the maintenance backlog. We have put 267 new police on this year and we will put 267 police on the year after that. We have added, and will continue to add, to front-line services as we add 1,100 extra police to the Police Service and deliver safer homes for Queenslanders.

We have increased Health funding by six per cent to \$13.6 billion. So the Health budget is now more than \$2 billion more than when the LNP came to government and, most importantly, now people are not waiting in ambulances trying to get services. They have a health service they can be proud of that will look after them when they get ill. Their record speaks for itself; so does ours.

(Time expired)

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (5.50 pm): I rise to support the amendment to this motion that has been moved by the Treasurer this evening. Many of my colleagues in this place would know that I love sport. Some of my colleagues would know that I particularly love the gentlemen's sport of darts. When you watch a top level game of darts, the players walk in to a theme song. I would like to suggest tonight that if Labor were to walk into this place each day to a theme song they could probably use one by one of their former MPs in the federal government—one of Peter Garrett's songs with the lyrics 'short memory, must have a short memory', because obviously that is what they have to move a motion such as this. If you are looking for a theme song for our government, you would probably use something more like 'signed, sealed, delivered', because we have spent the last three years delivering for the people of Queensland.

I would like to concentrate my contribution on one of the more ludicrous statements to be made by the Leader of the Opposition in this House. The Leader of the Opposition feels the need in the motion that she moved to condemn the Newman government for failing to deliver during this term of office. Let's look at some of the ways that this government has revitalised front-line services and delivered more for Queensland in just 2½ years than Labor were able to deliver in 14 years.

Labor's legacy that they left Queensland was a public housing waiting list where 30,723 people were waiting for public housing. By June this year this strong LNP government had reduced that list to just 18,597. Labor's legacy was to leave state school facilities with \$300 million worth of maintenance jobs that could not be undertaken because there was no funding available. Our strong LNP government has fixed our school buildings and reduced this \$300 million backlog to virtually zero.

Labor's legacy saw increases in public transport fares every year—15 per cent, then 15 per cent, then 15 per cent, and their plan if they got back into government was another 15 per cent and another 15 per cent. Our government's commitment to revitalising front-line services has seen not once but twice fare increases halved, we have introduced free trips after nine each week, we have made a historic five per cent cut to public transport fares, and we will ensure that there is no increase in fares at the beginning of next year.

When you look at Labor's record in health, their ineptitude could not be any clearer. When you look at our record in health, the contrast certainly could not be any more stark. I do not for a minute think that even the Leader of the Opposition believes her own delusional rants that Queensland Health is now in some type of critical condition. How could we forget in the dying days of the Bligh Labor government when we saw the bungled Health payroll system that is predicted to cost taxpayers \$1.2 billion and then we saw the fake Tahitian prince make off with \$16 million of public money?


On 12 December 2011, then Premier Bligh came out and said in a media release—

We have done everything possible to turn this ship around. We have doubled the budget, implemented every reform ... But this latest failure has made it clear to me that we need a new beginning for the administration of health services in Queensland ... Queensland Health as we know it will be abolished.

There in then Premier Bligh's own words Labor had no answer for Queensland Health and she freely admitted it. Fast-forward just three years, under the strong leadership of Minister Springborg, and Queensland Health is in better shape than it has been for years. Waiting lists have been cut. Emergency waiting times have been cut. Ambulance ramping has been cut. Queensland Health did not need to be abolished; it just needed someone and a government who knew what they were doing, and that is what we have provided for Queensland Health and for the people of Queensland.

The Newman LNP government is a strong team. We are implementing our strong plan and we are delivering a stronger Queensland. There are many other areas of Labor's legacy where they have let this state down: a \$7,000 tax put on the purchase of a family home; a waste tax slapped on businesses across the state; government expenses growing at an unsustainable rate at 10½ per cent each and every year. Under this strong LNP government, they have been fixed, fixed and fixed.

The people of Queensland know what they will get if they ever re-elect a Labor government in this state. They will get a rabble with no plan. They will get a rabble with a track record of an inability to deliver results in health, education or balancing the state budget. The Newman LNP government is delivering for Queensland. We will continue to deliver for Queensland. We will continue to be a strong team with a strong plan that will lead to a more prosperous Queensland. I support the amendment to the motion.

 **Mr PITT** (Mulgrave—ALP) (5.55 pm): There is no denying that the Newman government's reckless slash-and-burn approach has slowed Queensland's economy and increased unemployment. Back in 2012, the Premier was bizarrely claiming that he had saved 6,000 jobs by only axing 14,000 government workers instead of 20,000. However, it has since been revealed that this government has cut more than 24,000 workers, when workers in government owned businesses are included.

There are numerous independent assessments that confirm that this Newman LNP government has slowed our economy. In 2012 the Commonwealth Bank economics team said that the Newman government's cuts 'will weigh on the Queensland economy over the coming financial years and beyond'. Deloitte Access Economics said that the Newman government's cuts were 'a major negative for the state's growth last financial year'. I think the Premier would say, 'Cue scary music.' Deloitte went further to say that this government 'overdid it, leaving their austerity weighing on economic growth'.

The Premier's favourite economists at CommSec also said that the Queensland government 'had a significant amount of lay-offs in the public sector and that's having an impact to some degree in curbing the retail story'. Queensland's retail trade result in September was the weakest of any state in Australia. The Australian National Accounts for 2013-14 released last week detail that Queensland recorded growth of 2.3 per cent last financial year—nearly half the growth of four per cent inherited from the previous Labor government. This growth is both below the national average and below the historical average for Queensland.

When looking at domestic spending or 'state final demand', the figures are even worse, with Queensland recording the second weakest result in the nation last financial year. The national accounts further detail that Queensland recorded the largest fall of any state in gross state income per person last financial year. Over the year to June we have seen business investment fall by 12.4 per cent and private investment fall by 7.5 per cent, compared with growth in business investment of 32 per cent under Labor and private investment of 23 per cent over the year to March 2012.

This slowing of the Queensland economy under the Newman LNP government has had a devastating effect on jobs. Queensland now has the highest unemployment rate in Australia at seven per cent seasonally adjusted. On either measure—trend or seasonally adjusted—unemployment is at an 11-year high in this state. And on either measure the number of unemployed in Queensland in October is the highest on record in the ABS series dating back to February 1978. There are currently 175,600 unemployed Queenslanders—that is another 41,800 Queenslanders in the unemployment queue since the election.

The Treasurer in opposition used to obsess over full-time jobs, calling them 'breadwinners'. Yet under his watch, on a seasonally adjusted basis, more than 20,000 full-time jobs have been destroyed since the election. Even on the Treasurer's sometimes preferred trend measure, there are 18,600 fewer full-time jobs than at the election. Of course when the previous Labor government supported the creation of more than 53,000 full-time jobs, with the economy growing at four per cent, this Treasurer was calling the economy a 'basket case'.

Young people in my region have been hit particularly hard by this government's reckless slash-and-burn approach, with youth unemployment in the Far North skyrocketing from 11 per cent to more than 20 per cent. This means that one in five people aged 15 to 24 in my region are unable to find any work. This is not a record to be proud of and this is certainly not an economy back on track. And we have a youth unemployment crisis in other parts of the state, with Ipswich's rate increasing from 12 per cent to over 19 per cent, and Moreton Bay North from 10.5 per cent at the election to over 18 per cent in October. So much for the Premier's promise to lower unemployment to four per cent. Instead we have nation-leading unemployment of seven per cent—up from 5.5 per cent at the election. And, when it comes to the Premier's contract with Queenslanders, all we see is a litany of other failures and an F for 'fail'.


Instead of delivering a saving in the cost of living of \$250 to \$330 per household, all we have seen are increases in taxes and charges. Taxes per person have increased by \$330 under this government, including a \$1.2 billion hike on insurance duty and the emergency management, fire and rescue levy. Electricity prices have increased by more than \$440 a year on average, with Queenslanders being stung last financial year with the largest average increase in power prices on record. Before the election the Premier said he could control power prices and he said Queenslanders should take their bills to the ballot box. This is despite the power price increases

under this term of government being far higher than the last. Now the Premier has deregulated electricity prices in South-East Queensland, saying the market should determine them and he cannot control them.

To make things even worse, the Premier is planning to sell every government owned electricity asset in this state—electricity network assets the Premier previously described as ‘monopoly’ assets. We all know what that means in private hands with a profit motive; it means price gouging. These asset sales will tax Queenslanders twice, through both higher prices as private companies seek profits and lost returns from government owned businesses.

On election day, whenever it is to come, I urge Queenslanders to take their electricity bill as their chosen form of voter ID to send this arrogant and out-of-touch Newman government a message.

(Time expired)

 **Mr GULLEY** (Murrumba—LNP) (6.00 pm): I rise to support the amended motion moved by the Treasurer and Minister for Trade and to contradict and discount the outrageous private member's motion of the opposition leader. Performance is not about stunts, spin, hiding the truth or creating a parallel universe. Performance is about delivering on promises and on the contracts made to the people of Queensland. The government has delivered and will continue to deliver. We are happy to be held to account because we are delivering. Our contract with Queensland asked us to sort out the problems. The Treasurer has already outlined the parlous state of the state's finances when he was elected and has outlined much of the Newman government's delivery.

In my own region of Murrumba, the Newman government has delivered in infrastructure, health, schools, roads and transport. The residents of my electorate have seen much more delivered in the last 2½ years than has been delivered in any other term for decades. We are delivering the single biggest infrastructure investment ever made in my region, an infrastructure commitment for which I campaigned in 2006. The \$988 million Moreton Bay rail project will deliver 12.6 kilometres of railway line between Petrie and Kippa-Ring. Important upgrades to Deception Bay Road are underway. We have already delivered the first stage of works to the Boundary Road interchange, delivered a bus interchange at North Lakes and started a new interchange at Deception Bay.


In education we have delivered two new kindergartens, at the Mango Hill State School and at St Benedict's, and a brand new school is already underway at Griffin and is due to open in 2016. An additional \$3,157,208 has been spent on clearing the maintenance backlog left to us and fixing the run-down local state schools. We have spent an additional \$2.4 million to help our local children to improve their literacy and numeracy.

In health, the Queensland government has restored the service part of ‘health service’ in contradiction to the opposition leader's parallel universe where she accuses the health service of crumbling. Let us look at the real facts for Murrumba residents whom I serve where this government has delivered: a new ambulance station for North Lakes, a one-minute improvement in ambulance response times, an 18 per cent increase in the number of patients seen within four hours, an eight per cent increase in people receiving urgent elective surgery within 30 days, a 15.31 per cent increase in the number of local people receiving specialist outpatient appointments, a 14 per cent increase in the people seeking accident and emergency care, a two-year local dental waiting list slashed to zero and an additional \$12.45 million allocated to clear the maintenance backlog at the Redcliffe Hospital.

For business we have created an environment which is conducive to increased employment opportunities. This is especially so for the many small businesses in my electorate. The Newman government has taken the shackles off the Narangba industrial estate. Under the previous government, the only growth for businesses in that industrial estate was making chain mail fences and sign-writers making ‘keep out’ signs. Our government has been deliberate in allowing businesses to buy and build infrastructure and buildings that will generate greater employment opportunities for locals.

We are reducing red tape by removing 9,400 regulatory requirements and have progressed through 500 specific red-tape-reduction initiatives. We are reducing the cost of doing business by cutting waste that would lead to further electricity price rises, reducing compensation premiums by 17 per cent and implementing late payment policies so that state government agencies can pay bills from small businesses on time. Already the benefits for my area are making it easier for business as demonstrated by the opening of major stores Costco, Bunnings, Beefys Pies, Velocity Park, Hungry Jack's, Woolworths and the redevelopment of the Deception Bay shopping centre. Their investment is a tangible, physical demonstration of the faith and confidence that these major employers have for the future growth in Queensland.

I signed a contract with Queensland. I am proud that this government is reinvigorating the economy; reducing the cost of living by reducing waste; building infrastructure; revitalising front-line services such as health, education and policing; and, importantly, restoring accountability such as reversing the ALP's decision to allow lying to parliament. I support the Treasurer and the LNP government and I am proud to be held to account for delivering for Murrumba and Queensland.

 **Mr BYRNE** (Rockhampton—ALP) (6.05 pm): I rise to speak in support of the motion moved by the Leader of the Opposition that in essence condemns the Newman government for failing to deliver on what it promised Queenslanders before the last election. In the Premier's own words, judgement day for the Newman LNP government is coming and Queenslanders who approach me are waiting to hold each and every LNP member to account in the upcoming election.


Queenslanders are smart and they understand that this is a government that puts ideology before practical implementation and common sense. They know that the LNP are beholden to interest groups at the expense of the interests of ordinary Queenslanders. Over this term and even more recently today I have illustrated how Queensland businesses are being done over in questionable tendering processes with a lack of transparency and accountability despite accountability being one of the key parts of this nonsense LNP contract with Queenslanders. This is a government with members of parliament who do not even know what they are trying to achieve. It is not me saying it; it is the Auditor-General, who says that 73 per cent of the last state budget was unable to demonstrate any sensible performance metrics or was, sadly, lacking in some quarter in performance metrics.

So what do we have? We have LNP backbenchers who are simply robotic parrots without any sense of mission or purpose based in the real world. If a measure of success is saying hundreds of times, 'We have a strong plan for a brighter future'—a thermonuclear bright future I think—then this is the best government ever. I have sat back and watched this government for the last nearly three years with these plans. These plans that are published by this government do not even constitute coffee table material. In planning terms, they are the equivalent of junk mail. There is not a single goal or objective run out by this government that could ever even be described as smart. Remember that? There is all this business acumen that apparently sits out there with plans that no-one can action, no resources, no time lines, no substance whatsoever. Specific, measurable, obtainable, realistic, timely—some of them might remember that from their formative years. If success is about creating jobs, what sorts of jobs has the Newman government provided? It has made empty promises like everything else—simple rhetoric. When they took over government unemployment was at 5.5 per cent. It is a joke. Today the latest unemployment rate is seven per cent. How far away from the magical four per cent do we have to get before the government actually decides to engage on the matter? What are they going to go to—nine per cent or 10 per cent—before they are going to magically turn around to four per cent?

This morning the Leader of the House was talking about 'can-did'. It was a bizarre little speech. I have another term that he might like to develop: 'can-dud'. That is what we have seen in employment in this state. Can-dud! That is what they have committed to—four per cent. They have not made one step in the right direction and the government is going to go out to Queenslanders and rabbit on about their job creation strategies. Queensland has lost more than 20,000 full-time jobs since this mob started. That is 20,000 full-time jobs that have gone since March 2012.

That is a fact. Nobody over there has talked about jobs in any part of this debate. There is no job creation coming from them. This is a government that are job destroyers; that is what the LNP stand for. The three budgets from this government demonstrate the destruction of jobs, the destruction of job security and driving down the conditions of normal, average, ordinary Queenslanders. I do not know how this government can enter this debate today and rabbit off the sort of material that was put in the last election campaign and which every Queenslanders realises was just so much spin. They have plans that cannot be enacted. The material coming out of this government has no actionable quality whatsoever and there is money being wasted at catastrophic levels whether on advertising, latent policy or enabling big business and the coal industry to build infrastructure that should be part of the free market that they believe in. Why isn't there capital coming to these projects from big business? Where is Aurizon's investment in these coal developments? They have the common sense not to go there because the money does not stack up. This government should be ashamed of itself.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs FRECKLINGTON** (Nanango—LNP) (6.11 pm): It is with pride that I rise in this House today to support the Treasurer's amendment to the motion before the House.

Mr Gibson: It is with pleasure that we listen to you.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Thank you, member for Gympie. What needs to be reiterated is the \$85.4 billion of Labor debt. That is what those opposite have strangely forgotten. It is almost like a parallel universe for them. They bleat on about all of the things that they think we have not done. Let me tell you, Madam Speaker, that the electorate of Nanango is benefiting from this common-sense government. I could list numerous items from previous budgets that have benefitted our electorate, but a perfect example which those opposite have completely forgotten about is the nurses. In our term of government we have increased their pay by an incredible 10 per cent. I can see the member for Redcliffe over there smiling away because she is so pleased about that. Our schools are now being maintained and children can actually go to school in schools that have paint which is on the walls and not peeling off onto their desks.

I am very proud to have signed the contract for the improvement to front-line services such as the elective surgery waitlist and cuts to ambulance ramping. The previous administration was proud of ambulance ramping, proud of their long waitlists and proud of regional hospitals having no services. They did not care that you could not have any operation in the South Burnett regional hospital, but our government has now put in a rural general surgeon. How wonderful is that! My seniors love that because they can now have operations that they used to have to travel outside of the region for because that was the Labor way. Not only that, but as well we have doubled the patient travel subsidy for those people travelling out of the regions.

Mr Johnson interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: I do take the honourable Vaughan Johnson's interjection: they did not care about the regions. But our government is not just about the south-east corner; we are about the whole of Queensland. Queenslanders want a grown-up sensible government that looks after all Queenslanders and not just the crazy green groups. When we talk about the services that we have delivered, there are now an extra 761 teachers and teacher aides in our schools. We have 11,612 police now on the beat. We have spent millions of dollars on much needed regional road repairs that have been neglected for many years. There has been more maintenance done on the roads in the Nanango electorate in the last two years than there has been in the last 10.


Those opposite might laugh at how proud I am that money is being spent in the regions and in electorates like Nanango, but that is because I am part of a government that does represent all Queensland. This is where it gets interesting: what is the plan of those opposite? What is your plan? I think Steven Wardill of the *Courier-Mail* got it right on the weekend. I think the headline was 'Laboring for new ideas' and he said—

Annastacia Palaszczuk's Labor Party appears to be struggling to come up with anything of substance to offer voters before next year's election.

...

Annastacia Palaszczuk, the Queensland Opposition leader, has doggedly pursued a small-target approach and shown little appetite for new ideas.

In contrast our government has a strong plan and, unlike Labor, a strong team for a stronger Queensland.

 **Ms TRAD** (South Brisbane—ALP) (6.16 pm): Madam Speaker, I notice that all of those opposite did not mention anything about the \$6 billion worth of cuts coming our way thanks to Tony Abbott and their LNP mates. I notice that those people opposite said nothing about the billions of dollars that are being cut out of Queensland Health courtesy of Tony Abbott. I notice that those people opposite said nothing about the cuts to the ABC that before the election Tony Abbott promised would not happen. I notice those opposite are pretty mute on what their federal counterparts are cutting from Queensland, and I notice that even the Premier himself is not on the speaking list because even he cannot defend Tony Abbott's cuts or his own. It is despicable those opposite come into this place and defend their record, when clearly what has happened is the noses of those opposite are in the troughs and those of their political donors and—

Mr BLEIJIE: I rise to a point of order.

Madam SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

Mr BLEIJIE: The member for South Brisbane reflected on the whereabouts of the Premier and therefore not being on the speaking list. He is not on the speaking list because he is not in the chamber, and there are rules in relation to reflecting on why someone is or is not in the chamber.

Madam SPEAKER: Thank you, Mr Attorney-General. Member for South Brisbane, I ask you to take care and respect the fact that we have a convention about members who are not able to be in the chamber at a particular time. I think that it is cutting a pretty fine line, so I would ask you to please pay respect to the conventions of the House.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I did not actually reflect on his absence but more his not speaking in the debate, which I understand is allowed by convention.

Madam SPEAKER: Honourable member, I will ask you to pause. I think that that is fudging the line and I would ask you not to reflect in that regard because there are, as convention has shown, good reasons why members may not be able to be present during a particular debate in the chamber. I call the member for South Brisbane.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The facts speak for themselves: seven per cent unemployment. That has been triggered by the fact that this government came into power after promising that public servants would be safe and had nothing to fear, and then they sacked tens of thousands of them. I speak to small business owners all the time. They can mark very clearly when their income started taking a downturn, and that was when this government quite stupidly decided to take money out of the economy. More than 20,000 full-time jobs have been destroyed in Queensland because of those opposite and, quite frankly, that is the most severe cut of them all. All of the cuts to the community sector, some of which have been canvassed here tonight during the debate, have contributed to thousands more job losses throughout the state. Thousands more have lost their jobs because this government has decided to cut important front-line community service programs that this government deems are unnecessary.


The Queensland economy continues to shrink, contracting by 0.4 per cent over the year to June 2014. It is estimated to be contracting by 1¼ per cent in this financial year. Economic growth has slowed to 2.3 per cent. This terrible economic performance is directly attributable to the deep and cruel cuts inflicted by the LNP which have destroyed confidence in the economy.

We know that these cuts are only a precursor to what will happen if Campbell Newman and the LNP win a second term. We know that this has been just a warm-up. We know because the EBA for Queensland Rail is out there for negotiation now and the government's cruelty and their future cuts are currently on display. Queensland Rail is attempting to significantly reduce the earnings and quality of working conditions of employees. Queensland Rail is offering workers below-inflation increases but only if they give up allowances and other conditions. In anyone's language, that is an attack on working conditions.

We have seen in Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria and now federally that conservative governments have one thing ingrained in their DNA—that is, to savagely cut services and jobs. It does not matter what Premier Newman says; what he says and what he does are two different things. If the Newman government are re-elected they will cut harder and deeper than they already have. They did not tell Queenslanders what they had up their sleeves at the last election and they will do it again if they win at the next election.

Queensland cannot afford an arrogant, ignorant government that delivers high unemployment and shrinking economic growth and at the same time has no plans for jobs growth in Queensland. At the next election this government will get the message that it invited Queenslanders to give them.

(Time expired)

 **Mrs FRANCE** (Pumicestone—LNP) (6.21 pm): I rise this evening to speak against Labor's motion. When the LNP came to office, the extent of Labor's fiscal recklessness was laid bare. I would like to remind Labor that when we first came into government Queensland Treasury reported that Queensland's fiscal position and outlook were unsustainable and that restoration must be an urgent priority of this term of government.

Queenslanders are paying for Labor's poor financial management to the tune of \$4 billion a year. That \$4 billion per year could pay for 25 new primary schools, almost 900 kilometres of highway or the redevelopment of a 300-bed regional hospital. In contrast, the LNP's sound fiscal management over the past 2½ years is paying off for Queenslanders. We have reduced debt by \$5 billion this year from Labor's own overly optimistic predictions.

Only the LNP has a plan to pay down Labor's \$80 billion debt. We have been upfront and honest with the people of Queensland about our Strong Choices plan, which allows for debt reduction of \$25 billion—with \$8.6 billion to invest in the job-creating infrastructure our growing state needs and \$3.4 billion to be allocated to a cost-of-living relief fund.

Financial waste and mismanagement are the hallmarks of the former Queensland government, with project cost blow-outs and mismanagement becoming the norm. I would like to remind the opposition of their poor track record that they seem to reflect on as some of their best work: the bungled Health payroll system, costing us \$1.2 billion; the mothballed Tugun desal plant, costing over a billion dollars; the \$350 million spent on a dam which Labor then decided not to connect to the SEQ water grid; the blow-out in the cost of building the children's hospital which went from an estimated \$680 million to an actual cost of \$1.5 billion; not to mention the \$16 million stolen by the fake Tahitian prince.

Other examples of Labor's frivolous misuse of taxpayer funds include the planned \$6.1 million seven-lane Olympic ski jump with its own elevator; the \$680,000 spent on sculptures that were located a four-day trek into a walk; the thousand dollars they spent fixing a toilet lid of previous minister Vicky Darling—I am amazed that there is a toilet lid that could cost a thousand dollars to fix; not to mention one of my favourites of Labor's mismanagement in the 1,500 'buy local' T-shirts that they printed in Bangladesh.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam SPEAKER: Pause the clock. I actually cannot hear. There is too much noise. There have been interjections across the chamber and I know that members are provoking each other from across the chamber, but when I cannot hear the noise is too much. I would ask members to cease their interjections.

Mrs FRANCE: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I might just repeat that favourite one of mine: the 1,500 'buy local' T-shirts that were printed in Bangladesh.

Only the LNP has a strong and comprehensive plan to restore front-line services for Queenslanders. We have improved front-line services by increasing the number of police on the beat to 11,612 police officers as at 1 October. Crime rates are down across-the-board. We have an extra 761 new teachers and teacher aides. We have all but eliminated ambulance ramping. We have improved hospital emergency department and elective surgery wait times. We have slashed the long-term dental waitlist from 62,513 people to zero. We have a thousand more rail services a week and we now have trains that run on time.

While the LNP is delivering on its cost-of-living promises, Labor's shadow Treasurer actually gloats about how he raised taxes on Queenslanders. In his Mythbusters document he states—

Already we have:

- raised land tax and stamp duty at the top end
- increased taxes on casinos and introduced new liquor licensing fees ...
- increased coal royalties
- increased motor vehicle stamp duty and we have recently introduced a rise to car registration.

Labor will no doubt continue with their campaign of misinformation and diversionary tactics to try to cover up their disastrous track record. But the facts are the facts, and they cannot hide from the \$80 billion worth of debt that their reckless spending racked up while running our health system into the ground, allowing criminal gangs to get the upper hand, failing to maintain our schools, strangling businesses with red tape and costing Queenslanders jobs. The list goes on and on.

Labor do not have a plan. They do nothing but pat themselves on the back for their disastrous track record and try to convince Queenslanders that they did a great job on things like health and education. Only the LNP has a strong team and a strong plan and will work to build a stronger Queensland.

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

AYES, 61:

LNP, 61—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Cavallucci, Choat, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 7—Byrne, D'Ath, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Cunningham.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Madam SPEAKER: For any further divisions on this issue, the bells will ring for one minute.

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

AYES, 61:

LNP, 61—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Blejje, Cavallucci, Choat, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Watts, Woodforth, Young.

NOES, 8:

ALP, 7—Byrne, D'Ath, Mulherin, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Scott, Trad.

INDEPENDENTS, 1—Cunningham.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Motion, as agreed—

That this House notes:

- that the previous Labor government's own estimates showed Queensland's debt increasing to \$85.4 billion;
- that the previous Labor government lost Queensland's AAA credit rating and had no credible plan to return the budget to surplus;
- that the Newman LNP government will deliver Queensland's first fiscal surplus in a decade next financial year; and
- that since coming to office the Newman LNP government has cut waste and inefficiency, revitalised front-line services and restored accountability in government.

Sitting suspended from 6.35 pm to 7.35 pm.

WATER REFORM AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Resumed from 11 September (see p. 3262).

Second Reading

 **Hon. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (7.35 pm):
I move—

That the bill be now read a second time.

I want to thank the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for its consideration of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The committee tabled its report on 17 November 2014. I now table the government's response to the committee report.

Tabled paper: Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee: Report No. 52—Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, government response [\[6571\]](#).

Before I address the recommendations made by the committee and discuss the key features of the bill, I firstly want to correct an error in my introductory speech on 11 September 2014. In that introductory speech I stated that amendments to the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 relating to inspector powers and further harmonisation of safety terminology across both industries were contained in the bill. I wish to advise the House that some of these amendments are in fact not in the introduced bill and will not be considered until further consultation has been completed. However, the bill as it was introduced does contain other amendments in relation to the harmonised term of 'joint interaction management plans' and more consistently uses the key safety term of 'safety management system' across the coal and coal seam gas industries.

I now turn my attention to the recommendations made by the committee. I note that the committee made 12 recommendations and requested a number of points of clarification which have been addressed in the government's tabled response. The first recommendation is that the bill be passed with consideration of the recommendations in its report, and I thank the committee for its support. I firstly want to focus my attention on recommendations 3, 6 and 7 of the report. In recommendation 3 the committee has suggested that under clause 68, new section 85 of the bill, the chief executive should have the discretion to seek public submissions as part of deciding whether to grant a water development option. My intention in proposing amendments to the Water Act to allow

the granting of a water development option was to align the government approvals processes for major projects that require the development of water infrastructure rather than imposing alternative approval requirements and processes.

I want to reassure the committee and water users that the current framework already provides opportunities for formal public consultation at two stages during the environmental impact assessment process, providing for ample community input into the assessment and approvals process for a coordinated project. In addition to the formal processes, there are a number of ways that advice can be sought regarding the competing demands for the water without prescribing a submission process in primary legislation. For example, the government recently called for registrations of interests for general existing reserves of unallocated water across Queensland. The registration of interest process was administrative rather than legislative but achieved the outcome of providing up-to-date market information to my department that will assist in setting priorities for unallocated water releases in the future. Giving consideration to competing demands for the resource before granting a water development option can be addressed administratively to ensure that the highest priority use of the resource is supported rather than a first in, first served approach.

In recommendation 6 of the report, the committee has suggested that the bill be amended to universally require the preparation of an underground water impact assessment report or baseline assessment as the basis for the introduction of make-good arrangements. This necessitates the omission of exemptions proposed in the bill with respect to existing mines, low-risk activities and bore trigger thresholds. While I appreciate the intention of this recommendation, the bill in its current form provides safeguards to ensure that make-good agreements can and will be made for all bores affected by resource activity without creating the additional regulatory burden the committee's proposal would impose. In relation to existing mines, these safeguards include the ability for the chief executive to direct a mining operation to conduct a bore assessment, prepare an underground water impact report or a baseline assessment plan if circumstances require it.

In relation to the committee's recommendation to remove exemptions for low-risk activities, the bill does not provide for exemptions for tenure holders to prepare underground water impact reports and baseline assessment plans based on individual activities. Instead, the bill provides a head of power for a regulation to make exemptions for low-risk resource tenures from those reporting requirements. An example of a low-risk tenure would be for a very small scale mine that would not significantly affect underground water resources. This delivers on one of the drivers for reform of the water legislation, which is to reduce red tape and regulatory burden.

The committee also sought clarification as to the efficacy of existing make-good agreements and if there are any plans for an outcomes evaluation after a reasonable period when the negotiation of a number of make-good agreements has occurred. I am not aware of any make-good agreements where parties have been dissatisfied and taken their concerns to the Land Court. Therefore, it would appear that the efficacy of existing make-good arrangements has not been formally contested.

In recommendation 7, the committee recommended that the transitional provisions for the petroleum and gas industry are applied only to tenures existing at commencement. The bill proposes to apply the provisions to existing tenures and also to tenures granted in respect of applications made before commencement. The purpose of the transitional provision is to recognise that companies have made investments and developed their operations on the basis of the current framework and need to be able to transition their operations into the new framework. Allowing the applicant for a petroleum tenure to access the traditional process recognises that by this stage companies have already made a substantial investment and, in many cases, have taken part in the tender process.

I would now like to address briefly the recommendations made by the committee that I support. The committee recommends that I consider an amendment to the bill to include circumstances and events that are likely to impact the limits and features of a watercourse and riverine environment that would trigger a review of the watercourse identification mapping. The watercourse identification map will identify designated watercourses, which are watercourses within which there is no requirement for an entitlement to take or interfere with water. The map will be progressively updated over time and undertaken with community consultation on a catchment basis. The use of a water plan to provide this regulatory framework provides transparency and appropriate community consultation processes around the introduction of these limits. In addition, periodic reports through the water planning process will provide a trigger for the review of the management of watercourses, including the determination or designation of watercourses and other drainage features identified on the map.

The committee recommends that the department review the progress of voluntary negotiations to transition existing entitlements under special agreement acts into the Water Act after a reasonable time frame. The government is clear in its intent that it would like water rights in special agreement acts to be fully transitioned into the water entitlement framework under the Water Act 2000. This intention will form the basis of any future discussions that the government has with companies in relation to their take or interference with water. My department will also track progress in transitioning special agreement act water rights on an ongoing basis.

The committee recommends that the department consider further discussion with local councils to confirm the intent of clause 23 in new section 3(5) for the minister to be able of his own accord to establish, change or abolish a river improvement area. Any proposal by the government to establish, change or abolish a river improvement trust area will be preceded by full consultation with relevant local councils to ensure that all parties are fully informed. Again, I thank the committee for raising the issue.

The committee recommends that clause 24 of the bill be amended to expressly provide for constituent local councils to retain powers to appoint local council representatives to a trust where there are more than two local council areas that make up a river improvement area. I will move amendments to the bill during consideration in detail to make the recommended changes to ensure that each relevant local council will have representation on a board as provided for in a regulation constituting a trust.

The committee also made a number of recommendations that relate to correcting drafting errors in the bill. In response to these recommendations, I will be moving amendments during consideration in detail that correct the identified errors. The committee recommends that amendment be made for consistency as to the updating of the term 'safety management plan' in the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 with either the term 'safety management system' or 'safety and health management system'. To clarify in response to the query of the committee about drafting inconsistencies, any reference to 'safety and health management system' in the explanatory notes relating to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 will be corrected to consistently read 'safety management system'. Again, I thank the committee members for their participation in the process and for the valid points raised.

I would now like to talk about the bill in some more detail. Our government has a strong plan to ensure that Queensland's water resources are used responsibly and productively to deliver our vision of a four-pillar economy that will benefit all Queenslanders, accelerate the growth of the agriculture and resources sectors and create economic development opportunities for rural and regional Queensland. Reducing the regulatory burden on customers is a strong focus of the reforms in the bill and my department is committed to reducing this burden by 20 per cent by 2018. The Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill will modernise the existing regulatory framework and promote the efficient allocation and management of water in Queensland and create more flexibility in the administration of Water Act functions.

To set this new direction for water resource management reform, the bill establishes a new overarching purpose for the Water Act. Rather than applying to only one chapter, as it did in the previous act, this new purpose will guide the entire Water Act through four key objectives, specifically, the responsible and productive management of Queensland's water resources and riverine quarry material, a sustainable and secure water supply for local communities across the state, the management of impacts on underground water by the resources sector and the effective operation of water authorities. Importantly, the new purpose includes the recognition of economic, social and environmental considerations, including sustaining ecosystem health and water quality, and security of water entitlements by defining responsible and productive management. To address the recommendations contained in a recent report by the Ombudsman, the new purpose recognises the state's role in promoting the efficient use of water through the establishment and operation of water markets, the initial allocation of water and the regulation of water use if there is a risk of land or water degradation.

The bill also replaces chapter 2 of the Water Act to deliver a more flexible water management and allocation framework through streamlined water planning instruments and processes. Although the framework in its current form is comprehensive, it is also lengthy, overly prescriptive and inflexible with water users in some catchments forced to operate in an environment of uncertainty for several years while water resource plans and resource operations plans are prepared and implemented.

Ms Trad interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for South Brisbane, your interjections are not being taken. You can make your contribution later.

Ms Trad: Poor Andrew.

Mr CRIPPS: No, poor member for South Brisbane, who continues to try to interfere and prevent these proceedings from going forward with her inane and ridiculous comments that are more about spin and rhetoric than making a considered contribution to the debate. The member for South Brisbane will have plenty of opportunity to do so following my contribution and I look forward to it.

Currently, the Water Act establishes a two-tier planning framework, with separate catchment based water resource plans and resource operations plans required for the allocation and management of water. Across Queensland, currently, there are 23 existing water resource plan areas, with corresponding resource operations plans also in place.

Although these plans have delivered benefits, more can be done to improve the efficiency and flexibility of water planning processes and speed up the expansion of the water market. Under the new provisions, water planning will continue to be delivered through catchment based water plans that will remain as subordinate legislation. Like their predecessors, these new water plans will specify high-level objectives and may include strategies or methods for achieving the required outcomes for a specific area.

Existing water resource plans will be recognised through the bill's transitional provisions as water plans under the new framework. The new water planning framework, however, does differ significantly in relation to the mechanisms for implementing a water plan. The second tier in the current planning framework, the resource operations plans, will no longer exist. Instead, operational matters such as water sharing rules will be contained in a water management protocol for unsupplemented areas and in an operations manual for water supply schemes. The bill also provides for the converting, granting and amending of water entitlement schedules that are currently in resource operations plans to be replaced by a new, separate instrument called a water entitlement notice. This new instrument will remove the need to use the resource operations plan as the mechanism to convert water licences to tradable water allocations, which involves amendments to both the water resource plan and the resource operations plan, which can be a lengthy process taking in some cases several years. This amendment supports faster access to water and assists in the expansion of a fully realised water trading market by 2017.

Water users affected by a water entitlement notice will, as they did under a resource operations plan, have the ability to make a submission on the draft notice which will be considered before it is finalised. This will benefit water users with a streamlined planning process and a faster water licence conversion process. It will also allow for water to be moved to and used at its highest value use through an expanded water trading framework and allow allocation holders to retain a flexible and valuable asset that is no longer attached to their land to be used or traded at their discretion.

My department receives approximately 550 applications for changes to water licences each year. About three quarters of these relate to minor changes to existing water licences. Under the current framework, all applications for either a new water licence or a simple change to an existing water licence are subject to the same assessment and public notification process. This occurs regardless of whether a proposed change to a water licence involves taking additional water or other material changes that may impact on the water resource or other entitlement holders. These changes are referred to as dealings and include matters such as amending, transferring, subdividing, amalgamating and reinstating expired licences or replacing existing water licences.

To address a number of concerns raised by the Ombudsman in relation to the decision-making process associated with licence dealings, the bill simplifies and streamlines the process for changes to a water licence that does not impact on the water resource or other entitlement holders, confining detailed assessments to applications for new licences and dealings with existing licences that do have an impact on other water users or the water resource. Assessing these types of applications in accordance with simpler and more relevant criteria will enable more efficient decision making by the department leading to improved customer service. Also, removing the requirement for the applicant to incur public notification costs will create huge savings of up to \$1,500 for licensees in approximately 75 per cent of applications. Let me make the point though that an application for a new water licence or for a significant change to an existing water licence, for example to increase the amount of water to be taken, will continue to be advertised and assessed under the more detailed decision-making framework to ensure the integrity of water allocation and management is maintained.

The Water Act currently provides statutory rights to take or interfere with water for a range of low-risk activities, meaning that the take or interference does not require a water licence. The bill will expand on these rights by including a range of mechanisms by which low-risk take or interference with water can be managed into the future. Under the bill, a catchment water plan or regulation can identify thresholds for the take of, or interference with, water up to which the take or interference would not require a water licence and also nominate particular activities for which a licence is not required. A rigorous assessment process in conjunction with the statutory planning process that has determined the risk to be low will be undertaken prior to thresholds for take and interference being applied through a water plan or regulation. Risks associated with the removal of licence requirements in those areas will be monitored for signs that could warrant changes to the level of regulation. The bill includes exemptions where the take of, or interference with, water has been assessed and appropriately conditioned under an alternative approval process, such as an environmental authority under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. This is another change that will reduce regulatory burden and financial barriers for customers by removing duplicative regulatory requirements.

The bill will expand on existing mechanisms used to record watercourses by providing for the chief executive to establish a watercourse identification map. This map will show the extent of watercourses, designated watercourses, drainage features, lakes and springs as currently defined by the Water Act. It will identify watercourses regulated under the Water Act as well as watercourses declared by the chief executive that are not, for example, drainage features. It will also show designated watercourses, which are watercourses where a water licence or permit is not required for the take of, or interference with, water. The map will be progressively updated to provide information freely to the public through the Queensland Globe. This will mean that a water user can easily determine whether a licence is required for their proposed take of water without lengthy waiting periods for provision of this information. This map will replace the current information provided in the Water Regulation that describes upstream and downstream limits of watercourses. The bill will strengthen certainty and water security for water users by providing a process through which a resources company holding water rights under special agreement legislation can, following negotiation, be granted water entitlements under the Water Act. These entitlements would replace the company's water rights under the special agreement act to ensure that one consistent framework applies to all water users.

In line with the objective of facilitating a transition of water rights from special agreement acts to the Water Act, the bill also proposes an interim period of two years during which time water licences granted to Rio Tinto Alcan and Comalco will recognise rather than replace their existing special agreement act rights to support their current operations. This amendment will support previous successful negotiations undertaken by my department. The bill also includes provisions that provide a clear, consistent and transparent pathway for the assessment and approval of major water infrastructure projects that are declared coordinated projects under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

The government gave a clear response to the findings of the Commission of Audit review of Queensland's current and forecast financial position that any future bulk water storage facilities would be developed by the private sector unless there are compelling public good or market failure reasons not to do so. This reform implements an alternative delivery model for encouraging private investment in major water infrastructure projects. This includes removing duplication across assessments and approvals under the Water Act and the environmental impact assessment process for coordinated projects through better integration between them. The changes will also remove the current uncertainties and investment risk in order to encourage and facilitate greater private sector investment in major water infrastructure projects in response to private sector needs. This reform also promotes holistic consultation by including all aspects of development under one process to fully inform stakeholders about the impacts of the project when commenting. This means consultation is more efficient and streamlined. Importantly, it maintains the need for scientific rigour and appropriate community consultation.

My department has been working closely with the Office of the Coordinator-General and other relevant state government agencies to ensure Water Act requirements will be considered and included in preparing the terms of reference for major dams and other water infrastructure projects. Proponents have consistently advised that to secure funding for projects they need certainty, which currently does not exist, that the government is willing to set water aside for a project if the project's bona fides are proven through an environmental impact assessment.

To give this certainty, the bill will provide for a water development option to be granted for a major water infrastructure project to give an upfront provisional commitment over future access to water and exclusivity of access to that water for that project. There are a number of checks and balances that work together to ensure that not one megalitre of water is allocated to a project without it first having demonstrated to be a responsible and productive use of the resource. This includes setting appropriate terms of reference for the assessment, providing opportunities and requirements for consultation, setting terms and conditions on the water development option that must be met and providing mechanisms for the expiration and cancellation of a water development option. Additionally, the bill maintains the discretionary power for the minister to decide whether or not to change a water plan, if required, to accommodate the project. For the benefit of the House, I now table a paper that outlines the assessment and approval pathway for major water infrastructure projects.

Tabled paper: Department of Natural Resources and Mines document titled 'Major water infrastructure projects—proposed changes to the approval and assessment process' [\[6572\]](#).

I want to be clear that a water development option is not a right to take water; rather, it is simply a mechanism that brings together existing assessment and approval processes under one framework to provide more efficient and clear pathways that give proponents the certainty they need to invest in major water infrastructure projects. The proposed amendments support the transition of small water supply and drainage water authorities, commonly referred to as category 2 water authorities, to alternative institutional arrangements, such as cooperatives. This includes transitional contractual arrangements to ensure, where necessary, the new entity has secure and clear ongoing payment arrangements in place with customers for the distribution services provided. This would replace the former statutory charging regime under which they operated as a water authority. While existing authorities can continue to operate in their current capacity, the amendments further encourage a transition from category 2 water authorities to alternative institutional arrangements by simplifying some of the existing overly prescriptive procedures.

The bill makes a number of amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act 1940 to include improvements to the process for commencing, amending, amalgamating or dissolving existing trusts. Those actions will be achieved through the making of a regulation as appropriate. The act has been modernised to allow trusts to invest in a broader range of activities necessary to reduce erosion and sediment loss issues, and improve water quality more generally. This will allow trusts to work cooperatively with landowners and other parties to plan for and implement activities beyond the bed and banks of a watercourse; for example, working with landowners to implement best practice sediment management practices or undertaking work to prevent further gully erosion. Currently there are 11 river improvement trusts operating in Queensland, some dating back to their establishment in the 1940s. These trusts provide an invaluable service to their communities, undertaking preventative and remediation works in rivers and streams that protect property and infrastructure and mitigate impacts of watercourse erosion. Trusts also provide disaster relief activities, particularly after extreme flood and cyclone events. The bill allows for more catchment based trusts to be created and expands the scope of works that river trusts may undertake. This will prepare trusts to strategically tackle long-term issues, such as water quality, facing certain catchments.

To ensure the standard prosecution principles apply, the bill amends the Water Act to return the onus of proof to the state in pursuing alleged offences. This means it will not automatically be assumed the licensee is responsible for an alleged offence and water users will no longer have to prove that they are innocent of an offence under the Water Act. The amendment will restore natural justice principles and will require the state to provide evidence to prove that a person has committed the offence.

The bill will amend a number of acts to create consistency for underground water rights for the resource sector and for the management of impacts on underground water due to resource sector activities. These reforms will remove the need for a landholder to face prolonged uncertainty over whether they will obtain a make-good agreement and remove the need for court action to achieve the make-good agreements. It will also remove a source of uncertainty for mining companies that will now know upfront what their obligations are and they can plan their operations without the risk of lengthy delays resulting from court action.

There are good prospects for a productive and valuable onshore natural gas and oil industry in regions such as the Cooper Basin. The government is committed to ensuring a secure and sustainable water supply for industry and existing users, and this requires setting up a framework for managing the future increase in demand for water so that the industry and existing users can co-exist

and move forward with certainty and confidence. Currently, there are significant differences between the management of groundwater impacts as a result of mining impacts associated with petroleum and gas operations. These differences have created significant uncertainty for landholders on how impacts on their bore water supplies will be addressed.

The bill expands chapter 3 of the Water Act to ensure a statutory make-good obligation also applies to the mineral resources sector. Water bore owners will have certainty that any impacts as a result of mining operations will be remedied in an agreed manner. In addition to entering make-good agreements with any affected bore owners, chapter 3 of the Water Act will also include requirements for a mining tenure holder to prepare certain reports and plans, and conduct water monitoring. These measures are designed to ensure impacts on other water users and on springs are identified and managed. In fact, all of the measures that were previously required through water licence conditions, and several more, will now become statutory obligations. Therefore, the bill amends the Mineral Resources Act 1989 to establish underground water rights for the holder of a mining lease or mineral development licence, providing authority for them to take underground water as a direct result of a mining activity. This is referred to as associated water take and is a statutory right that is consistent with the rights provided to the petroleum and gas sector.

As well, the chapter 3 expansion will allow for the introduction of a cumulative management regime to deal with overlapping impacts from multiple mining operations. The bill will provide transitional arrangements in relation to existing mining operations. This means that, where existing mines have a water licence, permit or other Water Act authorisation relating to their associated water take, they will be exempt from the reporting requirements under chapter 3 unless they are declared to be part of a cumulative management area or they are requested to do so by the chief executive. However, all mining tenures will be subject to the general make-good obligation.

In relation to the petroleum and gas sector, the bill proposes amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 to limit the underground water rights for petroleum tenure holders so that they only apply to associated water. As a consequence, the take of non-associated water by petroleum tenure holders will be regulated in the same manner as other water users and will require a licence, permit or other Water Act authorisation to take underground water in a regulated area. The bill provides a transitional period of two years, or five years within the Surat Cumulative Management Area, for petroleum tenure holders to become authorised for their non-associated take of water.

As I mentioned earlier, safety amendments to the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 are in the bill to address the requirement for joint interaction management plans for overlapping coal and coal seam gas activities on overlapping tenures. This will help to ensure safety for all workers from both industries is adequately coordinated and managed. The joint interaction management plans include common safety requirements for both coal and coal seam gas industries. Since the overlapping tenure and safety practices were introduced in 2004, there has been substantial growth in the number of overlapping tenures. This growth highlights the need for improved cooperation, communication, planning and consistency of safety procedures when both coal and coal seam gas companies are operating over the same area, to address safety requirements. The bill harmonises the key terminology of joint interaction management plans across the two industries and requires an agreed joint approach to hazard and risk management.

Both industries will now refer to 'systems' rather than a mix of systems for coal and plans for coal seam gas for the overall management of safety and have joint interaction management plans that will be part of their respective safety management systems. The safety requirements incorporated in the bill will require coal site senior executives and coal seam gas operators to jointly assess and manage risks and hazards through consultation and exchange of information to formalise, as part of each industry's respective management systems, a joint interaction management plan.

To support the effective functioning of the reform, if agreement about the joint interaction management plan cannot be reached within the required time frame, the dispute must go to arbitration under the independent arbitration system established by the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014. This process is supported by both industries to resolve disputes and arbitrated outcomes do not affect the ability of the respective inspectorates within my department to intervene as necessary to regulate safety.

The bill provides greater guidance around the content of a joint interaction management plan and requires notification to the chief inspectors on the first occasion a joint interaction management plan has been developed for an overlapping area. The joint interaction management plans are dynamic and are subject to ongoing communication, cooperation, review and updating by both coal and coal seam gas parties, as circumstances change or for improvement in response to incidents.

Under the new provisions, all possible overlapping tenures are covered by the requirements for joint interaction management plans whether they are production overlaps, production and exploration overlaps or exploration overlaps. Transitional arrangements are provided for a period of six months after commencement for existing overlapping operations to transition to the more comprehensive joint interaction management plan requirements. Currently, the majority of newly developed overlapping plans include these requirements as best practice.

The Mineral Resources Regulation 2013 safety provisions will continue to apply only to coal leases overlapping with a petroleum lease where the regulation applied before the commencement of the new requirements. All other coal tenures will be subject to the new safety requirements added to the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999. This avoids duplication of requirements as only one or the other will apply.

Existing requirements in the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 applying to coal seam gas operators have been amended so they are consistent with the new joint interaction management plan requirements and there will be a six-month transitional period that will apply. My department has worked very closely with industry representatives during the development of these new safety provisions.

In conjunction with other mine safety and health legislative reforms, the bill also amends the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 and the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999 to broaden the categories of mandatory qualification for eligibility for appointment as the Commissioner for Mine Safety and Health. In addition to the existing categories of qualification, a person with either a qualification in law with professional experience in improving mine safety and health or 10 years experience in an operational mine safety senior management role and improving mine safety will also be eligible for appointment as commissioner. These amendments will ensure that a person appointed as commissioner has suitable skills, knowledge and experience to undertake the broad functions of the role.

I now turn to amendments I will move during consideration in detail. The amendments to the water related components of the bill correct a number of minor errors and oversights in the bill and address several issues raised by stakeholders. There are a number of amendments proposed in response to stakeholder concerns relating to river improvement trusts. The State Council of River Trusts and the Local Government Association of Queensland raised concerns regarding the responsible minister's powers to appoint additional community members to a trust and the restriction that those persons could not be local councillors.

While local councils do have mandated representation on trusts, it was not intended that community members who were also councillors should be excluded from eligibility to be appointed as ministerial appointees to a trust. An amendment is proposed to remove the limitation about who may be appointed to a trust by the responsible minister.

The LGAQ also raised concerns with the provision that required a local council to charge a separate rate where part of the local council area was in a river trust area. The LGAQ were of the view that local council should have the discretion in relation to whether it levies a special rate or utilises general rates to fund its contribution to a trust. This is a sensible approach so an amendment is proposed to remove the subsections that limit levying of rates and clarify when this levy is applied to provide more flexibility in these matters.

Following feedback from the operators of water supply schemes, I am proposing amendments to ensure that prior to approving new operating arrangements for the scheme, the department formally consider the impact of the proposed operating rules on other licence holders who supply or distribute water in the same scheme. Currently, the bill provides for a petroleum pipeline licence holder to be an entity who can apply for a water licence that does not attach to land; however, it does not prescribe a petroleum facility licence holder. Also, an applicant for such licences is not prescribed. The petroleum and gas sector raised this issue in its feedback on the bill. To ensure consistency, an amendment is proposed to be made to prescribe the holder of a petroleum facility licence under the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 as an entity and ensure an applicant for a pipeline licence or petroleum facility licence may also apply for a water licence.

The bill currently states that the resource operations licence or distribution operations licence holder must consent to the surrender of a water allocation. However, there is no such requirement in relation to the potential cancellation of the water allocation following surrender. Following consultation with stakeholders, I propose to address this oversight by proposing an amendment allowing the resource operations licence or distribution operations licence holder to stipulate binding conditions around the surrender, including conditions preventing the cancellation of the water allocation.

A further amendment to the bill will address an oversight to make it clear that it is not an offence under the Water Act to interfere with underground water via an authorisation under the Mineral Resources Act 1989 or the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004. While the bill recognises that the take of underground water may be authorised under these resources acts, the offence provision in the Water Act that relates to interfering with water without a Water Act authorisation does not acknowledge statutory rights under the resources acts.

In addition to the amendments to be moved during the consideration in detail stage that I have already mentioned, I will be progressing other amendments to correct a number of minor drafting errors in the bill and make minor amendments such as ensuring water licence dealings processes and the effects of land dealings on water licences can be prescribed by regulation; making it clear that a water plan is the correct instrument to state criteria for deciding a water licence application; clarifying to which chief executive a petroleum tenure holder must report their non-associated take during the transitional period; removing the redundant requirement for a river improvement trust to have a seal; correcting cross-referencing in a number of provisions; and providing improved clarity in the operation of transitional provisions.

I will also be moving amendments to some safety and health legislation. The bill contains amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 and the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999 regarding overlapping tenures. Consequential amendments to the Petroleum Act 1923 are also needed to harmonise terminology with regard to safety management systems and joint interaction management plans. I also propose two amendments to the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act to correct numbering oversights.

Further, the department recently identified amendments needed to remedy a technical uncertainty relating to the return of seized evidence under the Mining and Quarrying Safety and Health Act 1999, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 and the Explosives Act 1999. The uncertainty relates to the implication of inadvertently not returning seized evidence according to the periods specified in the safety acts. The acts are silent as to any implications.

While there has been no request by any persons entitled to the return of seized evidence, these amendments are needed to resolve the uncertainty. To achieve this, the provisions covering the return of seized evidence are being amended to provide a more flexible procedure for the return of seized evidence. If at any time after evidence is seized the chief inspector stops being satisfied there are reasonable grounds for retaining it, the evidence will be returned. These provisions also enable a person entitled to a seized item to request its return 12 months after it was seized.

The department, however, may retain an item for longer than 12 months if required when there are reasonable grounds. An example of reasonable grounds would be retaining an item as part of an investigation, prosecution or coronial inquest. If the department makes a decision not to return an item after 12 months despite a request for its return by a person entitled to it, the decision will be a reviewable decision. The amendments make the approach to the seizure of evidence more consistent with the approach in other jurisdictions such as the Work Health and Safety Act 2011 and the Fair Trading Inspectors Act 2014, and clarify reasonable procedures for seized evidence.

I also propose to make minor amendments to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 regarding overlapping coal and coal seam gas tenure framework and mining leases. The proposed amendments to the overlapping tenure framework reflect the coal and coal seam gas industries mutually agreed position for: transitional arrangements for existing mining lease applications and petroleum lease applications to allow them to move smoothly into the new framework; and an additional notice period for future non-concurrent mining lease applications and petroleum lease applications.

A further consequential amendment is required to address a drafting omission and clarify the intent of the provisions. It is anticipated that the amendments will provide investment certainty for the coal and coal seam gas industries and ensure the optimisation of the state's resources.

The minor amendments relating to mining leases will clarify the provisions that preserve the notification and objection rights of adjoining landowners to mining lease applications and the transitional process for mining lease holders to include restricted land into the area of the lease, while maintaining the landowner's right to withhold consent. These amendments to the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act relating to mining leases are clarifying only and do not alter the policy intent of the provisions.

I now table the explanatory notes to the amendments that will be moved during consideration in detail.

Tabled paper: Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014, explanatory notes to Hon. Andrew Cripps's amendments [6573].

In closing, I return to my introductory speech on the bill in September this year during which I committed to tabling draft amendments to the Water Regulation 2002, which will support the reforms in this bill. I now table a draft of the Water and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation 2014.

Tabled paper: Draft Water and Other Legislation Amendment Regulation [6574].

I commend the bill to the House.

Ms TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (8.20 pm): I rise to make a contribution on the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 and outline the Labor opposition's objection to the legislative changes outlined in the bill.

In essence, this is a shameful bill. It is an utter disgrace. It recklessly and irresponsibly deregulates water management and allocations in Queensland and walks away from decades of assessment and approvals of development according to the principles of ecologically sustainable development. It enables secret development agreements to be made that include significant water take without preceding scientific hydrological analysis or public notification and consultation. It permits broadscale, yet-to-be-defined, low-risk activities to occur in catchments without regulation or licensing and without assessment of the cumulative impacts. It proves that when the Premier and the Liberal National Party of Queensland say they are working to protect the Great Barrier Reef they cannot be believed and they are not to be trusted. Finally, it has been developed and progressed at a time when 75 per cent of our state has been declared drought affected, when water represents the most precious and scarcest natural resource our state holds. Fundamentally, this bill represents another ill-conceived, ideological assault from an arrogant and out-of-touch government that is still failing to listen to Queenslanders.

Let me first turn to the Great Barrier Reef and the impact that this bill will have on its long-term viability and future survival prospects. I will take this opportunity to also reflect on the contributions made by those opposite in relation to the G20 held recently in Brisbane. I note that, amongst all of the backslapping and crowing about having been such successful hosts, those opposite omitted to credit the former Gillard government with having secured the G20 for Brisbane. Nor did they remark on the pertinent and important remarks made by the President of the United States, Barack Obama, whom I was fortunate enough to meet during his Brisbane address at the University of Queensland. During that address, the President expressed—

Mr RICKUSS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There is no mention of this in the long title of the bill. This is totally irrelevant. I ask for your ruling on relevance, please.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): I would ask the member for South Brisbane to stay relevant to the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

Ms TRAD: Yes, I am talking about a great big body of water called the Great Barrier Reef, which the member for Lockyer is still yet to be acquainted with. During his address, the President expressed concern—

Mr Cripps: The Water Act has no jurisdiction.

Ms TRAD: I am getting to that, Minister. You just wait and listen.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane—

Ms TRAD: The President expressed—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I am speaking. You do not have the call when I am speaking. I would ask that you direct your comments through the chair and to not use the term 'you', please.

Ms TRAD: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Mr RICKUSS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask for your ruling again on relevance. She totally ignored the previous ruling and went back to a totally irrelevant quarrelling debate.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, members! We do not need conversations across the chamber while I am taking advice, please. The Great Barrier Reef is not referred to in the legislation, and I would ask that you remain relevant to the long title of the bill.

Ms TRAD: Madam Deputy Speaker, I do genuinely seek your guidance. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority was requested to provide a submission in relation to this.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for South Brisbane, I have taken advice from the Clerk. You were straying outside the long title of the bill, and I would just ask that you remain relevant to the long title of the bill.

Ms TRAD: The way in which watercourses, which are governed by this bill, are managed throughout Queensland, particularly catchments that feed into the Great Barrier Reef, is the subject of this bill. In relation to this bill, some of the key changes will affect these catchments and ultimately the Great Barrier Reef.

One of the submitters in relation to this bill—that was the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, which was invited to make a submission on the water bill—expressed some very significant concerns in relation to this bill which I will go into in a bit more detail. But fundamentally the issue that is of significant concern is the refocusing of the legislation away from ensuring that development occurs adhering to the principles of ecologically sustainable development to the effective and responsible management of water. There is a distinct difference between what was previously in the Water Act, which is—

The purpose of this chapter is to advance sustainable management and efficient use of water and other resources by establishing a system for the planning, allocation and use of water.

Further, that 'sustainable management' is management that contributes to the following—and this is section 10(2)(c)(ii)—

... the economic development of Queensland in accordance with the principles of ecologically sustainable development;

This is of critical concern in our debate here. This is of critical concern. We know that as part of its response to concerns expressed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, UNESCO, and specifically its recommendation that 'the State Party ... undertake a comprehensive strategic assessment of the entire property, identifying planned and potential future development that could impact the Outstanding Universal Value to enable a long-term plan for sustainable development that will protect the Outstanding Universal Value of the property'—that being the Great Barrier Reef—the Queensland government developed the *Great Barrier Reef coastal zone strategic assessment 2014: program report*—and I take the opportunity to table the report for the benefit of the House.

Tabled paper: Queensland Government, *Great Barrier Reef Coastal Zone Strategic Assessment 2014: program report*, July 2014 [6575].

Within this report it states that 'the overarching policy intent of the program is to achieve economically sustainable development throughout the Great Barrier Reef coastal zone'. The report further states—

The Queensland Government also agreed that in order to achieve ESD—
ecologically sustainable development—

... environmental considerations will be integrated into government decision-making processes at all levels by, amongst other things:

- ensuring that environmental issues associated with a proposed project, program or policy will be taken into consideration in the decision-making process ...

Under the 'Principles of Ecologically Sustainable Development' listed in this report, it states, just as the Water Act 2000 states—

If there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.

Here is the rub. This bill, for purely ideological reasons, removes the principles of ecologically sustainable development from the Water Act in direct contradiction to this government's pledge to UNESCO in their strategic assessment program report. When the Premier says, 'I absolutely want to

reassure President Obama we've got a government that's really solid on reef protection,' I want Queenslanders to think about this bill. I want Queenslanders to remember that, when it comes to the Great Barrier Reef, the Newman government says one thing and it does exactly the opposite. After all of these commitments to UNESCO, after decrying that they believe in the principles of ecologically sustainable development—

Mr RICKUSS: I rise to a point of order. I rise on relevance again. The member is definitely straying from the long title of the bill. There is no relevance in the issues that she is raising.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I would remind the member for South Brisbane to stay relevant to the long title of the bill as I have asked her to do.

Ms TRAD: The arrogant Newman LNP government removes all of the principles of ecologically sustainable development from the Water Act in Queensland as part of the largest deregulation of water management ever seen in Queensland. This is effectively what this bill will do. Removing these principles of ecologically sustainable development from the purpose of the Water Act is incredibly significant. The Gold Coast and Hinterland Environment Council stated in their submission—

The "purpose" of an Act governs the court's approach to its interpretation. It is therefore an important insight into understanding why these amendments are being made and the extent to which court interpretation may assist in protecting existing rights and liberties or see to the balancing of competing interests (and consequently how extensive the impacts might become).

This is a bill that seeks to take the mistakes made in the management of the Murray-Darling Basin system and repeat them right across Queensland in catchment systems that feed into the Great Barrier Reef. As Dr Claudia Baldwin, who worked on the Water Act 2000, said in her submission—and I think the minister would like to listen to this quote—

We do not want to repeat the costly struggles and buybacks which were required to remediate the Murray-Darling system. Yet this legislation sets up the guarantee that this is precisely what we will be forced to do.

The Wilderness Society of Queensland drew the same parallel, saying that—

... the key question for the Committee to consider is whether Queensland can afford another Murray-Darling Basin, which is the likely consequence of implementing this Bill in its current form.

I now turn to the issue of the new provisions called the water development option. The impacts of this bill for water users across the state and for water bodies across the state, including the Great Barrier Reef, do not end here. As the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority said in their submission in relation to this bill and the proposed water development option—and I think it is particularly important to quote the marine park authority's submission at length—

Regional water planning needs to consider both the quality and quantity of water required to sustain ecologically viable and fully functional aquatic and coastal ecosystems. Allocation of water resources prior to the full and open assessment of the potential cumulative impacts on groundwater, surface waters and the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Property may lead to unacceptable impacts to coastal waterways and Great Barrier Reef ecosystems. It is not clear how independent scientific advice regarding the cumulative impacts associated with the implementation of a development option for large scale water users will be obtained and considered in the decision making process.

It is not acceptable, as set out in clause 68, for the chief executive to only make a determination on 'whether an environmental assessment is likely to demonstrate that any significant impacts on flows that would affect the environment or existing water authorisations can be adequately mitigated'. This determination can only be subjective and it will be an assessment of probability with that assessment of probability based on the proponent's prefeasibility assessment including their hydrological modelling and data—hydrological modelling and data from a proponent with a vested commercial interest. The chief executive may as well lick his thumb and stick it in the air to see which way the wind is blowing such is the arbitrary nature of the assessment process set out in this bill.

In their response to concerns about the assessment based on likelihood, the department stated—

The use of the word 'likely' is intended to not pre-empt the outcome of the environmental impact assessment process leaving scope for the EIA to be unsuccessful and therefore lead to a cancellation of a water development option.

This contradicts the rationale provided in the explanatory notes for a water development option to 'provide the project proponent with assurance and exclusivity over future access to water resources while assessments are being undertaken'. Moreover, as the Environmental Defenders Office argue in their submission, the power of the chief executive to cancel an option if it is demonstrated that there is not sufficient water or the ability to mitigate impacts should be 'obligatory and not at the sole discretion of the chief executive'.

The department further advised the committee that—

One of the key changes that drove the need for a water development option from a policy perspective was: historically major water infrastructure was being developed by government or government based entities such as SunWater, Seqwater or councils—unlike, say, mining developments where the major infrastructure traditionally has been undertaken by the private sector. In undertaking the EIS processes obviously there is a significant investment that a would-be developer of water infrastructure would be undertaking in performing the environmental impact assessment, setting up their baseline and undertaking the consultation. The water development option gives them exclusivity over a water resource and certainty in terms of the process and connection between the current EIS process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act and a Water Act approval.

That is exclusivity over access to water resources for the purpose of raising finance. In making these claims, there is an inference that the proponent will have their water development option approved—a water development option that can be initially applied for without any proper independent hydrological assessment on the impacts to nearby water users or the environment or even an independent assessment of whether the water flow actually exists. What is worse is that the water development option can take effect from the approval by the Coordinator-General of the environmental impact assessment—and, let's be clear, an approval by the Coordinator-General to which there are no legal objections or appeal rights following recent legislative changes by the Newman government forced through in last-minute amendments late at night. There is nothing in this bill to prevent the onselling of water development options. AgForce raised concerns with this issue and also said—

The Bill currently does not require direct consultation of potentially-affected water users or the community in granting a WDO—a water development option—

and a WDO can even be granted without application through a process described in a regulation, which potentially lacks transparency ...

While the committee has recommended that clause 68 be amended to provide the chief executive with the power to seek public submissions—not even the mandatory power, just the simple power to seek public submissions—as part of an assessment of whether to grant a water development option, this not only fails to go far enough, but also I understand that the minister is not supporting that incredibly weak recommendation of the committee. This is consistent with how this arrogant and out-of-touch Newman LNP government continues to fundamentally fail to recognise that our state's natural resources are held by the Crown on behalf of the people. Our resources are not held by the Crown on behalf of vested interests and they are not held by the Crown so they can be sold off to vested commercial interests behind closed doors and without the public even knowing. There is no reason why the public cannot be consulted about large scale proposals to take hundreds of thousands of megalitres of water every year from our state's river system. I note that, of all the committee's recommendations, only three are being rejected by the government. One of them is about consideration of public submissions in relation to the water development option, as I have already informed the House.

Once again the arrogant Newman government is running true to form and riding roughshod over the interests of everyday Queenslanders. I really do not think it is unreasonable to ask that such consultation about how our state's resources will be fully utilised is mandatory. Interestingly, one of the biggest supporters of the water development option in the submissions on this bill was from Integrated Food and Energy Developments Pty Ltd, or IFED, the proponents for the Etheridge Integrated Agricultural Project. Their submission states, 'IFED applauds the introduction of the Water Development Option' and further states that it will 'provide more certainty for developers and will encourage and facilitate greater private sector involvement in relevant projects'.

IFED has entered into a development protocol with the Queensland government for an allocation of 550,000 megalitres per annum, but who has signed this development protocol? We know from the department's advice during the inquiry that the minister, as head of power, did not sign this development protocol, so I ask the minister to detail exactly who representing this Newman government signed the development protocol with IFED? Despite repeated requests the government has refused to release the development protocol and tell Queenslanders what deal has been done between the state and IFED, just as the Deputy Premier refuses to tell Queenslanders how many hundreds of millions of taxpayers' dollars he has promised the multinational mining firm Adani as part of yet another secret deal by this government. If the government cannot produce the regulations that accompanied this legislation, then it must produce the IFED development protocol as an example of exactly how water development options will unfold in the future.

According to the LNP, we need to sell essential public electricity assets in order to buy assets on behalf of a profitable multinational resource company. Meanwhile, the LNP claim they are merely enablers and believers in the 'invisible hand' of the market. The Wilderness Society advised the committee that in relation to the IFED development protocol—

We did a right-to-information request on the department which only took us up to September 2013. In that RTI request we got various documents which indicated the department's significant concerns with the sustainability of, at that point, a proposed 400,000-megalitre water take—so significantly less than what is currently on the table. The department also indicated in that advice that no in-principle commitment should be given to IFED before they did a detailed water resource assessment. That assessment was never started.

IFED's initial advice statement states—

An average annual flow of 550,000 megalitres per year will be flood harvested ... and channelled into off-stream constructed lakes with a combined capacity of 2.0 million megalitres.

The proposal further states—

Sufficient water is available from lakes to irrigate in excess of 65,000 hectares of cropping land.

However, a CSIRO report released in February this year for the Gilbert catchment states—

... there is the potential for irrigation development of 20,000 to 30,000 hectares supporting year-round mixed irrigated and dryland cropping.

The report also identifies a maximum storage capacity for in-river storage of 725,000 megalitres—

Mr RICKUSS: I rise to a point of order. This has nothing to do with the long title of the bill. It has nothing to do with the bill. It is not mentioned in the bill. It is a separate report. It is just totally ridiculous that this member keeps continually going off on wild tangents.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Member for Lockyer, the advice that I have received is that these were issues that were canvassed by the committee during its deliberations and in the report, so I will allow the member to continue but I will be paying close attention to the relevance of her comments.

Ms TRAD: The CSIRO report also identifies a maximum storage capacity for in-river storage of 725,000 megalitres, which is far less than IFED's proposed two-million-megalitre off-river water storage. IFED stated in response that this assessment is based on what they described as 'old-fashioned' in-river water storage and stated—

Unfortunately the CSIRO did not evaluate in detail the off-river storage potential for Gilbert catchment nor did it assess the system proposed by IFED.

While it may be true that the CSIRO did not look directly at IFED's proposal, this does not mean that the CSIRO's report provides any endorsement or affirmation of the viability of IFED's proposal. As the department advised the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee, IFED's revised proposal—

... certainly did indicate that what they were proposing was a very large development, but that was within the realms of the physical availability of water. That is a long way from saying it would be an acceptable development, that it would have acceptable impacts, that it was a viable project. Obviously that assessment is to be undertaken as part of a very detailed EIS process that IFED is undertaking under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act.

The question that arises from the whole development protocol in relation to IFED is in fact the lawfulness of this proposal. My question to the minister is: does this bill actually give retrospective lawfulness to the IFED development protocol, when it is quite clear that in fact the development protocol was not signed by the appropriate head of power under this legislation? I would ask the minister to address that question.

The opposition takes issue with the inference of approval for a very large development and water allocation via a development protocol for the purpose of the proponent securing finance. This is exactly why IFED was so supportive of the water development option, as it will provide a legislative mechanism for their development protocol. While it may be conceivable that the Coordinator-General may not approve the environmental impact assessment for a water development option, the framing of this legislation implies that this would be an exception to the norm. The allocation of water to large scale users must be based on an assessment of what water is actually available and whether it is environmentally sustainable.

In his earlier contribution I heard the minister talking about the time that it had taken to do organisational resource plans and resource operation plans, and can I say that science, evaluation, assessment and analysis do take time. This government might think that science represents green

tape and that it should be cut, but quite frankly the more that this government rushes in like a bull at a gate, arrogantly believing that it has all the answers and riding roughshod over the concerns of everyday Queenslanders, the more it is going to leave a mess for Queenslanders to fix up, particularly when we are talking about one of our most precious and scarcest resources: water.

The allocation of water to large scale users has to include a consideration of whether it will impact on the entitlements of existing water users as well as cumulative environmental impacts such as those to the Great Barrier Reef as outlined by the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority in their submission in relation to this bill. The opposition will be dividing on clause 68 of this bill to oppose a water development option because we share the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority's concern that it may lead to unacceptable impacts to coastal waterways and the Great Barrier Reef ecosystems.

Unlike the ideological troglodytes of the LNP, we in the Labor Party listen to scientists, we read, we base our policy on evidence and we listen to world leaders, including US President Barack Obama, who based his speech on well-established science when he warned of the threat to the Great Barrier Reef. Meanwhile, Tony Abbott's climate change adviser Maurice Newman is taking his advice from US Republican politicians such as Oklahoma senator James Inhofe, who believes that humanity is arrogant for believing that we could impact on God's vision for the global climate. That sounds a bit like our federal foreign minister, Julie Bishop, who does not think that the Great Barrier Reef is under any sort of threat. That is the type of ideological hysterical rubbish we get from the LNP in Queensland, who would rather see humanity and our environment perish rather than actually accept science, research and the indisputable facts of climate change.

There are serious questions as to why the LNP are so determined to push ahead with this legislation in the last sitting of the year and what is most likely the last sitting of this parliamentary term. I note that the minister has once again come into this House and furnished the parliament with some 80 last-minute amendments to the bill. I do place on record my appreciation to his department for providing a verbal briefing on the amendments, without actually having the amendments in front of me. I do appreciate them taking the time and I do understand that they are not setting the policy tone or temper in relation to the agenda of this government.

The Queensland Resources Council has described the time frame for the consideration and passage of this bill by the end of the year as 'aggressively ambitious', saying that it 'remains concerned that it is difficult to reconcile the caution of stakeholders with the pace at which reforms to the Water Act are being developed' and that 'all water users have been accustomed to deep and on-going consultation at a catchment level; which has simply not been possible in the time allowed for the development of this Bill'.

What makes this worse is that most of how this bill will actually operate in practice has been removed into the accompanying regulation, which is nowhere to be seen as yet. This includes, for example, the criteria for the chief executive to use to determine what watercourses are to be deregulated. As the Queensland Resources Council further advised the committee—

It is a complex set of reforms and a lot of the detail is in regulations and practices. So we are taking a bit of a leap of faith at the moment. We have seen the legislation, but we do not have the full picture of how it will work.

Not providing the regulation with this bill provides Queenslanders with no insight, no certainty and no information as to how this bill will work in practice. Unlike the Queensland Resources Council, the opposition is not willing to take a leap of faith with this government—not with their terrible track record of stripping away environmental protections in this state and not when they decide to take a great leap backwards, away from ensuring that development adheres to the principles of ecologically sustainable development.

Not only has the criteria not been released prior to this debate, nor the regulations on how watercourses will be deregulated under this bill; this bill also fails to specify any requirement for public consultation, leaving consultation at the discretion of the chief executive. Moreover, this legislative change to facilitate the deregulation of watercourses has been introduced without any comprehensive hydrological studies or localised consultation having taken place. Instead, we are told that we have to trust the government that it will undertake deregulation after following a rigorous assessment on a catchment-by-catchment basis and in consultation with affected stakeholders. This is well and truly putting the cart before the horse in trusting a government that has systematically stripped away statutory rights for landholders, leaseholders and the community to be notified of and object to major

developments in their communities. This is what this government does through late-night amendments, and it is asking us to trust it with this very important body of work. If this government were serious about the responsible management of our state's resources, it would do these hydrological assessments and engage in the consultation first, before making a decision to amend the legislation for the deregulation of a watercourse.

The consultation on this bill has also not included how a low-risk activity is to be defined, where water can be taken without regulatory oversight. Instead, this has again been relegated to regulations, and these are yet to be finalised. This is also critical to how this bill will apply in practice. If this government were genuine about consultation on this bill, it would have provided this information to the public prior to the debate.

These issues are significant. As SEQ Catchments set out in their submission—

The cumulative impacts of unregulated changes to drainage features particularly in the more densely populated South East corner of Queensland where peri urban landownership is greater and development pressure is growing could have potentially significant impacts on water quality, the availability of water for other users, groundwater recharge and downstream flooding.

SEQ Catchments went on to say—

Moreover given the population density in South East Queensland and number of small landholdings the cumulative impacts of unregulated riparian zone clearing could be significant. Therefore SEQ Catchments requests that the Committee consider ways that the riparian zones of South East Queensland can be protected and that the cumulative impacts are appropriately managed.

Similarly, the World Wildlife Fund submitted—

There is a significant risk that riparian regrowth vegetation in the Burdekin, Wet Tropics and Mackay Whitsunday catchments that is currently protected under s20 AB of the *Vegetation Management Act 1999* will be cleared if watercourses in these catchments are deregulated. Clearing riparian regrowth vegetation in these and other GBR catchments is likely to cause significant land degradation, which will substantially increase the amount of sediment that is transported to the Great Barrier Reef—thereby accelerating its decline.

The Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee report decided to take an optimistic view of these issues being resolved after the passage of the bill, stating—

The committee trusts that ... engagement of stakeholders such as riparian landowners provides the best opportunity for the mapping to reflect local knowledge of the state's diverse water systems and ensure that any declaration or redefinition does not reduce any necessary protection of smaller waterways, run-off areas and management of watercourse vegetation.

If ever there was an example of the parliamentary committee system being abused and being turned into a rubber stamp for the agenda of the executive arm of government, that is definitely it.

I do not share the committee's optimism in relation to the handling of this consultation process, particularly after the incredibly dodgy, secret deal we saw between this minister and the Deputy Premier and Karreman Quarries to make their operations at Harlin retrospectively legal. Before LNP members in this House cry out about relevance, let me be clear. The meeting in the minister's diary on 8 April this year with the Deputy Premier, which he admitted at estimates related to Karreman Quarries, was declared as being about the Water Act review that preceded this bill. This is despite submissions on the Water Act review not closing until 29 July this year. Questions remain as to why the Newman government moved amendments during consideration in detail to the Water Act 2000 in unrelated legislation on 20 May 2014 to make Karreman Quarries' operations retrospectively legal—the same Karreman Quarries that has donated \$75,000 to the LNP. If the meeting was truly about the Water Act review, why were those amendments not held off for this bill? Perhaps this is the IFED retrospective legislation bill.

This is the type of sham consultation process we are likely to see under a Newman LNP government—where proponents with vested interests are able to determine their own regulatory arrangements without any consideration of cumulative impacts on downstream users or the environment. And when one considers the introduction of the water development option then well and truly this could happen and happen frequently across our state.

Proponents who can make donations to the LNP in secret following changes to electoral disclosure laws can almost certainly get what they want out of this government for a price. That said, I do not support recommendation 2 of the committee that 'the department consider an amendment to the bill to include circumstances and events that are likely to impact the limits and features of a watercourse and riverine environment, which would trigger a review of the watercourse identification

mapping'. I would also like to note my support for the committee's comments questioning the need for amendments to what constitutes domestic water use and that it is important that these changes to domestic water use do not compromise existing volumetric water entitlements.

Another plank of the deregulatory agenda in this bill is the amendments to fast-track conversions of water licences which are currently not tradeable to tradeable water allocations. A number of submissions raised concerns with this process again proceeding without any baseline hydrological modelling in many parts of the state. As Dr Claudia Baldwin submitted—

No water licences should be converted to tradeable water allocations without sufficient baseline data and hydrological modelling to provide community certainty that water entitlements and natural values will not be compromised.

Similarly, the Environmental Defenders Office said—

... that it is essential that any conversion does not take place without having recourse to hydrological modelling, which is needed to analyse the impacts of these conversions on the environment or the security of existing un-supplemented water allocation holders. The Bill however, does not appear to require hydrological modelling as a precondition to conversion.

As AgForce puts it—

... the process of conversion of non-volumetric licenses to volumetric allocations should be done on a catchment by catchment basis using an equitable and fully consultative approach to ensure negative impacts on existing farming business models are avoided or minimised.

The Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee report on this bill does at least acknowledge these concerns, saying—

The committee accepts concerns raised by stakeholders with respect to the amendments that, in some circumstances, may allow for water to be allocated without detailed hydrological modelling and cautions against the issuing of water allocations where a lack of robust data creates uncertainty. Moreover, the committee considers that there is risk and liability to consider in the event that defined water assets are not sustainable and are devalued in the water market.

However, the committee has merely requested a point of clarification on the nature of issues associated with volumetric security and sustainability of rules based water allocations which, as I set out in my dissenting report, is simply not good enough. These concerns should have been addressed prior to this debate. There are unresolved issues in this bill that bring into question the sustainability of proposed water allocations. These are not just issues for the minister to comment on when arrogantly pushing through more legislation against the community's wishes. They go to the very sustainability and ongoing viability of water users in this state.

Before concluding, I want to run through some other areas in relation to the committee's report on this bill. I am broadly supportive of recommendations 6, 8, 9 and 10 of the committee's report in relation to make-good arrangements. As Mr Peter Shannon of the Basin Sustainability Alliance submitted under the proposed process—

Unless the resource company comes to the conclusion that not only is the bore impaired but that it is also due to the resource company's activity, the landholder has no entitlement to make good measures (i.e. a source of water, compensation, new bore etc.)

The Land Court's findings in the Alpha Coal case that the proponent was not adhering to the precautionary principles of water management and had insufficient water monitoring points is a key example of a company disregarding make-good agreements with landholders. When I asked Ms Joanne Rea from the Property Rights Australia group about the issue of self-monitoring, she advised the committee—

If the water monitoring authority is to be the mining tenement, it needs to be well and truly supervised. There is no indication at all that there is anything but intermittent requirements to report. I actually think there does need to be somebody independent looking over their shoulder all the time to ensure that what they are doing is being correct and accurate and taking landholder considerations into account.

Ms Rea further recommended that measurement reports be available to the public for consultation. I agree with these recommendations and ask that the minister consider them.

I am also supportive of the committee's recommendations 8, 9, 10 and 11 relating to river improvement trusts. The methodology for determining the funding contribution from local government for river improvement trusts should be determined in consultation with local governments which should have a right to nominate representatives on a river improvement trust. I note that the minister has accepted that recommendation and will be presenting some amendments to that effect tonight. Finally, I note the sensible amendments to allow the commissioner for mine safety to delegate prosecution powers.

I want to place on record—and I will table this document after I finish referring to it in a bit of detail—an analysis, a critique, that I received only on Sunday night from George Houen from Landholder Services Pty Ltd. Mr Houen's concern is the harmonisation between different resource extraction processes under the water reform amendment bill. Mr Houen in his critique says—

The Land Court's Alpha Coal decision shows, as is common sense, that mine water dewatering impacts are difficult to predict but involve major direct and permanent impacts on the groundwater relied upon by landholders and townsfolk as well as significant environmental impacts. Accordingly, mine dewatering should be made an integral part of the approvals process. But as explained below, CSG dewatering is very, very different in its process and its impacts. The proposition that mine dewatering needs to be deregulated to put miners on an even footing with CSG operators is contrived and invalid.

I will ask the minister to address Mr Houen's concerns about the different methods of dewatering in relation to both CSG and general mines and why they should not be harmonised, and I table a copy of this for the benefit of the minister. I understand that Mr Houen has distributed that to all members on the committee as well as, I think, the minister's office. I could stand corrected on that, but he has circulated it quite widely.

Tabled paper: Document, dated 22 November 2014, by George Houen, Landholder Services Pty Ltd, titled 'Water Reform etc. Amendment Bill' [6576].

Mr Trout interjected.


Ms TRAD: I take that interjection from the member for Barron River. He is getting a bit testy. I do not think he can concentrate for this long.

To conclude, the opposition will not be supporting this bill. We do not support the removal of the principles of ecologically sustainable development from the Water Act in contravention of this government's commitments to UNESCO on the Great Barrier Reef. We do not support legislation that establishes an inferred approval process through a water development option for the extraction of hundreds of thousands of megalitres of water a year prior to any independent hydrological assessment of whether the water is actually there, whether it will impact on smaller water users or whether it will cause irreversible environmental damage.

We do not support legislation that facilitates the deregulation of watercourses without prior hydrological assessment and prior consultation at a catchment-by-catchment level being undertaken—legislation that we are meant to vote on having not been provided with the regulation on what constitutes a low-risk activity and how watercourses are to be mapped. We also do not support the changes to regulatory thresholds for domestic water use without proper consultation or an assessment of potential impacts on volumetric water entitlements. Serious concerns have been raised by stakeholders in relation to the potential impacts of this bill on Queensland's water management, including on riparian zones that are crucial to preventing sedimentation, downstream flooding and protecting the Great Barrier Reef and Moreton Bay.

This is a bill that largely ignores years of scientific research and community consultation aimed at delivering long-term water security and sustainable environmental management in Queensland. There are questions to answer as to why this Newman LNP government is ramming this legislation through the parliament in the last sitting week of the year and potentially the last sitting of this parliamentary term, especially when it continues to refuse to release IFED's development protocol—a development protocol process that will enshrine in legislation in this bill a water development option. This bill stands to provide Queensland with a costly economic legacy by facilitating an unsustainable take of water.

As I set out in my dissenting report, this bill appears to take the mistakes made in the management of the Murray-Darling Basin system and repeat them right across Queensland and right across Queensland's catchments, affecting the Great Barrier Reef and other important ecological marine parks throughout the state. It is clear that this government cannot be trusted in terms of Queensland's water resources. It cannot be trusted on the reef. Only Labor will ensure that Queensland adheres to our UNESCO obligations on ecologically sustainable development and only Labor will develop the environmental policy needed to protect the future of the Great Barrier Reef.

 **Mr RICKUSS** (Lockyer—LNP) (9.09 pm): I rise to make a brief comment on the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I must congratulate the AREC on doing a great job. I also must congratulate the minister on introducing these amendments. This legislation is the second tranche of the water regulations and we are starting to make some real progress in cutting red tape and restoring common sense.

I congratulate the AREC. As members can see from the report that the minister has tabled, it was a well thought out committee report. There were a lot of government responses. I am pleased to see that the government also made a very full and comprehensive response to our report, which is some 14 pages long. So it has looked into the issues and responded well to them.

I realise that this is a House of debate, but I should apologise to those members who have been present for the last 45 minutes. It is 45 minutes they will never get back. The real problem is that the member for South Brisbane uses the omission. One of the great ways of misleading this place is through omission. The member tells only half the truth. The things about the Great Barrier Reef—

Ms TRAD: I rise to a point of order. Mr Deputy Speaker, I find those comments personally offensive and I ask them to be withdrawn.


Mr RICKUSS: I withdraw.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! Thank you very much, member for Lockyer. You have the call.

Mr RICKUSS: As for the low-risk activities that are going to impinge on the Great Barrier Reef, 75 per cent of the state is in drought. There is no doubt about that. But the member for South Brisbane does not say that at the moment the water storages in Queensland are 80 per cent full. We have episodic rainfall events, episodic stream flows—all of those sorts of things. The member has not taken that into account at all. I think the water development options by IFED relate to the Gilbert River catchment, which flows into the gulf. It does not affect the Great Barrier Reef. I think the spokesman for IFED is a Mr De Lacy. I think he was in this place at one stage. The minister might be able to fill us in on what side of the House he was on and what party he was with. I am a bit fuzzy on those details.

The member also attacked riparian landholders. I happen to be a riparian landholder. My family owns something like over a kilometre of Lockyer Creek bank. We want to look after our creek banks. There is no advantage in having them slip into the river. Most riparian landholders are trying to stabilise their banks and manage the riparian areas. Of course, with the assistance of the Minister for Energy and Water Supply, I am sure that SEQ Catchments and some of the other DNR groups will get the appropriate funding so that we can manage those areas. I have raised regularly with the Minister for Energy and Water Supply the sorts of issues that should be looked into.

This report takes the issue to the next level. In terms of the river trusts, the councils were a bit concerned that they were being stood over, but I think the minister has appropriately answered those queries in his response to the committee. The river trusts do their job, but they have to be active. They have to be properly involved. The trusts have to have people involved in them who are interested in the issues. At times that is difficult, because members of the community have trouble finding the time to get involved. Water management is an important issue. All I can say is that I support the minister with this tranche of legislation. I congratulate him on bringing it into the House.

 **Mr COX** (Thuringowa—LNP) (9.13 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. As a member of the committee, to me the member for South Brisbane seems to be obsessed with continuing Labor's scandalous abandonment of those in the north and the north-west. But this bill represents the most significant set of reforms to Queensland's water regulatory framework since the Water Act came into effect in 2000. It delivers on the government's commitment to ensure that the state's water resources are used responsibly and productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders. I am proud to speak to this bill, because I am proud of the fact that we are promoting our resources industry, be it coal, petroleum, or gas. My roots are in the agricultural industry. In my part of the world both the resources industry and the agricultural industry are very prominent. They are part of the four pillars of our economy, which we are turning around after 20 years of Labor and the huge debt that they have left us with.

This bill also underpins the Department of Natural Resources and Mines whole-of-water business transformation by delivering an efficient, effective and modern water resource management framework to better serve the needs and aspirations of all Queenslanders. Importantly, the bill delivers a number of key reforms while retaining certainty and security of water entitlements, which are vital to any business or someone wanting to invest in a project, and balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes.

There are some key components of this bill that will improve the framework for water planning, management and allocation. I will try to cover them briefly. A new overarching purpose will be established for the Water Act to ensure that it aligns with contemporary water management approaches. Under the previous Labor government, we had seen not enough consideration given to

the viable use of the water. This new purpose will apply to the whole act and it sets a clear direction for how water is to be managed in Queensland. Importantly, the new purpose includes and continues recognition of economic, social and environmental considerations and the security of water entitlements as key components of the responsible and productive management of the state's water resources.

The framework that guides water planning will also be modernised and streamlined in various ways to deliver a water resource planning and water licensing process that is more efficient, flexible and responsive and which, in turn, will lead to better productivity and outcomes—something that those opposite forget when it comes to this state's prosperity, economy and jobs. Under this bill, water planning will continue to be delivered through catchment based water plans that are subordinate legislation.

In the past, unallocated water has been an area of great uncertainty. It has meant that a valuable resource has been underutilised. I know of a dam in my old home district of the Burdekin. It is one of the most famous dams in this country, let alone the state. It has enormous amounts of water in it but, under the previous government, that water had never been released to be utilised for the productivity of this state. The current framework for releasing unallocated water is highly prescriptive and its legislative and administrative processes are neither flexible nor responsive to the water needs of Queensland business and communities. This bill facilitates increased access to water by not only expanding water markets—and apparently the member for South Brisbane thinks that is not a good thing—but also providing more flexible unallocated water release processes and allowing for unallocated water to be reserved outside a water plan area.

The water regulation will also be amended to allow for an expanded range of release processes, including where water users can purchase water entitlements through a fixed price so that fit-for-purpose and responsive approaches can be taken to release unallocated water. This will ensure a far more realistic pricing that is relative to the end user—something that in the past was missing. This will also result in faster access to almost 1,300,000 megalitres of unallocated water held as general reserve available for purchase to water users to stimulate the water market and create development opportunities for Queenslanders. That is a resource that we have had sitting there. There is no need to build another dam. There is water sitting there unallocated. Under the previous government we saw that further vital expansion and development were stifled. Consequently, production and jobs were lost. The department will continue to take into consideration a number of factors when deciding whether to grant unallocated water. These factors include access to alternative sources of water, including water trading, and the intention of proponents to use the water in the foreseeable future when releasing and granting unallocated water.

The bill also includes various provisions to improve and simplify processes and frameworks related to water licences and watercourse determinations that I would like to mention. The bill amends the water licence application process to ensure that simple changes to a water licence—those that do not impact on the water resource or other entitlement holders—do not require, as we saw previously, a lengthy public notification and assessment process and may simply be registered in the department's systems. It is estimated that at least 75 per cent of applications for changes to water licences will be able to follow this new process.

This will result in savings—I hope those opposite are listening—for water licence holders of up to \$1,500 for each application for a change to a licence and will also significantly reduce the time taken for making the change. Time is important for many reasons, especially when it comes to this valuable resource which this government understands is precious. The reforms in the bill will deliver a win-win situation by significantly reducing unnecessary red tape—something this government said it would do—and removing financial burdens, which is something that the people on the land and across the state are feeling at the moment, for both water licence holders and the government.

At a time like this it is important that we ensure that resource companies have the security that comes with maintaining this very valuable natural resource while operating in what is a very competitive world market.

The bill includes a number of provisions to manage the impact of the resource sector on underground water that I would like to talk about. Currently the take of underground water by the resource sector is managed under an inconsistent framework of rights and obligations established through various resources acts and the Water Act. The petroleum sector has full statutory rights to take underground water for any tenure purpose, subject to statutory make-good obligations. However, the mining sector is required to obtain a water entitlement to take water in regulated areas, which may

or may not be subject to conditions regarding making good any impact on bores. This bill provides a consistent framework for underground water rights for the resource sector and for the appropriate management of any impact on underground water caused by the exercise of underground water rights by a resource tenure holder.

The bill will provide the holder of a mining lease or mineral development licence with a statutory right to take associated water which is subject to their compliance with the requirements of chapter 3 of the Water Act. The bill protects water rights for bore owners by requiring mining companies to make good the impact on water supply bores of taking groundwater caused by mine dewatering and provides for them to have arrangements in place prior to impacts on water supply bores. It is a pity some members are leaving the chamber and cannot listen to what I have to say. This will reduce uncertainty over the timing and process for developing make-good arrangements between mining tenure holders and landowners and avoid adverse effects on the reliability and security of access to water for landholders who use underground water. Overall, this will provide upfront certainty to both landholders and industry in relation to underground water rights and obligations.


In relation to the petroleum and gas sector, without an appropriate framework there is a risk that either security of access to water for existing water users in the existing agricultural industry or the expanding onshore oil and deep gas industry would be adversely affected if the oil and gas industry's increasing demand for non-associated water is not managed. The bill establishes a more consistent framework for managing access to the state's underground water resources by including the take of non-associated water for the petroleum and gas sector under the planning and allocation processes of chapter 2 of the Water Act. This means that a petroleum tenure holder will be required to obtain a water entitlement or permit before extracting non-associated water in a regulated area.

This bill includes a number of provisions that will improve interactions with our customers and promote streamlined regulation for the responsible and productive use of water. In closing, this is about giving back to the people who should be making the decisions: local communities, councils and scheme operators. The bill provides amendments to the Water Act to allow category 2 water authorities to operate more efficiently and autonomously. In the past they have had to try to work under a one-size-fits-all approach, not allowing for local or regional scheme differences. Those opposite never considered local communities, especially in the regions. These amendments further support the transitioning of category 2 water authorities to alternative institutional arrangements. Provisions will still exist to allow these entities to rate and charge, provide disclosure statements for a prospective water allocation buyer in a distribution scheme and have more flexible board arrangements.

The bill also makes a number of amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act 1940 to simplify and improve the processes for commencing, amending, amalgamating or dissolving existing trusts. Significantly, the act has been modernised to reduce the need for government approvals for river improvement trusts. This will make it easier for them to conduct river improvement activities to address erosion issues and improve water quality. The bill also contains provisions that will require trusts to negotiate with relevant local governments regarding funding arrangements.

The bill establishes a standard process to facilitate the transition of water rights currently in special agreement acts into a water entitlement framework under the Water Act. In recognition that these water rights underpin significant developments across this great state, the transitioning of rights will still occur through negotiation between the state and the companies. However, the new standard process enables the negotiated outcomes with respect to water entitlements to be given effect without the need to continually amend primary legislation, which takes time and is not efficient in delivering improved water resource management outcomes in a responsive manner. This will make it significantly easier and more efficient to transition these rights over time once an agreement has been reached. This reform reflects the government's intent that in the medium to long term the take of water by these companies is managed under a single regulatory framework. This will provide increased certainty and security—which is absolutely vital for water users—and allow for enhanced water resource management across catchments.

To sum up, this bill delivers a planned, structured and considered approach to the management of a precious resource in Queensland to both engage and deliver sensible outcomes for a range of stakeholders. This is the sensible, long-term perspective that is characteristic of a government that has all of Queensland in mind. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (9.26 pm): It gives me great pleasure to rise to make a brief contribution to this debate on the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I do so from the perspective of a regional

Queenslander, I do so from the perspective of the Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry currently in Queensland and, of course, as one who has grown up in agriculture, particularly in the grain and cotton industries, on the Darling Downs in my own instance.

I think it is particularly important that we take note of a number of the contributions to the debate tonight, but the overall reflection, of course, is that we see in the presentation and the development of this bill by the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the Hon. Andrew Cripps, a significant achievement. The minister has, in his term in this parliament as minister, developed and shepherded through legislation that means so much for Queensland. He has delivered for Queensland in terms of vegetation management. He has delivered for Queensland in terms of land tenure reform. And tonight we see him delivering for Queensland in terms of this water reform bill.


The bill, as has been heard in the debate this evening, presents the most significant set of reforms to Queensland's water regulatory framework since the Water Act itself came into effect in the year 2000—some 14 years ago. In so doing the bill delivers on the government's commitment to ensure the state's water resources are used responsibly and that they are used productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders. I will come back to that point in just a moment. The bill promotes responsible and productive management of water resources for balanced outcomes and helps keep secure the water supplies for vital industries in so many regional communities and to make sure that that supply is sustainable. To see that this bill has a broader definition than in the current act and that the efficient use of water refers specifically to the efficient management of water, if you like, through market mechanisms ensures that we will see into the future that efficient and particularly sustainable use through water management systems that the minister has developed.

As we have heard tonight, the bill delivers a number of key reforms while retaining certainty and security of entitlements and, most importantly, balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes. I am sure that everyone would agree that Queensland's water resources need to be used responsibly and productively whilst retaining certainty and security for water entitlement holders and delivering the balance that I have talked about. In the debate this evening I have been interested in some of the contributions, particularly from those opposite which puzzled me greatly.

Any Queenslander can quite happily and quite rightly benefit from the produce of our great state, be it dairy or beef—and, of course, we are the most significant beef state in the country—be it horticulture, be it sugar or be it from other industries such as grain, cotton et cetera. I suggest most strongly that it is indefensible to happily consume and benefit from those quality Queensland products and yet, at the same time, not acknowledge or understand the realities in local communities from which so much of our agricultural produce is delivered across the state. In other words, it is simply indefensible to consume yet be disinterested in the responsible, efficient and sustainable management of our water resources across the state. This bill recognises those realities and it recognises the support for agricultural industries throughout the state. The water planning process will continue to be underpinned by robust science and, therefore, it will continue to enhance security and certainty of water access and, as I have said, responsibly allow for water related development in the future.

We all have various experiences that we have enjoyed throughout our careers and our personal lives. One of the delights in my life has been to complete some postgraduate studies, some years ago now, through the Cooperative Research Centre for Irrigation Futures. I learned that whether it was the Australian wine industry, the beef industry, the dairy industry or horticulture right across the country, not just in Queensland, it was when agriculture really understood the true supply-chain-wide need for efficient water supply and efficient water management that it delivered for communities, by taking a whole chain-wide responsibility approach.

There is a need for economic development in Queensland. The LNP government recognises that need and is assisting in the achievement of objectives related to that need in a responsible and sustainable way. We need certainty, we need security and we need reliability for current entitlements of primary producers, as is delivered through this bill. We need to do that without the risk of adverse environmental impacts. I believe the department and the minister have delivered very strongly through the development and presentation of this bill and they have that balance right. The economic, social and environmental issues and outcomes recognised in this bill need to be applauded. For that reason, I am very proud and pleased to support this bill.

 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (9.33 pm): The opposition opposes this bill because it both removes the principles of ecologically sustainable development from the Water Act in Queensland and introduces a water development option for the potentially unsustainable take of hundreds of

thousands of megalitres of water a year. This is the very same principle of ecologically sustainable development that this government was so committed to just four months ago in its July program report on the Great Barrier Reef coastal zone strategic assessment. Why the change now? The same program report forms part of this government's commitment to UNESCO to protect the Great Barrier Reef. In case we were in any doubt, tonight on ABC news the minister made it clear again when he insightfully responded to serious concerns about the Great Barrier Reef by saying that—

We won't be using the principle of ecologically sustainable development as a purpose of the Water Act in the future.

What a shame! Thanks, Minister, for stating the obvious. These principles of ecologically sustainable development include the principle that—

If there are threats of serious or irreversible environmental damage, lack of full scientific certainty should not be used as a reason for postponing measures to prevent environmental degradation.

It also includes the principle that, '... the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity should be a fundamental consideration in decision-making'. Clearly, both are important and common-sense principles that are lost to the minister.

This bill will allow for an overallocation of water from catchments that feed into the Great Barrier Reef, with the real risk of increased loads of sediment and nutrients, a loss of ecosystems and a long-term decline in the environmental quality of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area. It is not just me who says this. In relation to this bill, the Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority has said that—

Allocation of water resources prior to the full and open assessment of the potential cumulative impacts on groundwater, surface waters and the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Property may lead to unacceptable impacts to coastal waterways and the Great Barrier Reef ecosystems.

The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority related concerns, in particular about the water development option established in this bill where a company can be granted, with certainty and exclusivity, hundreds of thousands of megalitres a year prior to any independent hydrological assessment being undertaken or any environmental impact assessment statement being approved. The Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority further submitted that—

It is not clear how independent scientific advice regarding the cumulative impacts associated with the implementation of a development option for large scale water users will be obtained and considered in the decision making process.

What is worse is that the minister has ignored the recommendation of the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee to legislate for public consultation on a water development option. He has ignored the committee. This means that an agricultural producer could potentially have a water development option over their land without even knowing it. This bill has the potential for '... significant cumulative impacts on the outstanding universal value of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage Area'. Once again, those are the words of the authority; they are not mine. As the shadow minister for primary industries and fisheries, I also take issue with this bill facilitating the take of water out of the Galilee Basin at the expense of the agricultural sector.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order, members! The exchange across the chamber will cease. The member for Stafford has the call.

Dr LYNHAM: In relation to this bill and the Galilee Basin, Tom Crothers, who formerly headed the Queensland government's water allocation and planning group, has said—

The four mines that have been approved already will take potentially up to 1,770 gigalitres of water, that is over three-and-a-half Sydney Harbours, during their life ... These are all bits of legislation aiding the big end of town—the mining industry. And what happens is the little guy suffers, the landholder suffers.

The farmers shall suffer, that is, the people whom those opposite are supposed to represent.

Questions remain around exactly what this government has promised mining company Adani. It was recently reported that this government has provided Adani with an unlimited water take from the Great Artesian Basin for its mining operations. I really hope that that is untrue and that this bill is not about facilitating that take. Matthew Currell, a groundwater expert at RMIT, has raised concerns that the Carmichael mine could have a significant impact on sensitive springs in the Great Artesian Basin. It has been reported that the mine could lower the watertable beyond the boundary of the mine by as much as 20 to 50 metres. Earlier today, I asked this government to reveal how many hundreds of millions of dollars of taxpayers' money has been committed to finance Adani's rail line. Of course, the

Deputy Premier continues in his failure to provide any information beyond saying that the state's commitment would be capped at less than half the total \$2.2 billion cost, which could mean that the commitment is closer to \$1 billion, rather than in the hundreds of millions of dollars.


The Coordinator-General's report on Adani reveals that their project will support less than 4,000 ongoing jobs—not the 28,000 jobs the Deputy Premier has been claiming. This is an estimate of the jobs potentially created if every Galilee mine went ahead—many mines are already uncommercial and in the never-never. It remains unclear as to whether Adani will seek to bring in a 100 per cent, fly-in fly-out, 457 visa workforce from overseas.

This commitment to help pay for a rail line that will split many agricultural producers' properties in half follows the remarkable commitment from this government to buy contaminated dredge spoil. Once again we have no idea how much money has been put on the table by the Newman government. The introduction of this bill—that could potentially facilitate an unlimited water take from the Great Artesian Basin—is an act of a desperate government trying to buy their way back into office at the next election.

The LNP think that buying the dredge spoil and a rail line for Adani, as well as providing them with what is potentially an unlimited water take from the Great Artesian Basin, will allow the LNP to say that they have done something about jobs and for the economy during their first term. They think that stripping the principles of ecologically sustainable development from the Water Act—to facilitate a greater take of water and place the Great Barrier Reef at risk—will help them in their desperate attempts to be re-elected.

This bill will provide private companies with certainty and exclusivity over hundreds of thousands of megalitres of water a year. This is without any prior independent hydrological modelling and while more than 75 per cent of the state is drought declared. This lacks common sense. Farmers are capping bores to save the Great Artesian Basin while it is reported that miners have an unlimited water take.

This is a Premier who has overseen a rise in our state's unemployment rate to seven per cent. The LNP government has destroyed more than 20,000 full-time jobs in Queensland since the election. Now they are willing to destroy the future of the Great Barrier Reef and place at risk the future of our agricultural sector—our farmers—in a desperate attempt to convince voters that they have an economic plan for the future. This government knows that if Adani fails they fail. So everything is on the table—the Great Artesian Basin, our farmers, the environment and the Great Barrier Reef.

 **Mrs MADDERN** (Maryborough—LNP) (9.42 pm): I rise to support the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I have to say that I have never heard so many deviations from the title of the bill as I have heard in the last few minutes. The other thing I need to say is that it does not matter how many times you say something, it does not necessarily make it true.

Water is one of the most critical components—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! You will direct your comments through your chair, if you have any.

Mrs MADDERN: Water is one of the most critical components or input factors needed to grow our agricultural industry, to support the construction and manufacturing industry and to support our residential development and all the associated services such as hospitals and schools. It is almost a case of 'just add water', for without water our whole community dies and we only need to look to deserted former communities in deserts around the world to understand just how critical water is.

It is the critical nature of the need for water which underpins the importance of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This bill represents the most significant set of reforms to Queensland's water regulatory framework since the Water Act came into effect in 2000. The bill delivers on the government's commitment to ensure the state's water resources are used responsibly and productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders. It also underpins the whole-of-water-business transformation of the Department of Natural Resources and Mines by delivering an efficient, effective and modern water resource management framework to better serve the needs and aspirations of Queenslanders.

The bill contains a number of key reforms but retains certainty and security of water entitlements and balances economic, social and environmental outcomes to meet the general expectations of the community. The bill is wide ranging and covers a number of significant areas of water management. I propose to speak on just a few of these areas.

At this point I would like to thank my fellow committee members, committee staff and departmental staff for their support in the committee's deliberations and report preparation. Most importantly, I would like to thank all those who contributed submissions or provided evidence in the public hearings. We value your contributions.

As a member whose electorate covers a fair section of the lower reaches of the Mary River Valley and includes the Lower Mary Irrigation Scheme, flexibility in the accessibility and delivery of water is critical to maintaining and growing our agricultural economic base. The current process to convert water licences to tradeable water allocations utilises resource operations plans as the mechanism for the conversion. This can be lengthy and also involve amendments to both water resource plans and resource operations plans which can take years to implement. In our case locally, the resource operations plan has been in place for many years and lacks flexibility.

The bill therefore establishes a separate statutory instrument called a water entitlement notice to convert, grant, or amend water entitlements. The water entitlement notice will be able to be used across multiple catchments, enabling bulk conversions of water licences to tradeable water allocations. The implementation of the water entitlement process will facilitate the increased expansion of the water trading market delivering a fully realised water trading market in priority catchments around the state by 2017. In turn, this will also ensure that water is available to support economic development opportunities and will empower water users to make better informed investment decisions.

In my experience most people find it much easier to identify specific features from a map or drawing rather than from a set of words. The bill provides for the creation of a watercourse identification map. The watercourse identification map will show watercourses that are subject to regulation under the Water Act as well as other features that are not. The map will replace current provisions in the Water Regulation that are used to describe and designate upstream and downstream limits of watercourses.

These provisions are not easy to interpret and generally requires a field visit from a departmental officer to advise them whether a feature is a watercourse or not. The watercourse identification map will be publicly available and will provide greater clarity for water users about the regulatory framework that applies for activities such as the taking of, or interfering with, water.

The map will be delivered online and free of charge via the Queensland Globe. The Globe will make it easier for water users to determine whether a feature is a watercourse or not, and therefore whether a water licence is required for the take of that water or not. The mapping of identified features will be subject to rigorous quality assurance processes to ensure accurate mapping. Departmental staff will be required to consult with all affected stakeholders regarding watercourse determinations into the future before these determinations are reflected on the map.

Mother Nature has a habit of interfering with the best laid plans. The massive flooding experienced in quite a number of river catchments in early 2013 is likely to have made changes in these river catchments. In circumstances such as these, a review of the mapping would be advantageous just to ensure the accuracy of the flood mapping. I note that the minister has addressed this issue.

As set out in the committee's report, the bill also reforms the framework for the regulation of take and interference with water. There are three components to the reform: addressing the take and interference of water in minor watercourses; addressing the take of water where the purpose or volume of the take is of low risk; and addressing the take and interference where the two activities are linked.

The Water Act currently provides statutory rights to take or interfere with water for a range of low-risk activities, meaning that the take or interference does not require a water licence. Through water plans or the Water Regulation low-risk take or interference with water can be managed into the future. For example, a water plan can identify thresholds for the take or interference with water which sets the upper limit below which the take or interference would not require a water licence. The water plan will also identify particular activities for which a licence is not required. This means that such thresholds would be considered by catchment communities during consultation on water plans.

The bill reduces red tape for landholders and the government and will save landholders the costs of annual licensing fees by removing the need for a water licence for low-risk take of water where the resource is not impacted. The new watercourse identification map will be used in determining where the resource will not be impacted and therefore where the low-risk take can be undertaken.


An increase in the area for a home garden of up to half a hectare in size across the state is proposed and this area will not require a water licence. A water plan, however, may identify, through consultation with communities, a smaller or larger area for such gardens on a catchment-by-catchment basis. This option will provide assurance that there is oversight of the amount of unlicensed water take. The bill also addresses a potential duplication in assessment processes for activities by providing for exemptions from water licences or permits to take or interfere with water where the take or interference has been assessed and conditioned under an alternative approval process, such as an environmental authority under the Environmental Protection Act 1994.

One of the things which most disturbs me is the idea that someone can be guilty until they prove themselves innocent. This goes against the understanding of the law that we have all been brought up with. This bill removes provisions that reverse the onus of proof in relation to offences and ensures that standard prosecution principles apply. This will reduce the burden of proof placed on authorised holders, removing the risk that these holders will be wrongly accused of unlawfully taking or interfering with water where there is no evidence to suggest that it was their fault. Instead it will place the burden of proof on the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, requiring them to collect sufficient evidence to prove who is responsible for the offence. While water is a precious commodity and its use needs to be carefully monitored, it seems most unfair that the innocent majority should be punished for the sake of the guilty minority who may have unlawfully taken or interfered with water. In this case, the bill will restore the principles of natural justice and upholds the principle that a person is innocent until proven guilty.

In brief, this bill also provides a framework for the streamlining of water planning by introducing catchment based water plans under subordinate legislation and operational matters to be included in either a water management protocol or an operations manual. Transparent and streamlined assessment and approvals pathway reforms will be introduced in the bill to allow proponents of major water infrastructure projects to forecast and manage their investments, assessment, design and construction works in appropriate time frames.

Red-tape-reduction measures have been taken to streamline water licensing processes. The bill includes a number of provisions that will provide for the management of water in relation to the mineral resources and the petroleum and gas sector, provisions which will provide improvements and simplification of requirements for category 2 water authorities and river improvement trusts and provisions that will address the issues of overlapping tenure and safety and health.

As my area and many others are in the grip of a very severe drought, it is very clear that water is a very precious commodity, and this bill acknowledges this and seeks to ensure that water resources are used responsibly and productively, that there is security of supply and that there is balance with environmental and social outcomes, as expected by community standards. I am pleased to support the bill.

 **Mrs CUNNINGHAM** (Gladstone—Ind) (9.52 pm): I rise to speak to the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I certainly thank the minister for his interest in such an important commodity. Any property without water is just a dust bowl, and I think right across Queensland, whether you live on the eastern seaboard or further inland, the importance of water to our quality of life and indeed our ability to make an income is inarguable. There are a number of matters that I wish to raise and particularly I will make reference to the committee report. These reports over time are invaluable in trying to understand the implications of a bill but also some of the concerns that a bipartisan group of people might show.

At the outset I will refer to my own experience in relation to the impact of industry on water supplies. Much of the industry in my electorate is the treatment or the processing of a commodity that is brought into the electorate whether that is by land, by pipeline or by sea. One industry, however—Cement Australia—uses a lot of the local commodity in developing the cement that it sells both here in Australia and overseas. It gets the limestone from inland at the back of Mount Larcom.

For at least 20 years there has been an ongoing concern by the landowners in that area that their properties have been dewatered because of the coning down principle, if you like—as the mine gets deeper, it draws down the water supply. The mine is constantly pumping out excess water that comes to the surface in the mine. For properties surrounding the mine site, their bores, their aquifers, are constantly reducing, not all of which can be attributed to the drought at the time. So there has been over 20 years a huge amount of anxiety and anger and confrontation between the company, the government and those landowners in relation to the arbitration of their needs.

The former coalition government was involved back in the days of Rob Borbidge. They were involved in negotiation and consultation. The Labor government either side of that was involved to a greater or lesser degree, and to some extent those concerns for some farmers remain unanswered. Part of the response has been for the mine, QCL, to buy the properties around the mine site. But I guess the area that has not been determined yet is that of those who live outside the immediate vicinity of the mine site who fervently believe—and also believe they have the science to show it—that the mine has affected their water. There has been talk about grout curtains. There has been talk about a lot of other scientific principles to try to control the impact of the mine site—none of which have been on any full scale implemented, so those landowners remain with a problem and no foreseeable solutions.

So I have seen firsthand the anxiety that is generated when a farm's water source is problematic. Things like make-good conditions are fine, but they do not even come into the equation if the responsibility to prove the impact is passed to the landowner. That is certainly one of the concerns that is contained in the committee's report—that the onus of proof could go to the landowner who has neither the resources in terms of time and scientific knowledge nor the money to be able to constantly fight this battle, and that is what it becomes. I see this as an emerging problem in areas like the Surat where they will be harvesting LNG, but the issue of the water still from an outsider's point of view remains at that point where it is not fully finalised and indeed there remains some unknowns in relation to the impact on the aquifer. Water is a commodity that needs to be so carefully protected and carefully managed.

The committee invited the minister to liaise with the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection to ascertain how water related matters can be best presented within an environmental impact assessment, such as a discrete section or schedule, so that information is accessible to review. The importance of part of that is the baseline information in relation to water supply—bore levels, the electrolytic count and salt levels, water quality information. That baseline data needs to be available or gathered at the time that a major industry is proposed. In many instances once the industry has been in operation for a couple of years the opportunity is lost where farmers can prove the level of water, the recharge rates for their bores and all of that information that proves the value and worth to their farm unless it is gathered and stored at that point at which the operation has not yet started.


The water impacts are no less important than the social impacts in an EIS. Both of those need to be captured in an EIS, not as one sentence or a paragraph, but as a document that can be used as an implementation tool and also as a measuring tool into the future.

One of the witnesses at the hearing, Mr Shannon, indicated in a paper that he entitled 'Make Good Flaws' that this process is managed and undertaken by the resource company which is the water monitoring authority. The relevant resource company is in control of that bore monitoring and impact assessment process because it is the entity that undertakes the critical bore assessment that determines eligibility for make-good measures unless the resource company comes to the conclusion that not only is the bore impaired, but it is due to the resource company's activity. The landholder has no entitlement to make-good measures, that is, a source of water compensation or a new bore. It goes on to talk about Mr Shannon's submission. I have no doubt that the minister will respond to these issues in his summing-up, but again it is very difficult to argue with firsthand experience.

I have seen the make-good provisions and every single word is argued by a resource company if they do not want to be bound by that make-good obligation. They say that they will redig bores if a bore is lost—if the bore level is so low that the bore is obsolete and a new bore has to be put down. They will have the bore drilled, but the anxiety and angst that is put onto that landowner to prove the point as well as the timing of the bore drilling, the placement of the bore drilling, the constraints that are put around that landowner by the company that is doing the favour to the landowner all add up to a huge impost on the landowner where they are required to prove—and I am not saying that it is a blank cheque for any landowner to require make-good provisions on a company. It is a huge time pressure.

I have also seen that landowners have been told that if they run out of water the company will carry water for them. Yes, they will, but do not ring them on a Saturday morning to say that all the water points are dry and that the water has to be carted by this afternoon or tomorrow afternoon so that cattle can be watered because companies will probably not be able to contact a contractor by then. All of the onus is put back on the landowner, who is disadvantaged by the whole proposal. They

should not have to carry that anxiety, they should not have to carry the costs and they should not have to carry that nervous exhaustion that they feel if their concerns are not properly listened to and mitigated against at that planning stage. I am concerned about the bill and its potential impact.

 **Mr TROUT** (Barron River—LNP) (10.02 pm): I rise to support the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The bill delivers on the government's commitment to ensure the state's water resources are used responsibly and productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders. The framework that guides water planning will be modernised and streamlined in various ways to deliver a water resource planning and water licensing process that is more efficient, flexible and responsive.

Many of the provisions in the current water resource plans and resource operation plans are repeated across all catchments. The bill consolidates many of these in a state-wide provision which will now be prescribed once, either in the Water Act or the Water Regulation. This will contribute to delivering government's commitment to reducing the regulatory burden by 20 per cent by 2018.

Overall, the changes to the water planning framework will result in easier to understand water plans that can be delivered faster and that remove prescriptive regulations to enable water supply scheme operators to manage their own schemes more flexibly and more efficiently. The bill also facilitates increased access to water by not only expanding water markets but also providing more flexible, unallocated water release processes and allowing for unallocated water to be reserved outside a water plan area.

The Water Regulation will be amended to allow for an expanded range of release processes including where water users can purchase water entitlements through a fixed price so that fit-for-purpose and responsive approaches can be taken to release unallocated water. This will result in providing faster access to almost 1,300,000 megalitres of unallocated water held as general reserve available for purchase to water users to stimulate the water market and create development opportunities across Queensland.

Far North Queenslanders will benefit from amendments to the Great Artesian Basin water resource plan. The bill amends the water resource plan 2006 to provide access to 9,800 megalitres of unallocated water for the cape management area to support new development opportunities in Cape York. The amendment was informed by peer reviewed science to ensure that any development or increased access to artesian water in western Cape York would not adversely impact existing water users, the resources or springs. The bill also continues the existing unallocated reserves of 10,000 megalitres for all other areas of the Great Artesian Basin outside the Cape York management area.

Additionally, the bill amends the Great Artesian Basin water resource plan to facilitate the granting of a groundwater licence for 2,000 megalitres of the GAB water to improve the security of water supply for the Toowoomba Regional Council. These plan amendments are facilitated through this bill and enable responsible and productive access to water for responsible development in Cape York and also increase town supply security for the Toowoomba region.

To the west of Cairns and Townsville, which I am particularly interested in, the Flinders and the Gilbert catchment area lies directly below the Gulf of Carpentaria and extends eastward to the Great Dividing Range. The Flinders River, at 1,004 kilometres, is the longest river in Queensland with a catchment coverage of 109,000 square kilometres. The Gilbert River, at 610 kilometres long, has a catchment coverage of 46,810 square kilometres and has the sixth highest discharge of any river in Australia. With a catchment footprint larger than the state of Tasmania this area is serviced by 10 local council areas, all eager to pursue a larger development opportunity. Both catchments will provide an opportunity for producers to diversify into irrigated cropping which can provide a higher return per hectare than grazing. By unlocking the potential for irrigated agriculture, this initiative will contribute to the government's goal of doubling the value of agriculture production by 2040.

Mr Hopper: Potential.

Mr TROUT: It is potential; I take that interjection.

Mr Hopper interjected.


Mr TROUT: We will. This minister has made that happen. There are currently significant process and investment challenges facing proponents of major water infrastructure projects such as this. The reforms in the bill tackle these issues by tackling a transparent and streamlined assessment approval pathway that allows proponents of major water infrastructure projects to forecast and manage their investment, assessment, design, construction and operational time frames. The reforms provide an upfront provisional commitment of future access to water for the project through the

granting of a water development option. This gives proponents a greater level of certainty and enables them to secure further investment early in the process, thereby allowing the project to move forward in its development.

The conditions and requirements placed on a water development option, when fulfilled, provide sufficient information on water resources and issues and will give surety that thorough consultation with relevant stakeholders has occurred, allowing the minister to make an informed decision on amending a water plan and the chief executive to grant water authorisation for the project. The bill includes safeguards to ensure that the project stacks up in terms of the availability of the water and the infrastructure that will be required to access the resource. A water development option can be cancelled if the assessment does not identify the water to be available to support the project or how the proponents of the project will adequately mitigate the impacts on environmental flows or existing water entitlement holders. Conditions can be placed on the water development option to require the proponent to undertake the required studies and capital investment by specific milestone dates, with the water development option to be cancelled if this investment does not occur.

The water development option provisions were specifically developed to assist in facilitating major water infrastructure projects to drive private investment in water infrastructure that supports significant economic development in new or expanding areas where it is a responsible and productive use of the state's water resources. The bill underpins the Department of Natural Resources and Mines whole-of-water-business transformation by delivering an efficient, effective and modern resource water management framework to better serve the needs and aspirations of Queensland.

I commend the minister—who I call the farmers' minister—and his department, which has driven real reform that will drive our economy into the future. They have definitely got the balance right between resources, agriculture and the environment. This bill will create jobs for this state and help the four-pillar economy. I commend the bill to the House.

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (10.10 pm): I rise to speak on the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This bill presumably joins a catalogue of legislation that has come through this parliament to precipitate or facilitate more mining industry development in this state, and that is a notion which I am ordinarily strongly in favour of, provided that it does not inadvertently impact other users or conflict with the same resources. With the combination of the Mineral Resources Act, the Petroleum and Gas Act and the application of these licences, I share deep concerns about how this will play out for a lot of landholders who rely on our vital water resources west of the Great Divide.


As people would be acutely aware, from the First Australians onwards we have had very little groundwater and we rely on our subartesian and artesian water supplies. They are very precious and they are very complex systems. In the Lawn Hill Gorge in my area—and I do not know how on earth they do this—they have proven that the water that comes down the Lawn Hill Gorge is sourced from Papua New Guinea. That is fascinating and it demonstrates that they are enormously complex underground water systems.

One of the only real mining conflicts that I have had in my area in recent times has been with Ernest Henry Mining. The Curley family had a considerable conflict with the mine over groundwater because they were assured that it was not going to affect their groundwater supply. No end of tension was precipitated between that landholder and the mine, and I am sure that the mine had the best of intentions, valued their relationship with the landholder, probably did not foresee it as a problem and found it very hard to satisfy their needs or 'make good' as is talked about in this legislation.

There is a large amount of mining to go into the Galilee Basin, which also requires large amounts of water. We are a dry continent and we have more dams, but we do have limited water resources and there can be a lot of tension between those water users, as we are all acutely aware, during the punishing drought which we are experiencing. As has been expressed by a lot of landholders and their interest groups, there is a hell of a lot of risk to groundwater supplies associated with this bill. They are very complex systems and we still do not know a lot about how they interact. People have an inherent distrust of governments—not just this government, but any government—saying, 'You'll be right, mate. We'll look after you. We'll make good and so will the mining companies.' That is a shame, but there has been a litany of poor outcomes and maybe we should reflect on the Coral Creek issue with Garry Reed. I think he would argue that the legislation did not serve him very well in regards to how he was treated and how water rights affected his property.

On that basis I have extreme concerns about messing around with the precious water reserves and supplies that exist. I know there is going to be considerable demand and it would be great to have development in the Galilee Basin, but what is the inadvertent cost and what are the risks? The

landholders have taken such a beating with the accelerated growth of coal seam gas and coalmining. It is good to enjoy the fruits of that growth, but we have to consider the inadvertent cost to our existing industries. We know that coalmining is where the money is, and in this sort of playground in parliament and in government decisions they are always going to win the day and we have to work very hard to protect their interests. To me this is a shift in the balance towards the mining companies away from the landholders, and on that basis I will not be supporting the bill.

 **Mr BENNETT** (Burnett—LNP) (10.15 pm): I rise to support the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. The management of the state's water resources is an issue that concerns all Queenslanders, and so I welcome this bill, which delivers on the government's commitment to balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes for the benefit of all.

The large number of submissions made to the committee's inquiry reflects the fact that the responsible management of water is a topic close to the hearts of many people who depend on it for their livelihood. I thank the committee for their time in considering the large number of voices who weighed into the public consultation process.

With the face of the state's economy having changed significantly since the Water Act 2000 was enacted, it makes sense to make some significant reforms that reflect the current best practice standards and keep pace with the changing needs of the agriculture and resource sectors, all the while responsibly maintaining our environment—without which we have nothing to begin with. The co-existence of resources and agriculture in rural and regional areas is a relationship that has water at its very heart. As we have seen in some parts of the country, it is a relationship that has not always resulted in favourable outcomes for some parties.

I commend the Queensland government, in particular the minister and staff of the Department of Natural Resources and Mines, for actively taking the lead on this issue by implementing responsible legislation that seeks the best possible outcome for all.

There are a few key points in the bill that I believe are worth highlighting. The first is the establishment of a consistent framework for managing the impact on underground water due to resources activities. In particular I note the provision which ensures that a statutory make-good obligation applies for any landholder whose water supply bore is affected as a result of mining operations. Currently these make-good obligations only apply to petroleum and gas operations; however, landholders need to have certainty that any impacts to their bore water supply will be remedied in an agreed statutory manner.

The bill also amends the cumulative management area framework in the Water Act to ensure that the impacts of mining operations are soundly managed where it is predicted they will have a cumulative impact on underground water resources. I note that the minister identified the Galilee Basin in Central Queensland as an area where a future cumulative management area declaration may be beneficial. While this would be a future decision for government, I commend the department for their foresight in identifying this need and putting the necessary framework in place now.


Another significant reform in this bill will mean that for the first time the petroleum and gas sector will be bound by the same rules as everyone else when it comes to taking groundwater for all operational purposes other than where the water is an unavoidable by-product of the extraction process. As the minister pointed out in his introductory speech, this reform will be especially important as the sector looks to expand into parts of Queensland where water from the Great Artesian Basin is the lifeblood of many communities and pastoral operations—something that many areas of the Burnett electorate will be particularly interested in.

While the legislation establishes a better framework of control over water resources, it is certainly not designed to disadvantage the resources sector. In fact under the legislation, responsible operators across all sectors will be rewarded with significant reductions in red tape, which clearly fulfils the core objectives of this government to reduce bureaucracy and promote economic development. Some of these measures include: streamlining the process for water licences, in particular where an existing licence holder seeks changes to their licence; the simplification of the process and reduction of timeframes for releasing unallocated water; the provision for category 2 water authorities to enjoy more autonomy and efficiency; and the development of a watercourse identification map to provide clear and easily accessible information to stakeholders.

In conclusion, as we have seen in recent years here in Queensland nature can be harsh, and at times parts of the state are flooding while others are suffering the effects of drought. Water is a precious resource that does not always come along where we need it or when we need it. It is therefore vital that we take care of it responsibly and make the best possible use of it. Having said

that, the responsible management of our water resources and the enjoyment of the economic benefits of strong agricultural and resource sectors do not have to be conflicting interests. By passing this bill we will be putting in place a sound framework for balancing economic and environmental outcomes.

On a personal level, I am excited by some of the possibilities that exist within my electorate to take it forward economically but I also recognise the need to protect the water assets that characterise the region. I therefore thank the minister, his departmental team and the committee for their hard work and diligence in bringing this bill to the parliament. I look forward to seeing and experiencing the rewards it will bring to Queensland.

 **Mr HOLSWICH** (Pine Rivers—LNP) (10.19 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. I, like other speakers, wish to thank the Agriculture, Resources and Environment Committee for its consideration of this bill. I would like to restate that the bill introduces improvements to modernise the existing regulatory framework and promotes efficient allocation and management of water in Queensland to deliver a whole-of-water-business transformation for Queenslanders. The transformation focuses on putting our customers first by consulting with them and industry representatives about these changes to ensure our services are useful, understood, desirable and sustainable.

The transformation aims to achieve this vision through a range of activities to modernise the regulatory framework, streamline and improve business processes and modernise information and computer systems. This will be achieved by reducing red tape and regulatory burden for customers and providing more flexibility in the administration of Water Act functions. The reforms that the Minister for Natural Resources and Mines has highlighted today will deliver on this commitment. With that said, I would like to recap major amendments of the bill to be considered in more detail shortly.

The bill transforms the water planning framework under chapter 2 of the Water Act into a more efficient and easier-to-understand regulatory structure. The framework is characterised by catchment based water plans that are subordinate legislation under the Water Act, specifying the allocation and management of water resources of a river basin or aquifer system. The amended water planning framework will also provide for the accelerated conversion of water licences to tradable water allocations to deliver a fully realised water market by 2017.

The bill amends the Water Act to remove the requirement to obtain a water licence to take water or interfere with water where the risk to the sustainability of the resource is low. Additionally, it will allow a water plan or a regulation to set thresholds in particular areas to remove the requirement for a water licence to take or interfere with water. The bill also doubles the area for a home garden, which means that a water licence is not required for taking water for a garden up to half a hectare in size.

The bill amends the Water Act to introduce a new mechanism, known as a water development option, to facilitate the assessment and approval of major water infrastructure projects that are coordinated projects under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971. A water development option provides the proponent of a major water infrastructure project with a provisional and exclusive commitment to future access to water, subject to the outcomes of an environmental impact assessment process. The water development option was developed to respond to the private sector's needs for certainty so they can have the confidence to invest in robust assessment and approval processes.

These new provisions will improve the integration between assessments and approvals under the Water Act and the environmental impact assessment process. This cements the need for rigorous science and community consultation whilst removing unnecessary duplication across processes. There are protections included in this reform that work together to ensure a major water infrastructure project is demonstrated to be a responsible and productive use of the state's water resources before any water authorisations are granted. Ultimately, the bill maintains the discretionary power for the minister to decide whether to change a water plan to provide for the project.

The bill provides for a consistent framework for underground water rights for the resource sector and for the appropriate management of impacts on underground water caused by the exercise of underground water rights by a resource tenure holder. The bill brings the take of associated water by mining operations into line with the provisions for the petroleum and gas sector through amendments to the Mineral Resources Act and chapter 3 of the Water Act. This will provide the holder of a mining lease or mineral development licence with a statutory right to take associated water which is subject to their compliance with the requirements of chapter 3 of the Water Act. This will

reduce uncertainty over the timing and process for developing make-good arrangements between mining tenure holders and landowners and avoid adverse effects on reliability and security of access to water for landholders who use underground water.

The bill also establishes a consistent framework for managing the take of water to be used in resource sector activities, providing for the take of this non-associated water by the petroleum and gas sector to be managed under the planning and allocation processes of chapter 2 of the Water Act. A transitional period of two years will apply for existing petroleum tenure holders to comply with the new arrangements. This will be extended to five years within the Surat cumulative management area.

After the transition period, petroleum tenure holders who wish to take non-associated water will have the same requirements for licensing that apply to all other industries. In areas where groundwater is managed through a water plan, this will involve obtaining a licence or permit where this is required by the plan. This provides a secure framework to manage the expansion of the onshore oil and gas industry by ensuring that water users in the existing agriculture industry and the onshore oil and deep gas industry use water responsibly and productively.


The bill also makes a number of amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act 1940 to modernise the language in the act, reduce red tape for trusts in carrying out their activities and streamline many of the existing provisions in the act where other laws such as the Financial Accountability Act or the Statutory Bodies Financial Arrangements Act take precedence. Significantly, the act has been updated to allow trusts to invest in a broader range of activities necessary to act on watercourse erosion issues and improve water quality in streams.

The bill also includes overlapping tenure safety provisions to complement the new overlapping tenure framework for coal and coal seam gas under the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act 2014 by addressing joint safety requirements for both industries. The new provisions are based on the joint coal and coal seam gas industry proposals in the industry white paper and technical working group papers and subsequent consultation meetings conducted by the Department of Natural Resources and Mines. Coal and coal seam gas parties will be required to have a joint common approach to risk management, and there is a more comprehensive approach to who has right of way. The approach to right of way is through the new default framework of initial mining area, rolling mining area and simultaneous operating zone introduced through the Mineral and Energy Resources (Common Provisions) Act. Coal will generally have right of way, although there is still flexibility and other arrangements can be negotiated by the parties.

Coal site senior executives and coal seam gas operators must consult and exchange information to jointly assess and manage risks and hazards. They must agree to a shared joint interaction management plan or reach agreement through arbitration. However, arbitrated outcomes do not affect the ability of the coal or gas inspectorates to regulate whenever necessary to address any safety concerns. The parties must notify the chief inspectors the first time a joint interaction management plan has been developed for an overlapping area. The purpose of the notification is to inform the inspectorate that overlapping operations have commenced and thus enable the planning of inspections. The parties must also treat the joint interaction management plan as live documents that are reviewed and updated as circumstances change.

The new requirements for joint interaction management plans apply to all possible overlapping situations, whether they be production overlaps, production and exploration overlaps or exploration overlaps. The safety amendments improve the existing safety requirements for overlapping operations and will support the new overlap and tenure framework that will facilitate the further growth of both the coal and the coal seam gas industries in Queensland.

I conclude my contribution by again thanking all those who made submissions to the committee. I thank the committee for their work. I thank the department staff and the ministerial staff for their work on this. Finally, I thank the minister for his outstanding work on this bill. I am pleased to support this bill.

 **Hon. AP CRIPPS** (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (10.28 pm), in reply: The aim of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 is to deliver on the government's commitment to ensure the state's water resources are used responsibly and productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders. Importantly, the bill delivers a number of key reforms aimed at positively influencing business growth in the agriculture and resources sector and creating economic development opportunities for rural and regional Queensland while retaining certainty and security of water entitlements. Balancing this economic growth with social and environmental outcomes will be supported by a new overarching purpose for the act. The reforms will

also reduce the regulatory burden and remove prescriptive regulation placed on water users, enabling more flexibility for businesses, landholders, the community and the department administering the Water Act in terms of delivering services to its customers. A number of key reforms will improve the planning, allocation and management of Queensland's water resources that will better serve the needs of Queenslanders and assist in delivering a fully realised water trading market.

The major components of the bill include the creation of a new purpose that encompasses the entire act; a new water resource planning framework which includes a more efficient framework to transition water licences to tradeable allocations to support the expansion of the water market and mechanisms that offer better access to unallocated water; streamlining certain water licence processes and changing licensing requirements for low-risk take of water; the inclusion of a watercourse identification map providing clarity to customers; a process to facilitate the transition of water rights from special agreement legislation into the Water Act to ensure a consistent framework applies to all water users; a coordinated pathway for the assessment and approval of major water infrastructure projects; enhancements to river improvement trust legislation and the framework for the administration of category 2 water authorities; ensuring the government bears the onus of proof about who is responsible for offences related to taking or supplying water; creating consistency in the regulation of the resource sector's impacts on groundwater and water supply bores; and improving the safety requirements for overlapping coal and coal seam gas tenures to safeguard workers working in those overlapping areas. I turn now to the issues raised by members during the second reading debate, and they were raised by numerous non-government members contributing to the second reading debate.

Ms Trad: Just two.

Mr CRIPPS: The first issue focused on the process for the assessment and approval of major water infrastructure projects, in particular the viability of providing a water development option based on approval of these developments through the environmental impact statement process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

Ms Trad: Oh, right!

Mr CRIPPS: Just in terms of the ongoing interjections from the member for South Brisbane, I wonder if she might take some of her own suggestions and listen carefully to the explanation that is being offered by the minister in reply to the second reading debate. Like any coordinated project under that act that I previously referred to, the environmental impact statement process is guided by terms of reference that are developed transparently with opportunities for public input. For a major water infrastructure project, the terms of reference would address issues of concern, including the total volume of water allocated from a catchment. If a water development option proposed development in excess of the unallocated water reserved by a water plan, the environmental impact statement would need to demonstrate how the infrastructure proposal would mitigate impacts on the natural environment and existing users. If a project raises concerns within the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth government, for example, regarding flows that support natural assets like the Great Barrier Reef, then the Commonwealth assessment requirements will also apply to the project as they currently do through an environmental impact assessment process. A water development option can be cancelled if the assessment does not identify the water to be available for the project or adequately mitigate the impacts on environmental flows or existing water entitlement holders or if the proponent does not meet the conditions of the water development option. The minister administering the Water Act maintains the discretionary power to decide whether to amend a water plan to facilitate the development of major water infrastructure.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr CRIPPS: However, for the interest and the benefit of the member for South Brisbane, if consultation undertaken through the environmental impact statement process is not equivalent to that set out in sections 44 through to 46 of the Water Act—that is, the consultation undertaken in any other water planning process—then the minister cannot amend a water plan to provide for the project. So it goes directly to the concerns raised by the member for South Brisbane in her second reading contribution and goes to her point about me not accepting a recommendation from the committee that a separate and distinct process—a duplicated process—be established for the chief executive of my department to have public notification and call for submissions in relation to a water development option.

Ms Trad: To expedite major water development without consultation.

Mr CRIPPS: I have just told the House in detail and slowly, for the benefit of the member for South Brisbane, that the minister administering the Water Act cannot amend a water plan to provide water to a proponent of a project under the water development option unless the terms of reference and the consultation set out in the environmental impact statement process is not equivalent to that which is included already in sections 44 through to 46 of the Water Act. So, as usual, what the member for South Brisbane and the Labor opposition want is duplicated regulatory processes, not efficient and robust regulatory processes. They want duplicated regulatory processes.

Removing the requirement for a water licence for low-risk activities is another issue that was raised. The Water Act currently provides statutory rights to take or interfere with water for a range of low-risk activities meaning that the take or interference does not require a water licence. The bill simply expands on this by including a range of mechanisms by which low-risk take or interference with water can be managed into the future and improves the clarity of existing provisions. For the benefit of the member for South Brisbane, the chief executive already has the ability to declare upstream and downstream limits on a watercourse. In addition, schedule 1 of the Water Regulation 2002 already enables the chief executive to identify low-risk activities for general authorisations to take water. Authority under the Water Act will still be required for proposed excavation, placement or fill of quarry material removal in a designated watercourse.

The bill provides for a water plan or a regulation to set thresholds for the take or interference with water up to which the take or interference would not require a water licence and also nominates particular activities for which a licence is not required. A rigorous assessment undertaken on a catchment-by-catchment basis will inform any decision to reduce regulation in particular catchments. This will be done in close consultation with affected water users and involve detailed analysis of the needs of existing water users and the environment. In most cases this will be undertaken through the water planning process. Risks and impacts will be monitored and stronger regulation may be introduced if the risk profile changes.

The provisions of the Water Act have already provided for significant reforms through the rollout of 23 water resource plans. The current Water Act has radically changed the way that water resources in Queensland were allocated, planned for and managed over the last decade and a half. In many parts of Queensland these plans have established tradeable water allocations for many water users. This has progressed the establishment of a water trading market, with tradeable water allocations now accounting for greater than 75 per cent by volume of the water allocated across the state. The amendments in this bill are simply making the creation and amendment of these plans more efficient to support future water needs. While the structure of these plans is changing, the fundamental purpose of them will remain the same. By this I mean that the outcomes, the high-level objectives and strategies for achieving a balance between water for industry, irrigators, town water supplies and the environment will be maintained. In addition to encouraging growth in the agriculture and resources sector, the reforms will create economic development opportunities for regional Queensland while maintaining certainty and security of water entitlements and reducing unnecessary regulation.

More efficient water planning processes will retain strong community engagement as a key component, but will remove or reduce unnecessarily prescriptive and sometimes overly bureaucratic processes that have meant that the processes can be quite lengthy. I see the member for Warrego in the House. He represents a part of Queensland that can speak with experience about the difficulties that can sometimes be encountered with the development of water resource plans and resource operations plans. He speaks from experience and has done so in this House on a number of occasions.

Simpler licence dealings will help provide better services to customers by reducing the time necessary to assess particular applications and reduce costs to the applicants by removing the need for simple dealings to be publicly notified. Into the future, landholders will now have an assurance that if their water bore is affected by mining activities, it will be remedied in an agreed way through the new make-good provisions being introduced by this bill. The importance of stakeholder involvement in decision making has been considered in the development of the bill, which ensures that all genuine feedback is valued and incorporated into the approval processes. Proponents of major water infrastructure projects will have some assurance at an earlier stage in their project's development that the water that is necessary for a project will be available to them. This will remove some uncertainties and give increased confidence to proponents to invest in these types of projects.

I move now to some of the contributions that were made during the second reading debate by non-government members. Firstly, I turn to the contribution by the member for South Brisbane. Contrary to her assertion in her contribution to the second reading debate, the bill does not deregulate the management or planning of water resources in Queensland. It makes the regulation more consistent across various parts of the resources sector. It streamlines various methods of planning for, accounting for and allocating water resources on a catchment-by-catchment basis in Queensland, but it does not deregulate the management of water resources in Queensland.

I find it very difficult to understand and reconcile the assertion made by the member for South Brisbane that in some way the state of Queensland has entered into a secret agreement with the proponents of IFED when the IFED project will be going through a full environmental impact statement process that involves public notification and the receipt of public submissions to the terms of reference of that environmental impact statement. By definition, a fully publicly notified process involving public submissions cannot be a secret.

Furthermore, the assertion by the member for South Brisbane that the water development option provision in this bill will involve secret deals between the Queensland government and proponents of large scale greenfield irrigation projects is equally hard to reconcile when that process will involve a fully publicly notified environmental impact statement process that entails submissions by the public to the terms of reference set for that EIS. It is very difficult to reconcile in my mind, but perhaps not in the mind of the member for South Brisbane.

As I mentioned just a moment ago, the member for South Brisbane continued to refer to the science and the hydrology that is apparently not going to be part of water resource planning allocation and management in the future. She referred to the integrity of the existing process. But decades of regulation have been hotly contested by local communities across the state. We are now modernising and streamlining the process that is currently in place. I might point out that, despite the member for South Brisbane's defence of the current water planning and allocation process, the previous government did not complete processes for the development of water resource plans in all catchments across the state of Queensland, which calls into question the efficacy of the processes that the member for South Brisbane sought to defend during the course of her contribution to the second reading debate.

A lot of hot air came from the member for South Brisbane and a lot of historical doomsday scenarios were suggested by the member for South Brisbane and the member for Stafford in respect of the new purpose of the bill. So for the benefit of the member for South Brisbane and the member for Stafford, I am going to take the step of reading into the record what the new purpose of the act involves. The headlines that the member for South Brisbane seeks to grab are in contrast to the reality of what is in the bill. The new purpose of the bill is contained in clause 59, and it states—

Purposes of Act and their achievement

- (1) The main purposes of this Act are to provide a framework for the following—
 - (a) the responsible and productive management of Queensland's water resources and quarry material to optimise economic, social and environmental outcomes;
 - (b) the sustainable and secure water supply and demand management for the south-east Queensland region and other designated regions;
 - (c) the management of impacts on underground water caused by the exercise of underground water rights by the resource sector;
 - (d) the effective operation of water authorities.
- (2) For subsection (1)(a), *responsible and productive management* is management that—

So there is a definition for 'responsible and productive' and it contains the following—

 - (a) incorporates consideration of long-term and short-term economic, social and environmental considerations; and
 - (b) allows for the allocation and use of water resources and quarry material for the economic, physical and social wellbeing of the people of Queensland, within limits that can be sustained indefinitely; and
 - (c) sustains the health of ecosystems, water quality and water-dependent ecological processes and biological diversity associated with catchments, watercourses, lakes, springs, aquifers and other natural systems; and
 - (d) enables water resources and quarry material to be obtained through fair, transparent and orderly processes to support the economic development of Queensland; and
 - (e) builds confidence regarding the availability, security and value of water entitlements and other authorisations for those investing in developing the water resource; and
 - (f) promotes the efficient use of water through—
 - (i) the establishment and operation of water markets; or

- (ii) the initial allocation of water; or
 - (iii) the regulation of water use if there is a risk of land or water degradation; and
 - (g) facilitates the community taking an active part in planning for the management and allocation of water; and
 - (h) recognises the interests of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples and their connection with water resources.
- (3) For subsection (2), the *efficient use of water*—
- (a) incorporates water demand management and water conservation measures; or
 - (b) considers the volume and quality of water required for particular circumstances, including release into the environment.

This is a comprehensive, detailed purpose for the Water Act, which has a balanced approach to the allocation of water resources in Queensland for the economy, local communities and the environment. The hysterical doomsday predictions of the member for South Brisbane are absolutely ridiculous and out of step with reality. If she took the time to read the bill she would see that the proposed new purpose of the Water Act is very balanced, takes into consideration the need of all sectors, including the environment, as well as local communities and the need for economic development opportunities particularly in regional and rural Queensland.

I turn now to the comments that the member for South Brisbane made about the water development option. I reiterate what I said during the course of the second reading debate. The exercise of the water development option is not a guarantee that secures water resources for a proponent. The member for South Brisbane tried to warp the meaning of the clause by saying that it implied a guarantee. But I have clearly articulated both in my second reading speech and already in my reply that there is a range of safeguards in place.

Ms Trad: You're doing it now with IFED.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Watts): Order! Member for South Brisbane, please refer to people in this House by their title. The minister has the call.

Mr CRIPPS: What the water development option does is provide some certainty to a proponent that if they successfully complete an environmental impact statement process then the water can be made available to them at that time. They cannot impact on existing water entitlement holders or the environment. Allocations are regularly and routinely conditioned to provide for the take of water when the resource is available. That is why the member for South Brisbane cannot conceive of an allocation of substantial volumes of water for annual average takes, not full access each year to the volume allocated. That is a great deficiency in the understanding of the member for South Brisbane in terms of what the water development option means for large scale greenfield irrigation projects. Annual average take does not guarantee the take of full allocations nominated on an entitlement. Allocations and licences are often regularly and routinely conditioned to provide for the availability of the resource when the flow is in the relevant watercourse.

I could not help but share the amusement of the member for Lockyer when the member for South Brisbane raised her concerns about the water development option, particularly in relation to the potential impact on the Great Barrier Reef, and then cited the IFED project as an example. As was pointed out by the member for Lockyer, the IFED project is proposed on the Gilbert and the Gilbert flows into the gulf, which is separated from the Great Barrier Reef by Cape York Peninsula. Also the member for South Brisbane referred to the Alpha Coal Project as an example of the failure of make-good agreements. That is exactly why these changes are being proposed. The statutory responsibility to make good currently does not apply to the coal or the mineral sector in Queensland. That is why we are moving to address that situation now.

The member for Stafford made an allegation about the take of water from the Great Artesian Basin by the proponents of the Alpha Coal Project but would not disclose the source of his report and he largely repeated the hysterical and confused contribution of the member for South Brisbane. I ask him again: when is he going to make a contribution that includes an original thought that he has had?

I move now to the contribution by the member for Gladstone. Without understanding the specific circumstances that the member for Gladstone gave in terms of the limestone quarry and the processing of that limestone quarry material in town, without understanding the particular circumstances of that—and I am happy for the member for Gladstone to follow up in that regard—currently the operations of a mine in the mineral or the coal sector would require a water licence to take water from a mine, but currently there would not be a facility afforded to surrounding landholders for make good under those arrangements. Statutory make good is guaranteed currently for landholders under the petroleum and gas legislation and we are proposing that that opportunity for

statutory make good be extended to landholders potentially affected by projects under the coal and the minerals sectors. While the responsibility may be on the landowner to demonstrate that their groundwater reliability has been impaired by the activities of that resource project, to date the efficacy of make-good agreements have not been contested in the Land Court so we are not actually able to assess whether or not the current arrangements for make good are failing. We do not have any evidence in that regard.

There are two steps: if there is a dispute between a company and a landowner in relation to the outcomes of a make-good agreement, the first port of call would be a dispute resolution process that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines would facilitate. If we do not reach a satisfactory agreement between the landowner and the resource company as a result of that mediation process, the landowner does have an opportunity to go to the Land Court to have that matter resolved. The resources company involved is responsible for doing the monitoring of the bore, but in practice we know that the landholder who uses and observes the performance of the bore does so on a very regular basis depending on the use of that particular bore. So the dispute resolution process, the mediation process and the Land Court process can, of course, be activated by a landholder. They are not prevented from activating those dispute resolution processes by the fact that the monitoring is undertaken by the resource company that is responsible. I do invite the member for Gladstone, if she continues to hold concerns about her specific circumstances in her electorate, to contact me.

That brings me to the contribution of the member for Mount Isa. It is really hard for me to reconcile the contribution of the member for Mount Isa because he seemed to be arguing for leaving the regulation of the management of groundwater for resource projects the way it is now. But if we leave it the way it is now it will not address the issues raised by landholders such as those that took action in the Land Court to secure rights that this bill is now proposing to bestow upon them. I cannot say whether or not the member for Mount Isa understands fully what we are doing, but he appears to be contradicting himself, from where I sit at this point in time, insofar as he points to the struggle of those landholders in the Galilee Basin as one with which he has sympathy, but then he indicates that he intends to oppose a bill that seeks to bestow on them the statutory rights that they sought to secure through going to the Land Court. I cannot really reconcile his contribution with the reality of the provisions that we are proposing in the legislation.

Before I complete my reply to the second reading debate I would certainly like to acknowledge the contribution of the officers from my Department of Natural Resources and Mines, as I did in my introductory speech to the development of the water reform bill 2014. It was an extraordinary effort from those officers who have invested a lot of their own experience and knowledge into the creation of the provisions which I have placed before the parliament. I would also like to thank my ministerial staff for their support in assisting me to develop this water reform bill. I commend the bill to the House.

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

AYES, 63:

LNP, 63—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Cavallucci, Choat, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dillaway, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Johnson, Kaye, Kempton, King, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArde, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Newman, Ostapovitch, Pucci, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Smith, Sorensen, Stevens, Stewart, Symes, Trout, Walker, Woodforth, Young.

NOES, 13:

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

KAP, 2—Hopper, Katter.

INDEPENDENTS, 3—Cunningham, Douglas, Wellington.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.


Debate, on motion of Mr Stevens, adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr STEVENS (Mermaid Beach—LNP) (Leader of the House) (11.03 pm): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

White Ribbon Day


 **Dr LYNHAM** (Stafford—ALP) (11.04 pm): I rise to support White Ribbon Day. Since 2003, this organisation has been active in Australia. It is a testament to it that in 10 short years this has become a major day in our country's calendar. I am proud to be a white ribbon ambassador and I wear my badge with pride. As the foundation states, men who wear a white ribbon on this day demonstrate their opposition to violence against women, their commitment to equality between women and men, and their willingness to make a difference.

Last week in my electorate of Stafford I was fortunate to visit the Young Parents Program, which is run by an organisation that works alongside young pregnant and parenting women to assist them in that changing time. They work with many young mums from challenging and disadvantaged backgrounds. Those are our most vulnerable, and I was distressed to learn that 95 per cent of those beautiful young women suffer from some form of domestic abuse. There are many horrifying statistics surrounding domestic violence—just ask the police, the paramedics and the hospitals. For the police, it is one of the most challenging and confrontational crises they have to attend. We have all heard of tragic deaths that involved now emotionally scarred police officers and bereaving families where the initial spark was domestic violence.

White Ribbon Day should be above politics, but it does take political solutions to minimise this scourge. Our distinguished former Governor-General Quentin Bryce is heading a task force and we wait for its recommendations. I am dismayed when I hear statements from National Party senator Barry O'Sullivan suggesting some form of penal colony in Antarctica in what was, at best, an ill-conceived rant. Let us examine it more closely: it is a tertiary prevention. It is closing the stable door after the horse has bolted. The government's plans tend to be of tertiary prevention: lock them up and all ills will be solved. That simply does not work alone; it does not work by itself.

The most effective measures are primary prevention. There are many issues behind domestic violence but, as the police will tell you, alcohol and mental illness are two large and separate primary causes. Prevention aimed there will reap rewards and should not be ignored. Not only does the government ignore these issues, but also it has worsened the situation with ill-conceived policy. Alcohol has become more available than at any other time in our history through the extension of trading hours, and mental health resources such as the Barrett Centre have been cut. Along with many community organisations and the Police Union, I ask that this government quickly reverses those unsound policies and demonstrates its opposition to violence against women. It must put hotel trading hours back where they were and properly resource mental health. That will act directly on preventing violence in our community.

Brisbane West Wellcamp Airport; Agriculture

 **Hon. JJ McVEIGH** (Toowoomba South—LNP) (Minister for Agriculture, Fisheries and Forestry) (11.06 pm): Last Monday was the date of the first QantasLink flight from Wagner's new Brisbane West Wellcamp Airport to Sydney. I congratulate the Wagner family and their staff, in particular, on that wonderful achievement for Toowoomba and the Darling Downs, not just for business, travel and tourism but also for the future potential for airfreighting our region's best produce to Asia and other export markets. The Wellcamp Airport and the Toowoomba second range crossing will make it easier and cheaper to get Queensland's products to export markets and other domestic markets throughout the country. The Toowoomba Enterprise Hub, previously known as the Charlton Wellcamp Industrial Area, is critical to the future of agriculture in southern Queensland and northern New South Wales, as well. I can assure the House that it is an exciting place to be involved in.

The LNP government is determined to increase agricultural production and rural job opportunities as part of our plan to build a four-pillar economy. In particular, the free trade agreement with China supports those goals. The agreement delivers lower tariffs on beef, fruit, vegetables and grains, so there is a real opportunity for Queensland farmers to increase exports.


Last week I met with grain industry representatives and growers for a grain industry round table in Toowoomba, where I announced a four-year \$7.9 million partnership with the Queensland Alliance of Agriculture and Food Innovation at the University of Queensland. That partnership promises to boost sorghum yields and cut production costs for growers. Obviously, we are after higher yields, but a better drought tolerance in sorghum crops in Queensland, higher resistance to insect pests and better grain quality are also objectives of the partnership. The partnership promises to deliver higher

yields for Queensland sorghum growers and potentially make farming systems resilient to drought, not only here but also in other countries, particularly sub-Saharan Africa where sorghum is a human source of food.

Queensland is the most important sorghum-growing state in Australia, producing around 1.2 million tonnes annually. Of course, in Australia much of that production is used for intensive feeding in cattle feedlots and pig and poultry feeding. The eastern Darling Downs around Toowoomba has the nation's highest concentration of beef cattle feedlots, so those initiatives mean much to my home town of Toowoomba and the region of the Darling Downs.

In this government, we are very supportive of our agricultural industries. Delivering this sort of research and development provides real benefits and will assist in achieving our goal of doubling profitable farm output throughout the state. That is important to Toowoomba, the Darling Downs and, of course, all of Queensland as well.

Aspley Electorate

 **Hon. TE DAVIS** (Aspley—LNP) (Minister for Communities, Child Safety and Disability Services) (11.09 pm): It gives me great pleasure to update the House on events in the wonderful electorate of Aspley. Earlier this month I was delighted to host Minister Mark McArdle at Holy Spirit Home at Carseldine. There was a lot of lively conversation with the residents over a cuppa and some cake. Our seniors were delighted that the minister gave of his time to listen to the issues that were important to them and to share a joke or two. Holy Spirit is a vibrant, welcoming community and it is always such a treat to visit them.

Our local schools are also vibrant communities. Two of our schools brought the electorate alive with their trademark fairs. Aspley East State School held their country fair last month and it was so big it appeared to cover half the school campus. Just a few weeks later Bald Hills State School held their Art Fair, complete with craft stalls, student artworks and dance pieces across all year groups. It was great to visit both fairs and share in the fun. It was fantastic to see so many locals come out in support of our local school communities.


I have also had the pleasure of visiting some of our local organisations and to congratulate them on their grant funding success. Aspley Memorial Bowls Club was successful in its application to upgrade the bowling green to synthetic grass under this government's Get Playing initiative. The upgrade will not only provide a better playing surface for members but also allow the club to host a broader range of competitions. I would like to offer my congratulations to those who worked so very hard to make this upgrade a reality. I cannot wait to see the new green in action next year.

C&K Carseldine received a grant of \$1,000 under the Suncorp safer streets program. It was great to catch up with director, Michelle Hanson, who showed me the improved security lighting around their premises, bringing a welcome boost to safety for the centre's children and staff. Other successful grants recipients included: YMCA Y Care; Brisbane Malayalee Association; Be Uplifted, breast cancer support group; Guide Dogs Queensland; and Crime Stoppers Queensland.

All in all, 2014 has been a year where Aspley has really shone. We have shared in the wonderful music of our students when Craigslea State High School performed at the seniors concert. We hosted the multidisability lawn bowls state championships. The celebrations are still continuing over at the Aspley Hornets after winning the NEAFL grand final in their 50th anniversary year. There has been much, much more. Whilst 2014 has been a great one, there will be much happening in 2015, including Aspley State School celebrating 125 years of quality education.

The Aspley electorate is a great community. I would like to wish all residents a safe and merry Christmas and a happy new year.

Brown, Mr K

 **Hon. A PALASZCZUK** (Inala—ALP) (Leader of the Opposition) (11.12 pm): I rise to pay tribute to a great member of my local community in Inala, Keith Brown. Keith passed away on 11 November 2014 aged 84 years. At his funeral last week the love for Keith was clearly evident. One of his close friends highlighted the importance Keith played especially to the Labor Party with the following words, 'Labor has lost three great men: Gough Whitlam, Wayne Goss and Keith Brown.' He truly was in good company.

Keith was a passionate and much-loved member of the Inala community who dedicated his life to many causes. He took particular interest in keeping younger members of our community on the straight and narrow by engaging them in sport, especially tennis. He believed that if young kids were involved in sport that would keep them off the streets and out of trouble.

Born on 23 August 1930, Keith would learn his lessons at Catholic school before embarking on an apprenticeship as a boilermaker. His trade would ultimately take him to work on the railways where he completed a 47-year career. Keith's work in the railways also led him to join the union as a 19-year-old. His passion for the rights of workers led him to serve 43 continuous years as a union representative.

Keith further demonstrated his passionate advocacy for unity against oppression and being a voice for those who are rendered voiceless in his devotion to the great Australian Labor Party. He joined the Inala branch in 1956. When many are often prepared to shun extra responsibility, he held the role of senior vice president for 50 years. He was also a life member of the ALP. If he wanted to be president of the branch, he could have been. However, he refused to take on such roles so he was not taken away from his community work which was so important to him. Ultimately, he stepped down from this role when he fell ill.


Keith's dedication to others spread far beyond organisations like the ALP and the union movement. Sadly Keith's mother passed away as a result of motor neurone disease. Out of the love for his mother and his genuine desire to help others, Keith became a member of the Motor Neurone Disease Association. He believed that by having firsthand knowledge of the disease he was in a position to assist in the work of the association.

He wrote for the *Courier-Mail*, the *Sunday Mail* and, last but not least, the *Catholic Leader* as a tennis writer—penning the results of fixtures across South-East Queensland. He was also involved in St Mark's Catholic tennis club.

Keith Brown was a valued member of our local community and someone who selflessly gave his time, skills and devotion to help other people. He was also a friend to my family. As local members of parliament, we could not have asked for a more active member who was prepared to give so much to the community and to the people he loved so dearly.

When he fell ill, the people of Inala grouped together and built him a ramp as he could not make it up the stairs. His three passions were clear—his love for his family, his love for tennis and his love for the great Australian Labor Party. Keith was an honourable man—a man of great integrity, a man of great wisdom, a man who lived a very humble and modest life, but who passed his values on to others and enriched their lives for the better.

LNP Government, Achievements

 **Mr PUCCI** (Logan—LNP) (11.15 pm): Queenslanders have a clear choice. Two and a half years ago we inherited a budget in deficit and a debt forecast to rise to \$85 billion. The budget uncertainty and lack of economic activity impacted business and consumer confidence, hurting Queensland jobs. Labor and the minor parties offer nothing but mismanagement and chaos. Labor have not learnt from their past mistakes; they have preselected the same old failed team to return Queensland to the way we were—the bad old days of the Beattie and Bligh years when we had water pipes not connected to dams; trains without seats; payroll systems that did not pay people; secret waiting lists for hospital waiting lists; ambulance ramping; gangs running wild; a fake Tahitian prince; the highest cost in the nation to own, register and run a vehicle; public transport fares rising 52 per cent in three years, with 15 per cent fare increases year after year and state debt spiralling out of control.

Labor have no real policies and no plans to fund infrastructure. We know Labor will revert to higher debt and deficit, higher taxes and waste which puts Queensland's future in jeopardy. Labor is not listening to Queenslanders. It is only listening to the union bosses who decide Labor policy, and decide who will be their comrade leader.

In contrast, the LNP is building a brighter future. We have a strong team with a strong plan for a strong Queensland. We have worked hard to stop the unsustainable growth in debt, and next year the budget will be in surplus for the first time in a decade.


We know that not all Queenslanders are sharing in the growth in our economy and there is more work to be done. Our strong plan will help create jobs and opportunities by growing a four-pillar economy underpinned by construction, tourism, agriculture and resources. We understand Queensland families are feeling cost-of-living pressures, and we are doing everything we can to help provide relief.

Since coming to office, we have taken \$7,000 off the stamp duty cost of buying a family home. We have frozen family car registration for the entire term, provided a one-off \$80 water rebate in South-East Queensland and supported the axing of the carbon tax. For the first time in Queensland's history, we are delivering a state-wide cut in public transport fares, which comes on top of our free travel after nine weekly journeys initiative. This will save someone in Logan travelling eight zones over \$1,000 a year compared to what it would have been under Labor's 15 per cent fare increases year after year.

We are not stopping there, though. Through our Strong Choices investment plan, we will have an infrastructure fund to build the roads, bridges, schools and hospitals we will need in the future, creating tens of thousands of jobs. We are taking action to save Queenslanders hundreds of dollars on their power bills by ensuring the cost of the Solar Bonus Scheme is permanently removed from electricity prices.

Queenslanders have a clear choice: a choice between the LNP—a strong team, with a strong plan that we have taken to the people of Queensland—or a dysfunctional group of individuals with no policies and no plans to create jobs or fund future infrastructure. Only the LNP has a strong plan that will create jobs, grow the economy and build the infrastructure needed for the future.

Mudgeeraba Electorate, Public Transport

 **Ms BATES** (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (11.18 pm): Last month I tabled a petition signed by 1,023 residents of the Mudgeeraba electorate which called on the Minister for Transport and Main Roads to revisit our bus routes in Mudgeeraba. Since February, Mudgeeraba locals from all walks of life have reached out to me after the bus services that they relied on hourly had changed and the route from Robina to Mudgeeraba terminated in Robina after 5.30 pm.

Pensioners who used public transport to do their shopping or to attend urgent medical appointments were concerned that the department had changed their bus routes with little or no consultation with them. Businesspeople who use buses to get to and from the train station for their morning and evening commutes could no longer easily do so. On behalf of my residents, I sponsored this petition with the help of a concerned resident, Shirley Packham, after my concerns were not addressed in the way I had hoped following discussions with the department.


Residents brought to my attention the need to restore bus route No. 750 so it terminates in Mudgeeraba and for bus route No. 748 to return to half-hourly from hourly services, particularly during peak times. We need to ensure that pensioners can get out and about to purchase the supplies that they need or to attend the doctors' appointments that they require. We need to ensure that our kids can get safely to school and their parents do not have to drive them. We need to ensure that the businesspeople, particularly those who work at Robina Town Centre, are not stranded at the train station when they return from a hard day's work in the evening. We need to ensure that young Rochelle Roberts, a university student from my electorate, never again encounters a distraught teenage girl at the Mudgeeraba Market Shopping Centre who was left by herself, stranded and alone, because her bus back to Robina simply was not coming.

We have a basic responsibility to ensure the safety of the public and to provide them with the public transport services they need. Today I met with the minister and I outlined my concerns for residents who use these bus routes. Whilst I understand that the routes need to be utilised, in some cases it is the only method of transport for the elderly or for young people who have yet to obtain their driver's licence. I am very pleased that the minister took on board my concerns, particularly in relation to route 750. Route 750 goes from Robina Town Centre and used to go to the Mudgeeraba shopping centre, but it currently terminates at Highfield Drive on the eastern side of the highway. So that makes it very difficult for anybody who works at Robina Town Centre who relies on public transport to get back home to Mudgeeraba after 5.30 pm. As I said, the minister took on board my concerns and I hope to see a resolution of at least one of these routes in the very near future.

In the meantime residents need to ensure that the patronage increases. I understand that there are financial concerns about the number of people using buses but, as I mentioned before, sometimes it is the only method of transport. So, again, I thank the minister and hope that I can relay a solution to my constituents in the near future.

(Time expired)

Travel Compensation Fund; Anti-Poverty Week

 **Dr DOUGLAS** (Gaven—Ind) (11.21 pm): For many age pensioners, a holiday is the experience of a lifetime. But for two of my constituents who outlaid almost \$6,000 for a holiday with Australian Speciality Tours, which went into liquidation on 19 August, it has become a nightmare. Underlying this story in the deregulated travel environment is the importance of checking with your travel agent if they are now part of the new voluntary accreditation scheme operated by the Australian Federation of Travel Agents. In the case of my two pensioners in my electorate, the company was not and they have lost their money. Had they paid by 30 June, they would have been covered by the Travel Compensation Fund, which ceased on 30 June, but they paid a few days after, not knowing any of that.

The voluntary accreditation scheme, ATAS, began on 1 July and is available to travel agents as well as suppliers of travel and travel related services. These businesses may obtain insolvency insurance to cover collapses of suppliers or travel services, as well as their own risk of insolvency. However, Australian Speciality Tours was not part of this scheme, and unfortunately my constituents will not be having their holiday and the stress of this has impacted badly on both of these elderly ladies.


On 20 May, when our tourism minister said that the former fund had become increasingly redundant, that it had placed a costly administrative burden on the industry and that the changes reduced red tape and government involvement, she claimed the changes would maintain appropriate protection for consumers. My constituents would disagree. The LNP government spruik red-tape reductions at every opportunity, good or bad, but in this case it has clearly left these ladies without their money. They are pensioners and this is a lot of money for pensioners for what would have been a holiday of a lifetime.

Whilst on the subject of money, I recently organised a forum in my electorate to mark Anti-Poverty Week to educate people about ways to access assistance. There were some alarming statistics to come out of the forum. Firstly, up to 80 per cent of people seeking financial counselling on the Gold Coast are considering bankruptcy. Secondly, people living in Coomera and Pacific Pines are amongst the highest percentage of people facing mortgage and rent stress, resulting in further social and personal problems include relationship breakdowns, domestic violence, crime and gambling. Unfortunately a significant number of people leave financial counselling until they are on the brink of bankruptcy.

I was alarmed to hear a pensioner say he was directed by SPER, the State Penalties Enforcement Register, to cut back on his food consumption by \$3 to \$5 a week simply to meet government commitments. The irony is that the LNP government's job cuts, combined with the escalating price of power and water, has led to significant hardship in our community, including no access to public transport. These are the outcomes when you cut red tape when you should not.

(Time expired)

ABC, Funding

 **Mr KATTER** (Mount Isa—KAP) (11.24 pm): I rise to speak about the ABC cutbacks and the effects that they will have on Western Queensland. From the reports that I have received—and I will table one of those from the ABC News—the pertinent points that I would like to make are that the ABC has reported 400 jobs to be lost—about 10 per cent of the ongoing workforce—300 redundancies are to take effect immediately and 10 per cent from management.

Tabled paper: ABC News media article, dated 25 November 2014, titled 'ABC cuts: Managing director Mark Scott announces more than 400 jobs to go' [\[6577\]](#).


News bulletins are to be cut from 10 to five minutes. They will cut back on the number of concerts recorded by Classic FM. NewsRadio will move out of radio and into the news division. Radio National's iconic *Bush Telegraph* will finish up at the end of 2014.

There are many aspects of the ABC I disagree with. I find Q&A very hard to stomach and their lack of objectivity I find very difficult to digest. But I do respect the independence of the ABC. Far be it from me to judge. It is a wonderful institution out in Western Queensland. They provide vital services out there. You may say, 'There are no cuts in Western Queensland yet.' But it is exactly the same as the police cutbacks when they said, 'That is fine. There is nothing hitting us here,' but when you take away from middle management and other areas, there is always more pressure put on us.

I was talking to someone in the mainstream media here the other day. They said, 'There are five of us now where there used to be 20 or 25 journalists.' What does that do to the quality and content of our journalism? No wonder people find media so cynical now. I say that with no disrespect to our hardworking journalists. It does not reflect on them. It reflects on the way it is managed by the upper levels and how they are resourced. The result is that we now have these short messages from government. It is very cynical. They pick a winner in the papers, whether it be Liberal or Labor—or whoever is in government. If anyone else tries to put an alternative view, they do not get it out there.

We need these independent outlets, particularly in rural areas, to give us a voice and to provide an alternative view. If you start cutting resources and things like *7.30 Qld*—and we will only have a national *7.30*—that is terrible. News bulletins being cut from 10 minutes to five minutes makes it very tough for us. This is a resource that I listen to avidly and we need to hold on to that. I urge people to resist these cutbacks. I urge the federal government to reconsider the impact it is going to have on rural Queensland. It is a very critical service that they provide and that we do not want to lose.

Ipswich West Electorate, Events; White Ribbon Day

 **Mr CHOAT** (Ipswich West—LNP) (11.27 pm): This year has passed by very quickly. It will soon be Christmas and I know my people are looking forward to the well-earned holidays ahead and the joy and giving Christmas represents. I know too that the majority of people in Ipswich West recognise the real meaning of Christmas and will celebrate the birth of Christ.


Today is a very special day, with Nicky and I celebrating 19 years of happy marriage. The figures in our wedding photos may have changed quite a bit, but our love for one another remains strong. Just as both our parents have enjoyed long successful marriages, ours will go the distance.

Today we also commemorate White Ribbon Day, and it is pleasing to see so many colleagues wearing their ribbons in the chamber today. We must all fight hard to eliminate domestic and sexual violence completely. I read that St Rita of Cascia is the patron saint for abused wives and heartbroken women. She was an abused wife and widow herself who lived in Italy from 1381 until 1457. Rita was married and became a mother at age 12 and endured her husband's insults and physical abuse for many years. Through humility, kindness and patience, Rita was able to convert her husband into a better person before his death. St Rita died a nun and her body, which has remained incorrupt over the centuries, is venerated today in the shrine of Cascia. The story of St Rita gives hope to victims of domestic violence but demonstrates that this is an age-old problem that we just cannot allow to continue.

Of course, at this time of year we take time to recognise the achievements of our schools and our students, particularly our year 12 graduates. I am so very proud of the class of 2014 from my great Ipswich, Rosewood and Lowood state high schools and, of course, West Moreton Anglican College. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the other schools serving my community with whom I have been privileged to celebrate their awards and recognition of graduates; namely, St Edmund's College, Ipswich Grammar School and Ipswich Girls' Grammar School. Of course, our own daughter Charlotte, has graduated from St Mary's College Ipswich and last Thursday we celebrated a graduation mass and a ceremony. Congratulations, Charlotte; we are very proud of you. I would also like to congratulate all students from my 22 primary schools who graduate from years 6 and 7. I wish you well for your future studies in high school.

I have indeed attended many awards nights and commemorations of late, including Rosewood Golf Club's 60th anniversary dinner, the Ipswich Woodcraft Club's open day, district Neighbourhood Watch awards night, Day for Daniel Walk, Lowood Junior Golf Club's awards night, the Ipswich Greyhound Racing Club's Gold Cup final, the Marburg Pacing Association's Graham Harriott Memorial Trot, the Rosewood Scrub and Pine Mountain historical societies' AGMs, the Marburg Show Society's Christmas social and many other events. Indeed, over the next few weeks Nicky and I and the family will attend many more great celebrations across the Ipswich West community. I wish all of my residents and community groups well for a productive and successful 2015. I wish them a happy and holy Christmas. I hope that they stay safe throughout the holidays.

Electrical Trades Union

 **Mr RUTHENBERG** (Kallangur—LNP) (11.30 pm): I rise to inform my community of the most recent attempts by the Electrical Trades Union to silence criticism of its intolerant, bullying behaviour. On 19 October this year I referred on my Facebook page to the intimidating behaviour of the ETU towards one of my campaign workers on Anzac Avenue, Kallangur. By reason of their conduct, she felt intimidated and thought it necessary to retreat. Cognisant of that incident and following on from other like incidents, I described this incident and concluded—

... I will continue to work hard for you, even if the ETU and their candidate are trying to stop you from talking to me. I will do all I can to make sure you always have access to me to express your thoughts.

I table my Facebook statement.

Tabled paper: Comments made by the member for Kallangur, Mr Trevor Ruthenberg MP, on his Facebook account [\[6578\]](#).

On 20 October a PJ Simpson from the ETU sent a letter to my office and called on me to apologise for drawing the attention of the public to his union's behaviour. Much to my surprise, I then received a letter dated 21 October from a Luke Tiley from Hall Payne Lawyers acting on behalf of the ETU indicating that his client was aggrieved by my Facebook post but pointed out the ETU was not hypersensitive. I table copies of both letters.

Tabled paper: Letters, dated 20 October and 21 October 2014, to the member for Kallangur, Mr Trevor Ruthenberg MP, from the Electrical Trades Union and Hall Payne Lawyers regarding his Facebook comments [\[6579\]](#).

I table also an article from the *Brisbane Times* dated 6 March written by Rachel Nolan in which she indicates her thoughts about the ETU and that their actions are not completely honourable.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Brisbane Times*, dated 6 March 2014, titled 'The ETU is nobody's friend' [\[6580\]](#).

Following this speech I fully expect that the ETU will commence legal action against me as per their threats and their legal letter to me. That would be most unfortunate as I think the people of Kallangur want political opponents to concentrate on the issues that are important to our community. I would welcome a campaign based on common courtesy and respect where we address the issues, because that is what I think our community expects from us.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 11.33 pm.

ATTENDANCE

Barton, Bates, Bennett, Berry, Bleijie, Boothman, Byrne, Cavallucci, Choat, Costigan, Cox, Crandon, Cripps, Crisafulli, Cunningham, D'Ath, Davies, T Davis, Dempsey, Dickson, Dillaway, Douglas, Dowling, Elmes, Emerson, Flegg, France, Frecklington, Gibson, Grant, Grimwade, Gulley, Hart, Hathaway, Hobbs, Holswich, Hopper, Johnson, Judge, Katter, Kaye, Kempton, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Latter, Lynham, Maddern, Malone, Mander, McArdle, McVeigh, Menkens, Millard, Minnikin, Molhoek, Mulherin, Newman, Nicholls, Ostapovitch, Palaszczuk, Pitt, Pucci, Rice, Rickuss, Robinson, Ruthenberg, Scott, Seeney, Shorten, Shuttleworth, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Symes, Trad, Trout, Walker, Watts, Wellington, Woodforth, Young