ISSN 1322-0330

RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS

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

FIRST SESSION OF THE FIFTY-FIFTH PARLIAMENT

Wednesday, 9 November 2016

Subject Page

PW WELLINGTON
SPEAKER

NJ LAURIE
CLERK OF THE PARLIAMENT

LJ OSMOND
CHIEF HANSARD REPORTER

Table of Contents – Wednesday, 9 November 2016

WEDNESDAY, 9 NOVEMBER 2016

The Legislative Assembly met at 2.00 pm.

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

REPORTS

Auditor-General

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have to report that I have received from the Auditor-General report No. 3 for 2016-17 titled *Monitoring and reporting performance (Report 18: 2013-14).* I table the report for the information of members.

Tabled paper: Auditor-General's Report to Parliament 3: 2016-17—Follow up Report 18: 2013-14—Monitoring and reporting performance [2023].

Committee of the Legislative Assembly

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I table report No. 20 of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly titled *Annual report, former Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee 2015-2016.* I commend the report to the House.

Tabled paper: Committee of the Legislative Assembly: Report No. 20—Annual Report, Former Communities, Disability Services and Domestic and Family Violence Prevention Committee 2015-2016 [2024].

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

Visitors to Public Gallery

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I am pleased to acknowledge and welcome to our public gallery members of the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly. I welcome Mr Jeff Collins MLA, Mrs Robyn Lambley MLA, Ms Kate Worden MLA and Mr Scott McConnell MLA. I also welcome to our public gallery student leaders from Mudgeeraba Creek State School.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

ASEAN-Australia Leaders' Summit

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.02 pm): Queensland's engagement with the rest of the world is vital to the future jobs and prosperity of our state. This morning, the Deputy Premier launched our government's 10-year International Education and Training Strategy to Advance Queensland. Yesterday, the Minister for Tourism and the Minister for Training and Skills highlighted the importance of the double-digit growth in international tourists coming to Queensland. Tourism, education and training are major export industries for Queensland. As an export state, we earned $47 billion over the last 12 months selling our produce and products overseas.

My government is determined to continue to grow our exports, our tourism and our international education. Therefore, I commend the Prime Minister's recent proposal for a special ASEAN-Australia leaders' summit to be held in Australia in 2018. I can advise the House that I have now written to the Prime Minister to propose that Queensland host the ASEAN-Australia summit in 2018. The members of ASEAN—the Association of South-East Asian Nations—include Indonesia, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Brunei, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar and Vietnam. By hosting this summit and welcoming these leaders to Queensland, we can deepen our partnership with these countries.

ASEAN countries are a growing market for our exports, goods and services. Last financial year, Queensland merchandise exports to these countries increased to $3.5 billion. Almost 160,000 tourists from these countries travelled to Queensland in 2014-15 and 12,000 students from these countries studied in Queensland in 2015.

Queensland has the experience to host international government meetings, with the successful G20 world leaders' summit in 2014, the Pacific Islands Forum in 2009 and the APEC Finance Ministers Meeting in 2007. As Premier, I am offering Queensland to host this summit and showcase our state to the leaders of our South-East Asian partners.

Mer Island, Health Services

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.04 pm): My government is working hard to ensure that we have healthy and vibrant communities, even in the most remote regions in Queensland. In July, I was privileged to visit the Torres Strait with the Treasurer. It was my first visit to these remote islands. Both the people and the location make the Torres Strait one of the most beautiful places in the world.

During my three-day trip, I visited Mer Island—a small island in the eastern section of the Torres Strait. Mer Island is also home to the gravesite of the late Uncle Eddie Mabo and I will forever be grateful to the local elders for allowing me the opportunity to visit Uncle Eddie's grave and pay my respects. While on Mer Island, I also had the opportunity to speak with doctors and medical staff at the Mer Primary Health Care Centre. The centre supports the community through a visiting doctor service, nurses, Indigenous health workers and visiting primary healthcare programs. A nurse is on call there 24 hours a day. With the closest referral hospital located approximately 225 kilometres away, this team does an amazing job.

I promised the staff at the Mer Island clinic that I would speak to the Minister for Health and that I would get them the equipment that they need. I am pleased to advise that we are now delivering on that promise. With the assistance of the Minister for Health and his department, we have organised more than $30,000 worth of upgraded health equipment for the centre. Just some of the equipment that Queensland Health has ordered and progressively shipped to Mer Island include a digital otoscope, which improves accurate diagnosis and treatment of ear infections; a new pharmacy fridge for the safe storage of vaccines; a pulse oximeter and paediatric sensor to ensure accurate monitoring of adults, infants and children; blood pressure monitoring equipment; and an exam light to ensure efficient light for fine clinical procedures. Anyone who has travelled to the Torres Strait knows the depth of the health challenges that the local people there face. I am pleased to say that this new equipment will help ensure that the Mer Primary Health Care Centre continues providing the best possible care to local residents.

Science and Innovation

Hon. A PALASZCZUK (Inala—ALP) (Premier and Minister for the Arts) (2.07 pm): Science and innovation are essential ingredients to Queensland's future prosperity. Through my government's Advance Queensland agenda, our state is at the forefront of the development of new products, services and markets for our existing and emerging industries. The promotion of science is fundamental to how we embrace these opportunities. Under the stewardship of the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and the work of her department, Queensland is embracing more opportunities than ever before.

The role of the Queensland Chief Scientist is to provide leadership in science policy development and implementation. The Chief Scientist also provides high-level strategic advice to the government on the role of science, research and innovation in meeting Queensland's economic challenges and seizing our economic opportunities. In doing so, the Chief Scientist provides advice on maximising opportunities from the government's investment in research and development.

Today, I would like to pay tribute to the service of Dr Geoff Garrett AO, who has served as Chief Scientist since January 2011. I am quite sure that I can speak on behalf of the opposition in saying that he has done a mighty fine job. Prior to Dr Garrett's appointment as Chief Scientist, he served as chief executive and member of the board of CSIRO.

Today, I can announce that my government has nominated Professor Suzanne Miller to be Queensland's next Chief Scientist. Professor Miller will continue to serve as Chief Executive Officer and Director of the Queensland Museum Network. Professor Miller's appointment is an ideal opportunity for the Queensland Museum Network to further align with my government's science and innovation agenda and our emphasis on Science, Technology, Engineering and Maths, or STEM. The success of the World Science Festival earlier this year is testament to the importance of collaboration with the Queensland Museum Network. Professor Miller will also collaborate with the Chief Entrepreneur, Mark Sowerby, who was appointed earlier this year to further advance our innovation agenda and help to

deliver jobs and economic opportunities. On behalf of the parliament and the government, once again, I offer my sincere thanks to Dr Garrett for his leadership and I congratulate Professor Miller on her appointment.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Deputy Premier I am informed that we have the former member for Barron River, Mr Michael Trout, observing our proceedings in the gallery.

International Education and Training

Hon. JA TRAD (South Brisbane—ALP) (Deputy Premier, Minister for Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning and Minister for Trade and Investment) (2.09 pm): As ministerial champion for Queensland's international education and training industry, I have today launched a comprehensive plan to turbocharge the industry. The International Education and Training Strategy to Advance Queensland details 36 specific initiatives aimed at boosting IET export revenue from $2.8 billion and 19,000 jobs last year to an estimated $7.5 billion and 26,000 jobs by 2026. The strategy is supported by $25.3 million over the next five years, including a $6 million International Education and Training Partnership Fund. This represents the largest allocation and most comprehensive suite of support for the sector in Queensland's history—and the time is right. International education and training is already one of Queensland's most valuable industries. Only yesterday Deloitte Access Economics highlighted the future growth potential of international education in Queensland. Importantly, many of the benefits flow to regional Queensland. More than a third of international students study outside Brisbane, far and away the highest percentage of any other state. The strategy also has strong support from the sector. Council of International Students vice-president Dion Lee said—

It's great that Queensland is taking the lead in redefining how international students are supported. The strategy establishes international students as partners in charting a quality student experience for the years ahead.

Carol Doyle, president of Study Cairns, said—

The Queensland government has provided an excellent opportunity for regional Queensland to continue to drive growth in the international education sector, improve our local economies and create jobs.

Shannon Willoughby, president of Study Gold Coast, said—

The release of this strategy will help shape the future of our state and ensure that the international education sector in Queensland reaches its full potential, no doubt having positive economic and social impacts that we will all benefit from.

The strategy is built around four key strategic imperatives: promoting Queensland internationally, enhancing the student experience, strengthening our regions and connecting the industry. To inform the strategy implementation, the Queensland government has formed an advisory group with senior representatives from all industry sectors. The strategy also includes an annual industry summit and development of an international education and training partnership plan designed to align our collective marketing efforts.

I now table for the benefit of the House the final strategy. The strategy is also available online at tiq.qld.gov.au. The International Education and Training Strategy to Advance Queensland is a plan for well-paid jobs throughout our state and it will help Queensland thrive in the fastest growing region in our world.

Tabled paper: Trade & Investment Queensland: International Education and Training Strategy to Advance Queensland 2016-2026 [2025].

Business Development Fund

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (2.12 pm): The Palaszczuk government's prime focus is jobs for Queenslanders. We are driving job creation today and are laying the foundations for jobs for future generations of Queenslanders. Since the last election the Palaszczuk government has created 40,400 jobs and brought down unemployment from 6.6 per cent to 6.1 per cent. We know we have more work to do to create more jobs, more growth and new opportunities. A key initiative of the Palaszczuk government's last two state budgets is Advance Queensland. We have allocated $405 million to Advance Queensland to deliver a suite of programs designed to drive science and innovation to help create knowledge based jobs and attract and retain world-leading scientific and entrepreneurial talent. Advance Queensland encourages collaboration between industry and research bodies and to translate ideas and research into commercial outcomes and hone our competitive edge.

Advance Queensland includes the $40 million Business Development Fund which is playing an important role in developing a sustainable private market for venture capital finance in Queensland. I have previously announced to the House two successful recipients in Tridium and JESI Management Solutions. I am pleased to announce that the fund has recently made two more investments in Queensland based companies. Today I can announce that the Business Development Fund has invested $250,000 in MiCare Global to further develop their innovative enterprise management system for the child, disability and aged-care sector. MiCare Global's cloud and mobile-enabled communications portal and compliance platform aggregates multiple apps, programs, functions and solutions into the one system. This helps service providers to streamline their day-to-day operational effectiveness to deliver a greater quality of service.

The Business Development Fund has also invested in Queensland company EFTlab, which will assist them develop their products for the electronic payments market. EFTlab's innovative software architecture has enabled them to develop a flexible payments platform that is customisable and scalable, enabling them to meet the future growth and changing needs of their customers, which include banks and retailers. These are exactly the types of innovative companies the fund is designed to support. These investments are in addition to the matched contribution required from a co-investor, giving these Queensland companies the boost they need to take their business to the next level and continue to create jobs for Queensland.

Investments made to date total over $3.3 million in four innovative initiatives. There continues to be strong interest in the fund from both businesses and investors, with a pipeline of potential businesses and investments being considered by the fund's independent investment panel. The Palaszczuk government's single-minded quest for more jobs for Queenslanders means more broad-based job creation across tourism, mining, agriculture and manufacturing.

In addition, I directed the Queensland Productivity Commission to undertake an inquiry into Queensland's $20 billion manufacturing sector. Today I can announce the commission has released an issues paper on this inquiry. It highlights key focus areas that will be examined and outlines ways industry stakeholders and others can be involved in the inquiry. The Queensland Productivity Commission notes that a robust manufacturing sector has long been associated with high levels of innovation and productivity growth. I strongly encourage manufacturing businesses and other stakeholders to take this opportunity and get involved and put their ideas forward. As I have said before, the government's last two budgets and our policy settings are focused on creating jobs for Queenslanders. We are driving job creation, and the Business Development Fund and the work of the Queensland Productivity Commission are playing an important role in securing our Queensland economy for the future.

Biotechnology, Admedus

Hon. CR DICK (Woodridge—ALP) (Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services) (2.15 pm): Queensland is on the move and clearly becoming an in-demand destination for health and biotechnology companies, both regionally and globally. They want to invest and innovate here due to our talented people, infrastructure, regulatory environment, hospitals and our world-class academic and research institutions. The government's $405 million Advance Queensland initiative is at the heart of our economic program to create the knowledge industries and jobs of the future. Advance Queensland and its programs will help drive innovation in our state, build on our natural advantages and raise Queensland's profile as an attractive investment destination and solution finder for the global healthcare challenges we all face. Indeed, Advance Queensland is helping to bring jobs and business opportunities to Queensland.

Today I was delighted to open Admedus's new office in Brisbane. Admedus is an Australian based ASX listed company that has a global profile in tissue engineering, immunotherapies and biomanufacturing. The fact that Admedus has relocated its global corporate functions of finance, human resources, information technology, customer service and logistics from Perth to Brisbane demonstrates a high level of confidence in Queensland. On my recent trade mission I attended the opening of the new Admedus office in Minneapolis, Minnesota. It was very gratifying to see the international expansion of a successful Australian based company. The relationships we are developing will strengthen the links between the products being developed by Admedus and research work being undertaken in Queensland. Admedus works with Queensland's research trailblazers, such as Professor Ian Frazer and his team in the areas of herpes simplex virus 2 and the human papillomavirus, HPV. The work of Western Australian based Professor Leon Neethling and his team is another shining example of the

kind of work we can expect Admedus to support. Their collaboration has already progressed groundbreaking vascular technology research. This has given hope to patients across the globe with congenital heart defects and related issues. Here in Brisbane alone this research has been used to improve the lives of nearly 400 Queensland children at the Mater hospital.

Relationships like these are paving the way forward for Queensland and bolstering our state's growing reputation as an innovative hub for medical research. Importantly, these relationships are bringing business opportunities and jobs to our state. The biomedical and life sciences sector in Queensland has a total expenditure of around $2.85 billion and exported approximately $275 million of products and services in 2014-15. These figures suggest a world of opportunity awaits our state as we join with Admedus to further explore and capitalise on the biotech market, opportunities which are sure to benefit Queenslanders.

iPledgeQld

Hon. KJ JONES (Ashgrove—ALP) (Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events) (2.18 pm): We want all schoolies to get the message that violence is never okay. I recently joined year 12s at Ferny Grove State High School in the electorate of Ferny Grove to launch the iPledgeQld campaign. Schoolies are being encouraged to make the pledge and take a stand against violence. They will all receive materials in their schoolies pack and will be encouraged to share selfies with the iPledgeQld hashtag.

Today I also want to offer my congratulations and best wishes to all of the seniors for 2016. More than 50,000 year 12 students are busy completing their final exams before they graduate at the end of next week. Some graduates will head straight into the workforce and others will gain entry into university or go on to vocational education and training. Last year we saw 95.2 per cent of Queensland year 12s receive a Queensland certificate of education or Queensland certificate of individual achievement. We also saw 94.9 per cent of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander students achieve a QCE or a QCIA, and this year I hope we can close the gap even further. To this end, today I joined the CEO of the Broncos, Paul White, at the graduation ceremony for the year 12 students who participated in the Beyond the Broncos program. The program supports students through mentoring to achieve their QCE and to achieve attendance rates at school.

Year 12 results and OPs will be published online from Saturday, 17 November and Queensland certificates of education will begin arriving in the mail from Monday, 19 December. On behalf of all the members of the House, I congratulate all the year 12 graduates on their efforts and achievements. I also recognise the hard work and dedication of our teachers, school staff, parents and carers, and I thank them for their support for our year 12 students. Finally, I am sure all members join with me in wishing our school leavers all the very best of luck for the future, and a safe schoolies.

Water Resources

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.20 pm): Economic development and job opportunities in North-West Queensland are now one step closer, following the formal offer of more than 100,000 megalitres of unallocated water from the gulf catchment area. The Palaszczuk government is committed to unlocking access to water in the north-west to support sustainable agriculture, rural industry, jobs and local development in communities throughout the gulf region. Formal letters of offer have been sent to successful tenderers for a total of 107,000 megalitres of general reserve unallocated water from the Flinders, Gregory, Leichardt, Norman and Nicholson river catchments.

Water has been offered in a range of volumes and locations to cater for both small rural producers and larger ventures. Successful tenderers are responding to their offers this month. We will then finalise agreements with the state to enable the progress towards a water licence and access to water to commence as soon as possible. The water licences will include conditions to protect the environmental values of the gulf catchment and ensure existing water users continue to have access to their allocations. It is vital that peak flows continue through the catchments to provide ecological benefits to waterholes, floodplains, estuaries and the important gulf fisheries. Details of individual tenderers are subject to confidentiality while the process is being finalised.

The offers in the gulf follow the recent issuing of 1,780 megalitres of water entitlements from eight management areas within the Great Artesian Basin. My Department of Natural Resources and Mines has granted a total of 15 water licences in central and southern Queensland to support agricultural development, including feedlots and piggeries. The next cab off the rank will be the release of general reserve unallocated water from the Gilbert catchment, to start next year.

Theme Parks, Safety Audit

Hon. G GRACE (Brisbane Central—ALP) (Minister for Employment and Industrial Relations, Minister for Racing and Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (2.22 pm): All members of this House are deeply saddened by the terrible tragedy at Dreamworld. That incident is deeply shocking and again I offer my sincere condolences to the families and friends of those who lost their lives. My department has offered counselling and support to those affected, including workers and the general public who witnessed the terrible event. The department will continue to liaise with family members in these difficult times. The matter is being thoroughly investigated by Queensland police and Workplace Health and Safety Queensland. We will leave no stone unturned so that the causes are identified and action is taken to ensure this never happens again. I believe that the decommissioning of the ride by Dreamworld is a sensible approach.

In addition to the ongoing investigation into this tragedy, last week Workplace Health and Safety inspectors and electrical safety inspectors and engineers commenced a month-long campaign of amusement ride audits at the big six amusement parks: Dreamworld, Wet'n'Wild, Sea World, Aussie World, WhiteWater World and Movie World. Over 90 audits will be conducted in total using the national audit tool for amusement devices, which will provide a comprehensive audit of individual amusement rides. The audits focus on examining inspection and maintenance records and Workplace Health and Safety Queensland is working collaboratively with amusement park operators during this safety blitz. I understand that at each of the parks relevant persons have been contacted in relation to the anticipated dates of audits and that amusement park operators have been provided with a request for documents to enable the audit to be completed promptly. I have been advised that park operators are actively assisting the inspectors to ensure that the audits can be completed in a timely manner.

Since the safety blitz started last week, the audits of amusement rides at Movie World are well advanced. I am advised by Workplace Health and Safety Queensland that only one minor non-consumer safety matter has been identified to date, which was immediately rectified. Movie World has cooperated fully in the audit process, providing all required documentation on request. We expect that the audit will be wrapped up by Friday and that there will be a positive outcome. Yesterday, the Minister for Tourism and Major Events and I met with Movie World staff. I take this opportunity to thank Movie World for being so proactive in responding to the audit process. It is anticipated that all amusement park audits will be completed before the end of the month.

Visiting a theme park in Queensland is one of Australia's truly great tourism experiences. I have visited Dreamworld and other theme parks and I look forward to doing so again. I will continue to update the House on our efforts to ensure public confidence and to keep the visitors coming to the great Gold Coast.

Queensland Rail

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games) (2.25 pm): On a number of occasions I have said that I would provide the House with updates relating to the issues at Queensland Rail, which include correcting erroneous reports. I can confirm for the House that the process of recruitment of drivers and guards has been followed in line with the established practice of many years. The 2013 enterprise agreement signed off by the former government required QR to seek applications from existing employees in the first instance. The same practice exists in the in-principle 2016 agreement and was followed in the recruitment drives of last year and this year.

On 25 October, I announced that the recruitment of an additional 100 drivers and 100 guards would occur. Consistent with the practice and consistent with the 2013 and 2016 enterprise agreements, those applications were opened for internal applicants. I can advise that, at the close of applications, 394 applications were received for the 100 driver positions and a further 505 applications were received for the 100 guard positions. It is important to explain this process because, despite signing off on the internal first recruitment process, the former government never conducted a mass driver recruitment process.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, who was shouting out, 'You don't understand it'? Was that in the chamber or the gallery? I call the minister.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: Prior to 2015, the last major recruitment drive occurred in 2011 when the Premier was the transport minister. The 899 applications for the 200 driver and guard positions are currently being assessed and applicants will be required to undergo psychometric, physical and other

tests. I have said repeatedly that the government is exploring with Queensland Rail a means of fast-tracking and boosting the driver training process. That work is ongoing. QR has already complied with all required steps to source drivers from internal applicants. We have received a strong number of applicants and, following consideration of those applications, QR will determine if external recruitment is required. Those are practices that have been in place for many years, including under the 2013 agreement.

Emergency Vehicle Priority Program

Hon. MC BAILEY (Yeerongpilly—ALP) (Minister for Main Roads, Road Safety and Ports and Minister for Energy, Biofuels and Water Supply) (2.28 pm): In Toowoomba, emergency service vehicles will reach their destinations faster thanks to award-winning traffic technology switched on by the Palaszczuk government this month. The emergency vehicle priority or EVP system is innovative technology that gives fire trucks and ambulances green-light priority when responding to emergencies. The time it could save ambulance or firefighting vehicles arriving at the scene of an emergency and to their later destination, such as a hospital, could be the difference between life and death. The emergency vehicle priority system provides a green light signal for approaching emergency vehicles fitted with the technology when safe to do so. The Department of Transport and Main Roads has been working with the Queensland Ambulance Service and Queensland Fire and Emergency Services to have Toowoomba up and running with this internationally award-winning technology. Currently across Toowoomba there are 28 intersections and 35 Ambulance Service vehicles equipped and running with emergency vehicle priority technology. My department is working on having fire and emergency service vehicles fitted out and operational in coming weeks.

My department has already seen great results in other areas in Queensland where it has been rolled out previously. For example, the independent Australian Road Research Board determined that emergency vehicle priority equipped vehicles on the Gold Coast are showing travel time reductions of up to 26 per cent. The rollout of EVP in Toowoomba has been carried out in conjunction with emergency services to determine the routes and locations where emergency vehicles would have greatest benefit.

Last month the member for Mackay and I announced the rollout of EVP technology at the North Mackay Ambulance Station, following the Palaszczuk government's Whitsundays community cabinet. As well as Mackay and Toowoomba, this year my department activated over 300 sites to the systems already running in South-East Queensland, Townsville and Bundaberg. Cairns, Hervey Bay, Maryborough, Rockhampton and Gladstone are next in line as part of the Palaszczuk government's $13.5 million investment in this technology. Across Queensland there are over 1,550 intersections, 346 ambulances and 70 fire trucks available for use with emergency vehicle priority.

This Transport and Main Roads developed technology has won several awards, including in October 2015 at the International ITS Congress held in Bordeaux, France, where the EVP system won the Hall of Fame award in the local government category. Locally this system has been recognised at the 2016 Australian Road Safety Awards, picking up the State Government Initiatives Award and the Founder's Award for Outstanding Achievement. This is just another example of the Palaszczuk government's commitment to using smart technology to improve our road network to help save lives.

Community Sustainability Action Grants

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.31 pm): I am pleased to announce today that 18 heritage projects will receive a total of $701,944 under the initial round of the Community Sustainability Action grants program. Grants of up to $50,000, excluding GST, will be provided for urgent conservation activities, such as repointing crumbling brickwork, urgent stabilisation works and the control of termites.

Funding will also be provided for projects which seek to develop conservation management plans. These important documents will inform decisions on future conservation works to be conducted on a heritage building. Grant recipients include owners of heritage listed buildings and organisations that are responsible for managing such buildings.

Sites funded under the grant program are located right across Queensland and include the Rocky Creek World War II igloo at Atherton and Loudoun House at Irvinebank. Heritage places are central to our community's character and identity. They allow us to trace our history and feel connected to the important stories about our progress.

This grant funding is a demonstration of the Palaszczuk government's committed to heritage places and will help ensure they are conserved for the enjoyment of generations to come. The heritage category of the grant program received a strong response from Queensland's heritage community with 99 applications received.

The Community Sustainability Action grant program is providing a total of $12 million over three years to 2018-19. Today, I can also announce that the Palaszczuk government is now offering grants of up to $25,000 for sustainability and environmental projects, which will contribute to community action on climate change in Queensland. Climate change has the potential to reduce our quality of life and damage our unique environment in Queensland. Communities have an important role to play in taking action on climate change by working together to reduce our emissions and to build resilience for the environment.

Some $1.92 million is available under this round of conservation grants. Eligible applicants include landcare, environmental community and volunteer groups as well as other not-for-profit groups. The grants aim to assist communities to address the impact of climate change on Queensland's urban spaces and natural environment in innovative ways.

Projects funded under the grant program will improve the sustainability of community facilities and the climate resilience of Queensland's natural landscapes. This includes measures to: improve the energy and water efficiency of community facilities; installation of community gardens and community compost systems; greening of Queensland's urban spaces through revegetation activities and installation of green shading infrastructure on community facilities; and conservation of Queensland's natural resources through weeding and revegetation activities, pest control and litter and marine debris collection. Applications close on Tuesday, 13 December. I urge all members to work with groups in their communities to secure some of these funds.

Science in Parliament

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.34 pm): I would like to thank my parliamentary colleagues who came to our Science in Parliament event earlier today and give an overview of the event for those who missed this great occasion. In Queensland, Science in Parliament is a regular feature on the science calendar. The event provides an opportunity for scientists and innovators to talk to parliamentarians about Queensland science and innovation.

Today our focus was on the relationship between science and sport and how science can improve the wellbeing and performance of our athletes and the community more generally. Given we have recently celebrated the efforts of our 2016 Olympic athletes and we are now gearing up for the Commonwealth Games in 2018, sport and science was the obvious choice of topic for our Science in Parliament event.

Today, in conjunction with the Treasurer and the Minister for the Commonwealth Games, I launched the Advance Queensland Sport Science Challenge to help give our athletes the upper hand at the forthcoming Commonwealth Games. The Sport Science Challenge has three awards of up to $100,000 each for the best sport science innovations. It is very important that the innovations not only have application for our elite athletes but also encourage more Queenslanders to be active. We all know some Queenslanders are not as healthy as they could be and may be prone to disease. Becoming more active could definitely help.

I am looking forward to hearing about the innovations that come from this challenge, whether they are new sensor technologies, new fitness apps, brain training, machine learning, virtual or augmented reality learning or new sports clothing technologies. It will be exciting to see how Queensland will benefit, how these innovations will help our athletes to perform at their best and how they can help everyday Queenslanders be more active and enjoy sport. I look forward to updating the House about the successful innovations following the application process early next year.

Mr Mander interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: I do not know what that interjection was, member for Everton, but you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Advancing Tourism in North Queensland

Hon. CJ O'ROURKE (Mundingburra—ALP) (Minister for Disability Services, Minister for Seniors and Minister Assisting the Premier on North Queensland) (2.36 pm): I am very pleased to say that North Queensland's iconic destinations are taking centre stage in a new plan to boost tourism across the

region. In Mackay last month I was delighted to join the Premier, Minister Jones and many of my colleagues at DestinationQ, where I launched our government's Advancing Tourism in North Queensland strategy.

We know millions of people visit North Queensland every year to experience all that our region has to offer, from Rockhampton to the cape and west to the border. In fact, last year alone visitors spent around $4 billion in North Queensland, which is a strong source of jobs in the region. It is no wonder that visitors continue to flock to our great part of the state. North Queensland offers iconic cultural and natural destinations that draw visitors from all over the world. From the Great Barrier Reef to an outback adventure or rainforest retreat, there really is something for everyone in our diverse region.

We know that tourism is key to unlocking the north's full potential, and that is why it is one of my priority areas to advance North Queensland's economy. Our new tourism plan outlines actions to address the industry's key challenges, and also identifies four key action areas to develop the industry in the north. These include: growing quality products, events and experiences; investing in infrastructure and access; building a skilled workforce; and seizing the opportunities in Asia.

There is no doubt that tourism is booming here in Queensland. We want to ensure this success is shared right across the north. Through our Advancing Tourism in North Queensland plan and opportunities like DestinationQ, we will see the north's tourism industry go from strength to strength.

Social Housing

Hon. MC de BRENNI (Springwood—ALP) (Minister for Housing and Public Works) (2.38 pm): All Queenslanders deserve to live in a safe and comfortable home that accommodates their needs, particularly as those needs change. The capital works we undertake across the state, be they new builds or refurbishments, make a very real difference to the hundreds of thousands of people in most need of support. I am advised that since June last year this government has spent more than $18.7 million to modify social housing dwellings so that tenants with changing needs can continue to live in them.

There have been minor and major works all across Queensland—for example, 263 dwellings in the Cairns Housing Service Centre region, 307 in Woodridge here in Logan and 250 in Buranda to ensure the old and young and those with disabilities continue to have a place to call home. For some of our social housing tenants, those refurbishments are things such as grab rails and door ramps, toilet and bathroom modifications, wider doorways and soft-close doors. They are small projects but they can have an immense impact on people's lives. They assist men and women in Queensland to live with dignity.

For other tenants, there have been more substantial changes including 64 dwellings in Townsville, 53 in Ipswich and 14 in Bundaberg. We are talking here of redesigning and upgrading kitchens to make them accessible to people living with restricted mobility and building wider pathways to facilitate adequate ingress and egress to a property.

We are committed to ensuring that, where they can, seniors and Queenslanders with disabilities are able to age in place. This keeps us all in communities we know and trust while reducing the need to source additional social housing and the demands on support services. I am proud to advise the House that almost 50 per cent of the new dwellings completed since June 2015 are aligned with the Livable Housing Design guidelines, making them suitable for tenants with impaired mobility.

Not only is this department providing best-fit dwellings for people in need; the schedule of works for new builds has been estimated to support jobs for more than 3,700 local tradespeople. This is a government that not only helps people in their homes but also helps Queenslanders stay in work.

Skilling Queenslanders for Work

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (2.40 pm): Today it gives me great pleasure to announce that a significant milestone—that being 10,000 participants—for the highly successful Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative has been not only achieved last month but exceeded. October figures show that we have surpassed this figure, with 11,137 people having been assisted through Skilling Queenslanders for Work. These 11,137 participants have now commenced training and have either gained or are in the process of gaining the skills and confidence to help them get a job. This is an outstanding achievement and should be celebrated. Further, over 3,500 of these participants have already secured jobs as a direct result of Skilling Queenslanders for Work.

People in jobs is what the Palaszczuk government is all about. These Skilling Queenslanders for Work participants are real people who need extra support to undertake training and are completing qualifications and are on a pathway to gaining jobs in their local communities. Mr Speaker, after talking to participants on projects, I can tell you that this initiative has a direct impact on Queenslanders' lives. I also wish to congratulate the community sector as they are a key cornerstone to the ongoing success of this initiative.

Skilling Queenslanders for Work continues to impress, with latest participation trends showing that those most in need are being assisted—63 per cent are youth aged 15 to 24 years old, 18 per cent are migrants and refugees from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds, 18 per cent identify as Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander, 51 per cent are long-term unemployed and 14 per cent are mature aged 45 years and over.

Not only has Skilling Queenslanders for Work assisted 11,137 Queenslanders; it is also achieving strong outcomes, with 55 per cent of exited participants so far achieving a positive outcome of being in employment, returning to school or going on to further training or a combination of these outcomes. We know from previous experience that this outcome percentage will grow, with over 60 per cent of people expected to be in employment after 12 months.

So far we have committed $97 million, which is funding community driven training projects, skills development and direct job creation through traineeship opportunities. We also know from the Deloitte Access Economic evaluation of Skilling Queenslanders for Work in 2012 that more than this amount will be returned to the economy once the participants gain jobs. Finally, it is my pleasure that I have the opportunity today to demonstrate 11,137 very good reasons why it was so critical that we reinstated Skilling Queenslanders for Work.

WATER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (UNDERGROUND WATER MANAGEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Cognate Debate

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.43 pm), by leave, without notice: I move—

That:

- in accordance with standing order 172, the Water Legislation Amendment Bill and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be treated as cognate bills for their remaining stages, as follows:
  - (a) second reading debate, with separate questions being put in regard to the second readings;
  - (b) the consideration of the bills in detail together; and
  - (c) separate questions being put for the third readings and long titles.
- notwithstanding anything contained in the standing and sessional orders:
  - (a) the time limits and order for moving the second readings shall be: the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines—60 minutes, followed by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef—60 minutes; followed by the Leader of the Opposition or nominees—60 minutes (each bill); and
  - (b) the time limits and order for reply to the second readings debate shall be: Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines—30 minutes, followed by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef—30 minutes.

Question put—That the motion be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

NOTICE OF MOTION

Lockout Laws

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (2.45 pm): I give notice that I will move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk Labor government to scrap the introduction of a 1 am lockout from 1 February 2017 because it will destroy jobs, destroy our tourism reputation and make no credible difference to violence in our late night entertainment precincts.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Lee, Master M

Ms BATES (Mudgeeraba—LNP) (2.45 pm): I rise today to speak on behalf of Queenslanders and their ongoing concerns at the lack of action and perceived silence and secrecy around Child Safety's handling of the death of Mason Jet Lee. At today's silent protest a letter to the Premier was handed to me by Act for Mason, a group of mothers looking for answers. I will now read from the letter, which I will also table. The letter states—

To Annastacia Palaszczuk MP, Premier of Queensland,

We, concerned citizens of Brisbane, call on the Queensland Government to explain how the system failed Mason Jett Lee.

Many Queenslanders' trust in the Child Safety System has been completely shattered and dissolved because of the severity of Mason's story. Many of us have been thrown into a reality that has left in its wake feelings of great anxiety. We need answers and updates from our current Child Safety Minister, Shannon Fentiman. But the delay in actions taken, lack of empathy, urgency, communication and accountability shown to counteract this wrong, has left the public feeling completely disheartened and frustrated. Where is the leadership needed to right this wrong!

More than 30,000 concerned Queenslanders have put their names to an online petition calling for policy changes to provide more stringent intervention procedures for children at risk in the state's child safety system, in the wake of the death of little Mason Lee.

So here we are today, demonstrating to the Queensland government that Mason Jett Lee will continue to have a public voice. We call for bi-partisan support within Queensland government to legislate **Mason Jett Lee's Law**, which proposes that: **No child who is referred by a doctor, as having sustained injuries intentionally inflicted or sexual in nature will be sent home until a full investigation is completed. These children will be treated in the same manner as a 000 phone call: A LIFE AT RISK, and will be treated as a priority emergency.**

Giving doctors and medical staff authority to only report abuse cases to the Child Safety Department when it is already so heavily under resourced, is just **NOT** good enough. Using words like 'reviews' and 'investigations' only increases the public's anxiety, patronizes our intelligence and creates further frustration.

Having MASON JETT LEE'S LAW in place, will enforce that the department of Child Safety keep up with the demands enforced by medical professionals. The hospitals will be a 'stop gate' for abused children until 'Child Safety' fulfill their requirements to conduct a full investigation.

With close to 1,100 suspected child abuse cases being closed with no actions taken, the importance of enforcing this law is undeniable.

It is important that the calls by thousands of Queenslanders are not ignored. Please ease the public's anxiety and renew our confidence in the system by putting in place 'Mason Jett Lee's Law'.

Kind regards,

Katherine Christensen
Brisbane Co-Coordinator
Act for Mason

Tabled paper: Letter, dated 9 November 2016, from the Brisbane Co-Coordinator of CT for Mason, Ms Katherine Christensen, to the Premier and Minister for the Arts, Hon. Annastacia Palaszczuk, regarding Mason Jet Lee and the child protection system [2026].

We should never let the death of Mason Jet Lee be forgotten, and we must ensure that we do whatever we can to prevent it from ever happening again.

Small Business

Hon. CW PITT (Mulgrave—ALP) (Treasurer, Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships and Minister for Sport) (2.48 pm): Obviously we have seen another day where the lazy Leader of the Opposition, the member for Clayfield, wakes up, rolls out of bed, reads the newspaper and gets his tips from the newspaper that he will no doubt be asking questions about today, and he will go and lie in his hammock. We are going to hear all sorts of things today from the member for Indooroopilly, who no doubt will run the same lines that we have seen in his press release today that the LNP is apparently the saviour of small business. Let us look at what happens when it comes to small business in this state and which government has been providing support verses the rhetoric that those opposite continue to put out there.

Let us look at funding for small business under our government versus the last government. The LNP when it came to office in 2012 cut small business support. Those opposite abolished the small business commissioner. They cut $700,000 from the Mentoring for Growth program. They cut online business services. They cut 20 per cent of staff in DTESB. They had a litany of broken promises, but

one of the big ones to the business community was the payroll tax threshold increase of $100,000 each year over six years which they were meant to deliver. How many did they deliver in their three years? They delivered one. That was one of their key signature policies. They must have had some explaining to do to the business community. We have a different view, of course. We have a payroll tax initiative which looks at hiring apprentices and trainees because we believe we get a direct employment benefit out of our payroll tax liability reduction through this rebate.

When we look at the amount of funding over the 2012-15 period of the LNP in office, they were funding small business between $7 million and $9 million a year. The Palaszczuk government has boosted this spending to $12.9 million in 2015-16 and $18.8 million in the current financial year. We brought back government support for small business. I think we have the best small business minister we have seen in Queensland for many a year. The member for Algester is doing a terrific job engaging with the small business community. She has established the Office of Small Business and the five-year Advancing Small Business Queensland Strategy, which is a $22.7 million investment from this government in small business.

What small business needs most is customers. When those opposite, particularly the member for Clayfield in his first budget, pushed 14,000 people out the door, that had a chilling effect on demand. We know that the opposition leader does not believe public sector jobs are real jobs. We understand that he thinks the only real jobs are those in the private sector. Presumably he thinks that the wages of those public sector workers were not real wages either. When they used to spend in small businesses, clearly they were not spending real money in local businesses. Anyone around George Street and the Brisbane CBD knows that, after the massive public sector purge that happened under the member for Clayfield, coffee shops were closing. Everyone relied on people spending money in the economy. What they did was smother the Queensland economy. We will hear crocodile tears from those opposite today. We know that the real friend of small business in this state is the Australian Labor Party.

Gold Coast Commonwealth Games, Venues

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2.51 pm): What an interesting day this is. It started off fantastically with the great win from the parliamentary country touch team. Go country! That is five years in a row. It was at the mighty Suncorp Stadium, but thanks to those over there we now have to call it Brisbane Stadium (Lang Park).

Let us talk about other stadiums. We know that no-one has confidence in this incompetent Palaszczuk Labor government to deliver the Commonwealth Games venues on time. Now we have learned of another delay of a vital games venue—the Suns' wing of the Carrara sports centre, part of the $126 million Commonwealth Games precinct. Remember this was the venue that was originally going to be finished last month, in October 2016, but in estimates the Commonwealth Games minister said that that was being pushed back.

The LNP has always known it is the unions that decide when these venues will be finished and handed over. This government certainly does not have the stomach to stand up to its union mates. That is why during estimates this year I asked the Minister for State Development whether there would be any delays in delivering these facilities. The Minister for State Development did not want to answer the question and hid behind his director-general, who assured me that all the venues would be delivered on time and that the only one that had lost hours due to union action was Carrara. What have we found out now? More delays are on the cards. I table an article from AAP titled 'Union blamed for delay to Suns' new training facility'.

Tabled paper: Article from afl.com.au, dated 8 November 2016, titled 'Union blamed for delay to Suns' new training facility' [2027].

The Suns were hopeful of moving back in in October, as promised. Then they thought it would be November, but now it has been pushed out by a further two months due to union activity. This is what the Suns' CEO, Andrew Travis, said of the situation—

Our ideal scenario was that we would be completely moved in for day one of preseason but the broader project has slipped back. It is due to the CFMEU situation. We have been caught up in that without any ability to influence it.

That is what the CEO of the Suns said about this incompetent government. This is unacceptable given that several LNP shadow ministers raised this issue during estimates. This is an incompetent Labor government which is beholden to its union mates and obviously will not be delivering the Commonwealth Games venues on time.

Queensland Economy

Hon. LM ENOCH (Algester—ALP) (Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business) (2.55 pm): The Palaszczuk government has a plan for Queensland's economy and, in particular, a plan to support small business as a key driver of economic growth and employment opportunities. On that note, I would like to acknowledge the member for Ashgrove for all the work that she did as the former minister for small business. She taught me everything I know.

Our economic plan is setting the right conditions for business growth after the disaster of the Newman government. Reputable surveys, analysis and hard data show the benefits of working cooperatively with small business to generate new investment, new opportunities and new jobs. For example, the Deloitte Access Economics state outlook predicts nation-leading 3.8 per cent GSP growth to 2019 and potentially over the next decade. The NAB monthly business survey ranks us equal second with New South Wales on business confidence—trend—and ahead of Victoria. We are seeing these positive results because the Palaszczuk government is listening to small businesses and delivering programs to meet their needs.

In this year's budget we announced our $22.7 million Advancing Small Business Queensland Strategy with direct support for business operators. It puts in place programs that help small business grow, innovate and take advantage of digital platforms. We are expanding the Mentoring for Growth program—which the former LNP government slashed $700,000 from—an incredibly successful program. We are expanding that now to help small business meet challenges in their operations.

Yesterday I opened the $6 million Small Business Digital Grants program to help them enter the digital economy—something the LNP would never have done. Last month the $6 million Accelerate Small Business Grants Program was opened to support high-growth potential small businesses go to the next level by embedding high-level expertise within their enterprise, and we are acting on recommendations provided by the Red Tape Reduction Advisory Council, established by the member for Ashgrove in her time as the minister for small business, to reduce the regulatory burden for small business.

We also have a range of programs across government that are supporting small business instead of hurting small business, as the former government did. Our government has rolled out the regionally focused Back to Work program offering $10,000 or $15,000 incentives for engaging new staff. We have doubled the payroll tax rebate from 25 per cent to 50 per cent. By contrast, the LNP did nothing but cut jobs and services. They ignored the concerns of small business and have never stopped talking down the Queensland economy. As treasurer, the Leader of the Opposition cut small business support, he abolished the small business commissioner, oversaw $700,000 worth of cuts to the Mentoring for Growth program and cut online business services. It is very clear that there is only one party which supports small business in Queensland, and that party is Labor.

(Time expired)

Small Business

Mr EMERSON (Indooroopilly—LNP) (2.58 pm): What a change a day makes. Yesterday they wanted to cherrypick Deloitte's report. They wanted to ignore the reality of what that report says. Today they want to shoot the messenger of the CCIQ report. What do we hear from them? What a terrific job they are doing! The only people who do not believe them are the small business people. If we look at the CCIQ report, is it any wonder? What involvement has the Treasurer ever had in small business? We have run small businesses on this side. He has never run a small business.

Let us see what the CCIQ report says. Almost two in three businesses—60.9 per cent—believe the Palaszczuk government's policy works against them, not for them. That is the terrific job that the Labor Party is doing for small business—almost two in three. The reports says that 61.1 per cent of businesses rate the Labor government's performance as poor or very poor. That is a terrific job, according to Labor. The ministers think they are doing a terrific job, but that is not what small business is telling everyone else. The report also says that 65.6 per cent of businesses rate the government's performance when it comes to stimulating growth and job creation as poor or very poor.

Government members interjected.

Mr EMERSON: I will repeat that for those who did not want to listen to it, because they are not listening to small business. They are telling small business what a great job the government is doing, except small business does not believe them and that is what the CCIQ report says. It says that 65.6 per

cent of businesses rate the government's performance when it comes to stimulating growth and job creation as poor or very poor. When asked when they would like to see the next election, they answered, 'As soon as possible'. They want to get rid of this government, despite the terrific job Labor is doing, according to the Treasurer. No-one in small business believes him.

We believe that small business is the backbone of this economy. We believe in the 400,000 small businesses out there. We believe in the one million people that small businesses employ, but small business has no faith in the Labor Party. These are damming figures. This is what small business is saying. They are out there on the front lines, doing it tough, working hard, trying to make a crust. That lot over there are against small business. That is what this report says. The report says 'poor' or 'very poor'. The report says that Labor does not support small business, it does not believe in investment, it does not believe in business and it does not believe in jobs. That is the reality. To have the Treasurer say today that Labor is doing a terrific job is a further slap in the face to small businesses out there.

QUESTIONS WITHOUT NOTICE

Mr SPEAKER: Question time will finish at 4.01 pm.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Small Business

Mr NICHOLLS (3.01 pm): My question is to the Premier. I refer to the poll released today that shows that almost 90 per cent of small business operators believe this government's policies are not providing any benefit to them. Will the government change its policies to protect the jobs of nearly one million Queenslanders employed by this important sector of the Queensland economy and allow small businesses to employ more Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. On this side of the House, we support jobs for Queenslanders. We are the party for jobs. This is so ironic coming from the Leader of the Opposition. When he was treasurer, he sacked 14,000 people as a minimum. That is their track record. Their track record is not standing up for people in this state and not standing up for jobs in this state. We have just heard from the Minister for Training that 11,000 people have gone through Skilling Queenslanders for Work. On that side of the House, they axed that program, they cut that program.

Let us talk about small business. I am more than happy to talk about small business. My government recently hosted a reception for the small business community and they liked what they saw. In the Whitsundays recently, we met with members of the chamber of commerce and small business and we talked to them about our small business program.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: There is over $22 million in the budget to support small business in this state. We will continue to work with the community. Our Advance Queensland agenda has $405 million aimed at growing a new economy in this state. We are focused on small business. Whether it is small entrepreneurs, whether it is getting people to come to our state from overseas or interstate, we will back small business. What I say to those opposite is: rather than whinging and whining, how about you start showing some support for Queensland. Those opposite should start backing Queenslanders, not sacking Queenslanders, as I have said in this House many times before.

Whilst I am on my feet, I am more than happy to talk about the achievements in small business and in particular thank the Minister for Small Business for her work that she has been doing across the state. We are focused on having an Office of Small Business. I have mentioned our $22.7 million Advancing Small Business Queensland Strategy. As the minister mentioned in this House before, she has just opened up grants for digital access and help for small business in this state. We have our small business entrepreneur grants opening in January 2017. We have Mentoring for Growth. We have established the Red Tape Reduction Advisory Council. We also had the highly successful 2016 Queensland Small Business Week. I will stand on my record when it comes to dealing with small business and it is about time those opposite got on board as well.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition for his second question, member for Whitsunday, you are warned under standing order 253A for those interjections made earlier. They were disorderly. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Small Business

Mr NICHOLLS: My second question is to the Premier. I refer to today's poll which shows that two-thirds of small business operators say the Palaszczuk government's performance is poor or very poor at creating new jobs. Does the Premier accept that her government's poor performance and lack of recognition of small business puts at risk the jobs of nearly one million Queenslanders who are employed by this important sector of the Queensland economy and the ability to allow small business to employ more Queenslanders?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. How ironic is this question coming from the man over there who did not even stand up for jobs in this state. What did the Queensland public think of the performance of the former treasurer at the polls last time? They gave a very clear indication about what they thought of the performance of the former treasurer. That performance was marked dismally because the LNP had the largest majority that Queensland had ever seen and look where they are today. Their performance in relation to jobs was appalling and dismal. Whilst I am on my feet, I am more than happy to talk about jobs and promoting the private sector in our state.

Mr Seeney: All you do is talk about jobs.

Ms PALASZCZUK: I will take that interjection: 'All I do is talk about jobs.' Yes, that is right. I will take that interjection and let us talk about it.

Mr Seeney interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Callide, you are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Under my government, the unemployment rate is down. The Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services is putting on more doctors and more nurses. The Minister for Education is looking at front-line services and putting on more teachers and teacher aides. The Minister for Transport is putting on more train drivers.

Honourable members interjected.

Ms PALASZCZUK: Yes, that is what we are doing. The Minister for Training—

Mr Furner interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ferny Grove, you are warned under standing order 253A. Those interjections are not necessary.

Mr Boothman: Own goal.

Mr SPEAKER: Who called out 'own goal'?

Mr Boothman: Me.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Albert, you are also warned under standing order 253A. That is an own goal.

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Minister for Environment is talking about more rangers; they were savagely cut under those opposite. The Minister for Police has more police on the beat. The Minister for Training said that 11,000 people have gone through Skilling Queenslanders for Work. We will continue to back Queenslanders, we will continue to promote jobs, we will continue to drive the economy. It is obvious that those opposite have not even looked at the Deloitte report and they have not even bothered to talk about that. We will always be standing up for jobs and creating new jobs right throughout this state.

Aurukun, Education

Mr HARPER: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the House on the efforts to improve educational outcomes in Aurukun?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for Thuringowa for that very important question. From the outset, I would like to thank the Minister for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Partnerships who has been up to Aurukun on a number of occasions, and I know that the Minister for Police has been up there as well. The Minister for Education and I have also had the opportunity to visit the community to look firsthand and speak to the people at a community function. I want to pay tribute to the mayor for all of his work and to the community that is working together to look at the overall future of the Aurukun community.

As I said, Queensland is a very large state. We need to be responsive to communities, whether they are in the cape, out west or in the Torres Strait. That is exactly what a government should be doing. It is about focusing on delivering the right outcomes and delivering services. I want to thank the Minister for Education because we know how important education is for Queenslanders no matter where they live. In particular, we want to make sure that we can deliver the best educational outcomes for the people who are living in Aurukun. That is why I am very pleased today that I can announce that we have appointed a new executive principal to lead the Aurukun school campus from 2017. Experienced primary and secondary teacher and principal Mike Ennis has accepted the role. He is currently the principal of MacGregor State School. Earlier in his teaching career he taught in Aurukun and is an outstanding principal who is highly regarded amongst his colleagues. He will lead a quality teaching and learning agenda to ensure that we have improved outcomes and achievements for the students in Aurukun.

Whilst I am on my feet I want to talk about the attendance rates at Aurukun because I know the Minister for Education has been working very closely with the school community. I can confirm today that attendance rates have improved from 49 per cent in week 1 of term 3 to 53 per cent in week 9 of term 3. This is great news. I want to recognise the greater involvement of the parents and community engagement in Aurukun. The P&C met in August and October and has been working very closely with the local community to give them a greater voice in relation to school decisions.

I also want to thank the local Wik people because they are working very closely on developing a language curriculum for prep and preprep. It is very important that we keep the culture alive in these local communities. I understand they will be ready to go for preprep students during 2017.

Finally, in addition to direct instruction, the Australian curriculum is now taught in Aurukun. We are working with Good to Great Schools Australia to secure a new service agreement for direct instruction in Aurukun, Coen and Hope Vale. I would like to especially thank the mayor for all of his support as well as the Minister for Education.

Mr SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Indooroopilly, I am informed that earlier I acknowledged our colleagues from the Northern Territory Legislative Assembly. Unfortunately, they were not in the chamber at the time. They were visiting elsewhere in the parliamentary precinct. I now acknowledge Mr Jeff Collins MLA, Mrs Robyn Lambley MLA, Ms Kate Worden MLA and Mr Scott McConnell MLA. Welcome. I hope you enjoy our proceedings.

Palaszczuk Labor Government, Small Business

Mr EMERSON: My question is to the Premier. I ask: how can small business have confidence in this government when six months after being announced a small business commissioner still has not been appointed by this asleep-at-the-wheel government?

Ms PALASZCZUK: I thank the member for the question. I am advised by the Minister for Small Business that the position is in the final stages of appointment. Let me make it clear that, unlike those opposite, we want to make sure we get the right people. We saw what happened under the previous government when people like Michael Caltabiano were appointed as the DG and we then saw the high payout. On this side of the House we advertise, we get the right people to apply and we go through interview processes. We do not go and cherrypick and hand-pick mates. There is something called merit based appointments, unlike those opposite

Mr Nicholls: Falling asleep at the wheel.

Ms PALASZCZUK: We are still waiting for policies—I would like to see their small business policy. Have they got one of those yet? Probably not.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, it is not an opportunity for continual argument across the chamber. Premier, do you have anything further you wish to add?

Ms PALASZCZUK: Finally, I want to add we continue to support small business throughout this state.

Queensland Economy

Mr PEGG: My question is of the Treasurer. I ask: will the Treasurer outline to the House any recent commentary on business confidence? Will the Treasurer also outline the facts in relation to the most recent available assessments?

Mr PITT: I thank the member for the question, from someone who has a keen interest in how we support confidence in our business community and consumers in this state. I also add that the last question from the member for Indooroopilly was an absolute doozy. To be honest, abolishing the small business commissioner, as they did, and asking a question about how long it has taken for us to reappoint someone is quite absurd. I will get back to the question asked by the member for Stretton.

Mr Hinchliffe: They are really good at backing people.

Mr PITT: They are very good at it; I take that interjection from the minister. The National Australia Bank monthly business survey has been ranking Queensland at the top or near top in terms of business confidence since we handed down the 2015-16 budget. Not everyone on that side of politics cherrypicks. We have heard Malcolm Turnbull, the Prime Minister, quote the NAB index in February to say 'business confidence is strongest in Queensland'. For all the things I might have a go at the Prime Minister about, he gets the reputable survey. We have consistently referenced this survey. Past statements by the former treasurer contained only one mention of this particular survey in the entire time he was the treasurer. Maybe that was because in the October 2012 NAB monthly business survey there was some commentary about his 'destructive' first budget. It said—

... trend confidence in the mainland states remained strongest in WA (+5), while confidence was most subdued in Queensland (-4) ...

Queensland was the most subdued of all states in 2012 under the former treasurer, the member for Clayfield. That is why we never heard him talk about the NAB monthly business survey until yesterday when they could cherrypick a negative out of it, but they got that wrong, too. There was some suggestion that there was a significant slide in business confidence in the NAB survey. The NAB survey for October put us at equal second with New South Wales, with South Australia in first place. The trend figures show a rating of positive six compared with a national figure of five, and remember our ranking was equal with New South Wales. We do not hear them attacking the New South Wales government for having a terrible decline and a sharp fall in business confidence. Why? Because they know they cannot benchmark this against anything. True to form, there was more cherrypicking going on. We know that the seasonally adjusted figures show a bigger fall for Queensland, so they are going to run with that.

If they are going to continue to cherrypick, let us talk about it. They keep trying to slam the government using the CommSec report. They always leap on any hint of negativity in those reports. However, they did not shout this passage from the rooftops, which appeared in the 2012 September edition. This was obviously after the cataclysmic first budget from Tim Nicholls, the member for Clayfield. It stated—

... the substantial tightening in fiscal policy announced by the Newman ... Government in its maiden Budget ... will weigh on the Queensland economy over the coming financial years and beyond.

That is exactly what we have been saying—because of the cuts that they made to jobs and services. That affects small business, which is the line of questioning that those opposite are running today. If people do not have a job, they have no money and it is not going into the economy. They smothered the Queensland economy.

Queensland Rail, Train Crew

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: My question without notice is to the Premier. I table an article that appeared today in which QR has publicly contradicted the minister about train driver recruitment. I ask: how much more evidence does the Premier need to come to the same conclusion as Queensland commuters that the minister is out of his depth, not across his brief and should be sacked immediately?

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 9 November 2016, titled 'Union's Train Driver Cartel'. [2028]

Ms PALASZCZUK: The Minister for Transport made a detailed ministerial statement today talking about the recruitment processes in relation to the train drivers being exactly the same procedures that were signed under the enterprise agreement—

Mr Nicholls: No, that is not what QR say.

Ms PALASZCZUK: No. Signed by—this is my understanding.

Mr Nicholls interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Leader of the Opposition, a question has been asked of the Premier. She is answering. It is relevant. I would urge you not to unnecessarily interject.

Ms PALASZCZUK: It is the same enterprise agreement signed under the former government. There is nothing new. My understanding is that it is completely the same and it is the same practice. The minister also outlined the overwhelming number of applications that have been received from those people wishing to become train drivers and also guards. Queensland Rail is focused on delivering the reliable timetable, and the minister is 100 per cent focused on ensuring that the issue is fixed, and the minister has been making numerous updates to the House in relation to this matter.

Health Infrastructure

Mr PEARCE: My question is of the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister please update the House on how the Palaszczuk government is investing in health infrastructure in Queensland?

Mr DICK: I thank the member for Mirani for his question and his passionate commitment to regional Queensland, not just the constituents of the electorate of Mirani but Queenslanders who live in regional parts of our state who contribute so much to our economy and represent so much of what makes Queensland great—the fabric of Queensland society. He has been a tireless advocate for them over many decades of service in this parliament.

Since our election in February 2015, the Palaszczuk Labor government has continued Labor's tradition of investing in health infrastructure across Queensland—not just in the cities and not just in the regions but also in the bush. In fact, our government has committed over half a billion dollars in new funding for health infrastructure across the state. In last year's budget we committed $180 million over four years under the Enhancing Regional Hospitals program to deliver a new hospital at Roma, new emergency departments at Gladstone and Hervey Bay and a substantial refurbishment at Caloundra Hospital. We have also allocated $230 million over five years under our Advancing Queensland's Health Infrastructure program, which will deliver substantial refurbishments at the Thursday Island Hospital—I know that will be of interest to the member for Cook—a significant refurbishment of the Atherton Hospital, the upgrade of Nambour Hospital as we transition to the opening of the Sunshine Coast University Hospital—and we will complete that hospital—and temporary car park solutions, I am pleased to say, at Logan and Caboolture hospitals. We have also committed more than $100 million in funding to replace or significantly refurbish facilities at locations including Alpha, Aramac, Aurukun, Boulia, Cloncurry, Dimbulah, McKinlay, Palm Island, the Townsville paediatric ward and Wynnum, not to mention mental health facilities at Bundaberg, Gladstone and Mackay and $80 million in small projects such as the new kitchen and laundry at Proserpine. I have been out to Cunnamulla, where we are building a new laundry—a laundry that has not been built for decades. Big or small, Labor is delivering. What did those members opposite do? They built a monument to themselves: 1 William Street.

A government member: Shame!

Mr DICK: That is a shame. I will take the interjection. What a disgrace. It is going to cost the taxpayer $2.4 billion over 15 years.

Mr Springborg interjected.

Mr DICK: The member for Southern Downs can call out, but it took a Labor government to build the Roma Hospital 70 years ago and it has taken a Labor government to build the hospital in the 2010s. For 40 years in a row those opposite held Warrego and they never built anything in that city. If it were not for Labor there would be nothing happening in the bush. I tell you, the people in Roma know about the monument—a taj mahal—to politicians at 1 William Street. That was the LNP's priority. Our priority is delivering for Queenslanders wherever they live.

Queensland Rail, Train Crew

Mr POWELL: My question without notice is of the Minister for Transport. Last week the minister said external recruitment of qualified train drivers would commence this week. I ask: given his ministerial statement this afternoon, has the minister been rolled by the RTBU?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for Glasshouse for the question. What I have explained on a number of occasions, including this morning, is that the recruitment process undertaken by Queensland Rail is a process that has been in place for many years. It was reaffirmed under the former government—with deference to you, Mr Speaker—under the Newman government where the 2013 enterprise agreement confirmed the arrangements around an internal process that needs to be undertaken before any external recruitment processes can occur. What I referred to last week was the

fact that, under the internal recruitment process, the application process would close on Monday this week. In fact, it closed at 5 pm on Monday, 7 November. I have advised the House today of the level of internal interest and the number of internal applications there have been. Under the arrangements set in place in 2013 and continued under the in-principle arrangements in the 2016 enterprise agreement, the next stage would be to go to external recruitment.

What is happening now is the assessment and consideration of the 899 applications for the 200 positions which have come from the internal applications process. What we are seeing now is the assessment of those applications. It is utterly appropriate and right that those people who have come through that process are being assessed for their suitability for the positions. As I have reiterated on a number of occasions, internal recruitment is the best and quickest way to get drivers and guards into position. They are the people who have the route knowledge, who have the understanding of the stations, the network and the rolling stock that is used in the Citytrain network. They are in the best position to be trained up for the driver and guard positions. The next step, as is clearly outlined in the process and as agreed to by everyone—including those opposite in 2013—is to go to external recruitment should we not fill the positions through the internal process.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Glasshouse, you asked the question and I think you continually raised interjections throughout the whole of the minister's answer. I did not count how many times. You are warned under standing order 253A. If you persist I will take the appropriate action.

Tourism Industry

Ms LINARD: My question is of the Minister for Education and Minister for Tourism and Major Events. Will the minister advise how the Palaszczuk government's record tourism investment is helping to secure the best events for Queensland?

Ms JONES: I thank the honourable member for the question. Of course any opportunity to talk about how we are attracting new and great events to Queensland I will grab with both hands, because we know through our funding guarantee—which I talk a lot about in this House—we have been able to secure 15 new major events to Queensland. Not only have we secured new events to Queensland; we have also renewed major events that put Queensland on the map right across our country and internationally.

Today I had the opportunity to join with Tennis Australia to renew a five-year deal for the Brisbane International. We know that this is a growing tennis tournament on the calendar, and many of our stars are choosing to start their tennis season by playing here at the Brisbane International. I can confirm today that Rafael Nadal will be playing here for the very first time.

A government member interjected.

Ms JONES: I take the interjection. Yes, 'Rafa' is coming to Brisbane and we are going to put out the welcome mat for him. Indeed, we have five of the top 10 male players in the world coming to play at next year's Brisbane International. It was great for me to join John Millman, our local hero who went to the Olympics recently, in launching the Brisbane International and the five-year agreement that we have secured.

We are delivering when it comes to events in Queensland. I love a good event: Queensland Supercars, bringing $40 million to the Queensland economy; more than 7,000 people went to the Big Red Bash, delivering $6 million in economic activity to outback Queensland; Blues on Broadbeach, another major event sponsored by the Queensland government, brought $20 million to the Gold Coast economy; close to 700 visitors went to the Vision Splendid Outback Film Festival in Winton, bringing Hollywood to the outback; and the Global Tens, a brand-new event secured by this government which will see a weekend of Rugby heaven right here in Brisbane in 2017.

While we get on with the job of creating work and stimulating the Queensland economy, all we get from those opposite is knocking and knocking and knocking. I know they want to make Queensland great again by cutting jobs, sacking nurses, sacking doctors and sacking teachers. That is their track record. What did they deliver for Queensland? A growth rate of 0.8 per cent. Do members know what happens when the growth rate falls to 0.8 per cent? The economy stagnates and small businesses close, and what we saw in 2013 was a record 44 small businesses closing in this country every single day. That is their record on small business, and I saw it when small business owners came to my office in tears during the campaign because they had to shut up shop because they ground our economy to a halt. The member for Clayfield will always be known as 'Mr 0.8 per cent'. While they shrink the economy, we grow the economy.

(Time expired)

Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games

Mr LANGBROEK: I would like to ask my question without notice to the minister for the Commonwealth Games but Peter Beattie is not here, so I will have to ask the Minister for Transport.

Speaker's Ruling, Question Out of Order

Mr SPEAKER: The question is out of order. Resume your seat.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: No, it is not a laughing matter.

Mining Industry, Exploration

Mrs GILBERT: My question is for the Minister for State Development. Will the minister update the House on the latest developments in the exploration of petroleum and gas in Queensland?

Mr SPEAKER: One moment. There is too much noise in the chamber. Member for Mackay, I ask you to repeat your question when there is silence.

Mrs GILBERT: My question is for the Minister for State Development. Will the minister update the House on the latest developments in the exploration of petroleum and gas in Queensland?

Dr LYNHAM: I thank the member for Mackay for her question. Like other members of the House, she realises the importance of being able to turn on your gas at night at a reasonable cost and the importance of the royalties the CSG industry generates for Queensland to supply money for our hospitals, schools and teachers.

The Palaszczuk government has supported and will continue to support communities and resource industries within this state. That is why in July I announced the annual exploration program—the first time this has been announced—which provides a strategic direction for where exploration should go in Queensland. It provides a forward schedule of competitive tenders and identifies our priorities for the responsible development of Queensland's minerals, petroleum and gas. Exploration is that vital first step.

On 16 September 2016 I announced the release of a competitive tender process for 102 square kilometres in the north-west minerals province. I am pleased to advise the House that on Friday petroleum and gas exploration companies around the globe will be invited to participate in a competitive tender process to explore in two of the world's richest petroleum basins: the Bowen and Surat basins. The competitive tender process opens this Friday, 11 November 2016. The Bowen and Surat are well known as key petroleum provinces targeted for both conventional and unconventional gas. The next planned release of the Bowen and Surat basins petroleum and gas exploration tenders offers a great opportunity for investment in regional Queensland and to nurture further green shoots across Queensland's resources sector.

The Palaszczuk government is looking for companies with adequate financial capabilities and the right skills to explore this area and potentially take the resources to market and drive growth in our regions. The government has engaged directly with affected landholders, native title parties and local councils as well as industry peak bodies about this opportunity. I have also allowed mineral and coal explorers a reduction in their expenditure through the successful coal and mineral exploration concession program, announced by the Palaszczuk government earlier this year. This allows explorers to vary their expenditure commitments by up to 50 per cent until the end of 2017. Some 239 applications have been approved by my department. This saves $32 million in this sector.

Unlike me, during his tenure the member for Hinchinbrook did absolutely nothing. As Franklin D Roosevelt said, there are many ways of going forward but there is only one way of standing still. The member for Hinchinbrook knew very well about standing still.

Stock Squad

Mr MANDER: My question is for the Acting Minister for Agriculture. Does the acting agriculture minister support the police minister's decision to rename, repurpose and restructure the stock squad?

Mr BYRNE: The left side of my brain always supports the right side! The stock squad is doing its job exactly as it should be. I have no problems whatsoever with the advice that has been provided to me by the service. Obviously, with the way the cattle industry in particular is going in western and regional areas, stock theft is an attractive option—increasingly so. We see the prices being achieved

at saleyards across Queensland. We see how that is working successfully. We see how the industry is bouncing back. Of course, in terms of the willingness of some to thieve stock, the incentive is there and the criminal motivation is well seen.

I have no conflict of interest between the advice that I would seek from the police minister and the advice that I would give as the police minister to the agriculture minister. I am quite happy. All I need to get on with my business as the agriculture minister and the police minister looking at the stock squad is a good mirror, and I am a very happy man when I look in the mirror and have that discussion with myself.

I can assure members and the people of Queensland that the stock squad is doing its job, that the Queensland Police Service is well served and that the Queensland Police Service is supporting agriculture and the agriculture minister very effectively.

Jobs

Mr FURNER: My question is to the Minister for Employment. Will the minister please inform the House of the government's efforts to support job creation in Queensland and any alternative approaches?

Ms GRACE: I thank the member for Ferny Grove for his question. I know that he has had a passion for jobs for many years. He certainly is onside with this government's No. 1 priority issue of job creation in this state. I am proud to be part of a Palaszczuk government that wakes up every day with this issue on its mind.

What do we have opposite? The member for Clayfield did not care about jobs when he was in government. Those opposite do not care about jobs now. Now they cry crocodile tears about jobs in this state. Those opposite have no credibility out there in voter land. That is why they are sitting on the opposition benches.

Since the last state election we have restored job creation, with over 40,000 jobs created in this state since January 2015. The trend unemployment rate is down to 6.1 per cent and Queenslanders in the regions are getting back to work. What did we inherit when we came to government? We inherited a loss of 380 jobs per month and an unemployment rate of 6.7 per cent. They are the figures. That is the reality. Anything else that is espoused by those opposite is nothing but fiction.

The $100 million Back to Work program is also now operating. Since the figures of last week, 70 more have joined the employment ranks. We are up to 886. I will tell those opposite what we are doing for small business in the regions. Some 336 employers have now received a share of $3 million in payments under Back to Work. Of those 336 employers, 300 are small and medium sized businesses—over 90 per cent. Koppers in Cairns, which was going under under the previous government, has not only doubled but tripled its workforce since this government came to office. It is the florist in Cairns, the mobile repair shop in Mackay, the panelbeater in Emerald and the crane hire company in Gladstone. They are the ones that are benefiting from this government's program. They are the ones that are putting on workers and people are getting back to work.

We have a comprehensive package—one that includes infrastructure, a payroll tax rebate, Skilling Queenslanders for Work and Advance Queensland—to create jobs in this state. Small business in this state is benefiting a lot more under Labor than it ever did under those opposite.

Cairns Hospital, Maternity Services

Mr PYNE: My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Minister for Ambulance Services. Will the minister advise how long it has been since the new birthing unit at Cairns Hospital has been completed and when he thinks it will become operational?

Mr DICK: In responding to the member for Cairns, I am advised that the Family Birth Centre is in the final implementation phase of a Midwifery Group Practice model of care, a very important model of care that is progressively rolled out as hospital and health services feel it is appropriate to do so. That is in the final implementation phase and that will be co-located with the existing maternity services at the Cairns Hospital redeveloped maternity unit.

I am advised that the Cairns and Hinterland Hospital and Health Service identified safety issues earlier this year following the handover from the contractor. I am advised that these issues were rectified and completed in October. Of course, as with the introduction of any new service, I am pleased to

advise the member for Cairns that the Cairns Hospital undertook a functional unit readiness checklist to ensure the facility was safe to operate. With all maternity services, the No. 1 priority is to ensure that they operate and are delivered safely to the women of Queensland.

The only outstanding item is a final local agreement that needs to be completed between, as I understand it, the Nurses' Union and nurses and Queensland Health. While the delay is regrettable, I am advised it has not impacted on birthing services at the hospital, with 2,014 babies born so far this year, including Australia's first digital baby, baby Beau, who was born in Australia's first fully digital regional hospital—the Cairns Hospital—including digitised maternity services. It is regrettable, but we will open that service when it is safe to do so. I commend the hospital and health service on ensuring that the new birthing centre is safe to open before it commences operation.

North Queensland, Road Infrastructure

Mr STEWART: My question is directed to the Minister for Main Roads and Road Safety. Will the minister please update the House on the funding being spent to upgrade roads in North Queensland?

Mr BAILEY: The Palaszczuk government has committed real funding on a whole range of North Queensland road projects either directly or jointly, and let me run through them: the Bruce Highway; the Townsville ring-road; the Hervey Range Road upgrade; Riverway Drive; the Peninsula Developmental Road in the cape, which is a huge project changing that whole economy; the Peak Downs Highway; the Eton Range realignment; and the Mackay ring-road, which is getting going. There is so much going on for roads in North Queensland, but so much more could be done if it was not just the Palaszczuk government doing the heavy lifting in Queensland when it comes to road funding. In June last year we saw the announcement by the federal government of $600 million under its new Northern Australia Roads Program. In the federal budget in May this year we saw an allocation of $375 million for Queensland. What did we see when the allocation finally landed after being urged month after month to be released by the Palaszczuk government? We saw a cut of $150 million to Queensland. Only $223 million was allocated to Queensland. The Malcolm-Barnaby government has dudded Queensland. Clearly Barnaby Joyce, having now become a New South Welshman, has forgotten about his Queensland roots and is short-changing Queensland on northern Australian roads funding.

Let me go through some of the projects that are missing out. There is the widening on the Flinders Highway from Hughenden to Cloncurry and overtaking lanes and heavy vehicle safety from Townsville to Charters Towers. The Rockhampton to Duaringa bridge upgrade at Valentine Creek is not able to be done. The Gregory Developmental Road from Belyando Crossing to Charters Towers has been left off. The Cairns Airport access upgrade—a really critical piece of economic infrastructure in North Queensland—has been left behind and unfunded by Barnaby Joyce and Malcolm Turnbull. There is the intersection on the Capricorn Highway from Duaringa to Emerald and the list goes on—short-changed by Canberra. It is a disgrace. Where did the money go? I will table this: there is $130 million for the Northern Territory. Whose name is on it? Senator Matthew Canavan, the minister for Northern Australia, who says he stands up for Queensland but in the end he is just an apologist for Canberra. I table that. We have been short-changed, and what do we hear from those opposite? We hear those opposite not backing Queensland but backing their mates in Canberra. The opposition should be in here supporting the Queensland government and supporting Queensland roads in North Queensland, not justifying and apologising for Barnaby Joyce and Malcolm Turnbull, their mates in Canberra. It is time that they stood up for Queensland.

Tabled paper: Media release, undated, by The Nationals, titled 'More than $130 million for Northern Territory Roads' [2029].

(Time expired)

Townsville Turf Club

Mr KRAUSE: My question is directed to the Minister for Racing. I refer to the mass resignation of the Townsville Turf Club committee in protest at the actions of Racing Queensland, and I ask: what has the minister done to protect the hundreds of jobs reliant on the North Queensland racing industry?

Ms GRACE: I thank the honourable member for the question. At the moment the Townsville Turf Club is undergoing some difficulties and Racing Queensland has had to step in in relation to those difficulties. It has had McGrathNicol, the advisory partnership, undertake an independent business review of the club and it found that, if Racing Queensland had not stepped in, the club may have been trading insolvent and that it was struggling in relation to operating as a going concern. Racing

Queensland has spent well over $7 million in Townsville on the turf track and other infrastructure that is required for that club to operate. It is unfortunate that we find that it is in this current financial position. The forecasted financial performance for the 2016-17 financial year meant that management of the club could not continue the way it had.

As we know, Racing Queensland now operates on a commercial basis. It operates on sound business acumen and it operates on sound commercial standards. Having received the report from McGrathNicol, it had to ensure that it took the necessary action and the board unanimously voted that it would go to Townsville and speak to the turf club—local members have also been aware of the situation—to do all that it can to get the Townsville Turf Club back on its feet. It will help no jobs in the Townsville area if this club continues to trade on the basis it is currently trading on at the moment. Racing Queensland has been up there and discussed it with the club and it has provided the necessary funding in the form of a loan facility of up to $440,000 for the club to be able to operate this financial year and to continue great racing in Townsville.

I have full confidence in the board that it is operating on sound business, commercial and racing industry benefits and interests. It is in no-one's interests to continue to have a club struggle like the Mackay Turf Club struggled under those opposite previously and other clubs. Where we have had the ability to assist in the past, we will continue to do so. If those opposite have no confidence in the board, let me tell them that I have full confidence in the board. I have full confidence in the CEO. I am not going to let the club continue to struggle without the necessary finance, without the business acumen and without the assistance that Racing Queensland is providing. I am sure that Townsville will get back on its feet and that Racing Queensland will do all it can to ensure that the great industry of racing prospers in this state.

Domestic and Family Violence

Ms BOYD: My question is directed to the Minister for Communities, Women and Youth, Minister for Child Safety and Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Will the minister outline how Queenslanders are responding to new and expanding domestic and family violence support?

Ms FENTIMAN: I thank the member for the question and for her continued advocacy in tackling domestic and family violence in her local community. We know that escaping a violent relationship is the most dangerous time for victims and it is vital that Queenslanders know help and safety is available, and DVConnect provides that first point of call. As we head into the Christmas period, we have already seen a spike of more than 500 calls a day for help to DVConnect. As the Minister for the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, I encourage all women to come forward and seek help and the Palaszczuk government is acting to make sure that we can meet that demand. We have expanded funding to DVConnect with an extra $1.5 million to manage these extra calls and we are making sure that women and children fleeing violence can turn to it for help to access support services, including emergency accommodation. When reaching out for help, ensuring safe accommodation for women and children is paramount. DVConnect will always assess the safety of a potential placement to find the best suitable accommodation for women escaping violence, taking into account individual circumstances.

It seems that this message that women should come forward and have a safe place to turn to in their hour of need risks being derailed by claims from the member for Mudgeeraba—dangerous claims that run the risk of playing with women's lives by discouraging them from coming forward and seeking help. For the benefit of the House, I am happy to fact check some of the claims that the member for Mudgeeraba has made. She claims that the government has issued a directive to DVConnect about what shelters it can refer women to. That is wrong. Even DVConnect CEO Di Mangan has absolutely refuted these claims. The safety of women is the highest priority and we do not apologise for making sure that women and children have a safe place to turn to.

The member for Mudgeeraba also claims that DVOs are not worth the paper they are written on. She is wrong again. She is not just wrong, but irresponsible and dangerous. We want women to come forward to report domestic and family violence, to know that their complaints will be heard, that action will be taken and that they can go to court and get a protection order. To suggest otherwise is reckless and stands apart from what we are trying to do in Queensland when it comes to tackling domestic and family violence.

The member for Mudgeeraba has also claimed that we should have anticipated this increase in reporting and that we were caught unprepared. She is wrong again. Four weeks into my term as the minister I announced two new 72-hour accommodation shelters. We have more police than ever before. We have a specialist court in place. I call on the member for Mudgeeraba to return to adopting a bipartisan approach to tackling domestic violence in Queensland.

(Time expired)

Nerang Railway Station, Park-and-Ride Utilisation Survey

Mr CRAMP: My question without notice is to the Minister for Transport and the Commonwealth Games. Will the minister commit to conducting a park-and-ride utilisation survey, including the area in and around Nerang train station during events at Carrara Stadium on weekends when the problem of parking overflow into local streets in east Nerang and Carrara occurs?

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I thank the member for the question, because it gives me an opportunity to talk about the Palaszczuk government's Fairer Fares policy. Park-and-ride surveys are very important when planning for, analysing and understanding the utilisation of our park-and-ride facilities that support our South-East Queensland public transport network. Those facilities will be dramatically affected by the Fairer Fares policy, which sees 23 zones across South-East Queensland collapsed into eight different zones, with lower fares in all of those zones. That is something that the Palaszczuk government is delivering for South-East Queensland commuters. It is something that those opposite could only have dreamed of doing. They saw continued increases in public transport fares and a decline in patronage.

When the Fairer Fares policy comes into place in January, we will see a cut to public transport fares. It will not be a cut in the increase to the fares, but a cut—

Mr Emerson interjected.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I believe that we will see an increase in the patronage, which will require—

Mr CRAMP: I rise to a point of order on relevance. I simply asked will the minister commit to a park-and-ride utilisation survey during event times at Carrara Stadium around the areas nominated in the east Nerang area.

Mr SPEAKER: Will the minister make sure that his answer is relevant to the question.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: As I was saying, park-and-ride utilisation surveys are very important and part of what the government does on an ongoing basis. They will include all the park-and-ride facilities, including the park-and-ride facilities at Carrara.

I wanted to highlight to the chamber that it is very important that we conduct those surveys in the context of the impact of the Fairer Fares policy. That is why we will see a utilisation survey conducted across the whole of our network, including those park-and-ride facilities associated with the Carrara precinct. We will see a range of circumstances in which that precinct and those park-and-ride facilities are used. As a consequence, we will look at the results of those surveys and, importantly, take account of how those surveys will influence the way in which we plan for appropriate park-and-ride facilities across the whole of our South-East Queensland public transport network and make sure that we deliver the park-and-ride facilities in the places where our commuters need them and want them, particularly in the way that will be influenced and changed by a reduction in zones from 23 down to eight. Anyone who understands the way public transport works knows that people have a tendency—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I can assure those opposite that those who understand how public transport works—those who use it—appreciate that people tend to go beyond the next boundary and use the park-and-ride facility in a place that will give them a cheaper ride.

(Time expired)

Crocodile Management Strategy

Mr CRAWFORD: My question is to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef. Will the minister update the House on the progress of the Palaszczuk government's crocodile management strategy?

A government member interjected.

Dr MILES: Indeed, there are Northern Territorians in the gallery also. I thank the member for Barron River for his question and I thank him for his consistent advocacy, along with that of the Treasurer, for a responsible crocodile management policy in the far north. That is why we have bolstered the crocodile management program, made the staff permanent, invested an additional $5.8 million and funded a multiyear population study to make sure that our management approach is informed by science—something that the former government never did. Our approach has seen more dangerous crocodiles removed than in any other year, mostly in the Cairns urban area. Recently, our approach was endorsed in a public survey. Seventy-two per cent of respondents supported removing large or dangerous crocodiles and just 15 per cent supported their widespread removal.

Of course, on any issue such as this we would have extremists—the nut jobs out there who are more interested in headlines than public safety. That brings me to the member for Whitsunday. When he is not hiding around corners behind our Premier, he has been calling for—wait for it—a crocodile cull. Recently, on radio he said that we need to be looking at a culling program. Members might have come to expect that kind of crazy talk from the member for Whitsunday and they might think that he does not really speak for the opposition—that maybe on this issue the member for Moggill will be the voice of reason. No, the opposition environment spokesperson backed the call for a cull. On radio, he said that we need to talk about and have a sensible conversation about culling. That was never the opposition's policy in government but, apparently, it now is. Some people tell me that the opposition has no policies. Now, it has one. In yet another example of how this opposition looks more like One Nation than a Liberal National Party every day, the stated policy of the LNP opposition is to support a crocodile cull—or, at least, have a conversation about it.

Let us have that conversation here. I call on the member for Clayfield to confirm that the LNP is for a cull, where they are for it, how they will do it and what science they have based their policy on. I call on him to finally grow a spine, pick an issue on which to stand up to his lunatic fringe and rule out a cull.

In keeping with our approach to crocodile management, today, I can announce that the Palaszczuk government is reviewing its public education messages and signage to see whether improvements can be made to the current 'croc wise' approach. Public education will always be paramount. Regardless of any changes to the policy in the future, the key message will always be, 'Be croc wise when you're in croc country.'

(Time expired)

Asbestos, Illegal Dumping

Dr ROBINSON: My question is to the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef. Can the minister advise what measures have been undertaken to ensure that the water supply has not been compromised as a result of the illegal dumping of asbestos materials in the Cleveland-Redlands area?

Dr MILES: I thank the member for the question. It would have been better directed to Minister Bailey as the responsible minister for Seqwater. With regard to my portfolio, I can confirm that yesterday the environment department visited that site and is working with Seqwater, but it is primarily a matter for Seqwater to manage. If the member would like to redirect his question to the appropriate minister, that would be fine.

Dr ROBINSON: I rise to a point of order. The minister's officers are there on site. It is within, partly, the responsibility of the minister. I do not accept that it is out of order. The minister should say what he is doing to protect the community.

Mr SPEAKER: With respect, member, the minister has answered the question. You may not like it, but he has answered it.

Science and Innovation

Mr KELLY: My question is of the Minister for Innovation, Science and the Digital Economy and Minister for Small Business. Will the minister update the House on how the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland initiative is impacting on our state's science and innovation sectors?

Mr SPEAKER: One minute, minister.

Ms ENOCH: I thank the member for the question. I know he shares my passion for highlighting the opportunities for innovation and science related fields in our state. The Palaszczuk government has made significant and sustained investments in research and development. Our $405 million

whole-of-government Advance Queensland initiative is building on this investment with greater focus on research, translation and innovation. Today I am pleased to launch the 2016 *Health of Queensland Science & Innovation* report and I table that report for the House.

Tabled paper: Office of the Queensland Chief Scientist and Department of Science, Information Technology and Innovation: Health of Queensland Science & Innovation 2016—Science driven knowledge and our performance landscape [2030].

This report was prepared by the Office of the Chief Scientist and is an important snapshot of the state's science and innovation ecosystem. We are absolutely committed to ensuring that we have the right mix of initiatives to support science and innovation in our state. That is why we are seeing now in this government 41 research fellowships that have been supported in just over 12 months; a stark contrast to those opposite who only saw 14 in their whole three years. We have a government that is very much focused on the future and focusing on Advance Queensland.

WATER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (UNDERGROUND WATER MANAGEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Water Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 10 November 2015 (see p. 2693), and Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from 13 September (see p. 3413)—

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (4.02 pm): I move—

That the Water Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

I want to take the opportunity to thank the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee for its consideration of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 which amends the River Improvement Trust Act 1940, the Water Act 2000 and the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014, known as the WROLA Act. The Water Legislation Amendment Bill is essential in aligning the WROLA Act with Palaszczuk government policy and election commitments. I sincerely appreciate the time of all committee members in carefully considering this legislation and all legislation that proceeds through the committee process.

As part of its examination of the bill the committee initially held a public briefing with departmental officers on 30 November 2015. The committee received 102 submissions by the closing date of 18 December 2015. On 29 January 2016 the Department of Natural Resources and Mines and the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection provided the committee with a comprehensive set of responses to issues raised in those submissions. On 15 February 2016 the committee held a public hearing with witnesses drawn from the pool of submitters as well as officers from the Department of Natural Resources and Mines and Department of Environment and Heritage Protection. I would also like to thank the individuals and groups for their time in preparing submissions on the bill and participation in the committee's public hearing.

The committee tabled its report on 1 March 2016. The committee was not able to reach a majority decision on whether the bill should be recommended for passage through the House. Essentially, the committee was divided on two key elements of this bill: the explicit reinstatement of ecologically sustainable development principles to the purpose of the Water Act 2000, which were removed by the WROLA Act; and the omission of the water development option provisions, which were introduced by the WROLA Act. Both these elements of the bill are critical to delivering on the government's election commitment to saving the Great Barrier Reef.

While the committee could not reach consensus on the explicit reinstatement of the principles of ecologically sustainable development, the committee was satisfied with the government's reasons for not extending the application of the principles to the resources sector under chapter 3 of the act or to the entirety of the Water Act. The principles of ecologically sustainable development have been included in the purpose of chapter 2 of the Water Act since the commencement of the act in 2000. They provided a well established and internationally recognised framework for the proper consideration of social,

economic and environment factors in planning, allocating and using water resources. Reinstating the principles of ecologically sustainable development through the bill will ensure that the principles continue to have effect as originally intended. Reinstating the principles was also supported by the broad spectrum of submitters on the bill, as well as in witness testimony to the committee, including by peak agriculture, mining, environmental and community groups.

The water development option framework was another key element on which the committee was unable to reach a consensus. Government members of the committee support the omission of the water development option while non-government members of the committee do not support the omission of the provisions. In relation to the bill's omission of the water development option provisions, the committee recommended that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines continue to investigate alternatives for securing water for large-scale projects, taking into account the impact on communities. DNRM has previously explored an alternative approach to the water development option aimed at addressing stakeholder concerns. The alternative approach was tested with key stakeholders through the Water Engagement Forum. Ultimately, stakeholders still had concerns about the water development option provisions and alternatives. A legislative alternative to the water development option provisions is not contemplated by the bill, nor through amendments during consideration in detail. However, we have considered the issues raised by stakeholders and the committee and I have asked my department to continue to consult with stakeholders to better understand these issues.

The committee reported that it supported or was satisfied with a number of the provisions in the bill, including removing provisions to declare designated watercourses that were included in the WROLA Act, validating the Lower Herbert Water Management Authority, amending publishing requirements that save licence applicants money while maintaining opportunities for affected parties to have their say; and operational amendments to deal with resource tenure that straddles either side of a cumulative management area.

The committee was also satisfied by DNRM's advice about the clarifying provisions in the bill in relation to river improvement trusts. During the committee process there was considerable discussion within the community regarding the underground water impact management framework for the resources sector in the WROLA Act. I listened carefully to these discussions. I thank all stakeholders who provided significant personal time and effort in providing valuable input to the government's considerations. I asked my colleague Hon. Dr Steven Miles, Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, to prepare legislation to strengthen the effectiveness of the environmental assessments and regulations under the Environmental Protection Act 1994. These amendments have been made as part of the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, the EPOLA bill, and are intended to ensure underground water impacts are clearly considered and assessed early in the approval process when dealing with environmental authorities. The EPOLA bill also contains transitional provisions for the granting of associated water licences for advanced mining projects. I again thank the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee for its consideration of the bill and table the government's response to the committee's report.

Tabled paper: Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee: Report No 19—Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, government response [2031].

I will be moving amendments to the bill during consideration in detail. It has come to light that an operational policy was in place between 2003 and 2012 that provided guidance to departmental water licensing officers in respect to exempting certain mines from water licensing requirements for dewatering purposes. Under this operational policy, an administrative approach was adopted to not issue licences for certain dewatering activities that were considered to have little or no impact on other water users or springs.

Examples include situations where mines were expected to take only small volumes of water or to take poor-quality water unsuitable for use in irrigation or water supply, or where they were in a location with no existing water users. This administrative approach was adopted to minimise the regulatory impact on both mining operators and the regulator where it was deemed appropriate to do so. The operating policy was not consistent with the provisions of the Water Act and, therefore, was not lawful. As a result, a number of existing mining operations have been taking or interfering with associated water for many years without the appropriate water authorisations. Companies that own those existing mines have made significant investment decisions based on assumptions that their operations comply with all regulatory requirements. There are communities that derive significant economic and employment benefits from those mines.

The proposed amendments to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill correct the department's administrative and operational error that affects existing operating mines by validating their past associated water take and interference, and authorising it in the future. This will ensure that the operations of the affected mines are not disadvantaged by this erroneous administrative decision and provides them with past and future regulatory certainty.

There are safeguards under the WROLA Act with regard to general make-good obligations to ensure any impact of existing mines are made good. Further, if circumstances change and underground water impacts emerge over time, there are safeguards under the WROLA Act for the chief executive of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to call a project into the underground water impact management framework. This will require a company to prepare an underground water impact report and baseline assessment plan for the project. DNRM will work with DEHP to ensure that, if issues emerge, they will work together to respond to any potential elevated risks.

The amendments to the bill also correct minor errors and oversights in the WLA Bill and the WROLA Act. The amendments are necessary for the smooth transition from the current water planning framework under the Water Act into a new water planning framework under the WROLA Act. These amendments: correct a cross-referencing error to make it clear that a water plan amended under the transitional provisions still requires approval by the Governor in Council; ensure a water plan is not renamed a water plan until such time as it is transitioned to become a water plan; and replace an incorrect reference to 'statutory water resource plan' with 'water plan'.

I will now focus on outlining the bill in more detail for the benefit of the House. I remind the House that a key purpose of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill is to amend the WROLA Act to make it consistent with Palaszczuk government policy and election commitments by removing or aligning those provisions of the WROLA Act that are not supported. For the benefit of all those following the debate, the Palaszczuk government committed to the people of Queensland to: act immediately to prevent the commencement of the Newman government's water laws that will have a detrimental effect on the Great Barrier Reef catchment systems and allow for the over allocation of Queensland's precious water resources; and return ecologically sustainable development principles to the Water Act and remove water development options in their entirety.

The bill also includes the following core components: explicitly reinstating the principles of ecologically sustainable development in the purpose of Water Act 2000; omitting the water development option provisions in their entirety; and omitting provisions for the declaration of designated watercourses. We have taken a number of actions to deliver on our commitment. Upon taking office, I postponed the WROLA Act provisions that were scheduled to commence on 18 February 2015. To allow the commencement of that irresponsible legislation would have been inconsistent with the commitment we made only a few weeks before to the people of Queensland. Unlike those opposite, we keep our commitments. Unlike those opposite, when we go to an election promising one thing we do not change course as soon as the writs are returned. The postponement provided time for the government to review the provisions to align with our policy. As a result of that review, some consistent provisions commenced on 11 September 2015. The provisions that are not consistent with government policy are amended through this bill. As mentioned, the process has determined that various elements of the WROLA legislation were consistent with our election commitments.

I understand a significant amount of work would have been involved to develop the new water planning process. I know firsthand of the time spent by and dedication of the officers in the water team, who work hard to deliver real beneficial outcomes for the people of Queensland. They care sincerely and deeply about the long-term health and prosperity of Queenslanders and the water to sustain Queensland. I am sure that, despite our differences on key elements of water reform, the member for Hinchinbrook shares that sentiment.

The Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 is a comparatively small bill with only 19 clauses as introduced. However, this bill has major implications for the future management of water resources and, indeed, the future management of our state. The bill corrects the excesses of the LNP's reforms. A substantial portion of WROLA is being retained. However, as with most matters, the LNP could not help but overreach, even on water. Years of internal infighting and leadership quarrels, years of rejected policy or lack of policy by the electorate and years of pent-up frustration was unleashed between 2012 and 2015. With the puppet master, the member for Callide, whispering into his ear, the member for Hinchinbrook could not help himself. He could not help but overreach on this legislation.

Mr SEENEY: I rise on a point of order. I find those comments inappropriate and offensive. I ask that they be withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): Were they personally offensive, Minister? I am sorry: I did not hear the final comments.

Dr LYNHAM: I withdraw. As with MERCP, the member for Hinchinbrook legislated a common provision framework, but he overstepped here again. He removed community objection rights. He overstepped his mark again with water legislation. Reforms to a framework governing a resource as precious as water must maintain the community's confidence. That was never the case with WROLA.

This bill amends the WROLA Act to reinstate the principles of ecologically sustainable development in the same way that they currently apply under the Water Act and in the same way that they have been working successfully since 2000. The amendments will also clarify that concepts such as the efficient use of water are promoted only through the water planning framework and the allocation of new water, rather than by routine administrative decisions. The bill will replace all references to 'responsible and productive management' with 'sustainable management' to ensure that sustainable management is applied in planning, allocating and using water resources. Labor made that commitment to restore the principles of ecologically sustainable development because those principles have been integral to the structure and strength of water planning since the year 2000.

Ecologically sustainable development is not a new concept. It has been recognised for many years and is found in many pieces of key legislation, both here and overseas. For example, the principles in subclauses (e) and (f) are based on guiding principles contained in Australia's National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, December 1992. As an extension, the principles of ecologically sustainable development set out in subclauses (a) to (d) are the same as the principles of ecologically sustainable development in sections 3A(a) to (d) of the Commonwealth Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1994. Those are simple terms that are used internationally and by the Commonwealth, but thrown away by those opposite.

The National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development, which was endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments, recognised the historical failings in water planning and created a framework that would prevent the widespread damage that the over extraction of water resources was having on the wider environment. A key component preventing widespread damage was adopting the principles of ecologically sustainable development in decision-making processes. The principle has been the bedrock—

Mr Hart: What is that?

Dr LYNHAM: I take that interjection. It is amazing that the member is asking that question. He does not have a clue about anything to do with ecologically sustainable development or ecology. I suspect he has no clue about the word 'environment'.

Mr HART: I rise to a point of order. I find those comments personally offensive and I ask that they be withdrawn.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister, the member has asked you to withdraw your comments.

Dr LYNHAM: I withdraw, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Burleigh, you are making consistent interjections, not all of which the minister is taking. I warn you that the next time I will put you on the list.

Dr LYNHAM: Indeed, although the committee could not reach consensus on the provisions of the bill for reinstating the principles of ecologically sustainable development, I am pleased to say there has generally been support across sectors for these provisions. With such widespread support, it is peculiar to me that in the face of this support, and no external body of work to support the proposed changes, the member for Hinchinbrook decided to pursue its removal so rigorously, without seemingly any justification.

Some sectors sought an expansion of the current application of the principles to all provisions of the Water Act, or to particular parts of the act—such as the underground water impact framework for the resources sector. There are very clear and distinct functions of the different purposes that accurately reflect those functions. To apply the principles of ecologically sustainable development to all chapters of the Water Act would be incongruous with the respective chapter purposes and functions, and go beyond the government's election commitments.

I note the committee was satisfied with the reasons for not extending the application of principles of ecologically sustainable development. The bill therefore remains unchanged for this part, and the principles of ecologically sustainable development are proposed to be reinstated, as per our election commitment, so that they continue to apply to the planning, allocation and use of water resources.

As I mentioned earlier, omitting the water development option provisions is a key component of the bill and meets an election commitment we made to the people of Queensland. The purpose of water development options, as outlined in the WROLA introductory speech, was an attempt to provide certainty to proponents of large, major pieces of water infrastructure, to have water up-front, without any initial rigorous scientific approvals.

In opposition, Labor made it quite clear that we did not support this framework. Simply put, the Palaszczuk government and the community hold major concerns about issuing, in effect, a statutory promise to water, without sufficient up-front checks and balances. The LNP are continuing in their modus operandi of telling the people of Queensland about their brilliance, as opposed to talking to them to find policy solutions. It is clear, however, that such a framework was seriously flawed, and the removal of water development option provisions in the bill is generally supported by stakeholders for a variety of reasons, which I will touch upon now.

Stakeholders have frequently raised serious concerns with consultation and the ability for local communities to have a say early on decisions about local water use. Stakeholders made it quite clear that they wanted community input prior to the granting of a water development option. The process, as detailed in WROLA, did not provide for community input. What we heard loud and clear was that this was not good enough.

Without an opportunity to be consulted, without an opportunity to be heard, communities were in effect expected to fight an uncertain rearguard action for potentially years after the granting of a statutory promise. The framework was a process that in effect provided significant advantages to larger scale projects without explicit due consideration for small scale projects.

Opposition members interjected.

Dr LYNHAM: I do not know how those opposite portray themselves as being supportive of the agricultural sector and small farmers when they are only concerned about the big guys. I note the comments of the member for Hinchinbrook during his second reading speech on WROLA, when he stated—

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.

It may have been a first in with the biggest wad of cash approach. However, there remains significant opposition to leaving such consideration to administrative processes without formal notification requirements, explicit opportunity for submissions and little guidance for the chief executive to determine future demands.

While we are all debating water development options, it should be noted that water development options were to be located in chapter 2 of the Water Act, which deals with water planning and management. This is the very same chapter from which those opposite were attempting to remove the principles of ecologically sustainable development. Therefore, the water development options were to be included in a chapter which did not require that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment be maintained or enhanced for the benefit of future generations or that measures be taken to actively prevent environmental degradation.

These are principles that are absolutely fundamental to water planning in this state, and are principles that should never have been excluded from considerations in granting a water development option. Little guidance was found in the legislative framework regarding the criteria the chief executive was to have regard to in considering a water development option grant or signposts to reassure the community about the matters that a subsequent process administered by the Coordinator-General would consider.

This lack of guidance on consideration of issues such as impacts on other users, other competing demands for water, historical water planning and use in the region caused significant angst in our communities. The criteria that were provided were profoundly lacking in coverage and depth. It was never going to provide certainty or confidence to merely flag that the chief executive only need be satisfied that appropriate environmental assessments would be performed.

The prefeasibility assessment was also scant on details. It provides little detail about the hydrological information to be included in the prefeasibility. How the chief executive was to determine its appropriateness or its suitability in respect to the data provided or the appropriateness of matters addressed in relation to the region to be impacted leaves open the real risk approvals that should never have been granted due to the inappropriateness of the initial prefeasibility study. No process was provided in the framework for community members to have their voice heard, nor could they appeal the decision to grant a water development option.

Last, but most certainly not least, section 90 was to provide that the chief executive may cancel a water development option, if satisfied the environmental assessment for the project does not demonstrate that sufficient water is available or that impacts on flows affecting environmental flows or existing authorisations can be adequately mitigated. Let me repeat that for the benefit of the House. The chief executive may cancel the water development option if there is not enough water or mitigation measures will not be adequate. It says 'may'. He does not have to. Even if there is not enough water there he may consider cancelling a water development option.

At the very least, this should not be discretionary. A water development option must be cancelled. There is no may about it. It should have been 'must'. There is no better example of the concern that stakeholders had than this provision that water development options could be granted without the water resource plan for the area having sufficient unallocated water reserved to support the project. Even if there was not enough water reserve one could magically create water for a water development option. Water development options are beyond saving. It is a deeply flawed framework that just causes community angst and uncertainty.

I would like to reassure the committee and water users that while this investigation is occurring, there are existing mechanisms within the Water Act to sustainably support large scale infrastructure development. For example, a number of water resource plans set aside unallocated water reserves specifically for major water infrastructure projects. In water resource plan areas where there is no unallocated water reserved in an area for a project, the Water Act allows the minister to review or amend a water resource plan to make water available for development. This trigger to amend a plan would only be used where a comprehensive assessment, based on strong science and extensive consultation—that is the difference—supports additional water being made available. Community support for a review or amendment of a water plan can be canvassed through the minister's release of a notice of proposal.

The WROLA Act also includes provisions to enable the chief executive to declare a designated watercourse, which would remove the requirement for a water licence or permit to take or interfere with water in a designated watercourse. The Water Act provides for various exemptions that enable the unregulated take of water. These, however, are on the basis of purpose, not location.

Little support was found for retaining this element of WROLA and, for that reason, the Palaszczuk government proposed to remove it. The committee has indicated in its report that it is satisfied with these provisions of the bill. I thank the committee for their deliberations on this issue. The bill therefore is unchanged for this part.

The bill includes a number of WROLA Act amendments to enable smooth implementation and to correct errors. These amendments include transitional provisions for water planning, which will ensure the effective transition of water planning instruments from the current water planning framework to the new planning framework originally introduced by the WROLA Act.

There are also amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act 1940 to provide clarification to the changes made by the WROLA Act, which commenced on 19 December 2015. The amendments clarify the establishment and membership structures of river improvement trusts, as well as the powers and obligations of trusts in relation to the undertaking and maintenance of works. This includes trusts no longer being required to seek approval from the chief executive of the Department of Natural Resources and Mines prior to conducting works for the purpose of achieving the object of the River Improvement Trust Act.

The bill also proposes to amend the Water Act to validate the formation of the Lower Herbert Water Management Authority and the actions it has taken since its formation. This amendment corrects an administrative error in the forming of the authority. The committee has reported that it is satisfied with the provisions relating to the Lower Herbert Water Management Authority and satisfied with the advice given in relation to the amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act.

I now turn to the matter of managing the underground impacts associated with activities of the resource sector. The changes proposed to the management of underground water do not change the material take of water for mines. Under the WROLA Act, these mines will be provided a limited right to take associated water. Without the extraction of this water, there simply would be no mine. Landholders will be provided additional certainty with statutory make-good agreements, baseline assessments and the requirement for underground water impact reports.

In addition, after consideration of submissions such as those from the Queensland Farmers' Federation and AgForce who indicated general support for the expanded underground water management impact framework but sought further strengthening of the chapter 3 framework, my colleague the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, Minister Miles, introduced the EPOLA bill. I am pleased that this will complete a set of reforms that will provide greater certainty and protection to landholders going forward.

The Water Legislation Amendment Bill does not include any amendments to the framework, other than an operational amendment to enable the chief executive to deal with a resource tenure that is partially within and partially outside a cumulative water management area. All other provisions of the WROLA Act which are yet to commence have been reviewed by the government and are determined to be consistent with government policy.

The preparation of the bill has been informed by detailed consultation with key stakeholder organisations including through my department's Water Engagement Forum and the parliamentary committee process. The Water Engagement Forum includes senior representatives from organisations across the spectrum.

I supported the department's reinstatement of representatives from the environmental sector—fundamental stakeholders in discussions about water reform and any impacts upon aspects of the community and stakeholders who should never have been excluded. Other members include local government, fisheries, natural resource management, resources sector, water service provider and financial sectors.

I am pleased to advise honourable members that the organisations represented on the forum have provided general support for the bill. The Palaszczuk government is committed to ensuring long-term sustainability of the state's water resources. Certainty and security for all water users remains paramount in the management of water in Queensland.

We heard the concerns of Queenslanders across all sectors about the need to be involved in water management decisions, and when we took office we did not forget them. Together we have developed a policy solution that will ensure the community will continue to have a role in the water planning and allocation process in Queensland. We retained the elements of the WROLA Act that were supported by Queenslanders and aligned others with our policy and commitments.

The bill and amendments during consideration in detail together provide a fair and balanced framework that delivers on all fronts—for the economy, for the community and for the environment. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (4.33 pm): I move—

That the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 be now read a second time.

There is no denying the fact that water is a critical resource. Australia is the driest continent on earth—our priceless groundwater systems need to be carefully safeguarded and shared fairly to support our natural environment and all who depend on it. These safeguards are important to ensure prosperity now and in the future.

In sun-drenched Queensland our underground water reserves may be out of sight but they are the lifeblood of farming communities, vital for resource industry projects and crucial for healthy landscapes. Queenslanders need a framework for managing groundwater that strikes a balance between competing uses but does not jeopardise the quality and accessibility of this all-important resource. I am pleased to bring a bill to the House that restores protections to managing groundwater that were trashed by the previous Newman-Nicholls government.

Complementing the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, the EPOLA bill addresses deficiencies in the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014, known as the WROLA Act. This bill amends a number of acts to better manage the environmental impacts of underground water extraction by the resources industry and to protect the interests of farmers and other landholders whose groundwater is affected by resource industry activities.

Based on their performance last week, I imagine those opposite will focus their contribution in this debate on one particular project. Let us be clear about their murky involvement in that project. Campbell Newman sat at Alan Jones's kitchen table and told him that if the LNP won the election they would not support that project. At the same time the member for Mansfield was accepting a $2,000 cheque from a director of the company and the member for Glass House was heading off to see the Wallabies with them.

All through the election campaign, the LNP made strong commitments that that mine would not proceed because of the impact it would have on farming land, but after a whopping $700,000 in donations to the LNP and party branches, they approved it. They approved a project that has the potential to cause groundwater to drop by up to 50 metres and impact 350 water bores, destroying 1,300 hectares of strategic cropping land. At the same time they stripped the rights of citizens to object. We are here today to prevent these Newman-Nicholls' laws that allowed unlimited take of groundwater for large-scale mining projects from ruining farmers' livelihoods and destroying regional communities.

Ms SIMPSON: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. There has been a ruling from the Speaker with respect to appropriately naming members in this place and also with respect to previous governments. I draw Madam Deputy Speaker to the Speaker's rulings.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Linard): The member for Maroochydore's point of order is correct and upheld. I ask that you refer to the previous government by its appropriate name.

Dr MILES: I will rephrase. We are here today to prevent these laws of the previous government that allowed unlimited take of groundwater for large-scale mining projects from ruining farmers' livelihoods and destroying regional communities.

The bill introduces a strong new environmental assessment framework that will apply to future resources projects. With this bill we will actually streamline the process for mining companies seeking approvals on future projects. We will do this without stopping the community from having their say.

Amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will require resource companies to assess their project's impacts on groundwater—and propose strategies for avoiding, mitigating or managing these impacts—as part of the environmental authority application. This will ensure rigorous assessment of the impacts of resource activities on underground water up-front, before operations commence. The new requirements only apply to those applications which are subject to the higher level assessment process. They will not affect those projects with known and manageable impacts which proceed through a less rigorous assessment process.

The bill also provides for improved environmental oversight during the operational phase of mining operations. The bill modifies the existing underground water impact report process in the Water Act to include an assessment of actual against predicted environmental impacts of taking groundwater and, if relevant, provides the capacity to update predictions about future impacts.

Given the uncertainties inherent in groundwater modelling, it will rarely be possible to predict future impacts with 100 per cent accuracy. These amendments to both the Water Act and the Environmental Protection Act facilitate ongoing adaptive management, allowing for adjustments to be made in response to known impacts and any changes to predicted impacts.

I have been encouraged by the support that the majority of stakeholders demonstrated for these amendments. It is clear to me that this approach delivers a well-targeted and streamlined assessment process that applies the appropriate level of environmental scrutiny.

The improved assessment framework in the Environmental Protection Act is supported by amendments to the make-good framework in chapter 3 of the Water Act. These amendments have received wideranging support. The amendments to chapter 3 ensure that the resource industry is aware of its obligations to make good with landholders. Members of the House are well aware that the resource industry has a heavy reliance on groundwater and enjoys significant access to underground water rights. With this access comes an obligation to other groundwater users in the form of make-good agreements. Make-good measures are undertaken by resource tenure holders to compensate a bore owner for impairment of a groundwater bore which results from the company's statutory right to take

groundwater. Make-good obligations are delivered through a process of negotiation between the miner and the owner of the bore. A negotiation process can only deliver a fair outcome for both parties if there is a level playing field between the parties in terms of bargaining power.

To start with, the amendments in this bill include an important clarification that make-good obligations apply where there is a reasonable likelihood, as opposed to a certainty, that resource activities have caused or contributed to groundwater impacts. If in doubt, resource companies need to make good. This is an entirely appropriate recognition of the uncertainties that can exist in our understanding of groundwater systems. It means that individual farming families will not be left alone to shoulder an unfair burden. Scientific uncertainty should not be an excuse for avoiding make-good obligations.

The bill proposes several other important changes to the make-good framework in the Water Act to strengthen the bargaining power of farmers and other rural landholders and level the playing field for negotiation of make-good agreements by, firstly, ensuring that bore owners have access to the professional hydrogeological advice they need; secondly, removing financial barriers to bore owners who take advantage of the alternative dispute resolution process; and, thirdly, providing a cooling-off period to ensure that landholders can reflect with a cool head and ensure that they are not hurried into inappropriate make-good agreements.

The bill also deals responsibly with advanced mining projects that are still going through their approvals under the old arrangements. Transitional arrangements are proposed to ensure that advanced mining projects are still subject to a water licence process, in keeping with community expectations. These companies will be required to seek an associated water licence to allow them to finish the approvals process in a very similar manner to which they started. The transitional provisions will cover those projects that are currently in the approval process that will not be subject to the strengthened Environmental Protection Act. The requirement for these projects to obtain an associated water licence will ensure a smooth transition to the new impact management framework.

The bill also includes unrelated amendments to the Queensland Heritage Act to correct an oversight to ensure that local government has the capacity to appoint appropriate authorised persons in relation to local heritage and the Environmental Protection Act to provide consistency in the administrative arrangements for environmental authority applications.

I thank the Agriculture and Environment Committee for its consideration of the bill. I also thank the individuals and groups for their time in preparing submissions on the bill and participating in the committee's public hearing. The committee tabled its report on 25 October 2016, putting forward two recommendations. Before turning to these recommendations, I table the government's response to the committee report which addresses the committee's recommendations.

Tabled paper: Agriculture and Environment Committee: Report No. 25—Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, government response [2032].

The first recommendation was that the bill be passed. This recommendation reflects the bill's approach to the sustainable management of our precious underground water resources. The committee's second recommendation was that an examination be made on relevant mining licence holders' short-term prospects and the resulting impacts on affected communities. The committee requested that the findings of this examination be presented in this speech. I will address that recommendation now.

Firstly, the government notes the concerns raised by submitters and reflected in the committee report regarding those projects that are nearing commencement of operations either of a new mine or an expansion of an existing mine. We are talking about mining projects that have already commenced the approvals process for an environmental authority and, as such, would qualify for an associated water licence in the bill. Let us be clear: mines in Queensland have been required to obtain a water licence for some 20 years. For companies that have applied for or been granted an EA but have not yet secured a water licence, we are simply asking them to obtain a water licence from the DNRM, as has always been the case. For new projects, there will be a streamlined environmental assessment that includes groundwater impacts. For more advanced projects, it is business as usual. One way or another, we must ensure that groundwater impacts have been assessed and the community consulted.

Proponents who need to commence taking associated water in the near future can and should contact the Department of Natural Resources and Mines to discuss how they may prepare for transitioning into the new framework. Early discussions will ensure mining companies can transition

into the new framework in the smoothest and most efficient way. In turn, this could provide the certainty being sought by communities which are dependent on mining projects for economic and employment opportunities.

I have been advised that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines has discussions underway in relation to an application for a water licence for one new mining project. This company is well positioned to meet the information requirements for an associated water licence. In the absence of this bill, in order to commence dewatering, mining projects would need to have either obtained a water licence from the DNRM under the current law or submitted an underground water impact report to the DEHP under the post WROLA law. The fact that there have been few companies—just the one—approaching the DNRM for prelodgement discussions about a water licence, and I am not aware of any companies that have approached the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection for a prelodgement discussion about an underground water impact report, can only suggest that there are few, if any, mining projects with an urgent need to commence dewatering.

Without any indication of any imminent need to commence dewatering, any delays to mining projects are highly unlikely. For the one company that has approached the DNRM, I emphasise that the bill deliberately includes provisions to transition an application made under the current framework into an associated water licence application under the new framework to ensure there are no administrative delays for applicants. Resource companies will be well aware of the need to obtain a water licence before they start taking or interfering with underground water.

Adhering to the current regulatory requirements is an entirely sensible and rational approach for any company to take, whereas relying on the non-commenced LNP WROLA Act that received clear opposition from a wide range of stakeholders is a gamble that is not worth taking. I will add that, even if a proponent anticipated the WROLA Act would remove the need for a water licence, the proponent would also be aware that that act requires them to submit a draft underground water impact report before they commence taking water for dewatering purposes. This requirement was present even in the Newman era legislation and will continue here. Either way, there should be no surprises. The committee notes this very clearly on pages 5 and 6 of its report—

a) mining licence holders will have been aware of the potential for legislative amendment, and

b) affected mining licence holders have had sufficient time to apply for a water licence under the currently-applicable provisions of the Water Act, or to prepare themselves to do so.

I would like to make it very clear that any work undertaken to support either a water licence process or an underground water impact report should be readily applied to an application for an associated water licence. To start dewatering, mining projects will need one or the other, not both. Therefore, this is not wasted work or duplication. It is expected that projects that have already commenced the approvals process, including those nearing completion of approvals, have been preparing to meet the regulatory requirements based on the current regulatory framework.

This government is committed to consultation. We have carefully considered the comments of the parliamentary committee. We have listened closely to members of the House and stakeholders. We have reached a conclusion that it is possible in this legislation to provide recognition to previous court processes which have conclusively examined water impacts. As such, I will be moving amendments today that make this abundantly clear. These amendments will provide for streamlining of the assessment process for associated water licences. These amendments show that this government really listens. The associated water licence regime has been designed to respond to community expectations that impacts on the environment and other groundwater users should be appropriately assessed.

I will now move on to the amendments to the bill. In response to issues raised in submissions to the Agriculture and Environment Committee and to correct minor errors and clarify the intent of particular provisions in the bill, I will move several amendments during the consideration in detail stage of the bill. I table the amendments to be moved during consideration in detail and the explanatory notes.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, amendments to be moved during consideration in detail by the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, Hon. Dr Steven Miles [2033].

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Steven Miles's amendments [2034].

These amendments will ensure the efficient operation of the provisions on commencement. The majority of these amendments are to correct minor errors—for example, an error in the commencement clause and an error arising from a change in drafting style in the Queensland Heritage Act.

There are four more significant amendments which I would now like to talk to in more detail. During the committee's consultation on the bill, significant support was expressed for the proposed inclusion of a cooling-off period for make-good agreements. Stakeholders from both the agricultural sector and the resources sector have proposed a refinement to the cooling-off period that is mutually beneficial. I will move amendments to the bill which will provide a bore owner with a five-day cooling-off period which will apply to make-good agreements signed at any point in the negotiation process. This will replace the previous variable length cooling-off period which applied only in the initial stage of negotiation.

The second amendment which I would like to speak to also responds to concerns raised during the committee process. While the resources industry demonstrated support for facilitating landholder access to hydrogeological advice in negotiating make-good agreements, the resource industry also expressed a need to ensure that such advice would be constructive and of high quality. In that regard, I will move an amendment that will require any person providing hydrogeological advice under this provision to have the minimum qualifications or experience which will be identified in the bore assessment guidelines prescribed under the act.

The third amendment is proposed simply for the purposes of clarification to avoid any doubt in interpretation. The requirement for an associated water licence applies to mine expansions without a current water licence, regardless of the format of the environmental authority application. I will move an amendment to make this very clear to the reader in plain English.

I am also proposing an amendment that will, on a case-by-case basis, reduce any duplication that may exist between the associated water licence application process and other assessment processes. This will be achieved by allowing associated water licence applications to be exempt from public notification if the mining project has already been through an EIS process and a Land Court objections hearing in which objectors tested the groundwater modelling undertaken by the project proponent with expert evidence of their own. This exemption will only apply if the Land Court process was completed prior to the introduction of the bill. This will ensure that a streamlined process exists to avoid repeated public notification in circumstances where the groundwater issues have already been fully ventilated and tested in the independent Land Court and the Land Court has delivered its recommendation or decision prior to the bill's introduction. I am ensuring that the associated water licence process will link seamlessly with the underground water framework under chapter 3 of the Water Act and the environmental authority process by requiring consultation with the agencies administering those provisions before an AWL is granted.

Finally, I will move an amendment that will strengthen the expertise and knowledge between environmental regulators dealing with water issues. The proposed amendment requires that the director-general of NRM, prior to using powers to deal with an AWL, must consult with the director-general of EHP before each decision. I am pleased with this step towards harmonising and linking the important work of NRM and my agency. I will direct the director-general of EHP that he is to form his opinion regarding whether projects that qualify for this recognition have indeed had their groundwater impacts appropriately assessed based on advice from an independent panel. The panel will be formed by the director-general of EHP and the director-general of NRM and will comprise the Queensland Chief Scientist and three other members qualified in the law, public administration and natural resource matters.

The Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 will provide the environment department with greater powers to scrutinise and address groundwater extraction impacts. The previous government removed the requirement for a water licence. This bill will provide a sensible approach, ensuring that all new resource projects are subject to a proper environmental assessment of groundwater impacts before an environmental authority is issued. The associated water licence regime for projects which have proceeded partly or completely through their approvals process will ensure that projects which have not been subject to the strengthened Environmental Protection Act process will be assessed through a comparable process which will include rights for the community to be heard.

The bill addresses the needs of disparate water users to create a transparent, streamlined and environmentally responsible approach to allocating underground water rights. For the community, the bill will ensure groundwater impacts are properly considered and can be scrutinised by the public and the courts. For the resources industry, there is a streamlined process that better integrates groundwater

assessment into the environmental impact assessment process. For landholders, the bill not only provides a positive step forward for improved groundwater management, it also will assist landholders to better negotiate make-good agreements with resource companies. I commend the bill to the House.

Mr CRIPPS (Hinchinbrook—LNP) (4.54 pm): I rise to respond to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 on behalf of the LNP opposition. This bill was introduced into the House by the Palaszczuk Labor government on 10 November last year—a full 12 months tomorrow—almost nine months after it prevented the majority of the provisions of the former LNP government's Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 from commencing. That is the reason we are debating this bill today.

As has been the case for most of the life of the Palaszczuk Labor government to date, it has had very few ideas of its own. It has spent the last 22 months in office seeking to overturn, repeal and reverse the many initiatives of the former LNP government. When it has not been going backwards, it has been stalling everything else by reviewing it, creating a task force to examine it, establishing an inquiry to look into it or forming a committee to discuss it. This is certainly the case with respect to the bill before the House. We have had 22 months of review and inaction so that the Palaszczuk Labor government could catch up and work out what they supported and what they did not support with respect to the LNP's water reforms that were agreed to by the Queensland parliament in late 2014. The results of that 22 months of introspection by those opposite have been very interesting indeed.

The former LNP government knew that reforming the Water Act was an essential precondition of future economic development opportunities in regional Queensland, particularly I might say in North Queensland. The Water Act, which had been put in place by the former Beattie Labor government more than 10 years before the former LNP government came to office, was overly prescriptive and inflexible, with water users clashing with the Labor governments of the day throughout the 2000s. In 2013 the new federal LNP government had unveiled a Northern Australia policy which presented an opportunity to align the resources of the Commonwealth with a modernised, state water-planning process, paving the way for new greenfield irrigated agricultural projects in regional Queensland, particularly in North Queensland.

Hence, the LNP presented a bill to the Queensland parliament to reform the Water Act 2000. The reforms involved four key initiatives: inserting a broader purpose into the act so that it considered community and economic outcomes as well as the environment; updating unnecessarily lengthy and rigid water-planning processes that had created community concern; landmark reforms to chapter 3 of the act to provide for consistency in how groundwater is managed across all resource industry sectors; and creating a pathway for the consideration of new, large-scale water infrastructure projects, otherwise known as the water development option.

As I mentioned earlier, these reforms were passed by the Queensland parliament in late 2014 but some of them had not been enacted at the time of the election in late January 2015. In February 2015 the Palaszczuk government delayed these reforms pending the introduction of its own bill, which we now know would occur in November 2015. After opposing them in 2014 and ruminating over them for nine months in 2015, the Palaszczuk Labor government will go ahead and endorse half of the LNP government's reforms. After objecting to the changes which will make the water-planning process more timely and efficient and condemning the reforms that will make the management of groundwater consistent across all sectors of the resources industry, Labor now appears to have recognised the value and the robustness of these amendments. These changes by the LNP I am sure will make a significant contribution to the improved management of Queensland's water resources.

It does not seem so long ago that we heard the objections of the member for South Brisbane about how the LNP's water reforms would provide unlimited amounts of groundwater to mining companies. These claims largely repeated the equally baseless claims of green activist groups and other vested interests that had made submissions to the parliamentary committee and to various media outlets which carried their commentary. It was interesting and instructive to read the media statement issued by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines on 10 November 2015 after he had introduced his bill into the parliament. It said, in part—

Dr Lynham said the government would retain the proposed groundwater framework in the WROLA Act.

"The framework does not affect the amount of underground water the resources sector uses, or affect the Great Barrier Reef," he said.

"This framework will give landholders the protection of a statutory obligation on miners to *make good* any impact on their water bores," he said.

"Mines will continue to be subject to rigorous environmental impact assessments and landholders' rights will be protected."

In this respect, the minister was right, and of course that is exactly what I told them and others when I carried the former LNP government's legislation through this parliament in 2014.

Regrettably, the Palaszczuk Labor government has since backtracked on the clarity of thought that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines articulated on 10 November last year with the introduction by the Minister for Environment of the underground water management bill in September of this year. Then again, we should not be particularly surprised that Minister Lynham was not necessarily aware of what Minister Miles was up to. Minister Lynham's separation from the decision-making process within the Palaszczuk government with respect to his portfolio is well known and has become somewhat notorious amongst stakeholders in the natural resource management and resource sectors.

Having said that, the Palaszczuk government eventually decided after a lengthy review that it did not support the other half of the LNP's 2014 reforms to the Water Act. The bill before the House proposes to reinstate a restrictive purpose into the act to satisfy the Greens and prevent new large-scale water infrastructure projects being assessed and approved through the Water Act by getting rid of the water development option.

Labor's bill provides an insight into its ideological position when it comes to natural resource management. The return of the notoriously restrictive ecologically sustainable development, or the ESD, as the overarching purpose of the act should concern industry leaders, particularly those sectors looking to secure additional water to support new productive, job-creating projects. The reinstatement of ESD is a clear sign of Labor being captured by the Greens.

However, the most serious loss for agriculture and regional Queensland is the exclusion of the water development option, which removes a pathway for the assessment and approval of greenfield irrigated agriculture projects within the Water Act. In doing so, Labor has signalled its opposition to economic development opportunities requiring new large water storage infrastructure. This is a blow for communities in the bush, particularly in North Queensland where these opportunities are desperately needed.

The former LNP government delivered a modernised water planning framework that allowed for the productive and responsible use of water in Queensland. With the federal LNP government's Northern Australia policy offering an opportunity to develop North Queensland, the Palaszczuk Labor government is again proposing to make water much harder to access and secure. The LNP opposition opposes this bill strongly because it only seeks to turn back the clock to the circumstances that water users found themselves in under the Water Act before the LNP's 2014 reforms in respect of the primary purpose of the act and the inability to secure large volumes of water resources for greenfield irrigated agriculture projects. The LNP opposition believes these amendments proposed by the Palaszczuk Labor government are backward looking and unnecessary.

Some historical context is probably required at this point to understand the motivation of the former LNP government's reforms in 2014. For almost a decade and a half Queensland's water users were subject to the provisions of the Water Act 2000. This was not a happy time for Queensland's water users. This period was known in regional Queensland with absolutely no affection at all as the 'water wars' and they occurred most fiercely in catchments such as the Queensland section of the Murray-Darling Basin and in the Barron River catchment in Far North Queensland. Those water wars benefited few people and communities except lawyers in terms of client fees and newspapers in terms of endless copy.

For that entire period Queensland's landholders suffered under extraordinarily lengthy planning time lines, inadequate public consultation processes that failed to respect local knowledge and constant uncertainty through amendment bills as legislative inadequacies became apparent. Uncertainty was rife in regional economies where water is a critical input. Some of the members on this side of the House such as the member for Callide, the member for Southern Downs, the member for Lockyer and I have unfortunately all been here long enough to recall a number of those very frustrating debates with too much clarity and remorse when the rigid and uncompromising attitudes of the Beattie and Bligh Labor governments throughout the water wars cast people and livelihoods to one side.

The provisions of the Water Act are the primary framework for the planning, allocation and management of water in Queensland. The primary purpose of the LNP's 2014 reforms to the Water Act was to ensure the state's water resources were used responsibly and productively for the benefit of all Queenslanders while retaining certainty and security for existing water entitlement holders and balancing economic, social and environmental outcomes. The LNP believed then and still believes now

that it is vital for Queensland's water resource management legislation to keep pace with best practice standards and innovations in service delivery and technology. The experience of the water wars for almost a decade and a half certainly convinced us that the legislation needed a significant overhaul.

Our 2014 water reforms were part of a whole of water business transformation that was occurring at the time within the Department of Natural Resources and Mines to deliver an efficient, effective and modern water resource management framework that supported the growth of the agriculture and resources sectors and created economic development opportunities for rural and regional Queensland communities in particular. The 2014 bill established a new overarching purpose for the act, setting a new, balanced direction for water resource management in Queensland. That purpose was realigned to deliver an efficient regulatory framework for the responsible and productive management and use of water resources in Queensland that would facilitate strong uptake of water resource development opportunities while striking an appropriate balance between delivering on social, economic and environmental values for communities across the state.

In recognition that water was a critical input in the economic development of Queensland, whether it be through the resources or agriculture sectors, the new purpose of the act was designed to guide decision-making within a new framework to consider in a balanced way the outcomes of an application for additional water resources for the economy, local communities and the environment with each being given due consideration. Importantly, the new purpose continued to recognise the importance of sustaining ecosystem health, water quality and water-dependent ecological processes and biological diversity associated with catchments, watercourses, lakes, springs, aquifers and other natural systems. These are, in fact, the underlying principles of ecologically sustainable development. I need to repeat that statement for the benefit of those opposite who have tried to rewrite history about the effect of the LNP's 2014 reforms with respect to the purpose of the act. The LNP's new 2014 purpose of the Water Act continued to recognise the importance of sustaining ecosystem health, water quality and water-dependent ecological processes and biological diversity associated with catchments, watercourses, lakes, springs, aquifers and other natural systems.

In pursuing comprehensive reform of the Water Act, the LNP was committed to ensuring that accessibility, certainty and security for water users remained paramount within the new framework for the responsible and productive use of water resources in Queensland. The LNP's 2014 reform bill provided a framework that achieved an appropriate balance between delivering economic, social and environmental outcomes.

During that debate in 2014 the member for South Brisbane and the member for Stafford made some wildly inaccurate statements during the debate on that bill, alleging that the removal of ecologically sustainable development as the primary purpose of the act would be some sort of doomsday event for the management of water resources in Queensland. I went to some lengths to outline how the new purpose of the act—the productive and responsible use of water—was sensible and balanced in respect of its content. In fact, I went to the trouble of reading into *Hansard* record the new purpose of the Water Act as proposed by the LNP's 2014 reform bill. In contrast to the claims of the member for South Brisbane, the member for Stafford and their fellow travellers who opposed that bill, the new purpose of the Water Act in 2014 proposed the following—

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—

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.

As I observed during the debate in November 2014, 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 benefit of the economy, local communities and the environment. Indeed, these principles contain the underlying principles of ecologically sustainable development. The new purpose of the Water Act which I proposed was balanced, took into consideration the needs of all sectors, including the environment as well as local communities, and the need for economic development opportunities, particularly in regional and rural Queensland.

The comprehensive, detailed purpose of the Water Act that I have just outlined also directly refutes the statement contained in the explanatory notes accompanying this bill, which asserts on page 2 that the LNP's water reform bill in 2014 did not expressly include the principles of ecologically sustainable development. That is complete rubbish because, if you turn to page 10 of the explanatory notes and you go to paragraph 3 on that page, there in black and in green are the very same words which I have just read into the record a few moments ago in terms of the principles contained in the purpose of the 2014 bill. This exposes the claims of those opposite completely as being the result of some small-minded political pettiness.

As such, I absolutely reject the proposal in this bill to reinstate ecologically sustainable development as the primary purpose of the Water Act. The argument from the Palaszczuk Labor government that this is necessary to protect the environment is nonsense, and I have already demonstrated that in detail. Removing an explicit reference to the interests of local communities in terms of their outcomes and the consideration of economic outcomes from the purpose of the bill will once again saddle this legislation with a restrictive, narrow purpose that will adversely influence decisions about water allocation in the future.

I turn now to the other major amendment proposed in the bill, which is the removal of the water development option from the Water Act. This is also a provision that I strongly oppose. This was a new provision proposed by the LNP's 2014 water reform bill which proposed an assessment and approvals process for major water infrastructure projects through the Water Act. Here again I will take a few moments to explain in detail what was proposed by the LNP in 2014 in terms of the water development option. In short, it proposed to allow a water resource plan covering a particular catchment to be amended by the chief executive to accommodate a project that required a large volume of water subject to the proponent successfully completing a full environmental impact statement process.

Questions were raised by the Labor opposition during the 2014 debate—primarily by the usual suspect, the member for South Brisbane—about the adequacy of the assessment process involved in exercising the water development option. The assessment and approvals process was in fact based on the same process as that undertaken for projects subject to a Coordinator-General's process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act. Like any other coordinated project going through the Coordinator-General's process, the EIS process undertaken through the water development option would be 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 to be allocated within a catchment. If the proposed project required a volume of water in excess of the unallocated water reserved by a water plan within a particular catchment, the environmental impact statement would need to demonstrate how the proponents would mitigate any potential impacts on the natural environment, including existing water users.

Furthermore, if a proposed project touched on the jurisdiction of the Commonwealth government—for example, the value of natural assets such as the Great Barrier Reef—then the Commonwealth government's assessment requirements would also apply to the project as they did in terms of the existing EIS process associated with a Coordinator-General's report.

Under the former LNP government's water development option, an application would be unsuccessful if the EIS did not identify the necessary volumes of water for that project or could not demonstrate that the proponent could adequately mitigate the impacts on environmental flows or existing water users. Furthermore, the minister administering the Water Act maintained the discretionary power to decide whether to amend a particular water plan to facilitate the development of a major water project pursuant to the water development option.

The LNP's 2014 bill also made it clear that if the consultation undertaken as part of a water development option EIS was not equivalent to that set out in sections 44 to 46 of the Water Act—that is the consultation undertaken in any other water planning process—then the minister could not amend a water plan to provide for a water allocation for that project. There was a very robust process in place. If the Minister for State Development, Natural Resources and Mines and this government do not support assessment and approvals processes that mirror the current Coordinator-General's report or are equivalent to the current consultation process that applies to amendments to water resource plans, then all the current processes utilising those frameworks should be abandoned immediately.

I want to make it quite clear: the water development option as proposed by the LNP's 2014 bill was not a guarantee that secured large volumes of water for a project proponent. What the water development option did was provide some certainty to a proponent that if they did successfully complete an EIS the water would be made available to them at that time. I reiterate: successfully completing the EIS involved a full terms of reference, developed transparently through a Coordinator-General's process or equivalent and an equivalent public consultation process, currently required under the Water Act for the amendment of a water resource plan.

Existing water entitlement holders and environmental values were protected by the terms of reference of that EIS process and the equivalency of the public consultation process which is required under the Water Act. Under the Water Act, water allocations are regularly and routinely conditioned to provide for the take of water when the resource is available. Presently, daily and annual volumetric limits and flow conditions apply. Under the water development option there was absolutely no reason large volumes of water, based on an annual average take, could not also be allocated. Annual average takes would not necessarily guarantee the full take of a water entitlement each year but would facilitate the take of significant volumes of water when the flow conditions allowed.

The Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee tabled its report on 1 March this year. Since then, the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 has languished on the *Notice Paper*. Labor's reluctance to debate the bill will probably have a lot to do with the unanimous recommendation in that report supporting an alternative to the water development option. No doubt, Labor MPs on that committee have since been asked to explain this outburst of independent thinking. The inconvenient truth is that these Labor MPs probably support the LNP's water development option because it is a sensible, coherent and evidence based process. The submissions that came to the committee during its consideration of the bill all lined up in that regard to support the water development option as proposed by the LNP. I note that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines has advised that the government has rejected this recommendation from the committee. So much for being a listening government!

The Queensland parliament rejected the Palaszczuk government's anti agriculture and anti regional development vegetation management bill because it focused on scaremongering and Labor's political relationship with the Greens, not job-creating opportunities for communities in regional Queensland which sensible and balanced reform of natural resource management legislation can deliver. The same dishonesty is now on show here. Labor's Water Legislation Amendment Bill should be rejected by the Queensland parliament for exactly the same reasons.

There are a number of other relatively minor and uncontroversial amendments proposed in this bill which the LNP opposition has no real problem with, but they are unfortunately included in a bill that the LNP cannot support. I would urge the minister to bring those back in a less contentious bill where they will not be compromised by the government's other ill-conceived policy agenda.

I will now respond to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 on behalf of the LNP opposition. This bill was introduced by the environment minister, the member for Mount Coot-tha, on 13 September 2016. In part, this bill is a response to the amendments contained in the former LNP government's Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014.

The former LNP government pursued a comprehensive reform agenda in the area of water planning, allocation and management through its 2014 reform bill. That bill included reforms to introduce a greater level of consistency in how underground water is managed across all sectors of the resources industry in Queensland. The former LNP government was committed to ensuring that impacts on underground water from resource activities were managed fairly and consistently.

Our 2014 water reform bill expanded chapter 3 of the Water Act to ensure that a statutory make-good obligation applied to any landholder whose water supply bore could be affected as a result of mining operations. Up until that time, such rights only applied to those landholders where a bore was potentially affected by petroleum and gas activities. This statutory protection extended by the former LNP government sought to ensure that all landholders had the certainty and security of any impacts to their bore water supply being remedied in an agreed manner.

The 2014 water reform bill also extended the cumulative management area framework under chapter 3 of the Water Act to ensure the impacts of mining operations in the coal and mineral sector are appropriately managed where it is predicted that they may have a cumulative impact on underground water resources. Until that time, cumulative underground management areas only applied to the petroleum and gas sectors. For example, assessments have indicated that the Galilee Basin in Central Queensland is an area where a cumulative management area declaration may be beneficial to allow the potential cumulative impacts of resource projects on groundwater to be appropriately assessed and managed. This would be similar to the cumulative underground water management area that currently exists in the Surat Basin in South-West Queensland. While the former LNP government's 2014 bill included provisions that increased the level of regulation pertaining to the management of underground water resources, they were offset by amendments to the Mineral Resources Act to remove the requirement for these tenure holders to obtain a licence or permit for taking associated water.

The former LNP government keenly understood the need to manage the potential impacts on underground water from resource activities to ensure the community has confidence in the management of Queensland's water resources. The 2014 bill amended both the Mineral Resources Act and the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act to establish a consistent framework to manage the resource sector's access to underground water.

Under the 2014 bill, for the first time the take of water by the petroleum and gas sector, other than where the water was taken as a necessary by-product of the extraction of petroleum and gas, was to be managed under the Water Act planning, management and allocation framework, which already applied to the coal and minerals sectors. This meant that the petroleum and gas sector was being required to abide by the same rules as other sectors within Queensland's resources sector when they were taking groundwater for non-associated purposes such as providing water for workers' camps, dust suppression, constructing and testing infrastructure or developing production wells.

The then Labor opposition opposed the bill and committed to overturning the reforms. The current Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, the member for Stafford, introduced the Water Legislation Amendment Bill on 10 November last year. It did not touch on the reforms that the LNP's 2014 bill proposed regarding the management of groundwater in the resources sector. As I mentioned a moment ago during the debate on the previous bill, it was interesting and instructive to read the media statement issued by the Minister for State Development, Natural Resources and Mines on 10 November 2015, after he had introduced that bill into the parliament. It is worth stating again for the purposes of the debate on the underground water bill. The statement read in part—

Dr Lynham said the government would retain the proposed groundwater framework in the WROLA Act.

'The framework does not affect the amount of underground water the resources sector uses, or affect the Great Barrier Reef,' he said.

'This framework will give landholders the protection of a statutory obligation on miners to make good any impact on their water bores,' he said.

'Mines will continue to be subject to rigorous environmental impact assessments and landholders' rights will be protected.'

Notwithstanding that statement, it is now clear that the reason why Labor's 2015 bill was not brought on for debate for 12 months was that the environment minister, the member for Mount Coot-tha, has been developing this bill to amend provisions within the Environmental Protection Act, the Water Act and the Mineral Resources Act regarding the management of underground water resources. The stated objectives of this bill are to—

- strengthen the effectiveness of the environmental assessment of underground water extraction by resource projects
- allow the ongoing scrutiny of the environmental impacts of underground water extraction during the operational phase of resource projects through clearer links between the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and Water Act 2000
- improve the make good framework in the Water Act 2000
- ensure that the administering authority for the Environmental Protection Act 1994 is the decision-maker for specific applications relating to environmental authorities
- ensure the impacts of mining projects that are advanced in their environmental and mining tenure approvals are appropriately assessed for their impact on the environment and underground water users and opportunities for public submissions and third party appeals are provided before underground water is taken in a regulated area for mine dewatering purposes
- update existing provisions in the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 to provide for the appointment, by local government, of authorised persons to carry out compliance and enforcement activities for the local heritage provisions.

In respect of those provisions in the bill relating to the Queensland Heritage Act, I understand these amendments are not controversial and are supported by the LNP opposition. The shadow minister for environment and heritage, the member for Moggill, will comment in more detail about those amendments during his contribution to the second reading debate.

There are three main areas of change proposed by this bill, being the amendments to the Environmental Protection Act, the amendments to chapter 3 of the Water Act relating to the make-good framework and the transitional arrangements to the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act to capture well advanced resource projects and subject them to an additional associated water licence assessment and approvals process. The proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will require specific information to be included in certain site specific environmental authority applications and amendment applications in relation to the environmental impacts of the exercise of underground water rights by resource projects. These amendments will also require underground water impact reports to include an assessment of environmental impacts of the exercise of underground water rights and clarify that an environmental authority may be amended in response to the content of an underground water impact report.

The LNP opposition is not opposed in principle to initiatives designed to strengthen the up-front assessment of the potential impact of resource projects on underground water resources before an environmental authority is granted. The LNP is genuinely interested in the prudent and responsible management of underground water resources and these amendments are, at least, not retrospective in their application. Strengthening the up-front assessment with legitimate and objective criteria to assess the potential impact of resource projects on underground water resources should occur periodically as knowledge, technology and data improves. The LNP opposition does not disagree that underground water impact reports in cumulative management areas should be the tool to respond to emerging information in this regard.

Having said that, I must say that I am concerned about the proposal to allow the conditions of an environmental authority to be amended post grant throughout the life of a resource project for reasons of sovereign risk and regulatory uncertainty. This is a legitimate concern given the Queensland resources sector competes for investment in a global market where capital is extremely mobile and can choose from many resource jurisdictions in which to invest. Resource sector proponents do need a level of certainty and security to be willing to risk the investment of capital in projects that then create jobs, particularly in regional Queensland, economic opportunities in local communities and provide royalty revenues to the state. The diminution of regulatory stability and increasing perceptions of sovereign risk is something that the members of this House in developing public policy ought to be concerned about. If members consider the risk to an established resource project of having the conditions on its environmental authority post grant amended to the extent that those conditions impinge on its ability to continue production or continue an economically viable level of production, that investment, that economic opportunity, those jobs and those royalties could be at risk.

The proposed amendments to chapter 3 of the Water Act will require resource companies to pay a landholder's reasonable costs in engaging a hydrogeologist for the purposes of negotiating a make-good agreement, require resource companies to bear the costs of any alternative dispute

resolution in the make-good agreement negotiation process, insert a cooling-off period for make-good agreements, ensure that impacts on water bores as a result of free gas from coal seam gas extraction attract make-good obligations, and address issues in the make-good agreement negotiation process relating to uncertainty in the cause of bore impairment. Once again, the LNP opposition is not opposed in principle to genuine proposals to improve the framework for make-good arrangements between landholders and resource companies in Queensland both in terms of the negotiation process and the structure of the agreements themselves. The LNP has always been a stronger supporter of the rights of landholders and the importance of make-good agreements as a safety net for landholders who may be impacted on by resource activities. I would remind the House that the former LNP government's 2014 water reform bill extended the statutory protection of make good to all landholders, delivering that safety net to landholders potentially impacted by coal and mineral projects for the first time. Until the LNP took that step, the statutory protection of make good was only available to landholders potentially impacted by petroleum and gas projects.

I am concerned about the lack of consultation and the inadequacy of the process that has gone into proposing these particular proposals—that is, there has been none at all. The absence of any proper and robust consultation process was highlighted by a number of stakeholder submissions to the Agriculture and Environment Committee. That inadequacy is detailed at length in the report of the committee itself. This is in contrast to the lengthy but widely accepted process that was adopted to review the land access code. That review was initiated by the Bligh government but finalised and the recommendations implemented by the former LNP government. Ideally, significant changes to the make-good framework would have been developed through a similar consultative process that all stakeholders could have had confidence in. Questions about resource companies paying landholder costs, what constitutes alternative dispute resolution processes, the appropriateness of a cooling-off period and the proposals to lower the threshold to demonstrate that resource activities have impaired a bore are all issues that are of concern and are in part inconsistent with some of the recommendations of the review of the land access code. For example, the proposed requirement for resource companies to pay a landholder's reasonable costs to engage a hydrogeologist for the purposes of negotiating a make-good agreement is a new cost to resource companies but is still inconsistent with the results of the review of the land access code where resource companies must reimburse landholders for reasonable legal, valuation and accounting advice.

In relation to the proposal for resource companies to bear the costs of any alternative dispute resolution in the make-good agreement negotiation process, this is also inconsistent with the results of the review of the land access code where the party who triggers the alternative dispute resolution process must bear the costs. With regard to the amendments in this bill inserting a cooling-off period for make-good agreements, currently there is not a cooling-off period for make-good agreements, but I note the minister's foreshadowed amendment proposing a period of five days. It begs the question: what are the merits or otherwise of five business days for a cooling-off period as opposed to some other period? The absence of any robust consultation process to develop the amendments in this bill undermines their legitimacy and their credibility.

The amendments in this bill also propose to lower the threshold for make-good obligations to be triggered in terms of replacing bores impaired by underground resource activities. This effectively lowers the burden of proof to trigger make-good agreements where the performance of a bore has been impaired, allegedly by the activity of a resource project. The explanatory notes accompanying the bill attempt to provide some comfort that the contribution of the resource activity to the impairment of the bore cannot be tenuous or trivial. However, the absence of any robust consultation process to develop the amendments, once again, undermines the legitimacy and the credibility—

Mr Rickuss: There are so many bore owners over that side of the chamber. They understand the issue.

Mr CRIPPS: I take that interjection by the member for Lockyer. The amendments that propose to insert transitional arrangements into the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act are the most controversial and concerning provisions of this bill. These amendments propose to create a separate associated water licensing process for mining projects that are already well advanced in their environmental and mining tenure approvals. The associated water licensing process will require public notification and allow public submissions on underground water impacts associated with these projects and ensure that a decision-maker could refuse an application if the underground water take associated with the project is found to have unacceptable impacts on the environment or other waters users and provide an opportunity for a merit based appeal by third parties. In contrast to the amendments to the

Environmental Protection Act and chapter 3 of the Water Act, the impact of these amendments are retrospective in terms of their impact on resource sector proponents who will be caught by the associated water licensing application and approvals process. The LNP in principle does not support retrospective legislation and does not support these transitional arrangements in this bill.

There are a number of matters that all members need to understand in considering their position on these transitional arrangements. The resource projects most immediately affected by these amendments are Adani's Carmichael coalmine project in the Galilee Basin in Central Queensland and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project on the Darling Downs. There are others, such as Rio Tinto's Kestrel expansion, which involves an amendment to its environmental authority. It is not true to say, as some have—including, extraordinarily, the minister for the environment, who is carrying this legislation through the House—that these projects have not been assessed in terms of the potential impact on underground water resources and that these transitional arrangements are necessary for that to occur. That is quite wrong and very misleading. Both Adani's Carmichael mine project and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project have been through the full Coordinator-General's environmental impact statement assessment and approvals process, the terms of reference for which included an assessment of potential impacts on groundwater.

Mr Seeney: And it's in his report.

Mr CRIPPS: It is in the Coordinator-General's report, which was produced as a result of that process. The conditions in the Coordinator-General's report for Adani's Carmichael coalmine are included in the environmental authority attached to the mining lease for that project. That EA and that ML have been subjected to numerous and lengthy court proceedings where those conditions have been tested. Adani's Carmichael coalmine has been assessed, approved and scrutinised in terms of the potential impact of that project on groundwater and should not be subjected to additional and retrospective processes.

Two weeks ago, a broad cross-section of civic, business and industry leaders across north and Central Queensland made it very clear how they felt about this matter. Those north and Central Queensland civic business and industry leaders know and understand how the continued delay of the commencement of Adani's Carmichael coalmine will impact on business confidence in those regions and how it will deprive those regions of much needed jobs. It is remarkable that Labor MPs in this House representing electorates in north and Central Queensland appear not to be able to grasp that reality.

The conditions in the Coordinator-General's report for New Hope's Acland stage 3 coalmine are included in the environmental authority that may be attached to the mining lease for that project. Those approvals are currently the subject of court proceedings where those conditions are being tested. If New Hope's Acland stage 3 coalmine is successful in the Land Court, it will have been assessed, approved and scrutinised in terms of the potential impact of that project on groundwater and should not be subjected to additional and retrospective processes.

Last week, out the front of this House, several hundred workers, many of them members of the CFMEU—although they were not allowed to tell anyone that that was the case—rallied to send a message to the Palaszczuk Labor government that they do not believe that New Hope's Acland stage 3 coalmine should be subjected to additional and retrospective processes. The Palaszczuk Labor government has a track record of subjecting this project to politically motivated legislation. We all remember the extraordinary Broccoli Broccoli debacle that the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines embarrassed himself with when he relied on the advice of green activist groups instead of the clear views of the local community when he presented an urgency motion to the House for the passage of amendments to the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act in the first half of 2015.

These transitional provisions in this bill, if successful, will impose yet another public notification and objection process on these projects. These transitional provisions, if successful, will provide yet another opportunity for appeals by third parties—by green activist groups—who have a deliberate political strategy to delay and frustrate the progress of resource projects in Queensland. The retrospective effect of these transitional provisions on projects that are well advanced through the assessment and approvals process will send an appalling message to potential investors in the resources sector, which will be that they are not able to rely on the regulatory certainty of Queensland as a jurisdiction. It will have a further deleterious impact on Queensland's perceived level of sovereign risk.

The resources sector is making this reality very well known to the community. The Queensland Resources Council *State of the sector* report for the September 2016 quarter term outlines this sentiment at some length and in some detail. The report includes comments from the CEO of the QRC naming, among other laws, these new underground water laws as a cause for concern among Queensland's resources sector company. The CEO of the QRC also stated—

The current QLD government—

that is, the Palaszczuk Labor government—

seems fixated on delivering poor policy with little or no consultation with industry.

He pointed to several examples of legislation that have been rushed through, subsequently consuming extensive industry resources to ensure that the government fully understands what it has enacted. The September 2016 report carried data that illustrated a declining sentiment towards uncertain or poor regulations in the Queensland resources sector.

The QRC survey also included statements from CEOs, which outlined the sharp deterioration in sentiment around regulation and government resources since the Palaszczuk Labor government has been in office. Those statements were as follows—

State government appears to lack the strategic understanding of our industry and the impacts that ill-thought legislation/regulation has.

Another resources sector CEO stated—

The lack of consultation with industry by government prior to the introduction of new legislation which has a significant impact upon business is negatively impacting business confidence to invest in Queensland.

Another resources sector CEO stated—

The regulatory environment continues to be dynamic with the Queensland government seemingly disinterested in creating a legislative framework that will sustain and grow the mining sector. This is reflected in poor industry consultation, knee-jerk responses to issues raised by left wing interest groups and ill-considered legislation.

Finally, another Queensland resources sector CEO stated—

I continue to be extremely concerned about the lack of consultation from the QLD government.

It appears that the Palaszczuk Labor government is determined to ignore this growing sentiment in Queensland's resources sector which is a cornerstone of the economy, particularly the regional economy in this state. It appears that the Minister for State Development, Natural Resources and Mines is either unable or indifferent to the concerns of the resources sector as he watches the Minister for Environment and the Deputy Premier intervene in his portfolio to the detriment of Queensland's resources sector without any consultation with it.

Mr Costigan: I'd say unable is the real reason.

Mr CRIPPS: Unable, perhaps. In terms of the report of the Agriculture and Environment Committee which considered this bill, I note it contained two recommendations: one to pass the bill and one raising questions about the impact of the transitional provisions on projects that are well advanced through the assessment and approvals process. This second recommendation is a rather understated nod to the many stakeholder submissions to the committee that raised concerns about the almost complete absence of a satisfactory consultation process. The LNP members of the committee submitted a dissenting report against the bill being passed and afforded much more prominence to the concerns in stakeholder submissions to the committee about the lack of a satisfactory consultation. The member for Mount Isa also lodged a statement of reservation with concerns about the bill. The committee recommendations reflect the view of the three Labor members of the committee only. The committee report outlines the serious lack of consultation by the government with stakeholders during the drafting of this bill, the lack of a regulatory impact statement and the short time frame for the committee to investigate a complex and complicated bill.

The LNP opposition will not support these transitional provisions and will be moving amendments during consideration in detail on this bill. Our amendments will seek to remove the retrospective application of a duplicative assessment and approvals process on projects that have already been subject to extensive assessment and approvals processes, including in relation to the potential impact on groundwater resources. Those amendments, and explanatory notes associated with those amendments, have been circulated in my name. The LNP will not oppose the proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection Act in relation to up-front assessment criteria on matters pertaining to groundwater and will not oppose the amendments to chapter 3 of the Water Act regarding the make-good framework for the reasons that I outlined earlier.

However, the LNP will seek to protect jobs in regional Queensland, particularly in Central and Northern Queensland and on the Darling Downs, in terms of the transitional provisions involving amendments to the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act because these proposed transitional provisions are unfair, they are retrospective and they are unnecessary, as I have outlined earlier. These projects have been properly assessed and the local communities that are sweating on the jobs that these projects will create do not deserve to be put through a process that amounts to double jeopardy just because the Palaszczuk Labor government has political debts to pay to green activists and others with vested interests. It is very clear that the transitional provisions that are proposed in this bill are a political pay off to the Greens for their preferences and for other vested interests that the Palaszczuk Labor government is beholden to.

As I have outlined during the course of my second reading contribution to the debate, both Adani's Carmichael mine and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project have been through the Coordinator-General's process, the terms of reference for which included an assessment of any potential impact on groundwater of these respective projects. In relation to the Rio Tinto Kestrel extension project that I referred to earlier, being a brownfield expansion it has not involved a Coordinator-General's process. It is described as a significant amendment to an environmental authority which has been publicly advertised and that process and the terms of reference in that process encompassed any impact on groundwater. I would urge all members of this House to think very carefully about the reality of the assessment and approvals process that these projects have already been through and respect the fact that they should be not subjected to retrospective assessment and approvals processes. That is wrong. That is something that this parliament should not support except in the most extreme of circumstances.

Mrs D'ATH: I rise to a point of order. The member for Nanango keeps interjecting and she is not in her seat.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! I am on my feet and if someone speaks when I am on my feet they will be outside. I take the point of order. The member for Nanango should resume her seat before she tries to debate across the chamber.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (5.55 pm): I rise to address the Water and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 as a part of the cognate debate. I will first provide commentary on the Water and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. In doing so I have to once again make reference to the legislation introduced and passed under the former LNP government. The Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 was passed on 26 November 2014 by the former LNP government. Reform of the Water Act was undertaken in 2014 to cut red tape and encourage economic development using our water resources, particularly in regional and North Queensland, as economic leverage. Certainly we know that North Queensland is a rich opportunity to further develop our agricultural industries. I know the member for Hinchinbrook, the member for Burdekin and the member for Whitsunday absolutely understand the importance of North Queensland to our economy and to our economic development into the future.

Whilst these reforms were passed in 2014, unfortunately they were not enacted before the 2015 state election. Upon assuming office the Palaszczuk Labor government then delayed the commencement of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 pending consideration and review of the legislation which has really been in keeping with their modus operandi that all legislation that was passed under the former LNP government be overturned or amended.

Labor's bill proposes that some but not all of the changes included in the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 now be reversed. The aims of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 included reforming the Water Act to deliver a more responsible and productive water management framework for the use of Queensland's water resources and to also create a consistent framework for managing the usage of groundwater by resource sector industries. It is important to note that the various provisions of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 were set to commence at separate intervals—in December 2014, February 2015 and September 2015.

The Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 created a new framework for the management and allocation of water in Queensland. This legislation was to deliver a significantly more efficient, flexible and responsive water resource planning and water licensing process. The changes that this was to bring about included removing duplicate planning processes. The proposed changes

would have significantly reduced the regulatory burden, the cost of routine licence dealings and other operational planning activities for both water uses and the broader water industry. This legislation aimed to remove prescriptive regulations, allowing licence holders to manage water supply schemes flexibly and efficiently. These changes were to streamline legislative provisions to deliver water plans faster through more efficient processes to establish and/or review relevant plans. The changes under the proposed amendments retain the proposed framework but remove water development options, remove provisions relating to designated watercourses whilst also including the principle of ecologically sustainable development into the new purpose of the Water Act and replacing references to 'responsible and productive management' throughout the bill with 'sustainable management'.

In 2014 the LNP, in introducing a water development option, aimed to provide major resource projects with certainty of access to water early in their project development. Major water infrastructure projects were able to apply for a water development option that provided an up-front commitment over future access to water and exclusivity of access for the project. The major outcome for this change was in providing clear assessment and approval pathways.

Debate, on motion of Dr Rowan, adjourned.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Elmes): Order! Before calling the member for Kawana for the private member's motion, I remind honourable members who were warned under standing order 253A during question time that those warnings are still in place.

MOTION

Lockout Laws

Mr BLEIJIE (Kawana—LNP) (6.00 pm): I move—

That this House calls on the Palaszczuk Labor government to scrap the introduction of a 1 am lockout from 1 February 2017 because it will destroy jobs, destroy our tourism reputation and make no credible difference to violence in our late night entertainment precincts.

As we start this debate tonight, history is being made. As I stand to speak, the new President of the United States of America, Donald J Trump, is delivering his first speech as President of the United States. Let me be the first in this House to congratulate the new President on his election. Long may our trade and partnership with the United States continue.

In 2015, the Labor government took to the election a series of policies with respect to alcohol fuelled violence. The LNP had the most comprehensive strategy in Australia for dealing with alcohol fuelled violence, which was the safe night strategy that included education, tougher penalties and getting those doing damage to citizens to accept responsibility for their actions.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Whitsunday. Education started in year 7 and went through to the final years of schooling. Over the ensuing years, we have seen a complete breakdown of that great comprehensive policy, because the members opposite took a political angle on this and decided that they had a better policy. Despite the fact that our policy was showing good signs of success, they thought theirs was a better policy.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Mr BLEIJIE: I take the interjection from the member for Stafford, because this is his policy. He said that the only way to stop alcohol fuelled violence in the state of Queensland was to introduce new laws, including lockouts. That is what he said. He came into this place despite pulling the wool over the eyes of all Queenslanders with respect to his policy. On 8 July, John McCarthy wrote an article, which I will table, titled 'MP behind laws for alcohol-fuelled violence in Queensland says lockouts "don't work"'.

Dr Lynham: Read on.

Mr BLEIJIE: I will read on, with pleasure. The article states—

At his timeworn offices in Mary Street he leans across the table—

Let us play this out: he leans across the table, looks at the journalist and says—

'I've got a scoop for you. Lockout laws don't work.'

Dr Lynham: Now read on.

Mr BLEIJIE: The honourable member challenges me to read on and I shall. I assume he is still leaning over at the journalist. I quote—

'Lockouts in isolation are useless. The thing that works'—

that is, the one thing that works—

'is the reduction in trading hours so it should be called the reduction in trading hours legislation.'

Does the member want me to read out this bit? He continued—

Lockouts do absolutely zero to take away alcohol-induced violence.

He did not want me to read that. I table that article.

Tabled paper: Article from the *Courier-Mail*, dated 8 July 2016, titled 'MP behind laws for alcohol-fuelled violence in Queensland says lockouts "don't work"' [2035].

The government said that it was going to review these laws. Who did they get to review the laws?

Mr SPEAKER: I am sorry, member for Kawana, I know you are on a roll. I want to counsel the Minister for Natural Resources. I know you are on the speaking list. I urge you not to continue or it may jeopardise your chance to participate in the debate.

Mr BLEIJIE: They said that we were going to have a review into the laws to ensure they are working, despite the fact that we had laws that were working. Who did they get to review the laws? They put out a tender and the tender was won by a Mr Peter Miller, principal research fellow at Deakin University. Let us look at the independence of Mr Peter Miller. On 9 April 2015, bearing in mind that that is before the legislation was introduced, Mr Miller wrote an article for the *Conversation* titled 'Early pub closing times work for Kings Cross—they will work for Queensland too'. I quote—

The newly elected Queensland government has said it will push ahead with its plan to introduce lockouts and 3am closing times for pubs and clubs. Despite objections from vested interests, there's now plenty of evidence to show this is a good idea for patrons and businesses alike.

Then he wins a tender to review the very laws that he has proposed. He is reviewing the laws that he has suggested. He said to the Labor government, 'You should have these laws in the state of Queensland.' They give him these laws in the state Queensland and then he wins money for a tender to review those very laws. That is not an independent review.

This minister should hang her head in shame. Education is not happening in the schools. The harsher penalties are not there and the ID scanners are not there. They should immediately stop their proposal for lockouts in February.

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (6.05 pm): I must respond. He is touting the success of his Safe Night Out Strategy, but there was no database. The first thing was they got rid of the data. They were going blind. They would not know whether or not it was successful. There was no data, no measure, no research and no evidence. He would not—

Dr ROWAN: I rise to a point of order. The honourable member keeps referring to the honourable member as 'he' rather than by his title.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you. I urge members to refer to members by their correct title.

Dr LYNHAM: The member for Kawana referred to an article in the *Courier-Mail* where I stated that lockouts in isolation do not work. It needs a complete package, as was made perfectly clear in that article. Cherry picking data is typical of the member for Kawana. He also asked why we chose Peter Miller. He is a professor representing six separate universities. That is why he won the tender. The only reason he would have chosen Professor Miller's tender would have been if he were running a boot camp or something similar. That would be the only reason he would pick him.

We have evidence based policy. There is no doubt that when trading hours go up assaults go up. In Amsterdam, when trading hours went up, assaults went up; when trading hours went down, assaults went down. Global research shows that restrictions are effective in preventing assaults. A paper published on 3 November 2016 states, 'Governments are encouraged to follow the example of the Queensland legislation.'

I turn now to Kings Cross. Ian Callahan did a review into Kings Cross. A submission to that review stated that no other international city worth its salt has a lockout law. The ABC's *FactCheck* checked that claim and found it was exaggerated. It found that a last call is the usual practice in most cities around the world. It found that they are commonplace. In fact, Los Angeles has a 2 am closure for last drinks. Meta-analysis from Australia, Brazil, Canada, the United Kingdom and the USA concluded that the balance of reliable evidence suggests that extended late night trading hours lead to increased consumption and harms.

I turn to the claim of those opposite that this would harm business and that business will be destroyed. Let us have another look at the evidence presented to Mr Ian Callahan. Evidence presented to him stated that 30 premises in Kings Cross had closed. Let us look at some examples. One premises that closed was the Back Room. It was stated that it had closed because of the lockout laws. It actually closed in October 2014, well before, and had two strike offences.

The Iguana Bar in Kings Cross actually did not close. It continued to trade under a different name—the Dollhouse. Let us look at another one. The Piano Room closed way before the legislation came into effect. Why did Soho close? This is another one nominated as having closed because of the draconian measures implemented in Kings Cross. It closed because the licensee's son was convicted of raping a female customer behind the premises and that attracted undue media attention. That is why that premises closed.

The Bank Hotel closed prior to the amendments because of a series of police incidents. The Crest closed as the property in which it was located was simply sold by the owner. The Trademark closed and was replaced by the Studio, which was subject to intense police activity following violent incidents, including manslaughter, two stabbings and numerous glassings. That is just a simple example of why some of these premises were closed.

Mr Callinan formed the view that the precinct was grossly overcrowded, violent, noisy and dirty, but after the legislation—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mrs Smith interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, I apologise for interrupting. Pause the clock, please. Member for Pine Rivers, you are being very provocative. Member for Mount Ommaney, you are also interjecting. You are both going to be warned.

Dr LYNHAM: There is no doubt that after the legislation was implemented in Sydney the area was transformed to a much safer, quieter and cleaner area. This legislation simply works because the young people of today go out much later than those young people before them.

The secret to this legislation is to simply wind back the night-time economy. There is less opportunity to preload. With less opportunity to preload, people must get to the clubs earlier otherwise the clubs will simply closed. There is less opportunity to preload and less opportunity for alcohol consumption. That is why the clubs do better, assaults go down and people are safer. The people who are protected are those who work in our hospitals, our nurses, our paramedics, our doctors and our youth.

We stand for the people of Queensland. We stand for our children. We stand for the youth of Queensland. Those opposite stand for donations and company profits.

(Time expired)

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (6.12 pm): I am going to bring some real issues and realism into the debate tonight rather than the fairyland that has been painted by the member for Stafford. What's up, Doc? I will tell members what will be up. It will be unemployment across North Queensland. There is no doubt that the measures being introduced by the Palaszczuk Labor government from 1 February will be a kick in the guts for the communities that I represent and our tourism hotspots—not only Airlie Beach and the Whitsundays but also Cairns.

We just heard from the member for Kawana about the signs of success. I take this opportunity in the House tonight to quantify those signs of success. Under the LNP's comprehensive policy, which the member for Kawana has touched on, we saw education and safe night out precincts introduced. Some 15 of them were introduced across the state. Certainly from a parochial point of view, I point out that they were introduced in Cairns, Townsville, Mackay and the Whitsundays. The locals will tell people that just because it is a good rule in Fortitude Valley does not mean it is a good rule for North Queensland.

The member for Kawana was alluding to the signs of success. Under the LNP the early results were encouraging. Initial police data indicated that overall assaults across the state were down by nine per cent, sexual offences were down by 18 per cent, property damage was down 10 per cent and drug offences detected by law enforcement officers—the police—at the cutting edge were up 26 per cent across the 15 safe night out precincts in Queensland.

What is really interesting is that Labor councillor on the Cairns Regional Council Richie Bates famously said almost 18 months ago that he did not agree with his comrades down here on George Street. We need these laws like a hole in the head was the short version of what he thought. Let us go

to what Councillor Bates said. Let us not forget that the Cairns Regional Council put politics aside because they knew that in a tourism mecca like the Whitsundays and Airlie Beach these laws are dumb and ill-conceived and will not provide any tangible benefits in combatting the scourge of violence in our party precincts. Richie Bates stated—

Cairns is world renowned tourist and backpacker destination that relies on lifestyle and entertainment after hours as a main attraction—introduction of a 1 am lockout prohibition could significantly damage our reputation as a premier tourist city and place of recreation.

This proposed law has no place in our CBD where effective safety and security measures are already in place and keeping our streets protected.

I say to Bob Manning and the Cairns Regional Council: take a bow, Bob. He gets it. Sam Marino from the Cairns Chamber of Commerce and our recently endorsed LNP candidate for Cairns gets it. Our good friend who will put the trout back in Barron River, the former member for Barron River, Michael Trout, who was here today, Mr Speaker—you saw him and we all saw him—gets it. Bob Manning gets it, but these clowns opposite do not get it. We had the community cabinet, the red army, rolling into Airlie Beach the other day. There were no red submarines, there were no red tanks, but the red army was there. What happened? I will tell members what happened.

Mr POWER: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Whitsunday, I understand there is a point of order. I hope it is relevant, member for Logan.

Mr POWER: I think there was some unparliamentary language used. Also, I just wanted to give the member a break before he exploded.

Mr SPEAKER: Resume your seat.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. Frivolous points of order are considered to be disorderly in this House. I would suggest that the record of the member for Logan is such that he deserves to be warned about that.

Mr POWER: Mr Speaker, I did not make a frivolous point of order. I made a serious point of order.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I am trying to hear the member for Logan.

Mr POWER: I raised a serious point of order about unparliamentary language.

Mr SPEAKER: I have been reasonably lax with members. The member for Callide is right in relation to frivolous points of order.

Mr COSTIGAN: As I was saying, the red army was there. There were no red submarines and no red tanks, but there they were. They did not like me raining on their parade, did they? They were at the Heart Hotel. There was no heart from members opposite. There was nothing whatsoever.

Stacey Harvey was at the community cabinet in Proserpine. She is at the coalface of the tourism industry in Airlie Beach—the heart of the reef; the heart of the Whitsundays. She went to see the Attorney-General to try to convince the Attorney-General of the Palaszczuk Labor government that these laws are dumb and ill-conceived. As I said before, we need them like a hole in the head. It was like talking to a brick wall. 'D'Ath Vader' was sitting there. Maybe we need Luke Skywalker to give some assistance to the people who are coming through—

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order, Mr Speaker. You made a ruling yesterday specifically in relation to referring to members of parliament by fictional character names. I ask that you bring the member for Whitsunday to order.

Mr SPEAKER: That is accurate. I would urge all members, if they were not in attendance yesterday, to read the ruling I made.

Mr COSTIGAN: Stacey Harvey was trying to convince the Attorney-General that we do not need these laws in our community. It was a waste of time.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Whitsunday, will you withdraw the 'D'Ath Vader' comment.

Mr COSTIGAN: Of course, I withdraw, and I thank you for your guidance. Stacey Harvey has been a real crusader fighting the good fight, just like Mark Napier in Townsville and others in regional and rural Queensland. I saw the seven local news coverage of a punch-up and then some on Flinders Street East only a couple of months ago. At the end of the day, the LNP was onto a winner here. Was it the magic potion? Maybe not, but it was miles better than what is coming on 1 February.

(Time expired)

Mr CRAWFORD (Barron River—ALP) (6.19 pm): I rise tonight to speak against the motion. Like the Attorney-General and Minister Lynham, I support the government's strong and evidence based approach to tackling alcohol fuelled violence. I recognise the value of a comprehensive package of reform, one that addresses the environmental factors that provide for alcohol fuelled violence to occur and one that addresses the culture underpinning those behaviours.

I have stood in this House a number of times and referred to my 15 years as a front-line paramedic with both Queensland and Victorian ambulance services. In this time I saw the impacts that alcohol and alcohol fuelled violence has on individuals, on families and on the safety and integrity of our communities. In the debate on this issue in February this year I said—

I feel to date that there is no speech that I have done that is more relevant, more important and more pertinent to my background than this one. There are very few people in this House who have literally seen what happens on our streets in the middle of the night—who have been there and not only witnessed it but who have had to put up with it, who have had to see it, who have had to smell it, who have had to touch it, who have had to put their hands in people's chests to try to keep them alive, who have had to deal with bystanders who have been trying to assault you and threatening to cause you harm, and who have had to deal with other agencies and the like.

For 15 years I worked an average of four to six shifts per week and probably two or three of those were night shifts, and generally it is fair to say that when we are debating this bill we are talking about the middle of the night. I have read the reports. I have heard the evidence ... I have heard a lot of statistics.

What I heard from the member for Whitsunday in his reference to not only himself but the members of Cairns Regional Council is that none of those people have ever worked on the streets of Cairns in the middle of the night dealing with alcohol fuelled violence, dealing with the people and dealing with what goes on—none of them.

I was driven to enter this place because of my experience as a paramedic, particularly by the conditions that other paramedics and emergency service personnel routinely encounter in the course of their work. They are my family. I owe my life to some of them, and with some of them I have saved the lives of others.

The victims of alcohol fuelled violence are not just the patrons of nightspots and their family and friends. All too often the victims are people who hold a duty and take on the obligation to keep people safe. These are paramedics, police officers, security officers and many more who deal with the worst elements of alcohol fuelled violence.

Tragic situations are an all too common occurrence in the working life of most emergency service workers. One thing is certain: the most tragic of these incidents are the ones that are avoidable. Alcohol fuelled violence is avoidable. In this House we have the tools and we have the levers to drive change in culture and a change in environment that can reduce the risk and incidents of alcohol fuelled violence. We know from our experience, observation and evidence that no one measure in isolation is enough. We need a comprehensive approach. I support the current measures as part of a holistic means of tackling alcohol fuelled violence.

My experiences alone do not inform my view of the laws and funding support that our government has put towards tackling alcohol fuelled violence. I have looked at the evidence. I have listened to the experts. Members would recall that one of the most positive aspects of the debate in this House was the chance to bring together a range of community and industry partners concerned about these issues. They included the following organisations: the Queensland Coalition for Action on Alcohol, including Professor Jake Najman; the Foundation for Alcohol Research and Education; the Australian Medical Association of Queensland; the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons; Drug Arm; the Queensland Police Service; the Public Health Association of Australia; Clubs Queensland; and media organisations. These are just some of the voices supporting the government's comprehensive reforms. I urge opposition members to quit navel gazing and look at the reports informing this policy.

Queenslanders support the government in tackling alcohol fuelled violence to make our community safer. The reforms that our government has introduced demonstrate that the Palaszczuk government is getting on with the job and delivering on our commitment to tackle alcohol fuelled violence in Queensland. We will continue to consult and work in partnership with community groups

and licensees to improve safety and amenity around our licensed venues. Safer venues, safer entertainment precincts and safer communities—that is what is good for business, it is what is good for tourism, it is what is good for the patrons and it is what is good for Queensland.

Mr KRAUSE (Beaudesert—LNP) (6.24 pm): 'Lockouts in isolation are useless ... Lockouts do absolutely zero to take away alcohol-induced violence.' Does that sound familiar to the member for Stafford? He performed a massive backflip. The good Dr Lynham, the member for Stafford, who campaigned on this issue to get into this place, has performed a massive backflip. Other members over there should perform a backflip too and get rid of the lockout laws.

If the member for Stafford does not support lockout laws anymore then why should other members support them? What more proof do you need? Some members of the government I think can see the error of their ways because we know there is at least one minister who has been talking to the QHA, the Queensland Hotels Association, taking on board their point of view—and they want to get rid of the lockout laws—and pledging that she is going to go into bat for them in cabinet to get rid of the lockout laws. We know there is at least one member of that team over there who can see the error of their ways. Maybe we could have a few more who see that tonight too. Kate Jones, the Minister for Tourism, was at the Queensland Hotels Association awards night recently, saying how great the QHA is and how great an industry it is for Queensland. Why doesn't she stand up for the industry and get rid of the lockout laws as well? They are job-destroying laws.

Labor does not care about destroying jobs in the tourism industry and the hospitality industry. The only jobs they care about are the jobs that they have and jobs for their union mates. They are not concerned about the hours lost for people who work in bars. They are not concerned about the hours lost by university students who do not get extra shifts now. They are not concerned about the lost income for businesses and lost income for the entertainment industry because they do not have the extra hours to operate in. Labor are not concerned about the impact on jobs in the entertainment industry. What about Jobs Queensland? They are concerned about that. They are about the only jobs they can create—that bureaucracy, with a nice new shiny office that had for months no policy to create any jobs apart from those in that bureaucracy.

The lockout laws that are coming in on 1 February should be scrapped. We need to build up Queensland's reputation as a world-leading tourism destination, and a 1 am lockout simply does not fit with Queensland being a world-class, world-leading tourist destination. Whether it is in Brisbane or on the Gold Coast or at Airlie Beach or Cairns or on the Sunshine Coast, people want to enjoy themselves and part of that is the night-life. If they go outside a club at 1.05 am to call someone at home or to call someone overseas and then they cannot get back in to be with their mates or their family, they are not going to have a really good experience in Queensland, are they?

Instead of locking people out, let us encourage people to go out and enjoy themselves. The arbitrary nature of these rules frustrate people and no doubt will cause unintended consequences. Concerns have been raised about the safety of security people and the safety of women who go outside and are separated from their friends and family and then they have to walk through the Cairns CBD or wherever they are unescorted. It is a real safety issue. There are so many faults with these lockout laws. If the doctor does not support them, a number of government members do not support them as well.

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: There is too much cross-chatter. I have been pretty tolerant. We have one more speaker after the member for Beaudesert.

Mr KRAUSE: The government need to get rid of these laws. They do not have enough support. There are so many faults. Members do not need to believe me on that. When the committee went to Cairns, member for Barron River, the government could not rustle up a single witness to support these lockout laws. It was embarrassing. We had the member for Barron River at the hearing, but he skulked out because every single witness was opposed to these laws because Cairns has been doing the right thing for years—not even the police supported it, not even the medical professionals supported it. In fact, the medical professionals gave evidence that most alcohol related violence comes out of the home, not the licensed precincts and not the entertainment precincts. Those opposite refuse to accept that evidence from the medical professionals.

The local entertainment industry do not support the lockout laws at all because they have been managing their own affairs quite well. For their proactive work in keeping people safe, do they get thanks from the government? Do they get commendation? No. They got slapped with a one-size-fits-all approach that does not work for Cairns and does not work for other places around Queensland either.

Lockout laws can cause violence by forcing people on to the streets earlier in the night and creating frustration for people who cannot re-enter venues. The LNP's safe night out policy was a comprehensive, funded package of initiatives that should have been given more time to show that it was working. It was working. It had very good early signs. All members opposite should take a good look at themselves because the policies they are implementing are destroying jobs, destroying income for people who work in the industry and destroying income for businesses in our entertainment precincts. Just remember what the member for Stafford said—'Lockouts do absolutely zero to take away alcohol-induced violence.' Stand with the member for Stafford and vote for this motion.

Hon. YM D'ATH (Redcliffe—ALP) (Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills) (6.29 pm): It has been four months since this House passed the legislation to tackle alcohol fuelled violence, and those on the other side have nothing new to add to this debate—not one shred of evidence; no facts whatsoever to support their argument. I rise to speak in opposition to this motion. I want to put some facts on the table again—something that none of the three speakers on the other side has sought to do tonight.

On 13 September the Callinan report was released, but we have not seen one press release, one tweet, one social media post, one question in question time or one statement about that report. Why would that be? Would it be because the Callinan report acknowledged the following—

In my opinion, the objectives of the Amendments are valid.

Mr Bleijie: That is not a report on Queensland laws!

Mrs D'ATH: Mr Speaker, all we heard through the debate on the bill is that this will kill Queensland like it killed Kings Cross in Sydney's CBD. We heard it time and time again by those opposite. One would think that they would be referring to the Callinan report about what happened in Sydney. The Callinan report goes on to state—

Of all the groups holding opinions, it seems to me that the medical profession and the emergency workers have the least or no self-interest. Their opinion, formed on the frontline as it were, must carry a great deal of weight.

We have heard from two of those professionals here tonight. The way that those on the other side have verballed the member for Stafford in relation to his strong stance on this is appalling, but that is what we get when there is no evidence to back up their argument. We know that a poll by FARE in February of this year showed almost two-thirds of Queenslanders support the late-night trading hour measures recently announced by the Queensland government to reduce alcohol fuelled violence. Eighty per cent of Queenslanders believe that Australia has a problem with excess drinking or alcohol abuse. The majority of Queenslanders believe that more needs to be done to reduce the harm caused by alcohol fuelled violence, injury and death, and related issues. The majority of Queenslanders expect that alcohol related problems in Australia will remain the same or get worse—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Attorney-General, I apologise for interrupting. I counsel members that, if you are warned now, that will warning will continue. We have an important bill being debated tonight.

Mrs D'ATH: The survey goes on to say that the majority of Queenslanders do not believe that governments, alcohol companies and pubs and clubs are doing enough to address alcohol misuse, and two-thirds of Queenslanders consider the city or centre of town to be unsafe on a Saturday night—an increase from 52 per cent in 2015.

We have heard from those opposite that we are going to see job losses and clubs shut down. On 8 September this year an article in the *Gold Coast Bulletin* noted that three new nightclubs are planning to open in Surfers Paradise despite stiff new liquor laws. New owners of Shooters plan to reopen the first stage of a three-venue superclub in its existing premises. Across the road, Truth nightclub is promoting its scheduled 20 October opening. Cavill Avenue's Elsewhere nightclub has previously said it would be starting a new live venue on Orchid Avenue by October. If these laws are so bad and they are going to shut businesses, why are we getting three brand-new clubs opening on the Gold Coast? I can advise that since 1 July the Office of Liquor and Gaming has received 261 new licence applications.

Dr Lynham: Two hundred and sixty one?

Mrs D'ATH: Two hundred and sixty one new licence applications, and 238 licence applications have been approved since 1 July. The scaremongering of those on the other side is appalling. I will end on this—

Mr Molhoek interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Pause the clock. Member for Southport, you are warned under standing order 253A. As I indicated, debate on an important bill has started and it will continue to be debated later tonight. This warning will continue.

Mrs D'ATH: Let us remember why we introduced these laws. I noticed yesterday an article in relation to a one-punch attack outside a Canberra nightclub at 1.20 in the morning. The man who received the blow to the head was caught by a friend before he hit the ground, but he was still seriously injured and required facial surgery. His jaw was broken and he received three metal plates as part of the surgery to reconstruct his jaw. We might not see these headlines every day. We are not seeing deaths every day, but they have happened, they are happening, and people are being glassed and injured. We have a responsibility to act and that is what this government has done.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.

Sitting suspended from 6.40 pm to 7.50 pm.

WATER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION (UNDERGROUND WATER MANAGEMENT) AND OTHER LEGISLATION AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading (Cognate Debate)

Water Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from p. 4374, on motion of Dr Lynham, and Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill resumed from p. 4374, on motion of Dr Miles—

That the bills be now read a second time.

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (7.50 pm), continuing: The major outcome for this change was in providing clear assessment and approval pathways whilst removing current uncertainty and investment risk for projects. This provided greater certainty and enabled project owners to proactively invest and progress their development.

The Palaszczuk Labor government's Water Legislation Amendment Bill was referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee. This parliamentary committee, in considering the bill, could not come to an agreement. There has been absolutely no recommendation in the committee's report that this bill be passed, particularly with respect to key elements of the bill. This bill as introduced by Labor is more about satisfying the Greens than actually putting science before politics and constructively working on much needed reforms to the Water Act. I certainly endorse the reforms that were put in place by the former LNP government in 2014. I would like to add my congratulations to the former minister, the member for Hinchinbrook, Andrew Cripps MP, for all of the great work he undertook as a part of these reforms in the former LNP government.

I now wish to address the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This legislation proposes amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994 to strengthen the effectiveness of the environmental assessment of underground water extraction by resource companies, and their ancillary projects, as well as amendments to chapter

3 of the Water Act 2000 relating to the make-good framework. The amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will, in essence, strengthen the initial assessment of the possible impact of resource and mining projects on underground water resources before an environmental authority is granted.

Whilst this is a strengthened environmental mitigation process of which there could be a resultant benefit, there has unfortunately been an inadequate, and a lack of transparent, outlining by the Labor government of the impacts of these amendments with respect to legislative financial assurance, or bond provision requirements, and potential linkages of these to the Environmental Protection (Chain of Responsibility) Amendment Bill 2016. I was not satisfied by the responses provided at the hearings of the Agriculture and Environment Committee with respect to these matters. It should also be noted that there remains widespread stakeholder concern with respect to the statutory guidelines and Labor's chain of responsibility legislation, despite the principles being sound.

It is important to note at this point that the former LNP government on 28 October 2014 passed the Environmental Protection and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014. This then legislation included: increases to the maximum penalties for the most serious offences with respect to the Environmental Protection Act; further recognition of the Great Barrier Reef World Heritage area, as well as environmental authority related amendments to improve the operation of the Environmental Protection Act; and clarification and improvements to the Environmental Protection Act's environmental impact statement, EIS, process. These then amendments commenced on 7 November 2014, followed by other amendments on 30 September 2015, which included: the introduction of enforceable undertakings as an additional compliance and enforcement option, a simplified land framework that requires auditor certification of contaminated land investigation documents and a streamlined process for the payment of fees for amendment applications for environmental authorities.

Now, under Labor's proposed changes, environmental impacts of groundwater extraction for new projects will be addressed as a part of the environmental authority application rather than a separate water licence process. This will result in a single environmental authority covering groundwater and other environmental impacts. Resource companies will be required to detail any proposed excise impact of underground water rights, detail each aquifer affected by the activity and submit an analysis of the predicted quantities of water to be taken, and then specify any impact on the quality of groundwater.

The Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill was referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee on 13 September 2016 for consideration, with a reporting date back to the parliament by 25 October 2016. Although the committee has recommended that the bill be passed, opposition members of the committee did not support the recommendation that the bill be passed. I take this opportunity to congratulate the deputy chair of the Agriculture and Environment Committee, the member for Gympie, Tony Perrett MP, on the statement of reservation he submitted on behalf of the LNP which clearly identified a number of issues that we were very concerned about in relation to this bill.

The LNP opposition members of the committee noted that the objectives of the bill appear to be well meaning, but they were also very concerned about the practical implications of these amendments and the consequential outcomes in Queensland, particularly with respect to jobs, economic development and current resource sector projects which could be impacted upon because of this legislation. The main concerns stem from the hastened process and the lack of adequate consultation and due diligence with respect to key stakeholders. The absence of a regulatory impact statement has certainly compounded the problem for the committee in discharging its due diligence when considering the bill.

A proper regulatory impact process and statement does provide an opportunity to test the reasons behind the proposed need for change from the current legislative framework, test the shortage of the current arrangements and identify how the proposed changes would improve the current situation and/or the environment. The absence of a regulatory impact statement has heightened the problems faced by the committee in being able to adequately assess and discharge its governance responsibilities.

It is important to note that some communities who rely on planned mining projects for a large proportion of their economic security have not had time to be included within the consultation process due to the very short time frame provided to the committee prior to its required reporting obligations back to the Queensland parliament. In the Oakey area, many jobs are reliant on the Acland mine. In this area, alternative employment opportunities are limited. Stage 2 of this mine is nearing completion and job losses will occur if this legislation is passed without appropriate transitional arrangements for stage 3.

Having been a medical superintendent with right of private practice in Oakey for a number of years, I understand the importance of job security for many of those people who live not only in Oakey but in the surrounding districts. I understand what the loss of their jobs could potentially mean for their own economic security as well as their mental health and wellbeing. We all know that having stable employment and being able to pay your expenses on a weekly basis and discharge all of your obligations is very important for people maintaining their mental health and wellbeing. Having worked in the Oakey community and seeing people from the surrounding district, I know how very important it is to them.

With only four weeks given to report back on this very complex and complicated piece of legislation, this has meant that giving a qualified response to the bill despite its intent is an absolute necessity. Back in 2015, the Water Legislation Amendment Bill was given a consultation period of some 15 weeks. The question that must be asked is that, if further time had been allocated, could proposals about alternative regulatory approaches to achieve the proposed outcomes have been submitted and an even better and more balanced outcome have been achieved for all concerned?

I also wish to address the amendments to Queensland's Heritage Act which are contained within the legislation. The amendments, which include providing for the chief executive of a local government to appoint local government employees as authorised persons and clarification and clear stipulation of the powers and functions of these authorised persons, are really about streamlining governance processes and easing some of the more burdensome operational aspects of the Queensland Heritage Act. As such, neither I nor the LNP object to the amendments proposed with respect to the Queensland Heritage Act.

However, I do not support the bill overall without amendments, particularly and specifically with respect to the provisions in the legislation which I regard as unacceptable. Those provisions relate to the absence of an acceptable transitional arrangements process for New Hope at Acland and the Adani Carmichael project. These projects have already undergone rigorous environmental assessments over a number of years, with the approval process for Acland stage 3 having commenced in 2007. The potential impacts on groundwater from these projects have already been assessed.

The LNP will always achieve a balance. As the shadow minister for the environment, I will always argue and advocate for the delivery of balanced economic development, job creation and the maintenance of strong environmental protections. The Liberal National Party supports our landholders and it will always ensure make-good arrangements are an important protection for landholders here in Queensland. In my view, Labor has failed to undertake a comprehensive review of the current make-good arrangements and I would encourage them to do so.

Rural and regional jobs will be impacted negatively if this legislation is passed without amendments being agreed to. The Liberal National Party is a strong supporter of landholders' rights and the LNP understands the importance of appropriate make-good arrangements. However, the LNP also understands the importance of critical mining projects of state significance to Queensland's economy.

I conclude by endorsing the amendments being moved by the LNP in relation to the legislation and restate that the Labor Palaszczuk government should be aiming to achieve a balance with respect to economic development, current resource projects and environmental protection. Unfortunately, we know that the Palaszczuk Labor government is beholden to unions and third parties, which is creating sovereign risk for our state. I would call on the Palaszczuk Labor government to act in the interests of all Queenslanders and not continue with its unbalanced ideological agenda and accede to vested interest groups.

Intelligent people in Queensland, Australia and around the world are beginning to see through some of the hollow rhetoric of the modern Socialist Left. Blue collar workers will continue to abandon the Labor Party in the months and years ahead if there is not balance achieved in relation to some of our mining and resource projects.

Mr Rickuss: They don't represent blue-collar workers anymore.

Dr ROWAN: I take the interjection.

Mr POWER: I rise to a point of order. I believe the standing orders ask us to be in our chairs if we make interjections. Madam Deputy Speaker, I ask that you deal with the member for Lockyer.

Mr Rickuss interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Lockyer!

Dr ROWAN: I take the interjection from the member for Lockyer. They will continue to abandon the Labor Party if they do not continue to support blue-collar workers. If people support—

Ms BOYD: I rise to a point of order. The member for Moggill is taking an interjection from the member of Lockyer when the member for Lockyer was not, in fact, in his chair. I ask that you—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I have dealt with that, thank you. Enough of this frivolity. We will just allow the member for Moggill to complete his speech.

Dr ROWAN: If people support sustainable border control policies, the Labor Party brands them a bigot or a racist.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could everyone please just settle down. It has all been a bit of fun, but now we just want to hear the member for Moggill. If you need to have a conversation or to discuss it further you can take it outside the chamber.

Dr ROWAN: If people support family friendly policies, including supporting mothers raising their children at home, Labor brands them sexist or a misogynist. If people support our agriculture industry or our mining and resources sector, the modern socialists of the Labor Party dominated by corrupted unions actually brand them an environmental vandal. Queenslanders and Australians are sick and tired of the Socialist Left holding them to economic ransom by extremist third parties and their associated biased social media trolls and journalists within left-wing media outlets continuing to jeopardise our economic security here in Queensland.

Queenslanders expect economic and environmental balance in public policy, particularly as it relates to transitional provisions with respect to resource projects that have already undergone extensive evaluation and assessment processes. The Palaszczuk Labor government needs to consider the amendments that are being moved by the LNP in the interests of achieving a balance here in Queensland in relation to our resource and mining projects, landholders and also for our economic security.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON (Nanango—LNP) (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (8.05 pm): The Palaszczuk Labor government is no friend of rural and regional Queensland. This bill is a prime example of their hypocrisy. They say that they care about economic development in the regions on one hand, but on the other hand we see Minister Lynham, the Minister for Mines, bringing in amendments that will wreck a community and that will take away tens of thousands of jobs in Queensland. It also risks thousands of jobs that are already existing. It is interesting—I will not be able to make comment because the minister has just left the chamber. However, it is no secret that—

Ms Boyd interjected.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Maybe the member for Pine Rivers would like to depart as well. It is no secret that I 100 per cent support primary producers out there who find themselves working with resource companies. It is only the LNP that support make-good arrangements which fully protect landholder rights in respect of underground water. I agree with AgForce that primary producers must have up-front certainty that their access to water will be secure and will not be interrupted or impaired by mining or gas sector activities. The LNP acknowledges there are some concerns with the current make-good arrangements, but it must be noted that Labor has failed to undertake a comprehensive review of these arrangements. We urge the Palaszczuk Labor government to properly review the make-good arrangements, like the LNP did in 2013 with our land access implementation committee. These reforms are important and we need to see a proper review of make-good provisions for this legislation.

The LNP opposition have a strong commitment to appropriately protecting the interests of landholders and regional communities. It was the LNP who strengthened the make-good provisions. Prior to the LNP coming into government the previous Labor government supported make-good provisions for only petroleum and gas. We extended it to all landholders, in particular in relation to coal. In this respect I highlight that amendments to this bill that have been proposed by Minister Lynham have direct impacts on two major projects in our state. We see the expanded revised stage 3 of the New Hope mine that has been talked about here tonight. This project needs some clarification for this House because there are those opposite who are just deluded in their belief in relation to this. The approval process for the new Acland coalmine stage 3 started in April 2007. It has been a—

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: I ask the members for Logan and Gregory if you would like to have a conversation you are welcome to take it outside the chamber, but we are here to debate a bill tonight.

Mrs FRECKLINGTON: Since April 2007 it has been a long, exhaustive process to get to where we are. There was public consultation on the draft terms of reference for the EIS in 2007. The original EIS was released for public consultation in 2009.

The project languished under the then Beattie-Bligh Labor governments. The scope of the project was revised to take into account community concerns that were given through feedback in 2012. A revised draft terms of reference was taken on board by the LNP government, and the terms of reference for the EIS were released from 1 December 2012 to 4 February 2013. The EIS was then released for public consultation from January 2014 to March 2014. The additional information for the EIS was then released further in 2014. Finally, listening to what the community had requested, the Coordinator-General approved the project with extremely strict conditions in 2014. They worked with the community to address concerns about that project. New Hope then submitted applications for an environmental authority amendment and a mining lease. Both applications have been subject to community consultation. That is no less than seven public consultation processes for state based approvals about the project and its potential impacts. The Palaszczuk government even commissioned Synergy Economics to undertake a cost-benefit analysis on the New Acland project which found the project would yield a positive net present value of $1.68 billion.

In short, it is unbelievable that this minister comes into this House tonight after all of this time and after all of the public consultation—seeing 700 workers out there pleading with the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Mines to listen to their plight. With the amendments that this minister has brought into the House tonight he has thrown this project under the bus. Why do they hate the Darling Downs and the hardworking workers there? The simple fact is he has traded Peter to pay Paul. It is incredible that this minister, who goes up to Toowoomba and around the Darling Downs region and makes friends with them all and tries to pretend that he is listening, tonight goes out there and throws those good people under the bus.

Since this bill was first introduced I have received hundreds of emails from New Hope workers and contractors expressing their concern. There are too many to read, but first Matthew and Naomi Tonschenk, who were standing out there pleading for this minister to go. They both work at the Acland mine and Matthew has been employed there for 14 years. They wrote—

Our family and surrounding community have been exposed to 9 years of delays and changes. This legislation could further delay the approval of the Acland Coal Mine expansion and seriously jeopardise my future, my families future and the financial future of this area. We are pleading with you to make the right decision.

We also have David Wood, 'Woody', who works at the mine who says—

... 507 contractors and 2300 indirect jobs will be lost if the mine expansion is not approved.

They go on and on, Madam Deputy Speaker. It is interesting to note that those ministers over there have only met with the CFMEU; they will not meet with the workers of New Hope. After that protest I received a call from Coral and Barry Mason. The Masons are third-generation farmers whose property borders this project. They wanted to express their support for my statements because they want to see the revised stage 3 go ahead. They understand the community consultation, and they understand the amendments that we made to this proposal to satisfy that community. They believe that mining and farming can work together. They believe agriculture in the region will suffer if the expansion does not go ahead because many of the workers have farms and work at the mine to subsidise their income. Barry Mason said—

I like to sleep at night, and I can't sleep knowing that if the mine doesn't go ahead and I say nothing, the situation is there will be people will be out of work.

I would like to thank Coral and Barry Mason for speaking out. I would like to thank every one of my constituents who understand the real economic, financial and agricultural impact that this minister is landing on their lap right now.

I would like to endorse the well-thought-out amendments that the honourable member for Hinchinbrook has brought forward to enable the project to go ahead. It has been through EIS, community consultation, Land Court applications and pleading from 700 decent locals of the Nanango electorate who are pleading with this government to listen to them because they know that the Palaszczuk Labor government does not care about agriculture. The Palaszczuk Labor government does not care about the regions. They are all talk and no action.

Mr MADDEN (Ipswich West—ALP) (8.15 pm): I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Water Legislation Amendment Bill. I hope to bring some balance to the debate on these two bills. I will firstly speak in support of the underground water management bill which amends the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the Mineral Resources Act 1989—

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Lockyer and member for Logan, this is not about having a conversation across the chamber. If I have to speak to you again it will be a formal warning. I call the member for Ipswich West.

Mr MADDEN:—the Queensland Heritage Act 1992, the Water Act 2000 and the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act, otherwise known as the WROLA Act. The Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef presented this bill to parliament on 13 September 2016, at which time he said that the purpose of the bill was to better manage the environmental impacts of groundwater taken by the mining industry and to protect the interests of farmers and other landholders whose groundwater is impacted by resource industry activities. As the minister said, the underground water management bill will ensure that in the future the environmental assessment under the Environmental Protection Act will scrutinise the environmental impacts of groundwater taken by mining activities as part of the application for an environmental authority. By doing so, the bill strengthens the assessment of environmental impacts related to groundwater taken by resource activities. The bill complements proposed amendments to the WROLA Act which will be delivered by the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015.

After the underground water management bill was tabled it was referred to the Agriculture and Environment Committee, of which I am a member. In report No. 25 of the 55th Parliament the committee made two recommendations: firstly, that the bill be passed; and, secondly, that the minister examine the impact on relevant mining licence holders' short-term prospects and the resulting impacts on affected communities and present his findings in the bill's second reading speech. This bill addresses the concern about the WROLA Act's so-called unlimited right to take water by mining operators.

It is not surprising that farmers and other agricultural users in rural communities are so concerned about the impacts of mining operations on underground water resources. This bill addresses these concerns with amendments to the existing obligations and moves to address this issue in future under Queensland's environmental protection laws administered by the state's environmental regulator.

As detailed in the committee's report, the current water licensing scheme in Queensland, the Water Act, requires the holders of resource operations licences under the Mineral Resources Act to obtain a water licence prior to extracting any underground water within a regulated area.

The Queensland parliament passed the WROLA Act on 26 November 2014 in the last days of the Newman government. The WROLA Act inserted a new section 334ZP into the Mineral Resources Act, creating a limited statutory right for mining licence holders to 'take or interfere with underground water in the area of the licence or lease if the taking or interference happens during the course of, or results from, the carrying out of an authorised activity for the licence or lease'.

The WROLA Act also amended the Water Act, removing references to ecologically sustainable development as a criterion for assessment of an application for a water licence. These provisions did not commence upon assent of the WROLA Act. Subordinate legislation fixed various times for their commencement until the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2015 fixed the commencement date for all as-yet-uncommenced provisions as 6 December 2016.

I am a graduate of the University of Queensland Gatton campus. I hold a degree in horticulture and a graduate diploma in agriculture. For a number of years I worked as an agronomist, both in Australia and in Israel. I live near the junction of the Brisbane Valley and the Lockyer Valley. I understand more than most how important good-quality groundwater is for our farmers and the environment. Our water resources are simply too precious to risk. It mystifies me that the LNP opposition, which purports to stand up for Queensland farmers and graziers, does not fully support this bill.

The WROLA Act had the effect of removing all third-party rights of appeal over proposed groundwater mining licences including the right of farmers and graziers to object. Applying the environmental authority process to new projects and the proposed associated water licence process to existing projects has broad support and is a win for Queensland farmers and graziers as well as rural communities affected by mining operations.

Resource industry representatives, however, have been unanimous in their opposition to the application of the proposed associated water licence process to advanced projects. Advanced projects are those where an environmental authority has already been granted or applied for but a water licence has not yet been obtained. The committee noted that the mining licence holders who had voiced their opposition to the bills were largely large-scale operators for whom the administrative overhead required by the assessment process is the accepted cost of doing business in mining in Queensland.

The committee also noted that government water use policies have been in a state of flux for some time and that the bill has been developed after consultation with the industry. In this light, the committee considered that mining licence holders have been aware of the potential for legislative amendment and the affected mining licence holders have had sufficient time to apply for a water licence under the current applicable provisions of the Water Act.

The committee received a number of submissions concerning the New Acland stage 3 mine expansion, operated by New Hope Group. A number of workers from this mine attended the committee's public hearing in Brisbane. The New Acland mine currently employs 275 full-time employees, periodically employs some 500 contractors and contributes to the existence of approximately 2,300 jobs in South-East Queensland. Many of those workers live in Oakey, where alternative employment opportunities are scarce. An unknown number of employees have family who are rural producers and who are partially reliant on off-farm income for the financial stability of their properties.

Stage 2 of the New Acland mine is nearing completion and the current production rates will be unable to be maintained past mid-2018. The committee heard that if stage 3 is not able to be commenced by this point job losses will inevitably follow. For this deadline to be achieved, construction is required to be commenced in early 2017. This would be commercially unfeasible in the absence of security over water rights to dewater the mine. The committee had significant concerns about the flow-on impacts of any interruption to the New Acland mine and similar projects.

I would like to thank my fellow committee members on the Agriculture and Environment Committee, the committee secretariat and all those people who made submissions to the committee directly. I also thank the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef, Hon. Dr Steven Miles, for bringing this very important bill to the House.

I will now speak in support of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill. The government made an election commitment relating to the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014, known as the WROLA Act, that included to act immediately to: prevent the commencement of the Newman government's water laws, which will have a detrimental effect on the Great Barrier Reef catchment systems and allow for overallocation of Queensland's precious water resources; and return ecologically sustainable development principles to the Water Act and remove water development options in their entirety.

As the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines said in his first reading speech on 10 November 2015, this bill is a necessary step in implementing the government's strategy to align the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act, the WROLA Act, with the Palaszczuk government's policy and election commitments. The bill amends the River Improvement Trust Act, the Water Act and the WROLA Act for particular purposes.

As I have indicated previously, the WROLA Act was passed by the Queensland parliament on 26 November 2014, in the last days of the Newman government. It included wideranging amendments to a number of acts including the Water Act, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act 1999, the Mineral Resources Act and the River Improvement Trust Act.

Certain provisions of the WROLA Act commenced on 5 December 2014, the date of assent. The remaining provisions were to commence on a day to be fixed by proclamation. A proclamation was made on 19 December 2014, just a few weeks prior to the end of the term of the Newman government, commencing certain amendments to the River Improvement Trust Act, the Coal Mining Safety and Health Act and the Water Resource (Burnett Basin) Plan 2014 on that day, with certain other provisions to commence on 18 February 2015.

It appears that the WROLA Act was rushed through parliament in the last days of the Newman government without adequate consideration of its consequences for the environment or the agricultural sector. The Palaszczuk government when in opposition strongly opposed a number of amendments to the WROLA Act, including a new designated purpose of the Water Act that did not include the principles

of ecologically sustainable development but did include the introduction of a water development option for large-scale water infrastructure projects. After the change of government in 2015, a proclamation postponed the commencement of a number of water related reforms of the WROLA Act 'to allow time for the provisions to be reviewed for their consistency with government policy'.

Reforms related to water authorities commenced on 18 February 2015. A proclamation made on 11 September 2015 commenced certain provisions of the WROLA Act on that day. These included amendments to the Water Act to: establish a watercourse identification map; omit duplicate provisions dealing with drainage and embankment areas; broaden the definition of 'publish' to provide greater flexibility for public notices; and change the Water Resource (Great Artesian Basin) Plan 2006.

On 13 November 2015 the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment (Postponement) Regulation 2015 postponed the automatic commencement of uncommenced provisions of the WROLA Act to the end of 5 December 2016. Should the House pass the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, the WROLA Act will be amended on the commencement of the Water Legislation Amendment Act 2016. The amended WROLA Act will commence by proclamation on 6 December 2016 and amend certain provisions of the Water Act that I have already detailed.

The bill and explanatory notes were tabled by the minister after the first reading speech on 10 November 2015 and referred to the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee to consider. The committee tabled its report on 1 March 2016 and made only one single recommendation: that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines continue to investigate alternatives for securing water for large-scale projects while taking into account the impact on communities. On 30 May 2016 the Queensland government tabled a response to this single report recommendation. The government noted the committee's recommendation to continue to investigate alternatives for securing water for large-scale projects. The government also noted that water development option provisions in the WROLA Act are inconsistent with government policy and its election commitments for saving the Great Barrier Reef, which expressly commits to the removal of the water development option provisions in their entirety.

The government also noted that the removal of the water option provisions of the WROLA Act as provided in the bill delivers on the government's election commitments. The government advised that there are existing mechanisms in the Water Act 2000 which support large-scale water infrastructure development already. In closing, I want to thank members of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, the committee secretariat and the submitters. I also want to thank Dr Anthony Lynham, the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines, for his hard work in bringing this important legislation, the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, before the House. Like the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, the Water Legislation Amendment Bill is good for the environment and good for agriculture in Queensland. I am pleased to commend both bills to the House.

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (8.30 pm): I rise to speak to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and, to a lesser degree, the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I note that the stated aims of the legislation are to—

- align Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 provisions with Government policy and election commitments
- ensure provisions for water planning instruments appropriately transition existing instruments and processes into the new water planning framework and that the new framework can operate effectively.

In 2014 the former LNP government pursued reform of the Water Act to reduce red tape and encourage economic development opportunities using water resources, particularly in regional Queensland. The key reforms included to remove the ideologically driven ecologically sustainable development, or ESD, component and insert a broader purpose to the act to consider community and economic outcomes as well as the environment; to update unnecessary, long and rigid water planning processes; to provide consistency in how groundwater is managed across all resource industry sectors; and to create a pathway for the consideration of new large-scale water infrastructure projects, known as the water development option. These reforms were passed in late 2014. Since forming government, Labor has delayed these reforms and only in late 2015 did it introduce its own bill.

I note that the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee was not able to reach a majority decision on whether the bill before us tonight should be passed. The only recommendation from the committee states—

The committee recommends the Department of Natural Resources and Mines continues to investigate alternatives for securing water for large scale projects while taking into account the impact on communities.

I turn now to make the following points in terms of a Cleveland or Redlands perspective with regard to this bill to provide some local understanding about water reform. On many occasions I have brought the views of my electorate to this House about water management and water reform. Labor has been responsible for and known for poor water management across the Redlands for many years. I went on the record in my first year as a member of parliament condemning the then Labor government on its failed water policies of the time and how they impacted on the Redlands. My electorate of Cleveland and the broader Redlands has always been a water rich area in South-East Queensland. It was the foresight of local councils that implemented a sustainable water management system for the Redlands. Water supply and water security were a high priority for these former local councils long before the Redlands shire became known by its city status. There was plenty of water to provide the community in spite of long-term drought conditions and a growing population. This was all achieved with moderate cost to local consumers. It is called good planning.

The former Labor state government's disastrous takeover of the well managed Redlands Water is well documented. Labor took away the water rights of the Redlands, made poor decisions about water infrastructure and provided inadequate compensation for the assets it acquired. In a speech I delivered to the House in 2009 on the Water and Another Act Amendment Bill, I quoted former Redlands shire mayor Don Seccombe. In the *Redland Times* of May 2007 Don Seccombe stated—

... that the state government taking control of dams, weirs, bulk water pipes and waste water treatment plants in South-East Queensland while councils controlled the domestic distribution system and water retail businesses was 'not good for the Redlands'.

He went on further to state—

... all the investment this Council has made over decades to secure water supply have been stripped from us. Redlands has planned ahead and paid for its water security over the years and now we are being penalised and will have to continue to pay to help secure water for the rest of South East Queensland.

The hard work and planning of the Redlands council—

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I was just following the bill and I do not believe there is any relevance to the bill we are actually discussing tonight.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Order! No, there is no point of order.

Dr ROBINSON: Only the LNP had a plan to ensure that all Queenslanders would benefit from responsible water management and that there was an appropriate balance in water management in terms of balancing the economic, social and environmental issues, which are some of the important aspects or broadly underpinning aspects of this bill. I also noted in the House in 2010 that Labor's failed water management policy created a shortfall of an estimated $300 million as a result of the devaluing of Redlands water assets and that the final result of these water management policies was the price hike of water rates in Redlands city. Redlands now pays massive water rates costs compared to what used to be our cheaper water supply. The bill before the House today under Labor's management provides little hope for improving local water management.

Since 2009 I have expressed serious environmental concerns about Labor's decision at the time to take extra water from the North Stradbroke Island underground water aquifer and I note that that was an underground water aquifer that was under pressure from the mine, even though the mine has managed that water use well over the years, but also the increasing drawing of that water supply by the Redlands community and now broadly the South-East Queensland community. It is very important that that North Stradbroke Island aquifer be carefully managed and I was very happy to be part of the LNP government that implemented safeguards to protect that water resource. We managed the water usage of the aquifer in a sustainable manner and we put in place safeguards to make sure excess water was not readily taken from that source and only by a strict application and approval process could additional water be taken from that Straddie aquifer. That was something very important that a number of the local green environmental groups had been calling on for some time.

Another local water supply issue in the Redlands that is relevant to the bills is the management of the Leslie Harrison Dam. As a part of scheduled maintenance, the gate of the dam was removed—it was only meant to be for a short time while maintenance occurred—but now we learn that there is no plan from Seqwater to put the gates back on. Today we see the Tingalpa bridge area of the dam near Broadwater Road dry.

Dr LYNHAM: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Again, the member is drifting well and truly away from relevance to this bill.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cleveland, I ask you to come back to the relevance of the bill before the House.

Dr ROBINSON: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. As I have tried to make the point, it is very important in terms of how we handle the underground water—the aquifer—on North Stradbroke Island and what we do in terms of water reform in the Redlands. We have had another issue that has come about, and I am talking about local applications of water reform and management. It has been part of the history of the development of this bill in a number of pieces of legislation over the last seven years.

Mr Power interjected.

Dr ROBINSON: I note the interjections from the member for Logan, who continues to make frivolous interjections. I make the point that the member was not here in the parliament during previous debates about water reform and water management.

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The member is now explicitly making points about bills over the past seven years, not the bill at hand.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Cleveland, once again I will bring you back to the relevance of the bill.

Dr ROBINSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you for your guidance. I was taking an interjection from the member for Logan. The member for Logan likes to dish out frivolous points of order, but then when you take an interjection—

Mr BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cleveland, take your seat. There is a point of order.

Dr ROBINSON: Really?

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cleveland, for the disrespect to the chair that you have shown, you are now warned under standing order 253A.

Mr BROWN: My point of order was that the member made two reflections on the chair.

Dr ROBINSON: Mr Deputy Speaker, I certainly apologise to the chair. It was not my intention to in any way imply anything of the chair, but the very fact that there continues to be this frivolous interjection from those opposite, I am happy to—

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Cleveland, we are discussing the two bills before us. Please go back to the relevance of the two bills. Ignore the interjections.

Dr ROBINSON: Thank you. The former LNP government dealt with the North Stradbroke Island aquifer and its importance to mining. It was important water reform. This legislation tracks back many years to previous acts. It is part of the history of why we have what we have today. I make those relevant points.

It is interesting to note that, today, it has taken the former member for Capalaba Jim Elder to raise issues about the risk of asbestos in our water supply. The government has not been able to handle those questions.

(Time expired)

Mr HART (Burleigh—LNP) (8.41 pm): I thank the member for Cleveland for his interesting speech. I can take as good as I get from the member for Logan. If he would like to interject, I will give it straight back to him.

I, too, rise to speak to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill in this cognate debate. I will not be as succinct as the member for Hinchinbrook was in his contribution, which I think was one of the best speeches I have heard in this Queensland parliament in the five years that I have been here. The shadow minister, who was a former minister with responsibility for this issue, knows this legislation inside out. It is a real shame that those on the other side of the House do not have the knowledge of the member for Hinchinbrook. We have heard quite a few members on the other side of the House speak to this legislation. Clearly, they do not understand it.

I am going to limit my contribution to a few things in both pieces of legislation that I do not agree with because I agree with a lot of what is in them. If the member for Ipswich West would like to pay attention, I will explain that the LNP supports quite a bit of the legislation that has been introduced, but it has issues with it that were canvassed by the committee of which I was a member at the time this legislation was first introduced.

The infrastructure committee reported on the bill back in March this year. This legislation has been sitting on the *Notice Paper* for nine months. We have been wondering why it has taken this long to be debated. Obviously, it has taken that long because the Labor Party was coming up with something completely different. It was talking about one particular item and then it was off doing something completely different in legislation considered by another committee.

The issues that I take with the Water Legislation Amendment Bill relate to two matters. After the former minister changed the act, this government is taking it back to ecologically sustainable principles. The member for Hinchinbrook clearly articulated the difference between what the 2014 legislation put forward in terms of responsible and productive management of our water assets and ecologically sustainable principles. There were quite a few discussions during the committee hearing about this matter. The committee heard from a number of submitters. There were varying degrees of input from different sectors, especially the extreme Greens. As members are aware, the Labor Party is completely and utterly beholden to the extreme Greens. In fact, two members opposite are at risk of losing their seats to the Greens. That is why we keep seeing all of these pieces of green legislation coming before the House. We constantly see ministers putting forward very legitimate pieces of legislation with very good processes in place and with the right intent, but there is also another minister who is completely undoing that work and creating a whole lot of sovereign risk in this state. We really cannot afford that.

The committee heard from Dr Tim Seelig of the Wilderness Society. He said that putting the principles of ecologically sustainable development back into the legislation was 'an incredibly important point for us'. That was his contribution. There was no real explanation as to why it is incredibly important. On the other hand, the committee heard from Dr Dale Miller, who stated—

> We do not have significant concerns with what is in the bill in terms of the three areas that are focused on around the re-introduction of ecologically sustainable development principles and replacing the term 'responsible and productive' with the term 'sustainable' in relation to water management.

I was interested to hear the contribution of the member for Hinchinbrook and why he had amended the legislation and inserted the words 'responsible and productive' management. I was equally interested to hear Minister Lynham's comments about why we needed to keep the principle of ecological sustainability. During the minister's speech I interjected, asking him if he could explain to me what that term was. Throughout the committee hearing I asked the same question of everybody who came before us, 'What is your definition of ecological sustainability?' I could not get anybody to explain that to me. I do not think that anybody knows what it is. The minister took the interjection, but he did not bother to explain to me what ecological sustainability is. I would be very interested to hear the minister explain to me what that term means. I wait with bated breath. I have asked these sorts of questions before without getting a response. I am glad that the minister is taking notes and we may well hear what ecological sustainability is all about. I would be very happy to hear it.

The committee did make the comment that it was unable to reach consensus on the proposed provision relating to the inclusion of principles of ecological sustainability. That is because the government members, of whom there were three, voted along the lines that the government wanted them to vote on, and the other three of us had an open mind and we disagreed with that. The lemmings over there do not have an open mind. They will follow this government and the green agenda right off the edge of the cliff.

Dr Rowan: They are beholden to the Greens.

Mr HART: I take the interjection from the honourable shadow minister. They are completely beholden to the extreme Greens. The other issue that I disagree with is the water development option. Although we have heard from some of the contributors here tonight that the committee was split on that, I can tell members, from my involvement with the committee at the time, we were not, in fact, split on that. We all agreed there needed to be some form of water development option available. The government members, again with a closed mind, completely agreed with the government, but we did manage to get them to make one recommendation and that was that the government consider an alternative. We did have three Labor members who agreed that there was a need to have an alternative to a water development option. They wanted to call it something else. I will listen intently to the other members who were on the committee at the time to see whether they disagree with that comment.

Mr Cripps: How dare they have an independent thought!

Mr HART: I take that interjection from the member for Hinchinbrook. I doubt that they will have an independent thought because they do not appear to have had one so far. The bill proposes to omit the provisions relating to a water development option on the basis that it is not consistent with the government's position due to concerns about the potential risk to the Great Barrier Reef. How often do we hear that? How often are those opposite using that as an excuse?

Mrs Lauga interjected.

Mr HART: Those members who are interjecting have the opportunity shortly to jump up and explain exactly how this will affect the Great Barrier Reef. I challenge them to give us a definitive position as to why this will affect the Great Barrier Reef. AgForce argued—

In relation to the government's decision to remove WDOs we would propose that the underlying reason for their creation, namely the need for greater certainty of access to available water for potential developers, is considered further.

That is one of the reasons I cannot support that part of the bill. There were some interesting comments made around the water development options and I would just like to read what Mr Ian Johnson from the Farmers' Federation said—

The second issue is obviously the water development option. We were not totally in favour of the water development option as it was put forward in 2014. We believe that the way it was put forward it could override a water plan. A proposal was put forward by the department in the lead-up to 2015 which allowed for a redefined water development option, which allowed for the fact that it needed to take account of a water plan. If there were some provisions that were not taken into account, then the water development option could only go ahead if the water plan was reviewed. A good case and example would be the Gulf Water Plan review. So we are coming back, we are saying the water development option has been taken off the table totally and that is not a good move. We understand that the federal government is coming forward with a number of proposals for dams. This would be an important provision in the Water Act to give a framework for that.

This government has a history of not supporting the agricultural segment of the Queensland economy. We need to look no further than the fact that we have no agricultural minister and we have not had one for a period of time—although I see somebody over there jumping around in seats so maybe there is something we have not been told yet. We will have to wait and see about that. This is important for agriculture. If we are to be the food bowl of Asia we cannot do it without water. As I said, this government has history. As Mr Johnson from the Farmers' Federation said, the federal government has a plan for dams. That plan involves $2 billion to build dams in Northern Australia. That money becomes available on 1 July next year. The federal government has put forward just under $20 million for feasibility studies for those dams. The minister in charge of that has delayed those feasibility studies to the point where this money may not be available. The feasibility studies may not be completed. I think the minister has actually told us that one of them will not be completed in time and therefore that money may not be available.

A government member: You're just making it up, mate.

Mr HART: Given time I can probably prove all of that, but we will move on. In conclusion, I again say that I cannot support the Water Legislation Amendment Bill because of the change away from the intent of the bill that the member for Hinchinbrook put in place in 2014 and the removal of the water development options.

I would now like to briefly speak on the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. As I said, I was on the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee. We did a reasonable amount of travelling for a number of bills and we heard from a number of farmers and property owners that they were concerned about water impacts on their property from mining processes. If the member for Ipswich West would like to listen for a minute, the LNP and I are very supportive of the issues that are contained in this bill. What I will not support is the retrospectivity that has an effect on existing mines or existing approvals for mines. In particular, we need to look no further than the effect that this legislation may have on the New Acland mine and the Adani project. In his contribution tonight, Minister Lynham said that people with advanced approvals should not be worried.

Mr Costigan: Try telling them that!

Mr HART: I will take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday because these people are worried—worried to the point where last week 700 people from the New Acland mine protested outside parliament. They are worried. If the minister thinks for a second that these people should not be worried, why then did the minister not go outside and address those members? Why did the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection not address those members and put to rest their worry and their angst?

Dr Rowan: Because they don't care about the workers!

Mr HART: I take that interjection. They do not care about workers. They only care about the workers in the Public Service and their own jobs. That is all they care about.

A lot of the people who were protesting are members of the CFMEU. In his contribution, the member for Ipswich West said that he and the committee were very worried about the future of the New Acland mine. In fact, I think he said that there was an urgent need for construction to commence in early 2017. For the information of the member for Ipswich West, early 2017 is in a few weeks. I am not sure if any of the members opposite can read a calendar, so I repeat: early 2017 is in a few weeks.

The problem is that, when you move the goalposts on those people, they will not be sure if they can move forward on this. They are not going to be able to meet that timetable. What is going to happen then? The member for Ipswich West can worry all he wants, but the people at the New Acland mine are a lot more worried than he is. The Adani mine will bring a windfall to the state and the government, if it goes ahead. Every time this government does something, it introduces more and more sovereign risk to the state. For the lemmings on the backbench, that is exactly what—

Mr POWER: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. We have already had a ruling that the use of animals in parliamentary speeches when applied to people is unparliamentary.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): I was talking to the Leader of the House at the time. I did not hear it. Member for Burleigh?

Mr HART: Mr Deputy Speaker, I said that the lemmings down the back of the chamber are following this government off the edge of a cliff. We all know what lemmings are. It is the computer game where you follow one of the little soldiers and they keep marching up a set of stairs and eventually they go over a cliff. It is a computer game. That is where this government is taking us. Again, I fully support the amendments that the honourable member for Hinchinbrook will move during the conclusion of this particular debate. They are very sensible. I feel that, if we can get those particular things up, the rest of the bill is okay.

Mr LAST (Burdekin—LNP) (9.02 pm): I rise to oppose the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and to support the proposed amendments to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 as advised by the member for Hinchinbrook. In 2014, the LNP government reformed the Water Act to cut red tape and encourage economic development using water resources, particularly for regional Queensland. Key reforms included: the removal of ecologically sustainable development and the insertion of a broader purpose to the act to consider communities and economic outcomes, as well as the environment; the update of long and rigid water planning processes; the provision of consistency in how groundwater is managed across all resource industry sectors; and the creation of a pathway for the consideration of new large-scale water infrastructure projects known as the water development option. Those reforms were passed in 2014, but were not enacted before the election in early 2015, with the current Labor government issuing a proclamation postponing the commencement of a number of those water related reforms.

Labor's bill confirms the LNP's reforms to the Water Act that will make the water planning process more timely and efficient, and the reforms to make the management of groundwater consistent across all sectors of the resource industry. However, the bill also seeks to reinstate the restrictive ecologically sustainable development purpose and strike out the provision providing for new large-scale water infrastructure projects to be assessed and approved through the Water Act. There is no question that both actions have been pursued to satisfy the Greens. Tonight if this bill is passed, we will see a return of the notoriously restrictive ESD as the purpose of the act relates to industry, particularly sectors looking to secure additional water to support new projects.

The most serious loss for agriculture and regional Queensland is the exclusion of the water development option, which removes the pathway for the assessment and approval of a greenfield irrigated agriculture project within the Water Act. We do not need more obstacles to water infrastructure development. We need a genuine commitment and demonstrated capacity to deliver water projects in a timely manner. Reinstating the restrictive ecologically sustainable development purpose will simply bog down applications and see even more of those crucial projects tied up in the courts, to the detriment of Queenslanders.

I note with interest the comments from the Queensland Resources Council that there has not been sufficient consultation on the timing, application and transitional arrangements of the reforms. To say there is a lot at stake here would be an understatement. We are talking about mining projects with the potential to create thousands of jobs at a time when unemployment in rural and regional areas is at unprecedented levels. During the hearings, companies such as GVK Hancock expressed concern that the insertion of ESD in the Water Act may provide avenues and mechanisms for unmerited challenges

to the granting of water licences for coalmines. What we are seeing now with Adani and the endless court challenges confirms those fears. I also note that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines advised that the different chapters of the Water Act have clear and distinct functions and to apply the principles of ESD to all the chapters of the Water Act would be incongruous with the respective chapter purposes.

There is no question that certainty of access to available water is imperative for major water infrastructure projects. The issue, of course, is not to disadvantage existing water users or cause significant environmental impacts. In any development, there needs to be a degree of transparency and consultation with potentially affected water users so that their views are taken into account. If the project is approved, conditions may be attached to the Coordinator-General's approval, the mining lease and/or the environmental authority to limit the scale of the impacts to an acceptable level. The department further advised that the terms of reference for an EIS require the proponent of a mining project to assess and report on potential impacts on groundwater and to propose mitigation strategies for any identified impacts.

I now turn to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I support the amendments proposed by the member for Hinchinbrook. We need to bring common sense to the discussion about managing Queensland's water resources. I note the three main areas of change proposed by the bill are amendments to the Environmental Protection Act, amendments to chapter 3 of the Water Act relating to the make-good framework, and transitional arrangements in the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act to capture well-advanced resource projects in an associated water licence assessment process. Unlike those opposite, the LNP wants legislation that protects the rights of rural property owners and allows mines to operate in this state. If introduced, Labor's new underground water legislation would duplicate existing legislation, spark another round of lengthy and costly legal battles, risk thousands of existing jobs and halt the creation of new jobs.

If this bill if passed without amendment, it will require specific information to be included in certain site-specific environmental authority applications and amendment applications in relation to the environmental impacts of the exercise of underground water rights by resource projects. Furthermore, it will require underground water impact reports to include an assessment of the environmental impacts of the exercise of underground water rights and clarify that an EA may be amended in response to the content of an underground water impact report.

The New Hope Group's Acland mine expansion and Adani's Carmichael coal and rail project are advanced mining projects that have already passed rigorous environmental impact processes. They have gone through the environmental assessments and undertaken detailed studies into groundwater impacts. They have strict conditions on their approvals that relate to groundwater and they undertake regular monitoring and reporting on groundwater impacts. Those are two very important job creation projects for the state of Queensland. Without the amendments proposed by the member for Hinchinbrook, this legislation will further delay the start of the Carmichael coal and rail project or, worse, stop it from going ahead. That is despite Labor, only a month ago, invoking special powers to progress that project, declaring the combined mine, rail and associated water to be critical infrastructure and renewing the mine's special prescribed project status, expanding it to include its water infrastructure.

I have significant concerns about the impact this legislation will have on the Adani Carmichael mine and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project. If passed without amendment, this legislation will significantly disrupt mining production at New Acland, including a dramatic scaling back of the work with the associated loss of jobs. The bill also includes transitional arrangements in the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act which will provide for a separate associated water licensing process for mining projects that are advanced in their environmental and mining tenure approvals.

Last week we saw hundreds of mine workers from Acland come to Parliament House to hear from the state government about why it was continuing to hold up the approval of the New Acland stage 3 mine expansion. Also alarmed by the legislation is the north's regional councils and business leaders. Some 16 prominent community and industry leaders took the unprecedented step of signing an opening letter calling on Labor not to delay the Carmichael mine.

This powerful allied group needs to be listened to. Their respective regions are crying out for economic stimulus in the form of investment in infrastructure and job-creating projects. All of these prominent people see this bill for what it is—'lawfare' against job-creating projects in Queensland. This bill will destroy jobs in Queensland because it launches another appeal avenue against advanced projects like the Carmichael project.

The LNP supports rural landholders. They are the backbone of this country. I have enormous respect for our farmers. My family background is in the sugar and cattle industries. Farmers are hardworking and have invested heavily in their assets, with most families on the land choosing to pass their property down to the next generation.

That is why the LNP understands why make-good arrangements are an important protection for landholders. If a resource project is proposed, the environmental impact assessment process determines whether or not there is likely to be an impact on the groundwater of an adjacent landowner who has a water bore in that area. The company is required to make a statutory make-good agreement with that landholder before any activity starts.

The LNP certainly urges those opposite to review the make-good arrangements like the LNP did with the land access arrangements in 2013 with our Land Access Implementation Committee. Legislation must be able to provide statutory certainty for landholders so that if their water bore is impacted by resource sector activity it will be made good.

At a time when regional Queenslanders need a government that creates jobs, this anti-investment Labor government has done nothing but create hurdles and roadblocks. This state desperately needs the Carmichael mine and Acland stage 3 projects. We have an opportunity tonight to ensure these vital projects can move forward, whilst at the same time delivering the certainty, through the make-good arrangements, that our landholders need regarding underground water.

I oppose the Water Legislation Amendment Bill and support the proposed amendments that will be put forward by the member for Hinchinbrook to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill because these two bills have a huge impact not only on my electorate but also on my broader portfolio as the shadow minister for agriculture.

Mrs LAUGA (Keppel—ALP) (9.12 pm): The member for Burleigh and the member for Hinchinbrook called the members of the committee naughty boys. I am really offended, because what about me? I will channel Beyonce in response to the member for Burleigh and the member of Hinchinbrook: 'Tonight I won't be your naughty girl. I don't know what's gotten into me. The rhythm of this debate got me feelin' so crazy. Tonight, I won't be anyone's naughty girl.' I'll call all my girls—the member for Mackay and the member for Bulimba who will be speaking later—to join with me tonight in supporting these two bills.

The member for Burleigh also had a question about ecologically sustainable development. I really think the member for Burleigh needs to learn about this great thing called Google. If he does not have an understanding about ecologically sustainable development he should pop it into Google. The National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development comes up. It is the first thing that comes up when it is googled. It is a federal government strategy. It states—

Ecologically Sustainable Development ... represents one of the greatest challenges facing Australia's governments—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker. I cannot hear the speaker because of the unruly behaviour in the chamber.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): Once again, members, we will have order.

Mrs LAUGA: The strategy states—

Ecologically Sustainable Development ... represents one of the greatest challenges facing Australia's governments, industry, business and community in the coming years.

It is a wonder that the member for Burleigh has not heard of it before. It continues—

While there is no universally accepted definition of ESD, in 1990 the Commonwealth Government suggested the following definition for ESD in Australia ...

I speak to this strategy for the benefit of the member for Burleigh and perhaps all those opposite who need enlightening in terms of what ecologically sustainable development is. It is a strategy that was created in 1990. That is quite a few years ago now. One would think that they would be up with exactly what ESD is. The ESD definition, according to the Commonwealth government, is—

- 'Using, conserving and enhancing the community's resources so that ecological processes, on which life depends, are maintained, and the total quality of life, now and in the future, can be increased' ...

Put more simply, ESD is development which aims to meet the needs of Australians today, while conserving our ecosystems for the benefit of future generations. To do this, we need to develop ways of using those environmental resources which form the basis of our economy in a way which maintains and, where possible, improves their range, variety and quality. At the same time we need to utilise those resources to develop industry and generate employment.

...

Some key changes to the way we think, act and make decisions, however, will help ensure Australia's economic development is ecologically sustainable. There are two main features which distinguish an ecologically sustainable approach to development:

- we need to consider, in an integrated way, the wider economic, social and environmental implications of our decisions and actions for Australia, the international community and the biosphere; and
- we need to take a long-term rather than short-term view when taking those decisions and actions.

I table a copy of part 1 of the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development for the benefit of the opposition.

Tabled paper: Australian Government Department of the Environment and Energy web page titled 'National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development—Part 1 Introduction' [2036].

A government member: Or one member in particular.

Mrs LAUGA: And one member in the particular. I think they could all probably do with reading it.

I rise tonight to support the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. The make-good framework was put in place in 2010 to provide landholders with statutory certainty that their rights to existing water supplies would be protected into the future. The make-good framework acknowledges the fact that for a petroleum company to access the resource it will be required to dewater an aquifer and that this has the potential to impact on other water users. The framework has been operating for quite some time now and stakeholders have raised concerns about how it has been operating. The government has listened to these concerns and acted on them in this bill.

The science of groundwater hydrology inevitably involves a degree of uncertainty. It is, however, not conscionable for a company to exploit this uncertainty and fail to deliver on its legal and moral obligation to make good their impacts on other water users. We have heard from some stakeholders that this uncertainty can lead to disputes between landholders and resource companies over the cause of a bore's impairment. This bill seeks to address this issue by making the resource company responsible for making good a bore in circumstances where it is likely that the resource company's exercise of underground water rights is the cause of the bore's impairment. In addition, if the resource company's activities are a materially contributing factor to the bores impairment, it must also make good that impact.

The bill also includes amendments to address another important issue for our landholders—free gas. Over the last couple of years, particularly in the Surat Basin in South-Western Queensland, some farmers' water bores have become more and more affected by free gas because of coal seam gas production. This free gas poses a safety risk, can damage the bore's infrastructure and can reduce the pumping capacity of a bore so much that it can no long supply the quantity or quality water the landholder relies on.

When the make-good framework was designed in 2010 it was not anticipated that impacts from free gas would affect bore owners. Farmers have rightly pointed out that the framework does not cover this issue. Currently, under the make-good obligations of the Water Act landholders have no right to compensation for bores which become impaired by free gas.

The EPOLA bill addresses this oversight by requiring resource companies to enter into make-good agreements with landholders whose water bores have become impaired by free gas released by coal seam gas production. This is not a new obligation, rather a tailored amendment to ensure that companies live up to their social responsibility and licence.

Water is critical for farmers whether it be for stock watering, domestic purposes or irrigation. Both the resources and agricultural sectors are integral to our economy and to our communities, but both sectors can coexist. We do, however, need to ensure a level playing field and that one sector does not unduly impact the other. I commend the bill to the House.

Ms SIMPSON (Maroochydore—LNP) (9.19 pm): This is a cognate debate on the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I wish to commend my colleagues—in particular, the member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Moggill, as well as the member for Nanango—because in their initial presentations on behalf of the opposition they have outlined very succinctly not only the complexities of these issues but also the very real impacts that they have seen and that they have advocated for on behalf of the communities of Queensland. This is a complex area. As the member for Hinchinbrook outlined, it requires great consideration and care. It does require an understanding of the law in application and also an understanding of what it means for the communities and the economy.

Protecting the environment, ensuring the good management of water resources and supporting economic development in the agricultural and mining industries are complex and important issues. Getting the balance right is the challenge as these can be complementary interests in some areas and competing interests in others.

Opposition members are strongly committed to ensuring that the interests of landholders and regional communities are appropriately protected and that economic growth is underpinned by certainty of process. There has been an argument as to how this can be best achieved. That is essentially where the points of difference have been. However, the LNP is committed to getting the balance right and taking into account the needs of all sectors. It is also committed to ensuring management is based on science and appropriate monitoring without the ideological overlays of the Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad.

A number of amendments here are well intentioned, though. As some committee members noted, the absence of a regulatory impact statement has affected the committee's consideration of the bill. There has also been criticism of this government's lack of consultation. However, it is the retrospective elements in particular that we are concerned about. Retrospectivity has a great cost, and I do not believe that the minister has provided the assurances to the committee or to this House with regard to what the retrospective aspects of the legislation mean.

In summary, the bill makes changes to the make-good framework for the management of underground water in terms of potential impacts by resource projects. The state LNP extended landholder protections for make-good provisions while in government. While I think it is acknowledged that there are areas where more can be done, it needs to be done in a way that is based upon appropriate consultation and scientific based review. There was an extensive improvement under the measures that were put in place by the LNP in government.

With regard to the provisions in the bill, the key amendments are as follows: requiring resource companies to pay the landholder's reasonable costs in engaging a hydrogeologist for the purposes of negotiating a make-good agreement; requiring resource companies to bear the costs of any alternative dispute resolution in the make-good agreement negotiation process; inserting a cooling-off period for make-good agreements; ensuring that impacts on water bores as a result of free gas from coal seam gas extraction attract make-good obligations; and addressing issues in the make-good agreement negotiation process relating to uncertainty in the cause of bore impairment. With regard to landholders' rights, make-good arrangements are an important protection for landholders who have been affected by mining with regard to underground water.

The impacts upon the development of water infrastructure in the state have been addressed by my colleagues quite extensively, but it is worth emphasising with respect to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill. The development of water infrastructure is essential to the economic development of our state—in particular, in the north of our state where there are communities whose futures depend upon access to appropriate water infrastructure to see their regions unlocked.

There are vast parts of this state where people have not accessed mainstream economic opportunities. Everybody benefits from the fruits of economic development, but those people in the regions in particular would see an uplift in the value of their economy, in their lives and in the certainty of jobs that come about. For our friends in the north, the development of appropriate water infrastructure is absolutely essential.

To see people in some parts of our state lifted out of poverty by having access to local jobs and to see the added value to those communities of those higher value jobs is so important. That is why we are so concerned that this government has been against appropriate water infrastructure being developed in a timely way. It is one thing for them to pay lip-service, as they often do when they have meetings in the north. In reality, they are very slow to act and provide approvals and a pathway forward to see this water infrastructure actually developed. That is why we have grave concerns with regard to the legislation before the House.

Colleagues have also mentioned the concerns that have been echoed literally in the streets that projects such as the Carmichael mine and Acland stage 3, which have been through vigorous environmental assessments over a number of years, have failed to get the practical support from this government—lip-service but no action. They are great at the press releases; they are not terribly good at action. We do not want to see the government pay more lip-service; we want to see action. To see new stumbling blocks and barriers put in front of these projects that have been through rigorous assessments is just so frustrating for people who are desperate not only for their jobs but also for certainty so that they can plan for the future.

I support my colleagues in the amendments coming forward and also for the rigorous debate which is necessary to ensure that these complex issues are given air. We want to see this state develop. We do believe in getting the balance right. I do not believe that this government has the balance right.

Mr COSTIGAN (Whitsunday—LNP) (9.27 pm): I, too, am pleased tonight to make my contribution to the cognate debate in relation to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Water Legislation Amendment Bill. It goes without saying that I am very pleased to support the amendments as foreshadowed by my fellow North Queenslander here in the chamber tonight, a man who has been a great champion for northern development since he has been in this place. Of course I am referring to my good friend the member for Hinchinbrook, who would be well aware of the frustration and then some for people in Central and North Queensland in that big stretch of our great state between Rockhampton and Townsville.

It was no coincidence to see that coalition of the willing—those seven local governments from Mackay, Whitsunday, Isaac, Rockhampton, Central Highlands, Charters Towers and Townsville—all getting together. In Central and North Queensland we can be parochial—funny that. When it comes to Adani's $16 billion Carmichael coalmine and the associated rail project, we put those petty local politics aside for the common good—for the development of Central and North Queensland. You have to take your hat off to some of the key stakeholders, the captains of industry, who are sick and tired of the hold-ups. When it comes to the Carmichael coalmine, we have seen more hold-ups than the Kelly gang, and the people of Central and North Queensland have had enough.

Government members interjected.

Mr COSTIGAN: I can hear the howls from the cheap seats.

Mrs LAUGA: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I have to ask what relevance this has to the bill. The member has been speaking for over a minute now and still has not spoken to this bill whatsoever.

Mr DEPUTY SPEAKER (Mr Furner): I call the member for Whitsunday.

Mr COSTIGAN: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. Those captains of industry think this is pretty relevant. Some of them transcend the political divide. Let us go through some of the names—Margaret Strelow, the Mayor of Rockhampton; Greg Williamson, the Mayor of Mackay; Andrew Willcox, the Mayor of Whitsunday; Troy Popham from the Townsville Chamber of Commerce; and Bruce Hedditch from the Bowen Chamber of Commerce. I was at Bruce Hedditch's pub, the Larrikin Hotel, not long ago and there were some spies from the red army there. Former minister Spence had one of the faceless men at the back of the room, let there be no doubt, and the guest speaker was Peter Gleeson from the *Sunday Mail*.

Mrs LAUGA: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. This has no relevance to the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! I am listening to the member for Whitsunday. The member for Whitsunday has the call.

Mr COSTIGAN: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker.

An honourable member: Bowen needs the jobs.

Mr COSTIGAN: Bowen does need the jobs, and it is not just Bowen. Bowen, in many ways, is the epicentre. I remember waltzing into town in Bowen to work for the local newspaper many years ago reporting on the shipping movements at Abbot Point. There was a handful of ships going to markets in Asia back then. There was a huge novelty factor. In fact, I toured the port only the other day and we were looking across towards the inland wondering when the first train is coming in from the yet-to-be-developed Galilee Basin with the first bit of black coal from the Carmichael coalmine.

Last weekend it was 45 years since the first train left on the Goonyella line to Hay Point. Back in those days things happened in this state. We made it happen. Ron Camm, who was the greatest member for Whitsunday of all time—it was a pleasure to take his great-grandchildren from Bloomsbury State School through the parliament a few weeks ago—would be wondering what the heck is happening down here on planet earth because we keep waiting and waiting and waiting. I see Minister Lynham grinning like a Cheshire cat. He was cuddling up to would-be-minister Ryan a moment ago. He can grin like a Cheshire cat. He rolls into Bowen and orders lattes at Le Sorrelle. The girls are nice but their patience is being tested, because they want to see more than him coming in and giving a good game in terms of his mouth; they want to see action. People's patience is being exhausted. These are people who traditionally in many cases have voted for the Australian Labor Party. They want jobs in Mackay and the Whitsundays. They want jobs in Central Queensland, the Central Highlands and the coalfields. They want jobs in North Queensland.

I wonder what the member for Mackay has been thinking over the last 18 months. The Palaszczuk Labor government has come dragging its feet. It is all well and good for the Premier to turn up in North Queensland on the back of a CEDA business lunch and say that she sees the light. Where has she been—in a tunnel for the last 21 months? People are frustrated. If you go into the electorate of Mundingburra and talk to the bar flies—

Mr FURNER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I refer you to standing order 236. The member for Whitsunday has made no relevance to the two cognate bills. I ask you to bring him back to the relevance of the cognate debate on the two bills.

Mrs Lauga interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Keppel, allow me to make a ruling rather than yelling across the chamber. As I understand it, the member for Whitsunday is discussing the potential effects of legislation or lack of legislation.

Dr Lynham interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I am making a ruling. I would appreciate it if you would allow me to make that ruling without interjecting across the chamber. The member for Whitsunday has the call.

Mr COSTIGAN: There is no doubt that the proponents—in this case, Adani—

Mr FURNER: Madam Deputy Speaker, I seek some guidance on your ruling about the relevance of the member for Whitsunday's comments in the cognate debate of these two bills.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Ferny Grove, as I just indicated, my understanding of the contribution of the member for Whitsunday is that he is attempting to make a correlation with respect to his electorate and the debate that is currently going on in the House. The member for Whitsunday has the call.

Mr COSTIGAN: There is no doubt in my mind that the bill will have an impact on projects. We talk about economic development particularly for the regions in Central and North Queensland, and people are terrified about what has been going on and the state of play in our communities. There are communities that are haemorrhaging economically and in other ways. We are seeing kids being ripped out of school, and they are waiting for the Carmichael mine project and associated railway to come on line because that is good for North Queensland, regional Queensland and the state of Queensland.

I need to place on the record that the member for Mackay was famously photographed with members of the Mackay Conservation Group after her election win last year. The people of Mackay need to be aware of that. If you go and talk to the bar flies at the Shamrock in west Mackay, or the Austral, or in my electorate, they will say, 'We do not need more red tape or retrospectivity'—

Mr SAUNDERS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order on relevance. I find it very offensive that the people of Mackay are referred to as 'bar flies'.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! With respect, you cannot find something personally offensive that was not in reference to yourself. The member for Whitsunday has the call.

Mr COSTIGAN: As I was saying, the retrospectivity of the bills is absolutely absurd. People are very worried about what is going on economically and where things are travelling in their local communities. This is over a huge expanse of regional Queensland, not just in my electorate of Whitsunday where we have a lot of people working in the coalmining sector as well as agriculture. Both industries have been and will continue to be cornerstones of the Queensland economy, particularly in the regions. It is what we are good at—mining and agriculture—and we have seen them coexist over a long period.

As I said, there are people who are concerned about the retrospectivity of these bills. Adani have flagged that. We have seen the submissions put forward by Adani, and they are not alone. The Queensland Resources Council have also got off their chest what they think should be happening here. We do not need any more red tape or green tape. Adani has been trying to get this happening for a long time. We talk about making Queensland an attractive place for investment. How is it attractive to have delay after delay after delay?

Mr Minnikin: Sovereign risk.

Mr COSTIGAN: Sovereign risk is going on and on here, and it never used to happen. People are wondering what is going on here. I have no doubt it is reverberating in terms of potential investors. We can send all the trade delegations across to East Asia, North-East Asia or South-East Asia, but what is happening on the ground here? Is Queensland a great place to invest? Historically, it has been a

fantastic place to invest, but the shifting sands worries me and the people whom I represent. There is no doubt about that. A lot of pressure is being brought to bear on the members for Townsville, Thuringowa and Mundingburra and the Labor members for Mackay, Mirani, Keppel and Rockhampton in relation to these matters because people are not happy. People are protesting to them saying, 'Where is our economic development? Why are we missing out?'

Earlier I went through the coalition of the willing including people like Anne Baker, the Mayor of Isaac Regional Council. I have known Anne for 27 years. She is a great lady and she is a Labor lady, but she is putting politics aside here because she wants the best for her local government—the Isaac local government area which comprises the old local governments of Nebo, Belyando and Broadsound. Do you know where they are, member for Thuringowa? He is nodding like Noddy off the TV series. I think he has no idea. Anne Baker, as I said, wants the best for her local community. She is on the other side of the range. She is not in my electorate of Whitsunday, but we have a lot of people in my electorate who commute across the Eton Range—past those four wooden bridges that took about 21 months to get fixed under the Palaszczuk Labor government. The member for Mirani will be calling for oxygen in a moment after being reminded of it.

Anne Baker wants to see economic development in the former Nebo, Belyando and Broadsound shires which comprise the Isaac local government area. She gets it and all of those other mayors get it. People like Patricia O'Callaghan, the CEO of Townsville Enterprise; Troy Popham, whom I mentioned before, from the Townsville Chamber of Commerce; and Tony Caruso from Resource Industry Network all want it, and we want to make it happen sooner rather than later. We have had enough of the hold-ups. As I said, I warmly welcome the amendments foreshadowed by my good friend the member for Hinchinbrook.

In relation to the other matter that makes up this cognate debate, our river improvement trusts, I pay my respects to the late Pat Botto, who was the state chair of the river improvement trust family in Queensland. I remember the member for Hinchinbrook coming to my electorate in October 2013 for a gala dinner when the various improvement trusts came together. Unfortunately and sadly, Pat passed away some weeks ago and will be sorely missed by many members of the Proserpine community. Her legacy lives on: she has a park named after her in the cane fields of Strathdickie. She will be very fondly remembered by a lot of people in that community.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Before calling the member for Gregory, I remind those in the gallery that you must remain seated at all times.

Mr MILLAR (Gregory—LNP) (9.39 pm): The Water Legislation Amendment Bill deals with the use of that most essential resource—water. As a former member of the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee when we were examining these bills, I have two overriding concerns about the bill as it stands. The first is the primary objective of the bill. As members know, my electorate of Gregory has suffered under epic drought conditions for the past five years. During this great dry, the blessing of water from the Great Artesian Basin has been one of the few sustaining graces. Together with the green oasis that is the Emerald irrigation area, this experience provides a thought-provoking context from which to view these bills.

Simply put, this legislation seeks to replace the term 'responsible and productive' with the term 'sustainable' as the guiding objective of our water management. At first glance, this would just seem to be word play. As Dr Dale Miller of AgForce told the committee, responsible use must, by its very definition, be sustainable use. Only sustainable water management can provide reliability, and reliability is the holy grail of water management.

One of the most interesting and successful experiments in water management in the electorate of Gregory—and indeed in Australia—is the Great Artesian Basin Sustainability Initiative, or the GABSI. I call on the Minister for Natural Resources to look at the GABSI program when it comes to capping bores and make sure that graziers who want to fund and continue to cap bores have the access to the funds to be able to do that.

The purpose of the GABSI is to protect the Great Artesian Basin's underground aquifers by capping the free-flowing bores and replacing the historic drains with modern piping. This will limit water lost to evaporation and provide the control needed for active management. The Australian, state and territory governments have worked with bore owners in the Great Artesian Basin for 17 years to address the challenge. Given that it started in 1999, GABSI would have to be amongst the longest running and most successful multi government initiatives in Australian water management. Interestingly, it was

campaigned for by landholders and bore owners. They had to work very hard to bring governments on board. I must commend one of my constituents, Mr John Seccombe, in this regard and thank him for his continuing dedication to the cause.

The GABSI has increased our scientific knowledge of the hydrology and ecology of this vast basin, and GABSI has been astonishingly successful. Where we were losing water pressure due to a lack of management, now we are seeing water pressures and supplies returned, which is extremely important for Western Queensland. GABSI shows us that Queensland primary producers are tremendous guardians who have a lot to teach us about sustainability and balance. GABSI aims to ensure that the artesian basin water resource is sustainably used. The success of GABSI has created a situation where we can specifically manage the need for water to maintain natural artesian ecosystems, as well as a reliable and sustainable supply of water for artesian towns and for the primary producers who provide the economic underpinnings of Western Queensland.

GABSI shows us what good water management policy is: nature, society and economy are all brought into balance. As Dr Miller from AgForce said, responsible water use is, by definition, sustainable, but the reverse does not necessarily apply and this is where I worry about this piece of legislation. 'Sustainable' can be used to exclude, or at least subordinate, all water use not related to the natural environment. The committee was troubled by this. What is the definition of the word 'sustainable' in this context, and who defines it? The whole issue is that the word itself is debatable, so there will always be different opinions of how to apply it. The use of vague words in legislation is risky because all users could be held hostage to a single, ideological viewpoint. In the context of water management, one of the reasons the term 'sustainability' is vague is that science in this area is so rapidly evolving. The Fairbairn Dam near Emerald is a great example of this. It is a great asset and is Queensland's second biggest dam and it has seen the development of extensive, high-value irrigation cropping—something that I have known for a very long time and something—

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr MILLAR: Absolutely. I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. The dam is not a flood mitigation dam. It is solely an irrigation dam formed across the upper Nogoa. It has created enormous prosperity in the Central Highlands, supporting towns and mines as well as irrigation farming. It has also provided wonderful research opportunities which have greatly expanded our scientific knowledge in hydrology and ecology. A feature of the dam management is that from September to February, when a rain event triggers a flow upstream, environmental water is allowed to flow out of the dam downstream. This means that the flow below the dam echoes the upstream rain event. This has been heavily studied by ecologists and has been found to be very successful. Again, in a different setting, we have found a scientific balance between economic imperatives, social needs and ecological requirements.

The Fairbairn Dam construction was fully funded by the federal government and built by the Snowy Hydro authority, so it cannot really be claimed by the Queensland government. Unfortunately, to develop a similar piece of water infrastructure today seems to be beyond our capacity, which is very sad. We cannot seem to look beyond our comforting ideologies and actually use our brains. If members do not believe me, then they should consider this: one part of this Labor government is busily spending millions of dollars provided to them by the federal government to complete the 'business case' for the Rookwood Weir. As I have said before, the construction of the Rookwood Weir would see another $1 billion of agricultural production in Central Queensland, with an additional economic multiplier of about three. That is the business case, right there. It is great to see that at least some members of the Palaszczuk government appreciate that.

Mr Butcher interjected.

Mr MILLAR: I hope the member for Gladstone is supportive of Rookwood Weir. I hope he gets behind that because it will provide water for his town of Gladstone. In the meantime, I am standing here debating a piece of legislation from the same Labor government that, if passed, would make the construction of the Rookwood Weir next to impossible because it removes the pathway for the assessment and approval of greenfield irrigated agriculture projects within the Water Act. It removes it, full stop. Once again, the left faction of the Palaszczuk government is running its own version of the government. This version is not so concerned about job losses or debt; it focuses on pandering to the Greens, as we saw with the Vegetation Management Act and the Nature Conservation Act before that.

Mr Costigan: They've got form.

Mr MILLAR: They have got form. I take that interjection from the member for Whitsunday. This lot need Greens preferences and they will sacrifice the prosperity of Queensland to get them. Meanwhile, 22,900 Queensland jobs have been lost this year under the Labor government. That is from the ABS, seasonally adjusted, August 2016. No other member knows better than me how tough rural Queensland is doing it, yet it is agriculture that has been Queensland's unsung hero.

At the beginning of August, Treasurer Pitt issued a media release highlighting that Queensland's exports have risen while Australia's are falling. The reason for the rise was an increase in agricultural exports. As I have said before, Queensland agriculture is a hero. It may be going high tech, but as it becomes more high tech, it becomes even more sustainable. I have personally witnessed this.

Queensland agriculture has the potential to grow from $17 billion to $30 billion over the next 10 years, underwriting our earnings, increasing our prosperity and creating real, permanent jobs. Queensland's primary producers not only give us our exports; they provide urban Queensland with its biggest manufacturing industry in meat processing. This part of the economy can also be grown to include further value adding, such as biofuels manufacture. As I never tire of saying, if you want a signpost to the future status of agriculture, compare the starting salaries for many of our agricultural graduates with that of, say, law graduates.

With no major water development option, this bill if passed puts us all on the wrong side of history, and that brings me to my second concern. The bipartisan committee could not recommend the bill be passed without a development pathway for major new water infrastructure. The committee's first recommendation is the equivalent of being told by the teacher, 'You haven't answered the question so go back and do your homework again.' I sat on the committee and I can tell members that the reason for needing a pathway for the development of new major water infrastructure still exists. The Rookwood Weir is required now, and not just for the high-value agriculture it can produce or the 2,000 jobs associated with that. Rookwood Weir is also intended to supply water security for Gladstone townspeople, and I hope the member for Gladstone understands that.

Mr BAILEY: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I raise the point of relevance. The member is going all around the world. This has nothing to do with the bill. I ask him to come back to the bill.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Miss Barton): Order! Members, I am listening carefully to the contribution of the member for Gregory. The member for Gregory has the call.

Mr MILLAR: For the benefit of the Minister for Main Roads and Minister for Water Supply I point out that by removing the development option, the bill kills the Rookwood Weir dead. That is where the relevance is. We will not be able to attract the funding and if by some miracle we did, the development could not be approved. In taking such an extreme stance, the legislation also minimises the benefits that Queensland can seek from the federal government's Northern Australia Infrastructure Facility Fund, something on which I hope the Minister for Main Roads and Minister for Water Supply is keen. I sincerely ask how the government in 2016 can put up water legislation that removes any pathway for development of major new water infrastructure from the Queensland Water Act.

Just quickly, I will move on to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill. I thank the member for Whitsunday for his contribution to the parliament. As the member for Gregory in Central Queensland, I think he speaks for many people and what he said in his speech is absolutely right. The people of Central Queensland are wondering where the next job is coming from. We all remember that last year, unfortunately, we saw 500 jobs go from Townsville with QNI.

Mr Butcher: Eight hundred jobs.

Mr MILLAR: Eight hundred jobs; I take that interjection from the member for Gladstone. However, what about the up to 20,000 jobs in the mining industry from the Bowen Basin that have disappeared? What about that? What about the mining downturn that we have seen in Central Queensland which has had a major impact not only on mums and dads and kids but also on businesses right around Central Queensland? These people are looking for opportunities. These people are looking to make sure that they can stay in the mining industry. They are skilled in mining. They have been doing it for 25 or 30 years. They have had a massive impact. Every mining family in Central Queensland has made a massive injection into the economy in Central Queensland not only for small business but for local communities, local sporting groups and local schools. They made a significant contribution to the Central Queensland economy.

As a young bloke growing up in the Central Highlands, I went to school with many kids from mining families. They all played a major role, whether it was in the local Rugby League team such as the Tigers, the Capella Road Runners back in the eighties, the Springsure Mountain Men, the Blackwater Devils who turned into the Blackwater Crushers or the Bluff Rabbitohs. All of those mining families have made a significant impact in that region and they have played a significant role. What they are looking for and what is important here is the next opportunity to continue mining in Central Queensland.

Make no mistake, the protection of landholders and landholders' rights are absolutely paramount. As a person from agriculture and a person who has been involved in agriculture all my life, I believe it is absolutely important that we protect landholders' rights. What we do not like is green activists from the south—from Melbourne or from overseas—coming to dictate terms to us on how we should continue our economic productivity in Central Queensland. If people walk down the street of Emerald, Capella, Tieri, Clermont, Blackwater or Middlemount they will find that those families are looking for an opportunity to continue living in those regions—not being pulled away and having to leave that region and having to leave those jobs. It is important that we are able to provide some certainty for future mining opportunities in Central Queensland communities—for companies such as Adani, which has been waiting for a long time, and Acland, which has been waiting a long time. This is about people who are putting money on the table, who are spending it in business. We have to make sure that we continue to provide jobs for people in regional Queensland because they are the people who provide the wealth for Queensland. I call on members to continue to support these people.

Mr BUTCHER (Gladstone—ALP) (9.54 pm): I rise to speak to support the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill tonight. The committee has reported on the findings of the Agriculture and Environment Committee's inquiry into the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the committee for the work they did on this report, particularly the secretariat who have had many reports to deal with all at the same time. They have done an exceptional job over the past six to 12 months. I would like to take this opportunity to thank Rob Hansen, Paul Douglas and Colette Carey for the work that they have done.

I would also like to acknowledge the assistance provided by the office of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection and the Department of Natural Resources and Mines who provided high-quality advice in extremely tight time frames. The committee heard from resource companies, community associations and stakeholder groups during our inquiry. We sincerely thank everyone who contributed their views.

I will begin by providing a brief overview of the bill in the context of relevant water reform legislation that has either not yet commenced or is currently before the House. The bill aims to complement the framework for underground water management that was first amended by the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014, known as WROLA, then subsequently was sought to be amended by the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Fortunately, in my previous role on the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, I was involved in the hearings on the WROLA bill as well as the EPOLA bill. During the committee inquiries on the WROLA bill and the WLA Bill stakeholders raised concerns in relation to the impacts of underground water rights on both the environment and other water users but primarily agricultural users. Stakeholders also raised concerns in relation to deficiencies in the make-good arrangements under the Water Act. This bill addresses both of those concerns with tailored amendments to existing obligations and processes. In terms of timing, it is desirable that the committee consider the bill before the automatic commencement of WROLA provisions on 6 December, later this year, as the bill makes important amendments to this act.

The bill has been drafted to allow the government to deliver its policy which reflects a 2015 Palaszczuk Labor government commitment. There are essentially three key features of this bill. The bill proposes to better manage environmental impacts of groundwater take by the mining industry; strengthen protection for farmers and other rural landholders in negotiating make-good agreements with the resource industry; and provide for a separate water licence process for advanced mining projects in Queensland.

In terms of managing the environmental impacts of groundwater take, the bill proposes to achieve this in two ways. Firstly, the bill amends the Environmental Protection Act to strengthen the assessment undertaken as part of an environmental authority application. The bill inserts a new section 126A to require particular resource activities to provide information about predicted impacts on groundwater environmental values along with strategies for avoiding, mitigating or managing their particular impacts as part of the environmental authority application.

Secondly, the bill provides for improved environmental oversight during the operational phase of mining operations by drawing a clear link between the underground water impact reports performed under the Water Act and the requirements of the environmental authority. Essentially, the bill modifies the existing underground water impact report process in the Water Act to require the reports to include an assessment of actual against predicted environmental impacts of taking groundwater and, if relevant, to update predictions about future impacts. These modelling exercises are rarely perfect, so the bill allows for adjustments to be made as more accurate information concerning the types of impacts on volume of water required to be taken becomes available.

The amendments also include a power in the Environmental Protection Act to amend the conditions of an environmental authority in response to the contents of an underground water impact report. This power is equivalent to the existing Environmental Protection Act power for petroleum activities and will ensure that there is sufficient information to allow the ongoing adaptive management of groundwater impacts from particular mining activities. With regards to impacts on landholders, the bill amends the make-good framework in chapter 3 to strengthen the protection for farmers and other rural landholders and redress an imbalance in negotiating make-good agreements with the resource industry.

This was something that was raised in submissions during the parliamentary committee's inquiry into both WROLA bill and the WLA Bill. The bill addresses stakeholder concerns by extending make-good obligations to bores that are impaired by free gas during coal seam production; clarifying that make-good obligations arise where the exercise of underground water rights is the likely cause of the impairment, even if there is some scientific uncertainty; providing a cooling-off period for make-good arrangements under the Water Act; and finally, requiring resource companies to bear the cost of any alternative dispute resolution process and to pay the landholder's reasonable costs in engaging a hydrogeologist for expert advice in negotiating the make-good agreement. As I mentioned earlier, the bill provides for a separate water licensing process for advanced mining projects by including transitional arrangements in the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act.

I would now like to talk about the benefits to future resource industries and the transitional provisions. Unlike the WROLA Act, this bill includes appropriate transitional provisions for the reforms that are being introduced. The bill requires that advanced mining projects which are part way through their approval process and have already applied for or obtained an environmental authority will be required to apply for an associated water licence prior to dewatering. These projects would have been required to apply for a water licence under the law as it currently stands but, had the WROLA Act commenced, would have received an unscrutinised statutory right to take groundwater. The environmental impacts of this take would not in most cases have been rigorously assessed, as the other approval processes have proceeded on the basis that a water licence would consider those impacts.

Importantly, however, the amendments moved by the minister tonight will ensure that any groundwater assessments undertaken under other processes can be simply rolled into the associated water licence assessment so that there is no duplication in effort. The associated water licence process focuses, as it should, on the gaps left by previous processes and the more detailed information available following detailed design. Sensibly, the bill also provides that, in a small number of cases where a rigorous assessment has been undertaken through an EIS process and the underground water impacts have been satisfactorily considered in a Land Court hearing, further public consultation will not be required provided the Land Court outcomes did not specify any impediments to the granting of the application. This will ensure that all those with an interest in the underground water impacts will have their rightful opportunity to be heard while providing a streamlined process for proponents. I commend this report to the House.

Mr PERRETT (Gympie—LNP) (10.02 pm): I rise to speak on these cognate water bills. Rural and regional Queenslanders know and value water as a precious resource. They also know that it is not just a precious resource to be locked away; they know that it is vital for sustainable growth. It is important that we get the balance right for planning and its future use. The management of water resources, particularly groundwater resources, is notoriously complicated with complex public policy settings affecting a broad range of stakeholders. Firstly I will speak on the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, which the Resources Council described as—

... incredibly complicated legislation. It is not just a simple legislative bandaid that is being introduced. It is omnibus legislation. It amends acts that have not commenced. It amends bills that have passed but not commenced. You almost need a PhD in law to track through all the amendments.

The concerns of regional businesses, workers and farmers was demonstrated in the protest outside this place last week. These proud workers are concerned that proposals to shift the goalposts will seriously impact development and cripple their job prospects. Under the bill, conditions will be imposed on businesses even though they have already adhered to conditions which were attached to the approval at the time.

There are three main areas of change in this bill. Amendments to the Environmental Protection Act will require specific information to be included in certain site-specific environmental authority applications and amendment applications in relation to the environmental impacts of underground water rights by resource projects. It will also require underground water impact reports to include an assessment of environmental impacts of the exercise of underground water rights and clarify that an EA may be amended in response to the content of that report. Amendments to chapter 3 of the Water Act relating to the make-good framework require resource companies to pay the landholder's reasonable costs in engaging a hydrogeologist for the purpose of negotiating a make-good agreement. They require resource companies to bear the costs of any alternative dispute resolution in the make-good agreement negotiation process. They insert a cooling-off period of 40 business days for make-good agreements. They ensure that impacts on water bores as a result of free gas from coal seam gas extraction attract make-good obligations, and they address issues in the make-good agreement negotiation process relating to uncertainty in the cause of bore impairment.

There is concern regarding changes to the transitional arrangements in the Mineral Resources Act and the Water Act to capture well-advanced resource projects in an associated water licence assessment process. These arrangements will provide a separate associated water licensing process for mining projects that are advanced in their environmental and mining tenure approvals. Currently, the projects most immediately affected by these amendments are the Adani Carmichael coalmine project and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project.

This associated water licensing process will require public notification and allow public submissions on underground water impacts associated with these projects. It means that an application can be refused if the underground water take is found to have unacceptable impacts on the environment and other water users. Third parties will be able to submit a merit based appeal. Put simply, this is shifting the goalposts after businesses have already adhered to and implemented conditions which were attached to assessments at the time. No business can operate successfully in an environment where it is constantly looking over its shoulder on the lookout for being ambushed.

Businesses already operate with the threat of vexatious and frivolous legal challenges by environmental groups to development projects. 'Lawfare' has already cost the Australian economy up to $1.2 billion and the cost is still rising. Last week it was reported that Australia-wide the 32 legal challenges under the environmental laws that went to court meant developers spent a cumulative 7,500 days—or 20 years—in court, even though 28 of the environmental cases were defeated and three required only minor technical changes to go ahead. We all know that much of this relates to Queensland. The transitional arrangements in this bill will aid that agenda. They will stifle business and create uncertainty. We should not aid green groups who are stifling economic progress through green 'lawfare' who want to self-indulgently rip the guts out of our economy. It is driven by fanatics who have absolutely no interest in advancing the interests of Queenslanders and no interest in improving our job prospects and Queensland's economy. They manipulate the truth to demonise farmers and miners in order to appease the consciences of wealthy inner-city greens who live in their concrete jungles.

Environmental groups are being secretly funded from overseas so that they can undermine investor confidence and halt development and delay projects, causing economic damage to the companies and the state through lost jobs and lost investment. With their tax-free charity status, almost three-quarters of a billion dollars in funds have been provided to them in the last decade. Those workers and farmers who protested outside this place last week do not receive the same tax-exempt status, yet they do more for our economy and prosperity than any of these groups. Green groups are an ideological anti-coal, anti-farmer and anti-economic development crusade to hold up projects to reduce profitability and investment.

Changing the goalposts to the transitional arrangements is playing to their agenda. This is why we saw workers and farmers protesting last week and the week before. After the first protest a reporter tweeted, 'Never thought we would ever do this. Farmers and miners beg government to approve New Hope Acland mine expansion.' It was not a surprise to regional Queenslanders. In the regions are families and workers who want to save their jobs and businesses that are crippled by government regulation which is destroying industry in rural and regional Queensland.

As deputy chair of the Agriculture and Environment Committee I received numerous representations from many workers, their families, wives and husbands who are worried about the outcome of this bill. There are serious concerns about the lack of consultation with stakeholders during the drafting process, the absence of a regulatory impact statement and the short time frame to investigate a complex and complicated bill. Government claims of adequate consultation are contradicted by recommendation 2, which asks that—

... the Minister examine the impact on relevant mining licence holders' short-term prospects, and the resulting impacts on affected communities ...

This is because the committee has significant concerns about the flow-on impacts of any interruption of production at New Acland and in similar projects. The number of projects in a similar situation, the number of anticipated job losses and the economic and social impact on rural and regional communities were all beyond the ability of the committee to ascertain in the time available. Despite the impact on the New Hope Group and on the Acland stage 3 mine project, the government did not even consult with them before introducing the bill. This news apparently shocked the member for Gladstone, who asked the manager of Environment, Policy and Approvals, New Hope Group, Kylie Gomez Gane—

Has there been any consultation with the departments or the minister's office in relation to this new bill with your company?

Ms Gomez Gane said no. The chair asked again—

None at all?

Ms Gomez Gane again said no. The New Hope Group advised us that this bill will mean the loss of more than 200 jobs from New Acland, New Hope's corporate office in Ipswich, their QBH port facility at the port of Brisbane and additional losses of several hundred from various suppliers and service providers. Consultation was in effect mere lip-service.

The committee was expected to investigate, consider and complete a report on this complex legislation within four weeks. Inadequate time frames meant that affected stakeholders had only 15 days to provide submissions, preventing a proper assessment of the economic and social impacts on industry and the wider community. Condensed time frames curtailed briefings and responses to requests from departments. The process was so rushed that we received the chair's final draft less than two hours before being expected to consider the report's contents. In comparison, consultation on a bill with a similar subject matter—the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015—lasted approximately 15 weeks.

Stakeholders made it very clear that there was almost no consultation with them prior to the introduction of the bill. The minister's introductory speech glossed over this, claiming that Water Engagement Forum meetings on 7 March, 29 April and 6 September 2016 constituted consultation. Evidence to the committee revealed that those forums were not even about this bill and that the limited parts which were disclosed were provided in confidence, with stakeholders prevented from consulting with their member organisations and being required to provide written responses within a week. Mr Andrew Barger, Director of Economics and Infrastructure at the Queensland Resources Council, said—

… there was a process of seeing parts of the bill in confidence, not being able to share it with my members for a period of about a week and giving comments on that.

…

There was not an ability to understand the complexity of the projects that it would affect. There was not an ability to engage with members, get their feedback and channel that through. Fundamentally … I do not think I was representing my members because I was precluded from engaging with them. There was an announcement. There was an ability for me to give my personal feedback … over a very short time period for a very complicated process. I would not characterise that as consultation and certainly not consultation in … such a complicated process as water licensing.

Mr Matthew Paull, Queensland policy director of the Australian Petroleum Production & Exploration Association, said—

We all got a series of quite significant changes on the Monday. We were given 24 hours to respond and told that they would be in parliament the next week. We met with EHP and asked a lot of questions on the Tuesday following. A lot of those questions could not be answered in terms of the scope and intent. Then we basically heard nothing until quite recently when again they were put to the Water Engagement Forum and we were given an opportunity to respond in a very limited window.

Despite the Department of Natural Resources and Mines attending those forums, the discussion was so inadequate that the department said it was unable to provide advice requested by the committee in the time available regarding the number of individual and small enterprise resource tender holders affected by the provisions of this bill.

The EPOLA bill has no regulatory impact statement, RIS, which is surprising given that it will negatively impact hundreds of regional jobs and the security and certainty of investment decisions by companies in resource projects and that submissions often made conflicting and contradictory statements about the potential impact of changes. This could and should have been addressed by a proper RIS. It would have tested the reasons behind the change to the current legislative framework, tested the inadequacy of current arrangements and identified improvements from proposed changes. Stakeholders were prevented from proposing alternative regulatory approaches to achieve the same outcomes. Mr Andrew Barger, Director of Economics and Infrastructure at the Queensland Resources Council, said—

… the explanatory notes … identify no alternatives. That is an extraordinary statement. It is really difficult to believe that, with all the intelligence of the Queensland government, there is no other way to address the objectives of the bill other than the bill that we are seeing ...

He went on to say that an RIS—

… is a way of channelling feedback into the development of the legislation before it is drafted. It is a really good framework for providing consultation. It provides a lot more transparency. Unfortunately, with eleventh-hour omnibus bills … you run out of time … which is to the detriment of the outcome of the bill ...

Protecting the interests of landholders and regional workers and communities means that we should be concerned about the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. It has its genesis in the reforms to the Water Act by the previous government. Those 2014 reforms cut red tape and encouraged economic development, particularly in regional Queensland. The input of agricultural stakeholders resulted in the only recommendation put forward by the committee, a recommendation which contradicts Labor's proposal to remove the water development option from the Water Act.

Importantly, the LNP's reforms included the recognition of economic, social as well as environmental considerations, including sustaining ecosystem health and water quality and security of water entitlements by defining responsible and productive management.

Although reforms to the Water Act were made almost two years ago, the government put them on hold and then took almost a year before introducing its own bill, which now affirms the reforms already set out in 2014. It affirms the LNP's attempts to make the water planning process more timely and efficient and the reforms to make management of groundwater consistent across all sectors of the resource industry.

During the debate on the LNP bill two years ago, the Deputy Premier called the reforms an 'ill-conceived, ideological assault' and said—

… this is a shameful bill. It is an utter disgrace. It recklessly and irresponsibly deregulates water management and allocations ...

yet a year after those comments, the government has a bill which confirms our attempt to make water management timely and efficient. What hypocrisy!

The key reforms of the 2014 bill aimed to update unnecessarily long and rigid water planning processes; provide consistency in the management of groundwater across all resource industry sectors; and create a pathway for the consideration of new large-scale water infrastructure projects, known as the water development option.

They also sought to replace the term 'ecologically sustainable development', ESD, with a broader purpose to consider community and economic outcomes as well as the environment. Changing the term 'ecologically sustainable development' to 'responsible and productive management' stirred up the usual crowd of affluent inner-city green activists who now dictate the government's agenda, especially their champion the Deputy Premier. Queensland Wilderness Society spokesman Dr Tim Seelig said—

… putting the principle of ESD back into the Water Act, although only partially so, is an incredibly important point for us.

This is the same Dr Seelig who demanded the Premier hand the control of vegetation management issues to the Deputy Premier, who objected to witnesses appearing before the vegetation management hearings saying they were 'paraded' before the committee. I would not be surprised to discover that Dr Seelig is actually on speed dial from the Deputy Premier's office.

What we have here is a bill which has the stamp of approval from those green activists. The Labor-Greens bill will reinstate the restrictive ESD purpose and place more importance on ecological outcomes rather than community and economic outcomes. Once again, communities and local regional economies will play second fiddle to environmental considerations. The government also wants to strike out the provision providing for new large-scale water infrastructure projects to be assessed and approved through the Water Act. There is no mystery to this: this is to satisfy the Greens.

Reinstating the notoriously restrictive ESD should seriously concern industry, especially those sectors looking to secure additional water to support new projects, but the most serious loss for agriculture in regional Queensland is the exclusion of the water development option, which removes a pathway for the assessment and approval of greenfield irrigated agriculture projects within the Water Act. It demonstrates the government's ignorance of life and work in rural and regional Queensland. This is an executive government run by elites, like the Deputy Premier, who do not care or know about what is happening outside South Brisbane.

The LNP's bill amended a comprehensive framework which was previously lengthy, overly prescriptive and inflexible. Our reforms were just, prudent, sensible, responsible and workable. They retained strong community engagement while removing or reducing unnecessarily prescriptive and sometimes overly bureaucratic and lengthy processes. They recognised the importance of sustaining ecosystem health, water quality and water-dependent ecological processes and biodiversity. They delivered the appropriate balance between economic, social and environmental outcomes while promoting the efficient allocation and management of water and ensured that accessibility, certainty and security for water users remained paramount.

In considering both bills, we must ensure that water resources are used responsibly and productively to deliver an economy that will benefit all Queenslanders, accelerate the growth of agriculture and resources sectors and create economic development opportunities for rural and regional Queensland. The unfair transitional arrangements, the potential for regional job losses, the lack of comprehensive consultation and the absence of a RIS mean that the EPOLA bill is fundamentally flawed and the one-sided regulatory burdens in the water bill are why I urge this House to support the opposition's amendments.

Mr SORENSEN (Hervey Bay—LNP) (10.20 pm): I rise to speak on the cognate debate of the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill and the Water Legislation Amendment Bill. It is a real coincidence that we are speaking on these bills on the day of the American presidential elections. The Adani mine development, which claims to create 10,000 jobs in construction in Queensland and cheap electricity for tens of millions of poor Indians, has been delayed for at least seven years by various legal challenges, including against the railway line to the coast and the development of the port of Abbot Point. In a celebrative email to the Sandler Foundation in August last year after the decision against Adani mine, Sunrise Project director John Hepburn, a former green activist and one of the authors of the strategy to block coalmining in Australia, thanked the foundation for its support, saying—

Without your support none of this could have happened.

He added that he is going to buy a few bottles of bubbly to celebrate with his colleagues from GetUp, Greenpeace, 350.org, Australian Youth Climate Coalition—this one really gets me—the Mackay Conservation Group, Market Forces and the brilliant, tireless Sunrise team. It is very interesting to see all of that money coming from America to stop mining in Australia, especially the Adani mine. I just cannot get over that. A *Courier-Mail* article mentions the coordinated actions of organisations such as GetUp, Greenpeace, 350.org, Australian Youth Climate Coalition and the Mackay Conservation Group highlighted by the Queensland government and that it must now seize the agenda and deliver the mines. This was in the *Courier-Mail* on 1 November. An article in the *Australian* newspaper says that New Hope and Adani predicts that the legislation required to transition into the water licences will delay the project which has already been held up for years and that the assessment of this will take another couple of years.

Where are we going in this country? I thought we were voted to this place to represent Queenslanders—I really did—but, no, we have to take all of this funding from overseas to prop up the green groups which those opposite support. Tonight are those opposite going to go and pop a few bottles of champagne with all of these groups? It must be disappointing that the Clintons lost the election, but I really wonder what goes on sometimes. These groups are being paid millions of dollars from overseas foundations to take people to court in this country to block projects. It is a disgrace and something should be done about it and I hope the federal government—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: I have been told that the Deputy Premier said that Trump was a bigot. Somebody needs to apologise for that because it might have ramifications in the future.

In this bill Labor says that it cares about the economy, developing regional Queensland and jobs in regional Queensland, yet Labor brings a bill into the House that will risk thousands of existing jobs in Queensland and tens of thousands of new jobs in Queensland. Labor has said that it supports the Adani project, yet it brings this bill in at the last moment which will hold the project up for another couple of years. Are we fair dinkum about jobs in regional areas? I do not think so. It is ridiculous! Sixteen prominent Queensland community and industry leaders have taken the unprecedented step of signing an open letter calling on Labor not to delay the Adani project with any new approvals. There is quite a list of them—I will not go through them—but there are 16 of them altogether. Mayors and chamber of commerce and industry leaders want those jobs, yet all Labor is doing tonight is introducing a bill that will ensure that the project is delayed for another couple of years. Why? Because it wants the green vote. The Greens seem to dominate and I bet that Trump won the election because people have had an absolute gutful of what is going on. I think that same thing is going on in Australia and there will be repercussions.

Hundreds of mine workers from Acland came to Parliament House to hear from the state government about why it has continued to hold up the approval of stage 3. Stage 3 has been going on since about 2007—nearly 10 years to get approval! It has been going on for 10 years. Surely in 10 years we could do something—10 years! Think about it! Despite the invitation calling for the Premier and the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources to explain exactly what is happening, neither bothered to go out and meet with those miners and the farmers and the many people who work across-the-board. Many of those small farmers need these mining companies to exist when things get tough because they support the whole community. It is not like Brisbane where there is a lot of industry. Those small areas do need these jobs and they rely on them. Many subcontractors also rely on them. Not surprisingly, the Deputy Premier, Jackie Trad, and the environment minister, Steven Miles, did not turn up either. It is unbelievable.

With regard to regional employment, Townsville's regional employment is down. About 10,700 jobs have disappeared from the region and the unemployment rate has increased by 1.5 per cent. The participation rate has dropped by 6.7 per cent and 600 jobs were lost in September. The youth unemployment rate is still at a high 16.1 per cent. In outback Queensland it is worse. Almost 14,000 jobs have been lost in the regions under Labor's watch. In just one year the unemployment rate has increased by eight per cent and now it is above 13 per cent. The participation rate has fallen almost 20 per cent under Labor's watch. People are giving up looking for work, and that is an alarming rate. Youth unemployment has skyrocketed to 34.9 per cent.

The unemployment rate in Cairns has increased as well. In Mackay, 5,000 jobs have disappeared. In my area there are a lot of fly-in fly-out workers. Even areas such as Hervey Bay are affected. Carmichael mine and Acland stage 3 have gone through vigorous environmental assessments over a number of years. Approvals for the New Hope mine started in 2007. Why has it taken 10 years? How can people spend 10 years of their life just submitting approvals? It is unbelievable.

Labor has adopted the strategy that the activists are seeking—to delay resource projects in Queensland. Labor has said that it supports the development of new coalmines in Queensland, yet like the activists it seeks to impose a new delay on advancing mining projects. These projects have already gone through vigorous environmental approval and assessment processes. Some of these mines have to have bores all around them and the groundwater has to be tested. The mines have to report on the water quality all the time. I understand that, as I have been involved in building dams for a sewage treatment plant. The water has to be monitored around those plants.

Although a lot of good people fronted up to the committee and made suggestions, I think Mr Houen made more sense than most. He also made a submission to the committee in relation to what should be done with make-good agreements. During the hearing, Mr Houen stated—

> Here is a scenario. The mining application is active ... there is a proper baseline assessment. It has to be an assessment which includes the sustainable yield of the bore.

He states further that these agreements should be settled before the whole application is made. Why can we not make sure that the farmers are not affected by the groundwater around them? Surely, the water from all of those bores around mines and farms can be tested to make sure that that water is not affected.

I would like to thank all the other committee members for their work. I would also like to thank those people who attended the public hearings and those who made submissions to the bill. I also thank the people from Acland mine for coming along. Their jobs, their futures, depend on this mine going

ahead. For many years another mine has operated there. The development of the mine has been held up and a lot of people will most probably lose their jobs. The make-good agreements are very important so that, at the end of the day, everybody gets along.

As for the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, I really wonder why the government introduced it. If you read the report and see how many amendments the government is looking to make to the legislation, I really wonder why the government even bothered to introduce it. It is so amateurish.

Mr Power interjected.

Mr SORENSEN: We did not do that one. It was not our committee. Property Rights Australia is another green group that goes on about the price of water. I think some farmers have to be careful of the green lobby groups that are going to make them pay for any of the water that comes from underground. At the moment, a farmer can have a bore for livestock. Some farmers are struggling and it costs them a lot of money to put bores down a couple of thousand feet. I hope that legislation does not come in.

Mr PEARCE (Mirani—ALP) (10.35 pm): It is a pleasure for me to join in this debate. I rise to speak in support of the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill along with the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. As a humble backbencher, I am proud to be a member of a government that supports a strong resources sector and understands that the industry is integral to the state's economy, contributing much needed jobs, particularly in regional areas. In saying that, I express my concerns about the behaviour of multinationals and their treatment of the resources that belong to the people of Queensland. The government understands that, as a community, we expect resource activities to be undertaken safely, responsibly and without undue impacts on other sectors of the economy or the environment.

I want to comment on a couple of matters that will probably not help my PR between me and those who stand accused. I have to say that, as a local member, I am frustrated and disappointed by the lack of honesty coming from some of the mining companies and, to a lesser extent, some conservation groups. I am angered by the fact that I was asked to go in to bat for the mining companies that were wanting certainty on access to water, only to find out, when pursuing this issue, that these mining companies already had access to water but they had not applied for it.

Mr Cripps: That's a bit of a red herring, Jim.

Mr PEARCE: No, it is not.

Mr Cripps: It is.

Mr PEARCE: I have a red herring that I will give to you later as well.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! Member for Hinchinbrook and member for Mirani, please direct your comments through the chair.

Mr PEARCE: Madam Deputy Speaker, I will do that. Instead of sitting back in the belief that the LNP was going to regain government, these mining companies should have applied for their water licences so that they would not be in the situation that they are in now. It is simply immoral for companies to use backbenchers like me who are keen to help—and I will do anything I can to help—and not be 100 per cent honest with me and leave me in a position where I am probably making a bit of a goose of myself. I know that I do that sometimes, but not all of the time. If mining companies are forced to make an application under the amended legislation, if every mining company did the right thing, they would be better off.

After years of working in the mining industry in Central Queensland, I can say that the bloody-mindedness of some coal companies is unbelievable. Unfortunately, it is always the people who feel the consequences. This process has caused some heartache for landowners, coal industry workers and the conservation movement. Landowners want certainty about access to groundwater. That is the lifeblood of their business. They also must know that they have the certainty of continued supply.

Workers want job certainty. Every worker wants to know that their job is safe. In past years in the mining industry jobs were safe. There was a lot of certainty. Not any more. If we are decent human beings standing in this place talking about what we are going to do for people we must remember that the first thing that any man or woman wants is to have a safe, secure job so that they can put food on their table. That is where I come from. I do not really care about anybody else who does not believe that the people of Queensland are more important than some mining companies or other organisations who think that they want to rule what is happening in the local community. I want to make it very clear that I want jobs to come on line and certainty of jobs. The Adani project will certainly be a big job producer. The member for Mackay and myself are supporting Adani for potential job creation.

An opposition member: We want to see more evidence of that.

Mr PEARCE: I do not know if that was the member for Whitsunday who had a go at me then. I have a line here for him he if wants it. In Central Queensland we have lost 20,000 jobs out of the mining industry which has a multiplier flow-on impact across the region and into places like Mackay and Rockhampton. There are 3,000 empty houses in the Bowen Basin and 3,000 empty houses in Mackay. That is what has happened in our region because of a downturn in the industry and job losses. We go through a coal industry downturn from time to time, but it is the culture of the industry now that is taking opportunities away from workers, their families and communities. Our mining towns struggle from the massive population loss. The local and regional economies are on their knees. One has to go up there to actually see that. Cash flow has been reduced to a trickle. Mackay and Rockhampton are feeling the hurt as the economy declines.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr PEARCE: I have heard some comments coming from the other side of the House that I should be looking after Acland when talking about jobs. I happen to have here an extract from the *South Burnett Business News* on 20 February 2012 which states—

LNP candidate for Nanango Deb Frecklington says she has had a win within the party over the proposed expansion of the Acland coal mine.

"After months of lobbying by myself, Ray Hopper and Jeff Seeney, the LNP has made it clear that it will not support the proposal for Acland Stage 3 that would see the expansion of the open cut coal mine ...

I happen to have another document here. It is a photograph of Mrs Frecklington and she has a petition calling for Acland approval.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): Order! I ask the member for Mirani to refer to members by their formal title, please.

Mr PEARCE: The member for Nanango presented a petition to the parliament and she said the petition called on the Labor government to do what is necessary to allow the project to go ahead. On one hand she does not want it to go ahead and three years later she is blaming us and wanting to put the pressure on us.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEARCE: One thing I do not do is mislead. If you want to find out if I am any good at misleading I will go walking with you. I am disappointed to see representatives of mining companies cuddling up to LNP members such as the member for Dawson, George Christensen, and the member for Capricornia, Michelle Landry. I certainly do not want to have the same public affection from those people, but we need recognition that we need to be involved, not through desperation, but through common decency and a willingness to work together in partnership. This love affair that goes on sometimes is a little bit sickening. The same people do not think twice about coming along to see what we can do to help them. I know a lot of backbenchers get called in to provide this help when industry thinks that they cannot get anywhere with the people they are working with.

The resources industry can and does coexist with the agriculture sector, but it is important that we put in place a framework that protects the interests of farmers who may be adversely impacted by a resource project. I come off the land in north-west New South Wales. I have worked in the industry. I can see the great working relationship that we have with the farmers. Farmers are underestimated in the good work that they do. I would like to see landholders given a lot more respect for the good things that they are doing in today's world.

Mr Costigan interjected.

Mr PEARCE: Was that the member for Whitsunday again? I say to the member for Whitsunday: if you want to keep chirping away I have got something on here that would go across very well.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Two things: I remind the member for Mirani to address your comments through the chair and, member for Whitsunday, I think your interjections are persistent and if you make further interjections I will warn you.

Mr PEARCE: I accept your ruling, Madam Deputy Chair. When stakeholders tell us that the framework is not working or that the framework has gaps, we have an obligation to listen and take action. That is the good thing about being in this government. I have been in this place before. This is probably the first time that we have had so many committees out there working on the ground talking

to the residents of different communities, talking to people in business and talking to landowners. It is about talking to people, listening to what they have to say and providing the feedback either through reports or directly to ministers involved.

The bill makes a number of important improvements to the make-good framework that will make sure that rural landholders have a fair go when it comes to negotiating make-good agreements for the impairments their bores suffer due to mining and coal seam gas production. As I said, I was raised on the land. I do a lot of travelling around Central Queensland. I have been on a number of properties. There is a lot of activity on the land. People have bores jumping out of the ground all over the place. We have to respect that they deserve a right to live with the knowledge that they are not going to be overtaken by bores and water pipelines.

The reforms in this legislation will ensure that rural landholders are not left out of pocket if they need hydrogeological advice or alternative dispute resolution when negotiating a make-good agreement. That is very important. One afternoon I went to a property and the property owners told me about a negotiator from one of the gas companies coming on their land. They knew as soon as that person came through the front gate that he was out of the city and he did not have much of a clue what was happening and then tried to use smart talk and smooth talk to put it over these landholders. For once these people stood up for their rights and were able to convince the person concerned that they were not interested in what he was talking about at this particular time, at least until he got an understanding of what it was like for them to live on the land. I think a good bit of advice is do not think you can pop it over the cockies because you cannot.

The bill also provides bore owners with a cooling-off period to allow landholders to reflect, with a cool head, on whether a make-good agreement provides them with the compensation or access to water that they need to continue their business. The farmer has not asked or requested the impact that he or she gets on the land, but many of them try to live with it. We have to give them credit and recognition for being prepared to try to live with mining activities or resource-taking activities, either on their land or adjacent to it. I do not believe that we give our landholders and our farmers enough recognition and enough credit for having to put up with the activities of mining companies or gas takers.

The improvements to the make-good framework are fair and are needed to ensure that landholders and the resources industry can continue to coexist. A lot of claims are made by mining companies about coexistence and, in some cases, I would agree with them. I have seen mining companies go a long way and try their very hardest to do the right thing by landowners or their neighbours. I have also seen mining companies go to any extent to sign an agreement with a landowner, but as soon as they have the signature on the line they walk away from it and forget that they have an agreement. I come from the old days when the shake of a hand was as good as a signed document. I think that we should be able to continue to live that way. I support the legislation before the House.

Mr McEACHAN (Redlands—LNP) (10.51 pm): I thank the member for Mirani for that enlightening speech. I will try not to give the House any more personal anecdotes. I rise to speak in the cognate debate that combines the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I will speak first to the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Firstly, I will examine the motivation for this amendment bill. To me, the bill is ideological in its outlook and, as such, removes fair consideration of community and economic outcomes for large-scale water projects. Yet again we see vested green interests dominating the policies of the Palaszczuk Labor government at the expense of the broader community.

In 2014, the LNP sought to free up a rigid and very time-consuming process in developing water infrastructure, as well as to provide consistency in how groundwater is managed across all resource industry sectors and, lastly, to create a pathway for the consideration of new large-scale water infrastructure projects. I find it interesting that the ESD is proposed to mirror the definition in the Commonwealth EPBC Act. One would have thought that those opposite would stop and consider the Traveston dam proposal and the absolute debacle that they created. Those opposite want to reintroduce the ecologically sustainable development purpose. This is the very party that went ahead and wantonly harmed the Mary Valley communities and wasted some half a billion in taxpayers' money, only to have their own comrades assess the project and rule it out on environmental grounds, and rightly so. If this LNP legislation had been applied to Traveston, I believe it would never have stacked up in the first place, a hell of a lot of money would not have been wasted and a lot of heartache would have been avoided.

It seems to me highly hypocritical that Labor, which could not build a dam even when it tried, seeks to bring in more legislation to make large-scale infrastructure developments even more difficult. In Labor's parallel universe, you build a dam that floods prime agricultural land, harms several communities, kills protected species and is so shallow that evaporation loss makes it virtually useless for water storage—that is the Traveston dam—and you spend half a billion dollars in the process.

Mr Hart: You could bring up the Western Corridor Recycled Water Scheme.

Mr McEACHAN: I take the interjection from the member for Burleigh. There are plenty of examples that I could go through, but I will keep my speech mercifully brief.

Mr Dick interjected.

Mr McEACHAN: I take the interjection from the member for Woodridge. I can take the whole 20 minutes, if he would prefer.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): I suggest that the member for Redlands continues speaking, rather than worrying about interjections.

Mr McEACHAN: Thank you for your guidance, Madam Deputy Speaker.

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! It is a long night. Let us allow the member for Redlands to continue.

Mr McEACHAN: Jobs, community and industry development are at risk with this Water Legislation Amendment Bill. The parliamentary committee considering this bill could not come to an agreement and there is no recommendation in the report that the bill be passed. Just the following was recommended—

Honourable members interjected.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! There is a lot of cross-chamber conversation. Please allow the member for Redlands to speak. There is a bit of dobbing going on too, I can see.

Mr McEACHAN: Just the following was recommended: that the Department of Natural Resources and Mines continues to investigate alternatives for securing water for large-scale projects, while taking into account the impact on communities. Shadow minister Cripps said that this recommendation emerged almost in direct contradiction to Labor's proposal to remove the water development option from the Water Act and because of strong support from a range of agricultural stakeholders to keep this reform that was put in place by the former LNP government.

I will now address the proposed Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. This bill is yet another manifestation of the influence placed on the government by the Greens. The ever-present pressure faced by the government at the hands of radical green groups looms ever large. Its pressure is being felt in the ill-considered decision to kill off industry on North Stradbroke Island. It was demonstrated in the bulldozing of the rights of farmers and traditional owners in the thankfully defeated vegetation management bill. What we see in this bill is more of the same. The hypocrisy demonstrated by the Palaszczuk Labor government is quite staggering. They claim that they care about economic development for regional Queensland and yet they propose this bill, which will see thousands of jobs put at risk.

Last week we saw hundreds of workers from the New Acland mine rally outside Parliament House. Invitations were extended to the Premier, ministers Lynham and Miles and the Deputy Premier, but none of them showed. Why? I imagine it is difficult to explain how a deal with the Greens is putting the jobs of those Acland workers at risk. Last week, I met with a worker from Acland, living in my electorate of Redlands, who was dismayed at the uncertainty he and his family are facing at the hands of the Palaszczuk Labor government, because it apparently escapes their notice—so I remind those opposite—that the legislation we make and debate in the House has a human impact. It has an impact on the mums and dads trying to make ends meet, it has an impact on youth in regional centres who are without any prospect of employment and it has an impact on economic confidence for the whole of the Queensland economy and sovereign risk.

Projects such as the Carmichael mine and Acland stage 3 have already faced rigorous environmental assessments, including extensive studies into groundwater impacts. The approvals provided to those projects have conditions placed upon them directly relating to groundwater, including

regular monitoring and reporting. If we consider the Acland New Hope project, it is clear that this project had been through all the necessary approvals long before this ill-considered bill was conceived. New Hope had approval with strict conditions from the Coordinator-General in 2014. It has been through no less than seven public consultation processes for state-based approvals.

New Hope includes a comprehensive assessment of the project's potential impacts on groundwater and has imposed upon it strict conditions for an ongoing compliance and monitoring regime for the life of the project. In short, the approvals are there, the due diligence has been done and the monitoring and compliance processes are in place.

This bill proposes to unnecessarily duplicate and frustrate economic development in Queensland. This bill is another attempt by this Labor government to delay economic development in Queensland. It is an attempt to hold the extremist groups at bay and it is an attempt to do a deal with the Greens to keep safe the seats of the Deputy Premier and Minister Miles. Shame on this Palaszczuk Labor government for putting their own interests before the people of Queensland. I urge all members to vote against the bills.

Mr RICKUSS (Lockyer—LNP) (11.00 pm): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I do not know whether a lot of people are aware that New Hope is an Australian coal company that actually employs a lot of local workers. In the areas of Willowbank, Ebenezer and Jeebropilly, which I represent, there have been mines for quite a length of time. Unfortunately, they have had to continue mining around the Ipswich area simply because the resource they require to meet their contracts should come from Acland but access to that has been denied.

Since 2007 New Hope have been trying to get stage 3 up and running. I think they have had seven public consultations. It is a project that is worth about $1.7 billion to the Queensland economy. There are not too many jobs around Ipswich or Oakey where workers can earn over $100,000. They are top line jobs.

Here we are stalling and procrastinating again. As I have said, this has gone on since 2007. Why Labor members hate the Ipswich workers, I honesty do not know. I do not know why they continue to procrastinate on these sorts of jobs and make things difficult. The sovereign risk of the state is impacted simply because they procrastinate for so long.

The fact that we are now bringing the gas industry and the coal industry into alignment as far as make-good provisions go is a credit to the member for Hinchinbrook who brought that in in previous legislation. Unfortunately, the government has sat on it for almost two years. It is really disappointing that it has taken that long for this government to get these provisions through. I realise that there has been a dispute between the AWU and the CFMEU about Acland, Stradbroke and all those sorts of things. That has complicated things for the Labor Party. It is not about Queenslanders; it is about unions.

This bill should be changed. Acland should be approved. A simple amendment could get Acland through so that it can work. It has met the Coordinator-General's criteria. The government continues to procrastinate on this for no apparent reason. It is extremely disappointing.

I have numerous workers around Ipswich, Mutdapilly and other areas who depend on New Hope for jobs. I know people from the Acland area and families who have farmed around that area. They are more than happy for the mine to be there for the fact that their sons and family members can have great jobs.

Some of the rehabilitation work that Acland does is top class work. This is a company that we should be proud of as Australians. This is a great Australian company. Their AGM is on in Ipswich in the next few weeks.

Dr Rowan: A success story.

Mr RICKUSS: That is right. I will take that interjection from the member for Moggill. It is a success story for Australia. Why they are being held up by this Labor government beggars belief. Unfortunately, it is all about their union mates; it is not about the progress of the state.

Mrs GILBERT (Mackay—ALP) (11.04 pm): I rise to speak on the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 and also the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. I would like to thank the members from both committees and both ministers and departments for their work on the bills.

In regional Queensland we need to strike a balance in terms of water usage to meet the needs of industry, agriculture and the environment. One cannot sustain our state without the other. We need food, fibre, jobs from industry, farming, mining and tourism. The purpose of these two bills is to strike a balance and to preserve our water stocks for future generations. I enjoyed working with the member for Mirani to work towards supporting jobs in the region that are sustainable.

The Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 will amend those provisions in the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act that are inconsistent with the government's policy and election commitments. This includes: reinstating the principles of ecologically sustainable development in the purpose of the Water Act 2000; omitting the provisions for the declaration of designated watercourses; and omitting water development option provisions in their entirety.

This bill aims to remove unnecessary regulation, improve client services, reduce costs and deliver a more efficient water allocation and management framework for Queensland. Currently, the WROLA Act does not expressly include the principles of ecologically sustainable development. There are risks to the Great Barrier Reef, the potential to overallocate water resources and an absence of public consultation prior to the issue of water development options. This needs to be amended.

The current WROLA Act includes provisions to allow the declaration of a designated watercourse used to enable the removal of the requirement for an entitlement to take or interfere with water in designated watercourses. This bill amends this provision to ensure continued appropriate regulation of watercourses.

The Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 is realising the government's election commitment to act immediately to prevent the commencement of the Newman government's water laws which will have a detrimental effect of the Great Barrier Reef catchment systems and allow for the overallocation of Queensland's water resources and the commitment to return ecologically sustainable development principles to the Water Act and remove the water development options in their entirety. This bill removes the ability to declare a designated watercourse.

The Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016 will strengthen the effectiveness of the environmental assessment of underground water extraction by resource projects. It will also allow the ongoing scrutiny of the environmental impacts of underground water extraction during the operational phase of resource projects through clear links between the Environmental Protection Act 1994 and the Water Act 2000. It will also improve the make-good framework of the Water Act 2000. This requirement will extend obligations to bores impaired by free gas. It also clarifies that make-good obligations arise where the exercise of underground water rights is likely the cause of the impairment even if there is scientific uncertainty. The resource companies will bear the costs of any alternative dispute resolution process and pay the landholders' reasonable costs in engaging a hydrologist for expert advice in negotiating a make-good agreement.

The bill will also ensure that the administering authority of the Environmental Protection Act 1994 is the decision-maker for specific applications relating to environmental authorities. It will also ensure that mining tenure approvals are appropriately assessed for their impact on the environment and underground water use and that there are opportunities for public submissions and third-party appeals provided for before underground water is taken in regulated areas for mine dewatering purposes. It will update existing provisions in the Queensland Heritage Act 1992 to provide for the appointment, by local government, of authorised persons to carry out compliance and enforcement activities for the local heritage provisions.

With the amendments flagged by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines and the Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection, these bills will ensure that we get the balance right for Queensland. In the regions we need both the agriculture industry and mining as well as the jobs that they bring. I commend the bills to the House.

Ms LEAHY (Warrego—LNP) (11.09 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I acknowledge both pieces of legislation are complex and interrelated. Many speakers before me have spoken on a variety of issues and I do not intend to repeat the issues that have already been raised and prosecuted in the debate. I do, however, wish to contribute in relation to the consultation of the bills and the make-good agreements which are outlined in chapter 3 of the Water Act.

To understand where we are today with this legislation, I think it is very important to know about some of the events of the past, such as what happened with the former Labor Party governments during the Beattie and Bligh era and how they handled, or maybe I should say ignored, underground water issues, particularly those in the CSG industry. In 2007 the Queensland department of infrastructure produced the *Liquefied natural gas whole of state environmental impact study: full report, version 3*. The report was known as the matrix report. It is quite an extensive report about the impacts on underground water sources due to the emerging CSG industry across the Surat Basin region.

The report acknowledged that the water impact statement required under the Petroleum and Gas (Production and Safety) Act 2004 only obliges a CSG operator to have regard to Water Act bores. The act at that time did not impose obligations on the operator in respect of the bores which are not registered under the Water Act even though the owners of such bores have entitlement to take water for stock and domestic purposes on their own land. Effectively, there were few or no make-good obligations on water quantity or quality—and this is probably one of the reasons we are now here today debating some of these make-good provisions.

The department of infrastructure and planning report in 2009 by McLennan Magasanik Associates recommended regular reporting, including an underground water impact report to be filed early in the period of tenure or lease, a pre-closure report near the time of completion, annual monitoring of reports and to review reports every two to five years. The reporting provided for the establishment and adjustment of the water impact baseline on related aquifers, as well as regular reporting against this baseline and arrangements that define when impacts may cease and the outcomes or outstanding actions of the make-good obligations on affected bores. Both of those reports clearly outline numerous impacts and made recommendations for how the industry and the government at the time should address the emerging issues.

It is quite legitimate to ask: what did the governments, particularly the Labor governments of the time, do with those reports? They left them sitting on the shelf and they ignored them. Their own department commissioned reports, and recommendations were left to gather dust term after term of Labor government. Let us contrast this lack of action of the former Labor governments with that of the LNP when in government. The LNP did an enormous amount to try to reduce the conflict between the gas industry and landowners. I believe we should acknowledge the good work of the member for Hinchinbrook as the minister responsible during the LNP government. He was left with an absolute dog's breakfast by successive Labor governments.

The member for Hinchinbrook had only one term of government to try to right the inaction and disinterest in landholders' concerns which accumulated quickly during the years of the previous Beattie and Bligh government terms. There were numerous initiatives including a new Regional Planning Interests Act, the expansion of the strategic cropping land map, the establishment of the GasFields Commission and the reporting of the Surat Basin underground cumulative impact report, which is now updated by the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment annually.

The former LNP government conducted a wideranging review of the land access laws and made a number of changes, the most significant being the expansion of the Land Court's jurisdiction to hear conduct matters, as well as compensation matters, when considering conduct and compensation agreement proceedings between landowners and gas companies. In addition to this, I would also point out that, under the former LNP government, the CSG Compliance Unit within the Department of Natural Resources and Mines exceeded the auditing and inspection targets of CSG infrastructure, and the former LNP government provided funding to roll out the coal seam gas landholder project workshops.

What I find interesting is that this Labor government have instigated more than 130 reviews in 21 months of government. However, they have not undertaken a proper review of the make-good provisions. Why do they not do a review? They seem to want to review everything else. Despite their preference for reviewing everything and anything, this legislation is not a product of a rigorous review of the make-good provisions.

Mr Janetzki: They're making it up as they go along.

Ms LEAHY: I take that interjection from the member for Toowoomba South—yes, they do make it up as they go along, even on make-good provisions. The bill seeks to make the following key changes to the make-good provisions—and I acknowledge that there are some amendments which have been introduced by the minister tonight. These provisions require resource companies to pay the landholder's reasonable costs in engaging a hydrogeologist for the purposes of negotiating a make-good agreement; require the resource companies to bear the costs of any alternative dispute resolution in the make-good

agreement negotiation process; and insert a cooling-off period for make-good agreements. Currently there is not a cooling-off period for these agreements. I note that the amendments have actually reduced this period to five business days.

The provisions also ensure that impacts on water bores as a result of free gas from coal seam gas extraction attract make-good obligations. Migration of gas is a natural phenomenon. However, more gas would appear to be migrating due to the depressurisation of certain coal seams and other geological strata. It will be interesting to see how this legislative change will work in practice as there are some areas where water bores have been described as gassy bores by landholders well before coal seam gas extraction entered that area. The bill also seeks to address issues in the make-good agreement negotiation process relating to uncertainty in the cause of bore impairment, effectively lowering the burden of proof for causation of an impacted bore.

I note in the dissenting reports that there has been major concern expressed in relation to the consultation process and the limited time frames for the completion of the consultation. I would like to draw the attention of the House to an area in my electorate where I have been advised that six stock water bores have blown out in the last 18 months. It might be of benefit to members of the House to learn of the frustrations that landholders experience when they are dealing with make-good situations. I have a landholder who has been experiencing this since 2008. I will give a short summary of the issues that they have encountered. I have no doubt that even these amendments to the make-good provisions will not address all of the problems which I am about to describe.

Two bores are relied upon by the landholder for intensive animal production, and this particular landholder has no other access to continuous high reliability water for that intensive production. One bore was drilled in 1946. Gas bubbling could be heard in January 2016 and that had never happened before. The CSG company installed a logger which developed download data issues and had to be replaced. It took two years for that happen.

Another bore was drilled in March 2003. There were no problems pumping this bore. It started blowing out intermittently from 2008 to 2012. The bore stopped blowing out during 2012 until January 2016. The DNRM CSG Compliance Unit became involved. In July 2016—the first communication the landholder has ever had from the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection—the department advised the landholder that the company, which denied it caused the problem, had done a bore assessment in December 2013 and fulfilled its obligation under the Water Act chapter 3. The landholders believe that waiting almost 30 months for results of the bore assessment is just a bit overdue. No legislative changes here tonight will address these delays.

The only thing that saved this landholder from serious animal and financial losses was some winter rain. This particular landholder is still trying to progress their make-good agreement for the bore that first developed issues in 2008, as this is their only water source for their intensive animal production.

I will be supporting the reforms tonight to chapter 3 of the Water Act. However, given the landholder experiences I am seeing in my electorate, there is a need for genuine consultation and a formal independent review of the make-good provisions. They need to deliver outcomes and certainty, not delays and additional costs for all involved.

Mr WEIR (Condamine—LNP) (11.19 pm): I rise to make a contribution to the cognate debate on the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 and the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016. I will commence by addressing the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. This report has been laying on the table since 1 March 2016, so this debate has been a long time coming. Some of the issues addressed in the first part of this bill overlap with the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016.

One of the first concerns that I noted in the committee report was that expressed by some submitters regarding the Water Legislation Amendment Bill about the lack of consultation. This is a common complaint about any legislation brought before the House by this government. Queensland Conservation described the consultation process as excellent. The Queensland Resources Council, in contrast, stated that there had not been sufficient consultation on timing, application and transitional arrangements of the reforms. Cotton Australia expressed disappointment they were not included in the Water Engagement Forum that met on three occasions to discuss the proposed changes. Considering that cotton growing is a large contributor to the economy and is heavily reliant upon water availability, it would seem to be a glaring omission, particularly given the proposed changes to the water development option provisions.

AgForce expressed a number of concerns with the water development provisions including the following: opportunities to access water should be in the context of the available existing strategic reserves of water yet to be allocated and that can be sustainably taken; and the process of accessing such reserves should be done transparently and require direct consultation of potentially affected water users. QFF stated that the water development option had been taken off the table completely which they considered to not be a good decision. QFF went on to state—

Major water infrastructure projects will require some certainty regarding availability of water before they commit to detailed development investigations. Consideration should be given to providing a revised water development option in the Bill.

The committee notes these concerns in recommendation 1, and I would be interested in the minister's response.

Clause 16 of the bill proposes to amend the cumulative management area of underground water impact where there are one or more petroleum leases. The current act states that, if a tenure is partially within and partially outside a cumulative management area, the cumulative management area is to include the whole of the tenure. The amendment would mean that the chief executive would decide whether the tenure or part of the tenure is a cumulative management area on the advice from any relevant entities including the tenure holder and the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment.

The Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment was established by the LNP when in government and is widely respected across both the agricultural and mining industries. It was established in response to concerns around the accuracy of data relating to impacts on underground aquifers from the activities of the resource sector. Concerns about overlapping tenures have been around for a long time and amendments have never met universal support, and neither do the proposed changes in this area of the bill.

The Wilderness Society fully supports the amendments. The Environmental Defenders Office, in comparison, believes the amendments will create more administration and uncertainty for all stakeholders with minor benefits. AgForce supports the use of the scientific expertise of the Office of Groundwater Impact Assessment. A considerable section of the committee's report into this section of the bill covers issues such as the take of associated water and make-good provisions. These issues were outside the scope of this bill and are addressed in the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill.

Any legislation regarding water, either above ground, surface water or underground aquifers, is always going to be a controversial subject. There are opposing views and differing interpretations of the science and the legislation surrounding the various acts. Water legislation is a complex, crucial and emotive issue, particularly in relation to mining and agriculture. I do not expect this debate and the aftermath that will follow to be any different. I have spent my life involved in agricultural pursuits and have witnessed the passionate opinions of all concerned many times. I am fully aware that some proponents hold resolute views on the subject. The agriculture and resource sectors are two of the largest industries in this state, and one of the main causes of conflict between these two industries is the contentious issue of water entitlements.

The previous LNP government introduced the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act. The water reform bill was not without its critics—just like the bill which the government has brought into the House and we are debating today has its critics. The bill proposes amendments that would require a mining licence holder to apply for an associated water licence. This would include holders of an environmental authority who, but for the commencement of section 334ZP of the Mineral Resources Act, would have been required to apply for a water licence; applicants for environmental authorities whose application has not been decided by the chief executive; and projects notified as coordinated projects under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971.

The Queensland Resources Council expressed concern about the impact this amendment would have on any advanced projects. QRC argued that any advanced project has already been through a public submission phase as a result of the EIS process; nonduplication of public submission phases where an EIS has been completed is an accepted principle in the EP Act; and the proponent has been proactive into entering make-good agreements with potentially impacted landholders on the basis of detailed groundwater modelling.

The concerns voiced by QRC would obviously include the New Hope Acland stage 3 project. I think that all members in the House would be aware of the lengthy approval process that Acland stage 3 has been subject to. The Acland mine was first approved by the Beattie Labor government and applied to extend to stage 3 in 2007. The LNP when in government told New Hope to amend their proposal to

include moving the coal-loading facility beside the town of Jondaryan on to the mine site, not interfere with Doctor Creek and reduce the footprint so that the mine did not move any closer to the town of Oakey. The revised application met all of these requests.

The process is currently awaiting a Land Court decision where two weeks of hearings were importantly dedicated to underground water issues. Water security is an issue near to all landowners' hearts. Water security ensures landholders remain sustainable and profitable, and it is only right that this was given a high level of scrutiny. Any further approvals should be subject to make-good provisions and any other concerns raised during the process. The problem with this legislation is that under the retrospective aspects of this bill New Hope will need to go through the same evidence once again. The shadow minister, Andrew Cripps, has addressed this aspect of the bill. The amendments to the make-good provisions regarding costs incurred by the landholder being paid by the resource company and the impacts on bores by free gas have been well received by landholders and industry.

We had 700 protesters outside this building on Tuesday last. I went out and spoke to them. Many of them had sent me emails detailing their concerns about their future and concerns about their job security. I told them that I would bring their concerns into this House. The timing of this impact on their livelihood could not be worse. As members would know, Oakey is going through a terrible situation at the moment with underground water contamination. Many of these people own residences in Oakey. There are contractors who have businesses at the Acland mine who have mortgaged their homes waiting to see what the outcome of this legislation is going to be. If members have followed the story in Oakey at all, they would know the value of housing in Oakey at this moment. This could not have come at a worse possible time.

There are 275 direct jobs at the New Hope mine. There are 507 contractors. Every one of these people are concerned about their future. I told these people I would bring their concerns into the House. It is their livelihood and their future that concerns me, because for them this is the perfect storm and there is no way out. I would urge the entire House to look at the amendments that shadow minister Cripps will introduce later tonight.

Mr KNUTH (Dalrymple—KAP) (11.29 pm): In speaking to both bills, I can say that the most important thing is the balance between the large and equally important sectors of mining, grazing and agriculture. We need to find a middle ground because without all of these industries we will battle to survive. It is important to focus on removing the potential red tape from the existing projects like Adani to secure jobs in the region, while securing water rights for landowners, farmers, graziers and all primary producers, improving make-good arrangements and the eligibility for compensation and supporting better coverage to the types of bores, impacts and additional protection. It is understandable why landowners have been gutted by the coal seam gas companies, where they have sucked the aquifers dry and have left the farmers who irrigate crops with up to 30,000 gallons an hour with only 300 gallons.

While supporting mining developments, we still expect any mining project to follow due process in dealing with impacts of the underground water before the mine is granted access. However, we do not want to force projects that have already been through these rigorous processes back into the courts. Adani has been through all of these processes—the Land Court, the environmental authority, mining licences and 99 per cent of the make-good arrangements. This project will see not only massive jobs for workers in rural and regional Queensland but the flow-on effects spread right through the communities, such as Rockhampton, Cairns, Townsville and also Brisbane. By supporting the EPOLA bill without the amendments, it will see this project that has the potential to start digging within 18 months fail. I have been advised that one of the smaller mines in the Galilee Basin, such as Macmines, is larger than one of the largest mines in the Bowen Basin.

We also have great concerns with the removal of water development options as described in the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2014 introduced by the member for Hinchinbrook, Andrew Cripps, that it will be extinguishing the government's Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015. Extinguishing the water development options at a time when this state is crying out for development will send us backwards. The Mount Isa projects, the Flinders River shire council Flinders River project, the Pentland Biofuels Project, the Big Rocks upstream weir—all of these projects will be at risk if those water development options are removed. This legislation without amendment has the potential to restrict mining, stymie water development and cost jobs. The KAP will be moving amendments during the consideration in detail stage to restore balance.

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (11.32 pm), in reply: First of all, I thank all honourable members for their participation in this debate. The key aim of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 is to amend the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014—

Mr WATTS: Madam Deputy Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I do not think the minister was the next person on the list.

Madam DEPUTY SPEAKER (Ms Farmer): The member is well aware that whoever rises to their feet and has their light on and calls the Speaker is the next speaker.

Mr WATTS: Thank you very much, Madam Deputy Speaker, for your ruling.

Dr LYNHAM: As I said, the key aim of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015 is to amend the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 to align its provisions with government policy and election commitments. The government does not support aspects of the WROLA Act, which was passed by the previous parliament in 2014. In particular, the government does not support the new purpose clause, which no longer expressly includes the principles of ecologically sustainable development in the water development option provisions, and the provision for declaring a designated watercourse. The WROLA Act will automatically commence on 6 December 2016 and amend the Water Act. The bill steps in and delivers a number of key amendments that will ensure that Queensland's water resources, including those river catchments that provide critical freshwater flows to the Great Barrier Reef, continue to be managed in a sustainable manner.

The bill includes the following key amendments to the WROLA Act: the principles of ecologically sustainable development, which were to be removed from the purpose of the Water Act 2000 through the WROLA Act, are to be explicitly reinstated; references to 'responsible and productive management' will be replaced with 'sustainable management' in the purpose and throughout the WROLA Act; provisions in the WROLA Act that allow for the declaration of designated watercourses will be omitted; and provisions in the WROLA Act for water development options will be omitted. The changes made through the bill will deliver on the government's election commitments for saving the Great Barrier Reef by explicitly reinstating the principles of ecologically sustainable development and omitting water development option provisions in their entirety.

I turn now to the issues raised by members during the second reading debate. The first issue focuses on the explicit reinstatement of ecologically sustainable development principles. The member for Hinchinbrook stated in his speech that the bill removes an important component to the proposed Water Act purpose that would ensure community involvement in water planning. Quite frankly, this is rubbish. The purpose clause proposed by the bill ensures the community continues to play a key role in the water planning process. The bill retains the part of the purpose from the WROLA Act that states sustainable water planning should facilitate the 'community taking an active part in planning for the management and allocation of water'. In fact the bill goes a step further in relation to community understanding and involvement in water planning by stating that sustainable water management should promote 'the efficient use of water through … increasing community understanding of the need to use and manage water in a sustainable way'.

The member is also not correct in saying that the purpose puts ecologically sustainable development ahead of everything else. The bill includes ecologically sustainable development as one of a number of elements of sustainable management. All elements must be considered. What the WROLA Act fails to include, which was not supported by government, was the principles of ecologically sustainable development with respect to the planning and management of water resources. The previous government's WROLA Act explicitly excludes important concepts and principles for resource management.

The precautionary principle is excluded—that is, 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. Intergenerational equity is also excluded—that is, the present generation should ensure the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is enhanced or maintained for the benefit of future generations. The member for Gregory suggested that the Rookwood Weir project—

Mr Watts interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Toowoomba North, you are now warned under standing order 253. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action. You know the proper protocol in a debate.

Dr LYNHAM: The member for Gregory suggested that the Rookwood Weir project would be placed at risk because of these amendments. Again, this is simply not true. In fact the Water Resource (Fitzroy Basin) Plan 2011 set aside a strategic reserve of unallocated water specifically to support projects like the Rookwood Weir in the Lower Fitzroy River system. The member has demonstrated my point exactly—that is, that planning processes are an appropriate tool for providing certainty for project developments underpinned by science and consultation through reserving unallocated water for future development.

The member for Hinchinbrook claimed that the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee unanimously supported establishing an alternative to the water development option through this bill. This misrepresents the committee's recommendation.

Mr Hart interjected.

Dr LYNHAM: This was the committee's only recommendation and the member for Hinchinbrook has got it all wrong. To be absolutely clear about the recommendation, I will quote it verbatim—

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Member for Burleigh, this is not an opportunity for you to argue the case with the minister. You are warned under standing order 253. If you persist, I will take the appropriate action.

Dr LYNHAM: Again, the committee recommends the Department of Natural Resources and Mines continues to investigate alternatives for securing water for large-scale projects while taking into account the impact on communities. The member gave the impression that all committee members were on the same page. Let me provide another quote from the committee report. It states—

Government members of the committee support the omission of the water development option as set out in the bill. Non-government members of the committee do not support the omission of the water development option.

To be fair, there was agreement within the committee that my department continue to investigate alternatives. In my second reading speech I confirmed that I directed departmental staff to do just that. My department continued to consult the Water Engagement Forum in this critical piece of investigation work. It is important to recognise that there are existing mechanisms within the water planning framework under the Water Act that will support large-scale infrastructure development. It was a government election commitment to act immediately to prevent the commencement of the Newman government's water laws, which would have had a detrimental effect on the Great Barrier Reef catchment systems. We have committed to the people of Queensland to explicitly reinstate the principles of ecologically sustainable development and omit water development option provisions in their entirety. We have delivered on those commitments.

The member for Burleigh failed to understand how water development option provisions could pose a risk to the Great Barrier Reef. The freshwater flows from eastern catchments are critical to the ecological health of river ecosystems all the way through to the Great Barrier Reef.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, Minister. Pause the clock. The member for Burleigh is trying to attract my attention. Member for Burleigh, under our standing orders, you are able to make reasonable interjections.

Mr Hart: Reasonable interjections?

Mr SPEAKER: Reasonable interjections, if you check the standing orders, and I will rule what is reasonable.

Dr LYNHAM: As I said, the freshwater flows from the eastern catchments towards the Great Barrier Reef are critical to the ecological health of these systems affecting the reef. The water development option provisions, as introduced by the Newman government, allow the granting of an option beyond the volume of water available under a water resource plan. For water resource plan areas along the eastern coast, this opens the door for water to be promised to proposed projects even if it is not reserved in a plan at the time of granting of the water development option.

The Palaszczuk government values science, evidence, community consultation and transparency before it makes significant decisions about planning, allocation and use of the state's precious water resources. This is why the government simply cannot support the water development option provisions of the WROLA Act. The bill steps in and delivers a key amendment that will ensure that Queensland's water resources, including those river catchments that provide critical freshwater flows to the Great Barrier Reef, continue to be managed in a sustainable way by removing water development option provisions in their entirety.

During the debate, members also commented about changes to the underground water impact management framework in WROLA. These changes are relevant to the EPOLA bill, not this bill, which is a handy clarification for the member for Nanango. The member for Nanango also asserted that we were not looking after the rural or farming community. May I remind the member for Nanango that we were the ones who restored objection rights; we were the party that brought back the restricted land framework under that very unpopular MERCP bill introduced by the member for Hinchinbrook. Also, it is my colleague's bill that will provide protection for the agricultural community in the use and provision of their water as opposed to the mining communities.

The proposed amendments I intend to move during consideration in detail of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill are critical to correcting the department's administrative and operational error that affects existing operating mines by validating their past associated water take and interference and authorising it in the future. This will ensure that the operations of the affected mines are not disadvantaged by this erroneous administrative decision and provides them with past and future regulatory certainty. There remain safeguards under the WROLA Act to ensure any changes in the impacts of these existing mines can be appropriately responded to.

I would like to thank the parliamentary committee, the Infrastructure, Planning and Natural Resources Committee, for its consideration of the bill. In particular, I would like to thank the members of the Water Engagement Forum for their input at various stages in the development of this bill. I am also appreciative of those individuals and groups within the community who took the time to prepare submissions on the bill and participated in the committee's public hearing.

Further, I would like to acknowledge the staff within my ministerial office as well as within the Department of Natural Resources and Mines and the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection for their assistance in developing this bill, ensuring the sustainability of our precious water resources is critical in providing long-term certainty and security for water users and ensuring the water needs of the state's environmental and cultural assets are supported now and into the future including the protection of Queensland's iconic Great Barrier Reef. I commend the bill to the House.

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (11.44 pm), in reply: First of all, I thank all honourable members for their participation in this debate. I would also like to thank again the Agriculture and Environment Committee for their thorough consideration of the bill which included taking a broad range of community views into account.

Today members of the House have stood in support of this bill that will provide for improved management of the environmental impacts of underground water extraction by the resources industry. The member for Keppel spoke about the important improvements that the bill proposes in order to provide landholders with a fair go in their dealings with resource companies in seeking compensation for the loss of their vitally important water supplies. I am proud to say that the bill assists rural landholders by levelling the playing field in the negotiation of make-good agreements, ensuring that they have access to the advice they need and providing them with a right to compensation for the full range of potential impacts on their water supply bores.

We also heard from the member for Gladstone, who was impressed by the stronger, cleaner powers that the environment department will have to assess the impact of a groundwater take by mining projects in a streamlined process. As part of their environmental authority application, resource companies will be required to provide detailed information about any proposed exercise of underground water rights, provide information on each aquifer affected by the activity and submit an analysis of the predicted quantities of water to be taken and any impact on the quality of groundwater. This will ensure that decisions can be made on high-quality information.

The member for Ipswich West reminded us of the critical importance of good-quality groundwater to agricultural businesses and went on to note that the resource companies complaining about the proposed associated water licence process were big players who have long been aware of the need for a water licence.

I would like to start by thanking the members opposite for their support for the bill's amendments to the Environmental Protection Act 1994, the make-good provisions of chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000 and the Queensland Heritage Act. In contrast, though, the LNP has stood up and again attempted to justify their deregulation of groundwater take by resource companies in Queensland. The members opposite have indicated that they will move amendments to the bill which will, without sufficient justification, provide a complete exemption from the associated water licence process for a narrowly targeted selection of mines. The members have offered no coherent explanation for why the specific applications they have described in the specific date range they have nominated should have the benefit of an exemption which is not extended to any other projects.

The amendments that I intend to move tonight to the associated water licence process create fair rules for all mining projects which provide a fair exemption from public notification based on recognition of prior scrutiny of groundwater impacts. In marked contrast, the amendments that the opposition intend to move provide a complete exemption from further scrutiny for an arbitrary list of mines based not on whether their groundwater impacts have been appropriately assessed but instead based on the date the application was made. These amendments would create a complex and ad hoc exemption framework with a foundation in politics, not in science.

The member for Hinchinbrook was of the opinion that it is unfair for resource companies that have already commenced their approvals process to be required to obtain an associated water licence. He complained of delays to projects and uncertainty. We make no apology for safeguarding the groundwater resources which are so vital to the continued viability of our agricultural sector and the health of our natural environment. The failure to include appropriate transitional provisions in the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 to ensure the proper evaluation of groundwater take would occur demonstrates a level of carelessness that is the signature of the LNP. The members opposite can dress their complaints up however they want, but that does not change the fact that the requirement for an associated water licence is a standard, boring transitional provision of precisely the kind that would quietly and uncontroversially be included at the back of any bill which amends any kind of permitting regime.

The member for Hinchinbrook claimed that the ability to amend an EA in response to an underground water impact report would lead to sovereign risk. This is a pretty surprising complaint for him to make given that the existing provisions of the Environmental Protection Regulation, which were in effect under the former LNP government, allowed environmental authorities for petroleum to be amended in response to a UWIR. The only change made in this bill is to allow EAs for mining as well as petroleum to be amended in response to UWIRs.

I do not believe that the member, who was very pleased with a consistent framework for mining and petroleum, can seriously be suggesting that this power should apply to petroleum but not to mining. If the way in which environmental impacts relating to groundwater are managed cannot be changed in response to new information contained in the UWIR, then is the purpose of the UWIR to simply monitor environmental decline? This change is entirely consistent with other powers in the EP Act to require management changes in response to new information.

The member for Nanango acknowledged concerns with current make-good arrangements and urged a review, despite the fact that the bill includes amendments to strengthen the bargaining position of, and protections for, landholders which are strongly supported by the agricultural sector. She also made misleading suggestions that make-good conditions for mining activities did not exist prior to WROLA, and this is simply not true. It has been DNRM's practice for many years to impose make-good conditions on water licences for mining in appropriate circumstances. This bill strengthens those make-good provisions.

The member for Burdekin complained that the associated water licence process would create a new avenue for 'lawfare' apparently choosing not to understand that, under the bill with my proposed amendments, only those mines which have not been subject to a thorough Land Court process will be subject to public notification and third-party appeal rights. The water licensing framework has been in place for 20 years. The companies, the proponents of these projects, will simply be required to finish

the process that they started by getting a water licence. It should not come as a surprise to them that the requirement for a water licence is not new. Many of these mining companies could have submitted their water licence applications years ago.

This is not a threat to investment. For the past 20 years mining companies have shown that they are prepared to make significant pre-investments in order to progress their projects. Mining projects that are already in the pipeline have not been through the strengthened up-front assessment for the environmental authority and therefore have not had their groundwater take adequately assessed. The associated water licence provisions bridge this gap by ensuring an assessment of this take. Associated water licences generally continue the current regulatory requirements that exist in the Water Act as it stands today. There are no new regulatory requirements being imposed on proponents or industry compared to the present day.

This legislation does not give so-called activists a new avenue for court appeal. It is a pre-existing right of the community to be heard on the impacts that a mining project will have on their invaluable access to water. However, the amendments I have now moved will mean that, in cases where the community has already had adequate opportunity to be heard and to test the proponent's groundwater modelling in a concluded objections hearing, another round of public notification will not be required unless the independent Land Court has expressed reservations about the groundwater evidence or about whether the take of water should be allowed.

The bill responds to widespread concerns surrounding the WROLA Act. As the opposition continues to facilitate the tide going out on our precious water resources, the Queensland public is tired of the free passes that they grant to resource companies. It comes at the cost of our environment, the cost of our farmers and the cost of our small towns and communities. The water licensing framework provides the appropriate checks to ensure a proper scientific and hydrological assessment of proposed activities. Future resource projects will not be required to obtain a water licence, but they will be subject to a comparable level of scrutiny through the environmental authority process.

The Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill proposes a new process that will ensure that groundwater matters are considered in detail at the environmental authority application stage. The public will continue to have a right to have its say about the issue of groundwater, with community objections being allowed as part of the environmental approval stage instead of the current objection process for water licences. The bill delivers a streamlined approach to the future management of the environmental impacts of groundwater extraction; one department providing one assessment and one approval and one opportunity for objections.

Let me conclude by thanking the staff of my office, the team at EHP who have worked on this and all of the stakeholders and other organisations who have assisted us throughout the process. I commend this bill to the House.

Division: Question put—That the Water Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a second time.

Question put—That the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill be now read a second time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a second time.

Consideration in Detail

Water Legislation Amendment Bill

Clauses 1 to 7, as read, agreed to.

Clause 8—

Dr LYNHAM (12.01 am): I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 9, pt 9)

Page 7, line 12, 'provision'—

omit, insert—

provisions

2 Clause 8 (Insertion of new ch 9, pt 9)

Page 9, after line 12—

insert—

1283 Validation of taking of, or interfering with, underground water by holders of particular mineral development licences and mining leases

(1) This section applies to the taking of, or interfering with, underground water, before the commencement, by the holder of a mineral development licence or mining lease in the area of the licence or lease if—

(a) before the commencement, the holder of the licence or lease had started operations in the area of the licence or lease; and

(b) the taking of, or interfering with, the underground water was subject to any relevant alteration or limitation prescribed under a moratorium notice, water resource plan or regulation under section 1046; and

(c) the taking of, or interfering with, the underground water happened in the course of, or resulted from, the carrying out of an authorised activity for the licence or lease, including, for example, either of the following activities—

(i) mine dewatering of underground water to the extent necessary to achieve safe operating conditions in the mine;

(ii) taking underground water as a result of evaporation from an open mine pit; and

(d) the holder of the licence or lease did not hold a water entitlement or permit for the taking of, or interfering with, the underground water.

(2) The holder of the licence or lease—

(a) is taken to have been granted a water licence that authorised the taking of, or interfering with, the underground water, before the taking or interfering happened; and

(b) is taken to continue to hold a water licence authorising the taking of, or interfering with, underground water on the area of the holder's licence or lease, after the commencement, if the taking or interfering happens in the course of, or results from, the carrying out of an authorised activity for the licence or lease.

(3) The water licence continued under subsection (2)(b) attaches to the mineral development licence or mining lease.

(4) From 6 December 2016, the provisions of chapter 3 of this Act and the *Mineral Resources Act 1989* apply to the holder of the water licence taken to be continued as if it were a water licence granted under chapter 2 of this Act.

(5) In this section—

authorised activity see the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, schedule 2.

mineral see the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, schedule 2.

mineral development licence see the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, schedule 2.

mining lease see the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*, schedule 2.

started operations—

(a) for a mineral development licence, means winning a mineral from the area of the licence; or

(b) for a mining lease, means winning a mineral in payable quantities from the area of the lease.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Hon. Dr Anthony Lynham's amendments [2037].

Mr CRIPPS: I rise to speak to the amendments moved by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines. Earlier this afternoon the minister tabled his amendments and circulated explanatory notes in relation to a matter which he advises came to the

attention of his department subsequent to the introduction of the bill in November 2015. It relates to an operational policy under the Water Act that the minister has received advice has not been lawful for the operation of a number of operational mines in Queensland. The explanatory notes accompanying the bill state—

> It is not intended that these existing mines will be exempt from these new provisions, however it is intended that these new underground water management arrangements will apply to these existing operating mines in the same way as they do to other existing operating mines. This will mean the general obligation to enter a make good agreement will apply.

I am prepared to trust the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines in relation to the amendment that he has circulated with regard to this operational policy. The only matter on which I would ask him to provide some comfort to the House relates to the extension of underground water impact reporting on these operational mines and the advice in the explanatory notes that make-good agreements will apply to the resource companies with respect to landowners whose properties are overlaid by these operational mines.

I ask the minister: what is the motivation for a resource company operating one of these mines to enter into a make-good agreement with those landholders? The effect of the amendment proposed by the minister is to deem these mines as having an associated water licence, because we want these operational mines to continue as if the operational policy identified in the explanatory notes was a valid authorisation under the Water Act since the commencement of this policy. What is the motivation for a company, subsequent to this amendment, to enter into a make-good agreement, because it will otherwise be deemed to have an associated water licence?

Dr LYNHAM: As the member for Hinchinbrook is aware, some of these mines have been operating for many, many years. The number of complaints received against these mines, especially on the amount of water take or from adjacent landholders regarding their water, has been, to my knowledge, minimal—virtually nil. We have to consider, though, if circumstances do change into the future and underground water impacts do emerge over time. There have to be safeguards for the chief executive of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection to call a project in to the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 underground water impact management framework. Because we cannot predict what happens in the future—we want to protect adjacent landholders and farmers into the future—these safeguards are introduced as an amendment to the bill. This will then require them to prepare an underground water impact report and also a baseline assessment plan. It is the same as would occur with an expansion of an existing mine under an existing dewatering licence, given those licences are generally framed within volumetric limits, as the member has rightfully pointed out. I trust that explanation meets with the member's satisfaction.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 8, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 9 and 10, as read, agreed to.

Clause 11—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that the member for Mount Isa's amendment No. 1 proposes to omit clause 11. Thus the member should oppose the clause.

Mr KATTER (12.07 am): Our intention here is to retain the wording contained in the WROLA Act. The government proposes to take out 'responsible and productive' and replace it with 'sustainable'. Our feeling is that the word 'sustainable' is thrown around a lot. Large sections of this bill relate to irrigation development and water development. We believe that the virtues of the word 'sustainable' are adequately captured in 'responsible and productive' and how they are applied in the operations of the act. For most people who deal in this world, particularly in the north, throwing the word 'sustainable' in there just means there is a good excuse to shut it down and to stop it. That is code for blocking it. We would object to having that in there. That is the basis of the proposed amendment.

Mr CRIPPS: I rise to support the amendment moved by the member for Mount Isa.

A government member: He hasn't moved it.

Mr CRIPPS: The intention of the amendment proposed by the member for Mount Isa is to omit the clause he has just spoken to. That is the purpose of the amendments the member for Mount Isa and the Katter party have foreshadowed they will move throughout the consideration in detail of this bill.

In practice, the intention of the Katter party and the member for Mount Isa, in proposing these amendments, is to omit clauses in the government's bill that remove reference to water development options in the legislation and to maintain the 'responsible and productive' purpose in the Water Act as per the 2014 LNP bill.

Of course, that was the purpose of dividing on the second reading debate of the whole bill. The Katter party's proposals are to go through and omit those amendments clause by clause where they appear throughout the bill. It is the long way round of doing things, but given that the vote failed on the second reading the LNP opposition will be supporting these proposed Katter party amendments to omit those clauses proposed by the government that remove the reference to water development options and to the reinsertion of ecologically sustainable development as the primary purpose of the Water Act 2000.

Dr LYNHAM: I rise to speak against the amendment proposed by the member for Mount Isa. This is a government reinsertion that I note has almost universal support from the rural sector, the resources sector, the landholder groups and the conservation sector. Indeed, the only people that seem to support these amendments are those opposite. As I outlined in my earlier speech, ecologically sustainable development is the bedrock or foundation of chapter 2 of the water planning framework in the Water Act. It had been developed from the National Strategy for Ecologically Sustainable Development in 1993 which was subsequently endorsed by the Council of Australian Governments.

It was firmly established in Queensland's most significant piece of water reform, and that was the Water Act 2000. It is widely supported by stakeholders and it provides the most comprehensive platform for water management. It is also wider than the original section of WROLA as drafted by the former government in that it also ensures that the health, diversity and productivity of the environment is maintained and enhanced for future generations. The clause along with several others which ensure sustainable management and ecological sustainable development are entwined in the key provisions of chapter 2 and are vital for good, sensible evidence based decisions made in the long-term interests of the state and also of our children. These are provisions that are vital to the ongoing health of Queensland's water management and their removal will forever be a shameful mark on those opposite.

Division: Question put—That clause 11, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 11, as read, agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: If members are happy, for any further divisions the bells will ring for one minute.

Clause 12—

Mr SPEAKER: Members, I note that the member for Mount Isa's amendment No. 2 proposes to omit clause 12. Therefore, the member should oppose the clause.

Mr KATTER (12.18 am): Similar to the previous clause, again in this clause we have wording like 'sustainable management' in the purposes of the act and we feel that this sort of wording is not needed. I strongly object to the minister's earlier claim that this is something that the rural groups called for. We are trying to get any sort of development up there. There is hardly anything happening up there and the government is putting up more barriers with this. We can absolutely guarantee that nothing is going to happen, and that is the message that becomes clear with these sorts of changes. Everyone up there is after sustainable practices without having them forced on them. It is unwarranted and we see that as a message in terms of trying to stop development. We oppose that.

Mr CRIPPS: The effect of the proposed amendment by the member for Mount Isa would be to omit the clause from the bill and that would also be my motivation for speaking to clause 12, which seeks to remove the term 'responsible and productive management' and instead focuses on sustainable management, including the principles of ESD, in relation to the planning and allocation of Queensland's water resources in the future. The reason why I support the Katter party's proposed amendment and oppose keeping this definition or this primary purpose in the Water Act is as I explained to the House during my second reading contribution to the debate—that is, what the water users of Queensland found during the almost decade-and-a-half period after the Water Act 2000 was put in place by the Beattie government was an overly restrictive and inflexible piece of legislation that created a great deal of friction between water users in Queensland and the department responsible for administering the Water Act during that time.

One of the reasons that I believe and the LNP believes that there was that friction was that the primary purpose of the legislation was based on those principles of ecologically sustainable development and they were restrictive. The LNP put a new definition into the Water Act—or attempted to do so—by maintaining the principles of ecologically sustainable development within the purpose of the act but introducing into it relevant consideration to economic outcomes and community outcomes in terms of decisions about the allocation and distribution of water resources in Queensland.

Under the old Water Act 2000, the environment was placed at the pinnacle of the decision-making process, then there was daylight and then the interests of economic development opportunities and the interests of local communities were a poor third. That was the hierarchy of priorities. The new purpose of the act that the LNP placed in the Water Act in 2014 with its reform bill brought everything back to a sensible, balanced situation where environmental outcomes, community outcomes and economic outcomes were considered together. The LNP thought that that was a sensible way of making decisions about the allocation and planning of water resources in Queensland. The LNP still believes that and strongly believes that the purpose of the act, which was placed in the legislation in 2014, ought to remain, hence my comments during the second reading debate and hence the LNP's support for the amendment moved by the member for Mount Isa and its opposition to clause 12.

Dr LYNHAM: I have previously spoken to this matter during the debate on the previous clause. I respect the opinion of the member for Mount Isa, but I will say that ecologically sustainable development appears not only in the Water Act 2000 but also in the federal legislation and in international law.

As the member for Hinchinbrook stated, ecologically sustainable development was the primary purpose and then there was daylight. I understand the effect this has on rural communities, but this is rural communities now. I want to make a simple statement to the member for Hinchinbrook and to the member for Mount Isa. They say that this provision affects their communities to a degree. I do not agree with that, but in terms of ecologically sustainable development, they should think of themselves, they should think of their communities but, most of all, they should think of their children and their children's children, because this is the primary purpose.

Division: Question put—That clause 12, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 12, as read, agreed to.

Clause 13, as read, agreed to.

Clause 14—

Mr SPEAKER: I note that amendment No. 3 of the member for Mount Isa proposes to omit clause 14. Therefore, the member should oppose the clause.

Mr KATTER (12.27 am): For the reasons that we have gone through, we will be opposing the clause.

Division: Question put—That clause 14, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 14, as read, agreed to.

Clause 15—

Mr KATTER (12.30 am): I move the following amendments—

4 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 68 (Insertion of new ch 2))

Page 13, lines 18 to 31—

omit.

5 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 68 (Insertion of new ch 2))

Page 14, lines 8 to 15—

omit.

6 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 68 (Insertion of new ch 2))

Page 15, lines 10 and 11—

omit, insert—

(ii) to replace a surrendered water allocation; or

(iii) to implement a water development option;

7 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 68 (Insertion of new ch 2))

Page 15, lines 16 and 17—

omit.

8 Clause 15 (Amendment of s 68 (Insertion of new ch 2))

Page 16, lines 27 to 31 and page 17, lines 1 to 4—

omit.

I table the explanatory notes to my amendments.

Tabled paper: Water Legislation Amendment Bill 2015, explanatory notes to Mr Rob Katter's amendments [2038].

This is where the rubber hits the road in terms of irrigation development. The water development options were a very helpful tool in trying to establish irrigation development, particularly in the north. There are enormous irregularities and anomalies in the data that is collected and presented and the way in which water is allocated in the north. For instance, in the area of the Flinders River near Hughenden there can be massive rain events and the water will not even register in the flow meters down the river as it all goes underground. There are massive anomalies in river systems and measurements. With water development options one can demonstrate with an EIS that water can be taken out regardless of what the readings and the data is telling you. This is a rigid system. These amendments allow for developments. They are a very important part of this bill and need to be included. That is why we are moving this amendment.

Mr CRIPPS: I agree with the member for Mount Isa that this is where the rubber hits the road in relation to this particular bill and how it seeks to remove from the WROLA 2014 reform bill any reference to water development options in the legislation. What a mature contribution from the Deputy Premier there, hissing under her breath at me while I make a contribution to this particular clause.

The water development option was a very important part of the reform bill brought by the former LNP government in 2014. The water development option was designed to provide a mechanism whereby a potential investor in a large greenfield project for water infrastructure had the commitment from the government under the Water Act and the security of knowing that, if they successfully completed an EIS process with a terms of reference equivalent to those utilised through the Coordinator-General's process under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act and if they undertook a public consultation process equivalent to that in the Water Act for an amendment to the water resource plan, they would have the water plan amended to secure that volume of water for their project. This is an essential precondition to take advantage of some of the opportunities that are currently presenting themselves in Australia given the focus of the federal LNP government's Northern Australia agenda.

There is capital and there are initiatives available for investors to take advantage of these arrangements to take North Queensland, in particular, forward. The removal of any reference to water development options in this legislation is a huge step backwards for that part of the state that I represent and it is the reason why I think the member for Mount Isa has been motivated to try to omit the clause that removes references to water development options from the Water Act.

Page 14 of the explanatory notes in relation to this clause suggests that there is an absence of public consultation prior to the granting of a water development option. That is false. There are public terms of reference associated with the development of the Coordinator-General's report and there is an equivalent public consultation process to that which is undertaken through the Water Act for an amendment to a water resource plan. The minister has been false and deceptive in the preparation of these explanatory notes. I support the member for Mount Isa's amendment.

Mr KNUTH: I support the amendment moved by the member for Mount Isa. We see with the introduction of this bill the return of ecologically sustainable development principles which is a big kick in the guts for rural and regional Queensland development. We have also seen the removal of the water development options. We do not have many water infrastructure projects, but we are getting there. Removal of the water development options will see projects in line such as the Mount Isa project, the Flinders River project, the Pentland biofuel project and the Big Rocks Weir upstream project dudded if this bill is passed.

Dr LYNHAM: I rise to speak against the amendment moved by the member for Mount Isa. The government, as I said, supports sustainable development of the state's water resources. Quite frankly, the Water Act already contains mechanisms that support large-scale water infrastructure. It is already there. This can be seen in the planning for water reserves, the water reserves that the member for Dalrymple is talking about, such as the Burdekin, the Fitzroy and the Connors rivers. The Water Act already provides mechanisms for trade of water allocations and for review and amendment of water plans to make water available for these developments. There is no need for a water development option. Significant concerns have already been raised with almost all stakeholders: industry, conservation and the community at large. We need to ensure that nothing undermines the confidence in Queensland's robust water planning framework. We do not need water development options. We have over a decade of water planning framework.

The grant of water development options also lacks the fundamental requirement for up-front community consultation, a key element that stakeholders asked the former government to legislate for. The constituents that those opposite were supposed to represent were the ones complaining about water development options. We will vote against this amendment as this is consistent with our previous record, our election commitment and our commitment to not undermine water planning in this state.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Katter) negatived.

Division: Question put—That clause 15, as read, stand part of the bill.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 15, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 16 and 17, as read, agreed to.

Clause 18—

Dr LYNHAM (12.45 am): I move the following amendment—

3 Clause 18 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 20, after line 27—

insert—

(9A) Section 201, inserted section 1259(10), 'Section 51(1) does'—

omit, insert—

The consultation provisions under section 51 do

Amendment No. 3 corrects a cross-referencing error in chapter 9, part 8 of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014, which deals with transitional and saving provisions for the Water Act 2000. Section 1259 of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 provides for provisions of resource operations planned or enforced at the time of commencement to be taken to be a number of other documents under the amended Water Act 2000. Subsection 7 of section 1259 of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act allows a water plan to be amended—for example, the provisions of a resource operations plan are to be relocated to become provisions of a water plan. There is an error in subsection 10 that allows this type of amendment to a water plan to occur without reference to the consultation provisions under sections 44 to 46. By making this reference, the provision inadvertently excludes the amendment from Governor in Council approval under section 48 of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act. This amendment makes it clear that a water plan amended under the transitional provisions still requires approval by the Governor in Council.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 18, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 19—

Dr LYNHAM (12.46 am): I move the following amendment—

4 Clause 19 (Amendment of s 202 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary)))

Page 23, after line 7—

insert—

(2A) Section 202(2), inserted definition plan area, 'statutory water resource'—

omit, insert—

water

Amendment No. 4 amends section 202 of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act. An error has been identified in the definition of 'or planned area' inserted by the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 to the Water Act 2000. This definition refers to a planned area being for a statutory water resource plan. There is no such concept of a statutory water resource plan under the Water Act 2000. This amendment will amend the definition of a 'planned area' to replace 'statutory resource water plan' with 'water plan'.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr KATTER: I move the following amendment—

9 Clause 19 (Amendment of s 202 (Amendment of sch 4 (Dictionary)))

Page 23, lines 8 to 11—

omit.

This is the final one of these changes. It is the replacement of the words 'principles of ecologically sustainable development'. I would probably agree with it, except principles of ecologically sustainable development do nothing and leave it all as it is, because that is what those words are telling us. I object to everything that was said before about sustainable development. Principles are great. The words are wonderful. They sound great to all of us here, but on the ground we have so much trouble getting any of this stuff going. It will all be done sustainably and in a responsible manner. The assumption is always made that it will not be. It does not need to be there. That is a euphemism for nothing happening, which is what will happen if this clause is passed as it is.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendment (Mr Katter) negatived.

Division: Question put—That clause 19, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 19, as amended, agreed to.

Insertion of new clause—

Dr LYNHAM (12.54 am): I move the following amendment—

5 After clause 19

Page 23, after line 11—

insert—

20 Amendment of sch 2 (Amendment of Water Resource Plans)

Schedule 2, entry for *Water Resource (Whitsunday) Plan 2010*—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill

Clause 1, as read, agreed to.

Clause 2—

Mr WATTS (12.55 am): I would like to talk about the commencement of the bill which is at clause 2. Unfortunately, I was unable to speak to the bill earlier. Obviously, the commencement of this legislation has a great impact on the people of the Darling Downs and particularly those living in Toowoomba. The guillotine was brought down on my neck at 12 o'clock at night so that I could not represent the people of my region in this place.

Government members interjected.

Mr WATTS: Those interjecting now would still have me not represent the people that I represent in this place. They might try to silence me, but I will not be silenced. There are hundreds of jobs at stake as a result of this bill. Principally, this bill is about two jobs—one in South Brisbane and one in Mount Coot-tha. That is what this bill is about.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, I would ask you to speak to the clause.

Mr WATTS: The clause is the commencement of the bill. At clause 2 it states—

(1) Parts 2 and 4 commence immediately after the commencement of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act ...

In clause 4 it talks about a definition of underground water. We are talking about underground water and the fact that Acland coalmine will have to go through the entire process again which will put the livelihood of hundreds of people in my region at risk. There will be hundreds of jobs lost with the commencement of this bill simply to save two jobs—two that need green votes. They should be ashamed of themselves. They take money from the CFMEU, but they do not represent their workers at all. What they do—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Toowoomba North, will you make your comments relevant to clause 2.

Mr WATTS: Clause 2 speaks to the commencement of the bill. When this bill commences there will be hundreds of workers on the Darling Downs who lose their jobs. Tonight—

Honourable members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Members, it is not a chance for a shouting match.

Mr WATTS: Tonight I had the guillotine brought down on my head so that I could not represent my people with regard to the commencement of this bill. I was not allowed to speak on this bill because they are too ashamed to allow a member from the Darling Downs represent the people whose jobs are on the line.

That is what they did here tonight. They did that to save two jobs in the city—one at Mount Coot-tha and one at South Brisbane. Make no mistake, the commencement of this bill will cost hundreds of jobs on the Darling Downs. They should be ashamed of themselves. Those families work in the cafes. Their kids go to the schools. The families spend their money at our retail stores.

The commencement of this bill will see all of those people unemployed. Hundreds of people directly and thousands of people indirectly will be unemployed because of the commencement of this bill. That is why I oppose clause 2 and every other clause in this bill.

Dr MILES: I move the following amendment—

1 Clause 2 (Commencement)

Page 6, lines 8 to 10—

omit, insert—

(1) The following provisions commence immediately after the commencement of the *Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014*, section 11—

- part 2, heading
- sections 3 to 8
- section 10, other than to the extent it inserts new part 26 heading and new section 749
- part 4.

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

AYES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 2, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 and 4, as read, agreed to.

Clause 5—

Mr CRIPPS (1.02 am): Clause 5 of the bill inserts a new section which provides for particular information which must be included in site-specific environmental authority applications relating to mining leases, mineral development licences and petroleum leases which will involve the exercise of underground water rights. It also involves inserting a new section to provide for the assessment to involve the consideration of the accumulative impact of projects on groundwater resources in the region. As I indicated during my contribution to the second reading debate, the LNP will not be opposing this section of the legislation because we are not necessarily opposed to strengthening the up-front assessment of resource projects on underground water resources. These provisions are also not retrospective, which means they are not offensive in that regard.

The question that I have for the Minister for Environment relates to some concerns that I raised about regulatory uncertainty. I ask the minister to consider a situation where an environmental authority is amended in response to an updated underground water management report and a resource project finds itself in a situation where it cannot continue to operate as a result of those updated environmental authority conditions or it finds itself in a situation where it is no longer able to operate viably in order to comply with the new conditions on the environmental authority. Can the minister advise what would occur in those situations regarding an endorsed environmental authority attached to an endorsed mining lease or petroleum lease?

Dr MILES: The point I would make to the member is the same point I made in my summary speech in responding to his concerns regarding this—that is, that this is no different to—

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Order, members! I call the minister.

Dr MILES: As the member is aware, all we are doing here is applying the same process and the same standards as have been operating for petroleum for some time and that the member supported in his time as a minister. It has not been the experience in the petroleum sector that the kinds of scenarios he has outlined have occurred. The purpose here is to align those processes, to simply replicate the process that you supported in petroleum in gas.

Mr Cripps interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, you get one chance—one question.

Opposition members interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Thank you, members. We have quite a way to go yet.

Clause 5, as read, agreed to.

Clause 6, as read, agreed to.

Clause 7—

Mr CRIPPS (1.06 am): I will try to get an answer out of the minister in relation to clause 7 of the bill, which amends the Environmental Protection Act to allow the conditions of an environmental authority for a resource activity to be amended if the administering authority considers the amendments to be necessary or desirable because of an impact or potential impact on an environmental value identified in an underground water impact report. This follows on from the question that I asked him in clause 5 but is much more relevant to the Environmental Protection Act issue that clause 7 raises. It goes to regulatory certainty. If we have changing conditions post grant for an operating resource project, this raises real concerns for ideal arrangements for attracting investment to the resources sector in Queensland. I ask the minister if he can provide any comfort to potential investors looking at Queensland as a resource jurisdiction—

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr SPEAKER: Pause the clock. Deputy Premier, I urge you not to provoke the opposition or you might get warned under standing order 253.

Mr CRIPPS:—when the explanatory notes say that the assessment contained in the underground water impact report may be used to review the way in which the environmental authority regulates environmental impacts.

The minister in his previous answer to clause 5 did point out that similar provisions exist in the petroleum and gas legislation to allow for the chief executive officer to update an environmental authority in the case of emerging information. I am not arguing about that. What I am trying to get to the bottom of—unsuccessfully to this point in time—and to get out of the minister is an explanation as to how the government proposes to deal with a situation where a project has its conditions on its environmental authority amended to the point where it is not able to operate in order to comply with these new conditions or it is not able to operate to the point where it is viable to meet the new conditions on its environmental authority. In that scenario, what happens to an existing resource project which has a signed mining lease or a signed petroleum lease with a valid EA attached?

Dr MILES: In response, I would make a couple of observations. The first one is that EHP does consider the standard criteria when making these decisions which include financial considerations, so they would be taken into account at that stage. An environmental authority holder also has internal review and appeal rights that they can use in the case that the administering authority does decide to amend an environmental approval. EHP already has the power to amend EAs in circumstances where there is emerging information, and a UWIR would be emerging information. The most compelling point here is what would be the point of doing a UWIR if you then did not use it to condition the enterprise?

Clause 7, as read, agreed to.

Clauses 8 to 21, as read, agreed to.

Clause 22—

Dr MILES (1.11 am): I move the following amendment—

2 Clause 22 (Amendment of s 153 (Compensation))

Page 18, after line 15—

insert—

(3) Section 153(3), as renumbered, 'cost'—

omit, insert—

compensation

(4) Section 153(3)(a), as renumbered, after 'amount'—

insert—

of compensation

(5) Section 153(4), as renumbered, 'an amount be paid'—

omit, insert—

the payment of compensation

Amendment agreed to.

Clause 22, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23 to 25, as read, agreed to.

Clause 26, as read, agreed to.

Clause 27—

Mr CRIPPS (1.12 am): Clause 27 inserts into the act a make-good agreement period and a cooling-off period for that make-good agreement negotiation process. I note that the minister has foreshadowed an amendment to insert into the act a cooling-off period of five business days for the purposes of a make-good agreement. The question that I would like to ask the minister in relation to this cooling-off period of five business days is: what are the merits of a cooling-off period of five business days compared to 10, 15 or 20? Specifically, can the minister advise the House what stakeholders have nominated five business days as an appropriate cooling-off period and the reasons why they have nominated those five business days as an appropriate cooling-off period?

Dr MILES: I can confirm for the member that we consulted with the agriculture and resource industries and other stakeholders on a range of different options, and five business days was supported by all of the stakeholders.

Clause 27, as read, agreed to.

Clause 28—

Dr MILES (1.14 am): I move the following amendments—

3 Clause 28 (Insertion of new s 423A)

Page 21, lines 5 and 6, 'during the cooling-off period for the agreement'—

omit.

4 Clause 28 (Insertion of new s 423A)

Page 21, lines 14 to 20—

omit, insert—

(4) This section does not apply to a make good agreement for a water bore that is the subject of a decision of the Land Court under division 4, subdivision 4.

(5) In this section—

cooling-off period, for a make good agreement for a water bore, means a period of 5 business days—

(a) starting on the day the make good agreement is entered into; and

(b) ending at 5p.m. on the fifth business day.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 28, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 29—

Mr CRIPPS (1.15 am): Clause 29 establishes the opportunity for landholders to enter into an alternative dispute resolution process with a resource company if they are unable to successfully conclude the negotiation of a make-good agreement. The LNP is not necessarily opposed to these improvements to the way that make-good arrangements are negotiated or entered into between resource companies and landowners, but one of the questions that came up during the committee hearings in relation to this bill was the lack of a formal consultation process undertaken with those stakeholders before putting these amendments into the House.

The example that I used during my second reading debate contribution was the rather comprehensive consultation process that was undertaken to review the land access code. The land access code review commenced under the Bligh government and was concluded under the former LNP government, and we subsequently implemented the recommendations from the land access code review. They were widely supported by both sides of the House, and it was a satisfactory process to achieve broad consensus about how that land access code could be improved for the benefit of all stakeholders.

A similar or an equivalent process has not occurred for these changes to the make-good process, and that is something that I have some reservations about. For example, in this amendment to the bill the provision is for the costs of an alternative dispute resolution process to be borne by the resource

company and not by the landowner. That is inconsistent to the way which the recommendations came forward from the land access code where the party that triggered the alternative dispute resolution process was required to bear the costs of that process.

What we have is an inconsistency about costs being borne by different parties and in what circumstances. I think that the development of these changes to the make-good framework would have benefited from an equivalent process where all stakeholders did have a satisfactory opportunity to have input into the development of these changes. We are always interested in ways of improving this framework, but I do not think that the process to develop these particular changes has been very robust. I would ask the minister to comment on that and why resource companies will be required to bear the cost if they do not trigger the alternative dispute resolution process.

Dr MILES: It appears the LNP is attempting to have a bet each way on this one. They are supportive of our suggestion that resource companies should pay for the ADR while at the same time demanding that farmers should have to pay. It is our view that alternative dispute resolution is a useful process that should be available to landholders even where they cannot incur those costs or without the risk of incurring those costs, so we support that. The feedback I have had in discussing these provisions with industry is that very often they voluntarily bear these costs, so it is a chance to incorporate what you might consider best practice landholder engagement and embed that in the act.

Clause 29, as read, agreed to.

Clause 30, as read, agreed to.

Clause 31—

Dr MILES (1.19 am): I move the following amendment—

5 Clause 31 (Insertion of new s 11A)

Page 23, line 7, after 'authority'—

insert—

, or for an amendment of an environmental authority,

Amendment agreed to.

Mr SPEAKER: Honourable members, I have reviewed the amendments circulated by the member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Cairns. While I have no issue with the amendments as drafted and circulated, I am concerned that, should the amendments be agreed to, it may lead to confusion in the numbering of clauses being inserted into the bill. Both members have amendments to clauses 31 and 36 of the bill, and some of these amendments insert new subsections to clauses that are being inserted in other acts. The amendments as drafted include consequential renumbering of subsections, and in some cases the consequential renumbering overlaps with the other member's amendments. In order to avoid confusion, I have asked the members to revise their circulated amendments to remove any ambiguity for the House. I thank the members for doing so.

Mr CRIPPS: I move the following amendments—

1 Clause 31 (Insertion of new s 11A)

Page 23, line 10, after 'made'—

insert—

on or after 13 September 2016

2 Clause 31 (Insertion of new s 11A)

Page 23, line 30, 'Section'—

omit, insert—

Subject to subsections (4) to (6), section

3 Clause 31 (Insertion of new s 11A)

Page 24, after line 1—

insert—

(3A) Subsection (3C) applies in relation to the mineral development licence or mining lease if—

(a) during the period starting at the beginning of 1 January 2014 and ending on 1 January 2015—

(i) if there is a notified coordinated project in relation to the licence or lease—the proponent was given a Coordinator-General's report for the EIS for the project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 34D; or

(ii) otherwise—the proponent was given an EIS assessment report for the EIS in relation to the licence or lease under the Environmental Protection Act, section 57; and

(b) the Coordinator-General's report or the EIS assessment report for the EIS considered the impacts on underground water that may be caused by, or are likely to be caused by, the exercise of underground water rights by the holder of the licence or lease.

(3B) Subsection (3C) applies also in relation to the mineral development licence or mining lease if—

(a) during the period starting at the beginning of 1 October 2015 and ending on 31 January 2016, an application for a major amendment for an environmental authority in relation to the licence or lease was approved; and

(b) the application included an assessment of the impacts on underground water that may be caused by, or are likely to be caused by, the exercise of underground water rights by the holder of the licence or lease; and

(c) the notice given under the Environmental Protection Act, section 229 stated that chapter 5, part 4 of that Act applied to the application.

(3C) Section 334ZP applies to the holder of the mineral development licence or mining lease.

6 Clause 31 (Insertion of new s 11A)

Page 24, after line 10—

insert—

major amendment, for an environmental authority, see the Environmental Protection Act, section 223.

These amendments have been revised in accordance with the Speaker's advice to the House. I have already circulated a copy of the amendments and the explanatory notes to those amendments. The purpose of my amendments is to ensure that section 11A of the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 to insert a new chapter 15 part 12 of the Mineral Resources Act 1989 only applies to environmental authority applications made on or after 13 September 2016—in other words, the date of the introduction of this underground water bill.

The amendments also seek to ensure the conditional right to take associated water under the Water Reform and Other Legislation Amendment Act 2014 applies to advanced mining projects, being a mineral development or mining lease if groundwater impacts are assessed as part of a coordinated project under the State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971 and a Coordinator-General's report was given between 1 January 2014 and 1 January 2015, or received an environmental impact statement assessment report under the Environmental Protection Act 1994 between 1 January 2014 and 1 January 2015 or an approval was provided for an environmental authority major amendment application between 1 October 2015 and 31 January 2016 if the application was subject to public notification.

That is the technical way of saying that the amendments that the LNP opposition are moving tonight are seeking to remove the burden of these transitional arrangements in the government's bill from those projects that are significantly advanced through their assessment and approvals process. It is important to understand in light of the contributions in the second reading debate by all those opposite—but in particular by the Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines and the Minister for Environment—that this will mean that projects like Adani's Carmichael mine project, New Hope's Acland stage 3 project and other projects going through a major amendment to their environmental authority, such as Rio Tinto's Kestrel mine, will not go through without having had a robust assessment process.

Both Adani's Carmichael project and New Hope's Acland stage 3 project have had full Coordinator-General's reports produced, and those Coordinator-General's reports included an assessment of the impacts or potential impacts on underground water of that resource activity. The Adani mine has an endorsed EA attached to an endorsed mining lease. In relation to New Hope's project, they have a Coordinator-General's report but they are currently in the Land Court having those conditions tested publicly. They have been through a robust process, they have been assessed for the impact or potential impact of underground water on those projects, and they should not be subject to a double jeopardy assessment and approvals process through these transitional arrangements.

Mr WATTS: I rise to support the amendments put forward by the member for Hinchinbrook. For the people of the Darling Downs, this is where the rubber hits the road. They have been going through an exhaustive process to gain the various approvals required for them to be able to continue mining on that site. The process has been tested, there have been public submissions, it has been through the court and it has involved the Coordinator-General. They are now being put in double jeopardy after they have gone through this entire process in good faith over many years. The original court process was

supposed to draw to a close long before this, but what I would call green lawfare broke out, where they just kept trying to wrap the process up with more and more objections—none of which had any great consequence to them and all of which were designed to make sure this project was delayed and delayed and delayed.

The greenies, including those in South Brisbane and Mount Coot-tha, have been fully aware that this mine will run out of coal if this is not approved on a certain time line. Their objective has always been to push that time line out so that the people of the Darling Downs who I represent would lose their jobs and this would impact on the families that are dependent on their income—simply based on an ideology held by those who live in South Brisbane and Mount Coot-tha. That is all they are trying to achieve. They have wrapped this process up over and over again in green objections. They have done everything they possibly could through the court process, and they are now putting them through a double jeopardy by making them go through all of those green processes again to prove what has already been publicly debated and to prove what has already been proved. All of that will occur and hundreds of people will lose their jobs, and that is something they should be ashamed of.

I would like to see them come up and visit the mine and visit the rehabilitation that has gone on in that mine and meet some of the families whose lives they are destroying and whose homes will be repossessed by the banks when they cannot pay their mortgages. They are the people I would like them to come to the Darling Downs to talk to, as well as anybody else whose income is dependent on the workers of this mine. The government members purport to represent workers in this state, but this is just embarrassing for them. Clearly they do not. These transitional arrangements of the original bill should not put them into double jeopardy. I certainly will be supporting the amendments put forward by the member for Hinchinbrook.

Dr MILES: This goes to the heart of the disagreement between the government and the opposition on these laws. It is the government's view that the EIS process should be strengthened to properly consider groundwater impacts, and where projects have already been through that process they should have a water licence. The LNP have sought to create a very broad exemption using a couple of arbitrary dates essentially. The proposed exemptions create an ad hoc, confusing and complex transitional process. It is not based on any kind of science. They have just come up with some dates—removing third-party scrutiny, removing the right of people to raise their concerns. Any exemptions from the water licence should be based on science and the scope of any previous assessment, and the extent to which the public have already had a right to be heard on groundwater issues rather than just some arbitrary lassoing of projects that have arrived during a certain date.

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

AYES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the noes.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Cripps) negatived.

Division: Question put—That clause 31, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 31, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 32 to 34, as read, agreed to.

Clause 35—

Dr MILES (1.34 am): I move the following amendments—

6 Clause 35 (Amendment of s 119 (Amendment of s 423 (Requirement to enter into make good agreement and reimburse bore owner)))

Page 26, line 9, before 'Section'—

insert—

(1)

7 Clause 35 (Amendment of s 119 (Amendment of s 423 (Requirement to enter into make good agreement and reimburse bore owner)))

Page 26, after line 15—

insert—

(2) Section 423—

insert—

(4) However, the holder is not required to reimburse the bore owner for hydrogeology costs incurred for work performed other than by an appropriately qualified hydrogeologist.

(5) In this section—

appropriately qualified hydrogeologist means an individual who has the minimum experience or qualifications, stated in the guidelines made by the chief executive under section 413, for undertaking a bore assessment.

Mr CRIPPS: Clause 7 is the one that I am interested in. It relates to the situation where the amendments will require a bore owner to be reimbursed by the resource company for the costs of engaging hydrogeology advice during the negotiation of a make-good agreement. Once again, I want to say to the minister that the LNP opposition is not opposed to strengthening the framework around the development of make-good arrangements. Once again, I point out that the absence of a robust consultation process similar to that which occurred during the development of proposed changes to the land access code would have assisted me and the parliament having more confidence in these arrangements.

For example, as I mentioned during my contribution to the second reading debate, the provision of assistance to landowners to secure hydrogeological advice is one thing, but the recommendations that came through from the review of the land access code indicated that landholders should be able to secure support from resource companies for the engagement of other expert advice. I wonder why the minister does not believe that other expert advice would be appropriate when entering into a make-good agreement between a resource company and a landowner. If we had an equivalent consultation process, we could have had a more robust discussion about what landowners need to be furnished with when negotiating these types of agreements, but that is not possible. I wonder if the minister can explain why no other types of expert advice were considered in the preparation of these particular amendments to support landowners negotiating with resource companies about a make-good agreement.

Dr MILES: This is informed by the insight that hydrogeology can really help landholders have an understanding of where they are negotiating from and what it is they should be seeking. In this amendment we simply stipulate that the hydrogeologist has to be suitably qualified, which came from submitters to the committee process. It seems pretty sensible to me. I share the Deputy Premier's chagrin at being lectured about consultation by those opposite. It is not exactly what they were known for in their three years in government, especially not when they were dealing with environmental matters like these ones. If the LNP would like some sessions on consultation—

Mr SPEAKER: Minister, please do not provoke the opposition.

Dr MILES:—I would be able to organise those during the next sitting.

Amendments agreed to.

Clause 35, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 36—

Dr MILES (1.38 am): I move the following amendment—

8 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 27, line 8, after 'authority'—

insert—

, or for an amendment of an environmental authority,

Mr CRIPPS: The minister has moved an amendment, which is a very interesting amendment given the original content of the bill and the contribution to the debate by many members on the opposite side of the House. The effect of this amendment will be to allow the Adani project to proceed by securing an associated water licence without a public consultation process if the chief executive is satisfied that groundwater impacts have been assessed under the EIS process and a Land Court hearing did not specify any impediments to granting an application for a groundwater impact. The Land Court hearing must have heard experts' evidence on underground water.

Dr MILES: I rise to a point of order. I think the member is speaking to amendment No. 9 rather than amendment No. 8. Amendment No. 8 is a point of clarification. I do not think it is a controversial amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr CRIPPS: I apologise for getting up one amendment early, but for the benefit of the House I will not start again. Nevertheless, it is good to have an opportunity to speak about this clause. It is a very interesting clause because what the government is about to do—

Mr SPEAKER: Member for Hinchinbrook, sorry to interrupt. Can you please move your amendment.

Mr CRIPPS (1.41 am): I move the following amendments—

7 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 27, line 9, after 'made'—

insert—

on or after 13 September 2016

8 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 27, after line 25—

insert—

(2A) However, this division does not apply in relation to the mining tenure if—

(a) during the period starting at the beginning of 1 January 2014 and ending on 1 January 2015—

(i) if there is a notified coordinated project in relation to the tenure—the proponent was given a Coordinator-General's report for the EIS for the project under the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*, section 34D; or

(ii) otherwise—the proponent was given an EIS assessment report for the EIS in relation to the tenure under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, section 57; and

(b) the Coordinator-General's report or the EIS assessment report for the EIS considered the impacts on underground water that may be caused by, or are likely to be caused by, the exercise of underground water rights by the holder of the tenure.

(2B) Also, this division does not apply in relation to the mining tenure if—

(a) during the period starting at the beginning of 1 October 2015 and ending on 31 January 2016, an application for a major amendment for an environmental authority in relation to the tenure was approved; and

(b) the application included an assessment of the impacts on underground water that may be caused by, or are likely to be caused by, the exercise of underground water rights by the holder of the tenure; and

(c) the notice given under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, section 229 stated that chapter 5, part 4 of that Act applied to the application.

10 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 27, after line 26—

insert—

major amendment, for an environmental authority, see the *Environmental Protection Act 1994*, section 223.

I table the amendments and explanatory notes that have been circulated to support it.

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, revised amendments to be moved in consideration in detail by the member for Hinchinbrook, Mr Andrew Cripps MP [2039].

Tabled paper: Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill 2016, explanatory notes to Mr Andrew Cripps's amendments [2040].

The minister's amendment will allow Adani to go forward, as I mentioned earlier, but it will do so in recognition of the fact that the Adani project has been through a full Coordinator-General's process and had a report and secured a mining lease and an environmental authority where the conditions from that Coordinator-General's EIS is attached, but what they will not do is allow for other projects such as New Hope's Acland stage 3 project to be similarly allowed to proceed notwithstanding that that project also has a full Coordinator-General's EIS report that has been completed.

May I remind members of the House, particularly those opposite, that to secure that Coordinator-General's EIS report that EIS also would have had to have been approved under the Commonwealth government's EPBC Act process. It has been approved at the state level, it has been approved and ticked off on by the EPBC Act process and that project is currently being scrutinised in the Land Court. The conditions associated with the assessment of potential underground water impacts are contained in the Coordinator-General's report, and those conditions will be attached to the EA. If that project is successful in the Land Court it will be attached to the mining lease.

What is the difference? There is no material difference between the Coordinator-General's report that Adani has secured and the Coordinator-General's report that Acland stage 3 has secured, yet something has happened here tonight. The government propose an amendment to allow one project to proceed if they have a report and that report has gone through the Land Court and the Land Court heard expert advice. What is the difference between the Land Court process that is currently going on in Queensland in respect of the proposed environmental authority and mining lease for Acland stage 3? There is no material difference between these two projects, and something is going on here that is not being explained properly and the minister—

(Time expired)

Mr WATTS: I am very interested in why the minister would be proposing such a thing. With his green credentials, to be proposing that the Adani mine could go ahead seems strange. I am sure the voters of Mount Coot-tha will thank him very much for making sure the Adani coalmine does go ahead, and I am sure that the member for South Brisbane will also be thanked—rightly—by her members for ensuring that the Adani mine goes ahead. What I am most curious about is the point that the member for Hinchliffe makes as to what is the material difference—

An opposition member: Hinchinbrook!

Mr WATTS: Hinchinbrook. Sorry, what did I say? I was very concerned that I will miss my train going home tonight. I apologise profusely to the member for Hinchinbrook.

My concern is what the material difference is here. There seems to be a very slippery political deal being done here by people who would like to see one mine project go ahead at the cost of another, and that is a great danger when we have laws being tampered with and messed around. It causes problems such as sovereign risk, because how can this House be trusted when the process is different between different projects? I am interested and very curious to hear from the minister as to why he would, with his great concern about his Green preferences, be endorsing the Adani coalmine to go ahead at the expense of the hundreds of families from the Darling Downs that I represent who are losing their jobs. I would like to hear what the material difference is.

I would like to understand why these amendments have been proposed by the member for Mount Coot-tha, and certainly I am sure that the people I represent on the Darling Downs would like to understand why they are not as important to the member for Mount Coot-tha and to the Labor Party as those who might live in other parts of the state. I put it to you that it is a political slippery deal that is being done here and something that this House should not be doing. It is something that the member for Mount Coot-tha should be ashamed of. He has certainly not stood by his own principles and he has done a deal to make sure that the mine in my area does not go ahead, while others have done a deal to make sure a mine in their area does go ahead. I think all parties should be condemned for it.

Ms Trad interjected.

Mr WATTS: I hear the member for South Brisbane, and I look forward very much to her Green opponent campaigning against her after she has approved the Adani mine and supported—

(Time expired)

Mr RICKUSS: I would like to add to the arguments that have been put forward on this side of the House. As I have said before, the Acland coalmine is an important coalmine for the member for Ipswich and the member for Ipswich West simply because of the fact that New Hope works in that area, and it is struggling to survive because this no-hope mob over here are really delivering a death blow to them. I cannot understand why the minister will not give New Hope, a great Australian company, the same level playing field as Adani. This is just crazy, because it is all about Townsville and Green votes. They are trying to keep Scotty in his job and trying to prop up Jackie Trad.

It will be interesting when we do not run a candidate in that seat just to see how the Green votes fall, because I think that will be extremely interesting. I really think it is disappointing that you will not support New Hope but you will support overseas companies. I cannot believe this. Member for Moggill, I think New Hope is based in Brookfield, is it not? Yet you will not support New Hope, a great Australian company. Shame! Shame! Shame!

Dr MILES: The member for Hinchinbrook and the member for Toowoomba North asked the same question repeatedly—what is the difference between two projects, and one project is significantly more advanced than the other. It has the findings from its Land Court proceedings while the other is still before the Land Court. That is a very significant difference.

I remind the member for Toowoomba North that at the moment we are discussing the member for Hinchinbrook's amendments 7, 8 and 10, not my amendment No. 9. He is concerned about arbitrarily determining that some projects should be exempt while others should not be, but that is exactly what the member for Hinchinbrook attempts to do with his amendments 7, 8 and 10. They define an exemption based on a period of time—1 January 2014 to 1 January 2015. Why is that anything but the kind of arbitrary, ad hoc, confusing arrangement that those opposite just railed against? I urge members to vote against the member for Hinchinbrook's amendments.

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

AYES, 42:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

Resolved in the negative.

Non-government amendments (Mr Cripps) negatived.

Dr MILES: I move the following amendments—

9 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 29, after line 22—

insert—

(5) However, section 112(1) and (3) does not apply to the application if—

(a) the chief executive is satisfied the impacts on underground water in relation to the mining tenure—

(i) were assessed in an EIS under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* or the *State Development and Public Works Organisation Act 1971*; and

(ii) were subject to consideration in a Land Court hearing in which objectors led expert evidence on the impacts on underground water, and the Land Court outcome on the mining activities application did not specify any impediments, relating to taking or interfering with underground water, to the granting of the mining activities application; and

(b) the Land Court outcome mentioned in paragraph (a)(ii) was given before 13 September 2016.

(6) In this section—

Land Court outcome, on an application, means—

(a) an objections decision of the Land Court under the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* for the application; or

(b) a recommendation on the application made by the Land Court under the Mineral Resources Act.

mining activities application means—

(a) the application for the mining tenure; or

(b) the application for an environmental authority in relation to the mining tenure.

10 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 29, line 29 and page 30, line 2, '1250D(3)'—

omit, insert—

1250D(4)

11 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 30, line 1, 'section 111'—

omit, insert—

section 112

12 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 30, line 23, 'aquifiers'—

omit, insert—

aquifers

13 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 30, after line 33—

insert—

(2) Before making a decision under subsection (1), the chief executive must consult with—

(a) the chief executive of the department in which chapter 3 is administered; and

(b) the chief executive of the department in which the *Environmental Protection Act 1994* is administered.

14 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 31, line 1, '(2)'—

omit, insert—

(3)

15 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 31, line 6, '(3)'—

omit, insert—

(4)

16 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 31, line 17, '(4)'—

omit, insert—

(5)

17 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 36, line 6, 'and;'—

omit, insert—

and

18 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 36, line 12, 'This section'—

omit, insert—

Subsection (2)

19 Clause 36 (Amendment of s 201 (Amendment of ch 9 (Transitional provisions and repeals)))

Page 37, line 21, after 'appeal'—

insert—

under this Act

Mr CRIPPS: So the deal has been done! There are members in this House who have done a deal with the government to pass the government's amendment to allow one project to go ahead with the Coordinator-General's report and underground water impacts having been assessed as part of that Coordinator-General's report. The report conditions have gone under the EA and they are on the ML and that project will be allowed to proceed without having to go back for a double jeopardy.

There are members of this House who have done a deal with the government that will prevent other projects from going forward, in particular and most publicly and concerningly, an advanced project—New Hope's Acland stage 3 project, which has actually been going through an assessment and approvals process for longer than Adani's Carmichael mine project. That project has a full Coordinator-General's report which has had its potential impacts on underground water assessed as part of that EIS process and it has had it ticked off under the federal government's EPBC Act and it is currently being scrutinised in the Land Court in terms of those conditions being attached to the EA and then on to the ML. This government is not prepared to give the Land Court process an opportunity to play out transparently in public and for those conditions to go on that EA and then go on that ML. It is a disgrace. It is a disgrace that there are members who purport to support regional jobs in Queensland in the resources sector who have obviously done a dirty deal with the government to allow one project to go forward and not another.

The minister's amendment No. 13 says that it will be a requirement for the chief executive making a decision about an application for an associated water licence to first consult the chief executive of the department administering chapter 3 of the Water Act 2000 and the chief executive of the department administering the Environmental Protection Act 1994. I warn those members who think they have been clever doing the deal that the requirement under amendment No. 13 moved by the minister is for the CEO of the Department of Natural Resources and Mines and the CEO of the Department of Environment and Heritage Protection, being the CEO administering the Environmental Protection Act, to approve that associated water licence. I think you might have put yourself in a very compromised position. It is a trap.

Dr MILES: First of all, the member for Hinchinbrook seems to be under the misapprehension, or perhaps just put his caucus under the misapprehension, that what they have proposed with their amendments is similar to what we have proposed with our amendments. What the member for Hinchinbrook has proposed is entirely removing the requirement to have a licence for projects that qualify for the arbitrary two dates that he picked out of his head, whereas we are saying that all of these projects need a water licence. The only difference is in the case of projects that have finalised their Land Court proceedings. They will not be publicly notifiable, but the director-general of NRM will consult the director-general of the environment department in that process. This is a much more robust and transparent application of a licence, while those opposite would have these projects not assessed at all.

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

AYES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Division: Question put—That clause 36, as amended, be agreed to.

AYES, 46:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 42:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Clause 36, as amended, agreed to.

Third Reading (Cognate Debate)

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.03 am): I move—

That the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Division: Question put—That the Water Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

AYES, 44:

ALP, 42—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 2—Gordon, Pyne.

NOES, 44:

LNP, 42—Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Cripps, Davis, Dickson, Elmes, Emerson, Frecklington, Hart, Janetzki, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stuckey, Walker, Watts, Weir.

KAP, 2—Katter, Knuth.

The numbers being equal, Mr Speaker cast his vote with the ayes.

Resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read a third time.

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.06 am): I move—

That the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Question put—That the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be now read a third time.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a third time.

Long Title (Cognate Debate)

Hon. AJ LYNHAM (Stafford—ALP) (Minister for State Development and Minister for Natural Resources and Mines) (2.07 am): I move—

That the long title of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Water Legislation Amendment Bill be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

Hon. SJ MILES (Mount Coot-tha—ALP) (Minister for Environment and Heritage Protection and Minister for National Parks and the Great Barrier Reef) (2.07 am): I move the following amendment—

20 Long title

Long title, '**the *Mineral Resources Act 1989*,**'—

omit.

Amendment agreed to.

Question put—That the long title of the Environmental Protection (Underground Water Management) and Other Legislation Amendment Bill, as amended, be agreed to.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. SJ HINCHLIFFE (Sandgate—ALP) (Leader of the House) (2.08 am): I move—

That the House do now adjourn.

Burnett Electorate, Buddy Bench Project

Mr BENNETT (Burnett—LNP) (2.08 am): This morning I rise to inform the House of a local buddy bench project that has commenced in the Burnett electorate, with buddy benches being delivered to schools throughout the region to encourage friendships in the playground to stamp out bullying. The buddy bench is as a tool to help schoolkids who are lonely and want to make friends. We all know that the schoolyard can be a tough place for kids, who sometimes forget to think about others. The buddy bench is a place for kids to sit, to send out visual signals to each other, and of course it is about prompting to extend a helping hand.

We hear more and more about the impacts of bullying every day, and as kids get older it seems to get worse. By addressing friendships and inclusion at an early age, we hope the buddy bench project will make our schoolyards a better place. What has been found is that it is students alone who are driving this initiative at our schools with the buddy bench and how to be kind and compassionate towards their classmates. Our motivation is to see long-term effects in terms of bullying, including students learning empathy and kindness towards other people, and of course sometimes we want to see kids break outside their small circle of friends to look to others.

I enlisted the help of the Bargara Men's Shed to manufacture a number of benches, and members will be on hand next week to help deliver six benches to our local schools. I want to thank the great team at the Bargara Men's Shed. When I first approached Mike Brady and the guys, they were very enthusiastic to participate and were particularly interested in a concept that would engage their members but more importantly contribute to an antibullying campaign.

This initiative of buddy benches is a simple concept renowned for helping to create inclusive playgrounds. Buddy benches will provide students with a safe, comforting place to go when they are feeling lonely or in need of a friend. It is great to see our local schools getting behind the campaign to boost friendships and morale in the playground. Our local schools are doing a wonderful job in promoting antibullying messages, and these buddy benches complement the schools' social learning and campaign against bullying.

Seventeen of our local schools have engaged with me on this issue, all supporting the concept and the desired outcomes. We look forward to delivering the buddy benches to six local schools next week. We have another dozen being made, to be supplied in the near future. Such a simple concept can do so much to boost confidence of a lonely child. I thank the local men's sheds for getting on board. Thanks to their help, 17 schools will benefit from the buddy bench program in the Burnett electorate. It is timely to acknowledge other members from this side of the House who have engaged with this best practice initiative and of course the member for Burleigh and his team who started this project. It was clearly a good project and I think other members of the House could consider the same.

Singapore Navy, Reception for RSS *Resolution*

Mr FURNER (Ferny Grove—ALP) (2.11 am): Last Saturday night I had the pleasure of representing the Premier of Queensland aboard the RSS *Resolution*, a Singapore Navy ship docked at Hamilton in Brisbane. The ship had been docked there for a couple of days after doing training activities with the Australian Navy in Exercise Trident. Upon boarding, I was met by the commanding officer, Senior Lieutenant Colonel Ching Kim Chuan, who was such a pleasant host. He greeted me, along with a few of the other dignitaries, and we chatted in respect of the training exercise they had been involved in and enjoyed the evening reception with them.

The Singaporeans being involved in training with Australian defence personnel has been made possible due to the comprehensive strategic partnership which was signed in June 2015. Furthermore, an MOU related to military training was entered into in October 2016. This will provide significant opportunities for Queensland, with up to 14,000 Singaporean military personnel involved in training for up to 18 weeks a year over the next 25 years. No doubt members can imagine that as a result of the number of defence personnel from Singapore the injection into the Queensland economy alone will be quite significant. Commanding Officer Chuan indicated that the purchasing of local produce for the reception on the evening was of significance as well.

Singapore shall invest up to $2.25 billion in the expansion of two military training facilities at Shoalwater Bay Training Area and the Townsville Field Training Area. I recall when I was up there in 2009 as part of the defence committee at the time on Exercise Talisman Sabre. I saw firsthand the economy being encouraged through the troops in Rockhampton at the time. We flew into the Rockhampton Airport and then flew out to the USS *Essex*. You could see the all-round benefit to the economy of having troops on the ground from these exercises.

The Department of State Development and Defence Industries Queensland, with the support of the Minister for State Development, Minister Lynham, have been working really hard to make sure Queensland businesses capitalise on defence business opportunities locally and internationally. It is encouraging to see the level of involvement of the Singaporeans—and no doubt all other international troops that come to Queensland to be involved in our bilateral training—in terms of not only their training methods and their ideas of how we train but also the economy of Queensland. It will mean more jobs as a result.

Currumbin Electorate, Community Consultation

Mrs STUCKEY (Currumbin—LNP) (2.14 am): The natives are getting restless in the seat of Currumbin. First they discovered that Palm Beach residents would be ignored, despite their requests for community consultation before any decisions were made regarding the proposed stage 3 route of the light rail along the Gold Coast Highway. The minister has made it clear that he will limit the scope of any consultation to directly affected landowners and key stakeholders. Poor Joe Citizen will not get a look-in! Failure to include the wider residential population in consultation is insulting.

It is not just the Gold Coast Highway that residents of the southern Gold Coast cannot have a say about. They are being completely left out of discussions to widen the M1 from Mudgeeraba to Tugun and the border. This minister thinks the Gold Coast stops at Varsity Lakes. Why did he not include us in the business case for the section from Mudgeeraba? We all know that it costs more in the long run to do separate planning. Millions have already been spent investigating a corridor for heavy rail. There has even been a tunnel built under the airport runway to accommodate it. Currently there are significant roadworks on the M1 at Palm Beach. TMR confirmed this project is guardrail extension work and safety maintenance due for completion in mid-December. Instead of wasting taxpayers' money on this project, the government should be widening the M1 at the same time.

We remember the desal plant—yet another example of no consultation from a Labor government. We are still paying through the nose for it. Interest payments alone for it and the failed western corridor are over $150 million a year. We could have widened the M1 to the border by now on the millions we could have saved if Labor had not spent so recklessly. Think about it: $150 million a year just on interest, not on the principal loan.

Now we are being kept in the dark over Commonwealth Games event routes for cycling and walking events. We are not being kept in the loop. While Goldoc and government officials snoop around our community, our organisations, our facilities and our schools, we are told nothing will be disclosed until around April next year. That is simply not good enough. How many races will be held in Currumbin? We know that the beach volleyball is coming to Coolangatta, but the route for cycling and walking races is a secret. Rumours abound that cycling will go along the beachfront then up into Currumbin Valley via Currumbin Creek Road. What of the time trials? Are the men's and women's held on separate days? How long will the hundreds of affected businesses need to be closed for—one, two, three, four or more days?

It is critical to engage the community and get it on side, not withhold information and ignore it in the consultation process. I call upon the minister to do so before arrangements are set in stone. When the games bid for 2018 was secured the deal was that the road cycling race would go up through Currumbin Valley, and at that time I had concerns about the poor condition of the road and works that would need to be done. There was no talk about the race going through light industrial sections, impacting on hundreds of small businesses. Once again I call on the minister to disclose to residents.

Lytton Electorate

Ms PEASE (Lytton—ALP) (2.17 am): I am not going to talk about conspiracy theories tonight; I have actually turned my porch light off. I want to talk about the bayside and what a fabulous, vibrant community we have. It is full of events and festivals and innovative industries. The inaugural Wynnum Manly Wynnum Seafood Festival, which drew crowds of well in excess of the expected 5,000, was a

huge success. I congratulate and thank Nick and Caroline from Niclin Group, local developers who grew up in the area, who saw an opportunity to showcase their beloved Wynnum. There was plenty of fresh seafood and local art and craft, and Wynnum Family Day Care entertained younger visitors with an aquarium.

On the same morning, Bayside Women in Business hosted its second Bayside Business Expo, with over 30 small businesses showcasing their businesses. Manly Harbour Village Chamber hosted the annual Halloween festival. This event has been delighting baysiders and visitors for over 20 years with in excess of 15,000 in attendance, many of whom dressed for the occasion. It was a great opportunity to showcase the Brisbane version of the Monopoly board game, with Manly Harbour Village having its very own square on the board.

On another note, CB Aerospace Pty Ltd is a consulting and research and development business based in Hemmant that provides sensing and automation solutions serving a number of industry sectors including aerospace, mining, agriculture, academia and motorsports—in other words, unmanned aerial vehicles, or drones and drone solutions. This inspirational group of enthusiastic young scientists and engineers are busy working on the future. They observed that platoon-level aerial fire support currently does not exist because the hardware required is too heavy for a man-packable system and multirotors have a limited range and endurance, whilst fixed-wing UAVs are difficult to manage on take-off and landing. Their solution was to develop two hybrid tilt-rotor drones.

They were recently successful in an Advance Queensland Knowledge Transfer Partnerships grant of $38,000 to develop the Chimera project. This grant is being used for prototype testing of proprietary software and hardware, utilising wind tunnel facilities to further develop engineering advances in Chimera, which is a unique multirotor design that bridges the gap between manoeuvrability and endurance. Chimera is uniquely placed to service a range of Queensland, national and international markets. It takes the base drone platform and adds an aerodynamics package.

This impressive next generation of drone technology for commercial and military applications is an example of innovative start-ups happening all across Queensland with the assistance and support of the Palaszczuk government's Advance Queensland strategy.

Kenmore Meals on Wheels; Moggill Electorate, Events; India Day Fair; Toowoomba, Recycling Initiatives

Dr ROWAN (Moggill—LNP) (2.20 am): I rise tonight to acknowledge the Kenmore Meals on Wheels organisation, which has been servicing the residents of Kenmore and surrounding suburbs for over 30 years. Kenmore Meals on Wheels services a large area including the suburbs of Anstead, Bellbowrie, Brookfield, Chapel Hill, Fig Tree Pocket, Karana Downs, Kenmore, Kenmore Hills, Lake Manchester and many other suburbs in my electorate.

Meals on Wheels generally is embedded within the fabric of our psyche and also our communities. Social connections are formed and health outcomes are improved by this iconic service. Not only do Meals on Wheels volunteers provide quality meals to their clients; they also, and just as importantly, provide regular social contact, which is of great benefit and support to family and friends who are unable to visit their loved ones on a regular basis. The delivery volunteers also monitor their clients for any changes in their health and then they are able to offer sensitive intervention if and as required.

I pay tribute to Heather Heyen, who has been the coordinator of the Kenmore Meals on Wheels organisation for the past four years. Heather and her band of 200 volunteers look after some 75 clients day after day, week after week and often year after year. Their generosity and goodwill make a positive contribution to my local community and many people's lives. Such wonderful volunteers, by providing home delivered, nutritious meals to local residents, enable many to remain independent and living in the homes that they cherish and love.

Meals on Wheels bridges all social, economic and cultural divides. Client ages range from younger people with a psychological or physical disability to those older members of our community who are determined to stay independent for as long as possible. For anyone with spare time on their hands, Meals on Wheels is a very worthwhile organisation. The organisation is always on the lookout for volunteers who may be able to assist with invoicing, providing handyman assistance or helping with general administration. If anyone has spare time once a week, once a fortnight or even once a month, I know that Heather and her management committee would be delighted to hear from them. I congratulate the volunteers of Kenmore Meals on Wheels on their outstanding and ongoing service within the electorate of Moggill.

In the time remaining to me, I acknowledge the organising committee of this year's Brookfield Long Lunch. It was a great day for all of those attended. I also enjoyed the recent India Day Fair, held at the Roma Street Parkland. Recently, the Kenmore Scouts Group celebrated its 50-year anniversary. I congratulate group leader, Dr Annie Ross, volunteers, parents and many others for their contribution to the social, emotional and educational development of young people in my local area over many years.

Finally, the Rotary Club of Karana Downs held a very informative community health forum at Karana Downs. I say well done to president Harrison Evans as well as David and Mary Kearney and many others for educating and reducing the stigma of mental illness and building community resilience, particularly in the areas of Karana Downs and Mount Crosby.

Finally, recently I also visited Toowoomba. I thank the members for Toowoomba North, Toowoomba South and Condamine for accompanying me on that visit.

Mr Watts: Great members.

Dr ROWAN: They are great members. We got to see some local businesses that are involved in recycling and also undertook a number of meetings with local environmental organisations. I thank those members for their time and their advocacy for the people of Toowoomba and also for the Darling Downs region.

Mining Industry, Labour Hire Companies

Mr PEARCE (Mirani—ALP) (2.23 am): As we sit at this hour of the morning, up to 90 full-time employees at the German Creek mine south of Middlemount in Central Queensland are to be told later today that they are to be made redundant. As they are being told that they no longer have a job, labour hire company One Key is driving casual workers through the gate to replace those who have been dumped—dumped because Anglo American can do just that. They can simply make highly skilled, loyal employees redundant—out of work, with no secure income. Unemployed men and women will now be forced to relocate, in most cases taking their families with them. They take their children out of their educational environment. A significant withdrawal of cash flow will mean the end of small business in the area, as they will be tipped over to the point of being nonviable.

Tonight I apologise to those workers and their families and small business operators whose lives have been turned upside down because of the selfish, uncaring behaviour of Anglo. I also apologise for the lack of interest coming from my government in allowing Anglo American to do what it is doing and not challenging the way in which such mining companies are behaving in Central Queensland. It is about time someone had the guts to take on these companies and pull them into line. We are in government. We own the resources in the ground. We have a right to make sure that our people—workers—are looked after and given the opportunities that they deserve.

To be fair and reasonable, the state is limited in what it can do to assist workers, families and communities impacted. I can also point the finger at federal members representing Central Queensland—the member for Capricornia, Michelle Landry; the member for Dawson, George Christensen; and the member for Flynn, Ken O'Dowd. Why? Because coal workers work under a federal award and those federal members have the ability to take on their cabinet and talk to them about what is happening. To the best of my knowledge, they have done nothing. Our federal members simply lack the courage to take on the system, take on federal cabinet and fight to stop the slack policies of their government—policies that are destroying people. Those policies cater to the right of resource companies to destroy the values of working families who choose to live and work in regional Queensland.

Cleveland District State High School

Dr ROBINSON (Cleveland—LNP) (2.26 am): I rise to speak in support of the e-petition of the Cleveland District State High School that calls on the government to provide the school with a hall. Under the LNP government, much was achieved in education in Cleveland, including the construction of a year 7 building at Cleveland District State High School, a hall at Bay View State School, education options for the Quandamooka high school students of North Stradbroke Island, e-tablets for children at Redlands District Special School, the IPS initiative and much more.

The construction of the year 7 building at Cleveland District High School by the LNP government, at a cost of $8.3 million, was a substantial investment in education infrastructure in our region. The construction of a multipurpose hall at Bay View State School, at a cost of $2.8 million, was another substantial infrastructure investment. The P&C at Cleveland District State High School observed the construction of the hall at Bay View State School and, although glad for that school, pondered why Cleveland District State High School does not have a similar hall as it is a school of almost 2,000 students and one of the few schools that does not have a hall.

With the LNP government's achievements in education, the Cleveland District State High School hall is now the highest priority education infrastructure in Cleveland. For some unexplained reason, the current government has refused to recognise this priority. The school P&C has started an e-petition and a campaign to call on the government to act. When last I checked, there were 1,764 signatories to the e-petition.

The school P&C is seeking answers from this minister. Firstly, the P&C points out that recently the education minister told the *Redland City Bulletin* that EQ officers were working with the school to prepare a business case for the hall but, despite repeated requests to meet earlier from when the minister wrote to the P&C president, it took six months for EQ officers to meet with school personnel. Subsequently, it took another six months for these same officers to prepare a draft strategic assessment. A month ago the school returned the edited assessment to officers from the facilities section. Again, despite repeated requests and phone calls, there has not been any response from the EQ officers. The school P&C wants to know if the minister finds this reasonable and when the school might expect a response and progress on this matter.

Secondly, the P&C want the minister to explain why Cleveland District State High School—a very large school—has been put through an onerous and undefined 18-month process to prepare a business case for the hall, and with little support from EQ officers, while other smaller schools have been provided with multimillion dollar halls without going through such an arduous process. Clearly, it is time for the minister to do the right thing by the school community and the families of students of Cleveland District State High School and support the construction of a hall.

HMCS *Vancouver*; Remembrance Day

Mr MINNIKIN (Chatsworth—LNP) (2.29 am): Last Friday night I attended a cocktail reception representing the Leader of the Opposition aboard the HMCS *Vancouver*. The reception was hosted by the High Commissioner of Canada, His Excellency Mr Paul Maddison, as well as the Commander of the Maritime Forces Pacific, Rear Admiral Art McDonald. They both spoke very eloquently to the assembly on board the HMCS *Vancouver*.

During the couple of hours that I was at this cocktail reception, as part of me doing my bit in trying to promote collegiate relations with the Canadians on board I met Leading Seaman Kevin Roth, a naval electronic sensor operator, Leading Seaman Zach Lye, the cook to whom everyone showed the utmost respect, and Ordinary Seaman Susannah Weber, an electrical technician, all from the *Vancouver*. These three young people were supreme ambassadors for not only the Navy but also Canada itself. They spoke very highly of the different ports they have travelled to on this particular tour of duty—ports such as Darwin, Guam and Singapore. However they said that, of all the ports they have visited so far, the welcome they received from the people of Brisbane was without doubt the best. I thank those three sailors for the hospitality they showed me. It was a wonderful function.

In keeping with things military, the next day I had the honour of attending a centenary of the laying of the foundation stone at Mowbray Park at East Brisbane. There was a range of speakers there. We were also graced with the presence of His Excellency the Governor, who also spoke very well. It reminded me again, as we lead into the centenary of the laying of that foundation stone, how much we continue to owe the men and women who made the ultimate sacrifice in World War II.

It leads me, with a great deal of solemnity, to praise past fallen men and women. This year marks the centenary of two significant battles in Anzac history—the battles of Fromelles and Pozieres. Anyone here who has a passing interest in military history, as I do, will know the significance of both of these battles that were too horrific for words. I have read many, many books on both battles. Some other members in this place may have done the same thing as well.

This coming Friday will be one of the most solemn days in the Australian calendar, the 11th of the 11th, Remembrance Day. One hundred years ago, in 1916, the world witnessed two of the most decisive battles of World War I: Verdun and Somme. May we always use the words 'lest we forget'.

Guinness World Records, Centenarians

Mr WILLIAMS (Pumicestone—ALP) (2.32 am): I hear there has been a big party in New York, but I want to talk about a party I went to last Friday. It was not a normal party but a celebration attended by beautiful, graceful women and the most dapper of gentlemen. I was right here in Parliament House with Premier Annastacia Palaszczuk and Minister Coralee O'Rourke. The wonderful people I am referring to are 45 of our centenarians.

I want to talk about one of those centenarians, Mrs Dorothy Tipper from Bribie Island. I visited her home and celebrated her 105th birthday with her and her family on 13 May this year. I received a phone call about a month ago and Dorothy asked whether I was going to guarantee that I would be at the celebration, and I agreed. Dorothy, who is as tough as nails, had a fall and hurt herself two days before the celebration. The ambulance came but she did not go to hospital, as suggested by the paramedics, because she was not going to run the risk of missing the party here at Parliament House.

This party was not like any other party. It was a chance to be part of Queensland centenarians becoming the holders of the Guinness world record for having the most people over 100 in one place at one time. The previous record of 31 centenarians in one room for about 12 minutes was held by the Regency Nursing Home in Somerset, New Jersey in the USA. The Public Trustee officers were in Parliament House as timekeepers. I am happy to say that we blitzed it: 45 centenarians in one room for 21 minutes. That record will stand for decades. This is a wonderful achievement by these centenarians, brought about by the Palaszczuk Labor government for Queensland. Only a Premier who really thinks and cares about Queenslanders would initiate a wonderful, serendipitous milestone like this. What a great day and congratulations to all involved!

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, this weekend at the Mount Perry races in my electorate—

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Hang on, you do not have the call.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, earlier this evening the Deputy Speaker ruled that the first person on their feet ready to speak had the call. I was clearly the first person on my feet.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! Member for Callide, there is an understanding that there is a speaking list and I have been very—

Mr WATTS: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: Order! One moment. Before I call the member for Toowoomba North, there is an understanding—and I have been very gentle with all members since I have been Speaker where I have allowed members to take their time for the three minutes—that there is a list. Member for Callide, you are not on the list. There are members from your side on the list and members from the government on the list. I think it is bad form that you are now proposing, without consultation with me, to change what has been the understanding of the way our parliament has operated.

I would suggest that you raise this matter at the next meeting of the Committee of the Legislative Assembly. I know what you are saying. There is a list organised and the arrangement has been that members on the list are the ones who get the call. There has been no notification to me that any of the members on the list are not intending to speak and, unfortunately, I propose to not receive your call. I will call the person who is on the list, the member for Ipswich.

Ms HOWARD: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr SEENEY: Mr Speaker, I rise to a point of order. Earlier this evening there was also a list and the Deputy Speaker's ruling caused a number of members including me to miss the chance to speak to the bill. I therefore move under standing order 247(4)—

That the member for Ipswich be not further heard.

Division: Question put—That the member for Ipswich be not further heard.

AYES, 32:

LNP, 32—Barton, Bates, Bleijie, Boothman, Costigan, Cramp, Cripps, Dickson, Elmes, Hart, Janetzki, Langbroek, Last, Leahy, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Millar, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, Perrett, Powell, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Seeney, Simpson, Sorensen, Springborg, Watts, Weir.

NOES, 42:

ALP, 41—Bailey, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Crawford, D'Ath, de Brenni, Dick, Donaldson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Furner, Gilbert, Grace, Harper, Hinchliffe, Howard, Jones, Kelly, King, Lauga, Linard, Madden, Miles, Miller, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Pitt, Power, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Stewart, Trad, Whiting, Williams.

INDEPENDENT, 1—Gordon.

Resolved in the negative.

Mr SPEAKER: Before members leave can I indicate that I have been operating on a practice during the adjournment debate that I work on the names of the people who are provided by the government whip and the opposition whip. I allow members discretion. I do not strictly enforce the three-minute rule depending on the matter that the members are talking about. If it is the case that a member does not appear then the arrangement that we have been working on is that someone else takes that position. That is the way I intend to continue to operate unless the Committee of the Legislative Assembly wants to send a further direction.

Mr SEENEY: I rise to a point of order. My only concern is that there is consistency. The Deputy Speaker made a ruling this afternoon that prevented half a dozen members from speaking on a bill, a bill that was particularly important to some of those members, as we saw with the member from Toowoomba North. So long as there is consistency I am happy to work within your rulings.

Mr HINCHLIFFE: I rise to a point of order. I want to acknowledge and note that the Leader of Opposition Business has drawn attention to what would seem like an inconsistency in his eyes. Mr Speaker, in your remarks in relation to the adjournment debate and the practices that you have adopted, both before the vote that we just had to endure—in so many senses—and also again in your ruling just now, you made the point that you have regarded that there is a distinction between the way in which the adjournment debate has been conducted and the way in which other debates have been conducted. The convention has always been about people being recognised on the jump and the call in relation to debates, and we have seen that ruled upon on a number of occasions by not only yourself but also Deputy Speakers. I would suggest to you that the Leader of Opposition Business is trying to test you by fallaciously suggesting there is some sort of inconsistency.

Mr WATTS: I rise to a point of order. I was on my feet with a point of order prior and you sat me down and then we had the division. I would just like to further that point of order if I may, please.

Mr SPEAKER: What is your point of order, member for Toowoomba North?

Mr WATTS: I would like to table the speaking list from the debate earlier, very similar to the speaking list you have in relation to the adjournment debate, and I would like to suggest that we need some consistency so that I as a whip have clear guidance as to whether we are following the list or I need all my members to jump on every occasion. If not, I cannot give clear guidance and it will make it very difficult to run a debate.

Tabled paper: Document, undated, titled 'Water (Cognate) Wed 9 Nov' [2041].

Mr SPEAKER: Members, there have been very clear distinctions between what happens during the adjournment debate in relation to members going over time and what happens during the debate on ordinary bills—very clear distinctions. Tomorrow I will look at the *Hansard* and make further comments. I call the member for Ipswich.

First Start Initiative

Ms HOWARD (Ipswich—ALP) (2.50 am): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you for dressing for the occasion. I rise to speak on the First Start Initiative.

Mr BAILEY: I rise to a point of order.

Mr SPEAKER: One moment, member for Ipswich.

Mr BAILEY: I raise a point of clarification. I notice that the member for Hervey Bay appears to be not wearing a shirt. Is that appropriate under the standing orders? I seek your clarification about standards.

Mr SPEAKER: No, it is okay. For the benefit of new members, in divisions when the bells are ringing you get here as quickly as you can.

Ms HOWARD: Tonight I rise to speak on the First Start initiative and the role it is playing in my electorate of Ipswich. The Palaszczuk government is committed to training and skilling Queenslanders right across the state and, in particular, in regional Queensland. We have seen this in the Skilling Queenslanders for Work initiative, which provides training to people who are underutilised or underemployed in the labour market as well as builds the skills of young people, Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people, people with disability, mature-age jobseekers, women re-entering the workforce and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. Skilling Queenslanders for Work represents a significant investment of $240 million over four years to support up to 32,000 Queenslanders. Earlier today we heard from the minister that so far 11,137 people have been assisted back into the workforce.

An important part of the Skilling Queenslanders for Work program is the First Start initiative. The program provides funding of up to $12,500 per trainee to local councils to employ additional trainees. It offers opportunities for young people and disadvantaged jobseekers to gain nationally recognised qualifications and 12 months of stable employment while undertaking a traineeship. A large number of those trainees go on to complete their traineeships and apprenticeships.

I am pleased to say that in the 2015-16 period the Ipswich City Council had seven trainees in the First Start program. The success of the program and the demand for places have seen the 2016-17 allocation increase to 23 places. Across Queensland, the Palaszczuk government has increased the total number of trainee allocations from 250 last year to 300 this year. I believe that the increased allocation is not only good for the trainees who participate in the program but also good for the council and our communities in general.

I cannot overstate the importance of the First Start program in my electorate. The program encourages local jobseekers, particularly young people, to remain in the local community. It allows them to be engaged in the activities of the council and provides councils with a valuable source of labour for council activities in the delivery of important community services. I commend the Palaszczuk government, in particular the Attorney-General and Minister for Justice and Minister for Training and Skills, Hon. Yvette D'Ath, for its continued commitment to training and skilling Queenslanders right across the state.

Question put—That the House do now adjourn.

Motion agreed to.

The House adjourned at 2.53 am (Thursday).

ATTENDANCE

Bailey, Barton, Bates, Bennett, Bleijie, Boothman, Boyd, Brown, Butcher, Byrne, Costigan, Cramp, Crandon, Crawford, Cripps, D'Ath, Davis, de Brenni, Dick, Dickson, Donaldson, Elmes, Emerson, Enoch, Farmer, Fentiman, Frecklington, Furner, Gilbert, Gordon, Grace, Harper, Hart, Hinchliffe, Howard, Janetzki, Jones, Katter, Kelly, King, Knuth, Krause, Langbroek, Last, Lauga, Leahy, Linard, Lynham, Madden, Mander, McArdle, McEachan, Miles, Millar, Miller, Minnikin, Molhoek, Nicholls, O'Rourke, Palaszczuk, Pearce, Pease, Pegg, Perrett, Pitt, Powell, Power, Pyne, Rickuss, Robinson, Rowan, Russo, Ryan, Saunders, Seeney, Simpson, Smith, Sorensen, Springborg, Stevens, Stewart, Stuckey, Trad, Walker, Watts, Weir, Wellington, Whiting, Williams